

## Skegness Neighbourhood Development Plan – Stage 2 Report

### Appendix 2

#### Evidence Review of East Lindsey Local Plan Evidence Base

Evidence	Author	Date published	Summary of Findings
<b>East Lindsey District Council Retail and Economic Assessment</b>	NLP	March 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With regard to the national hierarchy/shopping index, Javelin’s Venuescore ranks the top 3500+ retail centres. Venuescore measures the presence of multi-national retailers in a centre. It doesn’t consider independent retailers or the quality of the retail offer.</li> <li>• In 2013/14 Javelin’s Venuescore ranked Skegness at 320. This compares with Louth at 450.</li> <li>• Both Skegness and Louth rank much lower than Lincoln and Grimsby at 77 and 143 respectively.</li> <li>• The NLP report only considers the potential for new convenience floorspace in Louth, Horncastle and Alford and the need for new retail development in the three towns up to 2018, 2023 and 2028. It does not include Skegness.</li> </ul>
<b>East Lindsey District Council Retail and Leisure Study</b>	Chase and Partners	January 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Study looked at 8 postcode areas (zones 1 to 8): Zone 1 - PE25 (Skegness); Zone 2 - PE24 (Skegness and rural area); Zone 3 - PE22 (Rural area north of Boston); Zone 4 – PE23 (Spilsby and surrounding area); Zone 5 – LN9 (Horncastle and surrounding area); Zone 6 - LN8 (Alford and surrounding area); Zone 7- LN11 (Louth and surrounding area); Zone 8 – LN12 (Mablethorpe).</li> <li>• Skegness and Mablethorpe experienced over 1 million domestic tourism visits in 2003 (Lincolnshire Tourism Model, Geoff Broom Associates (Appendix A).</li> <li>• Household Survey (1,000 households) indicates:                         <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Skegness does not provide an extensive comparison goods (retail) offer;</li> </ol> </li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. Limited bulky goods offer which draws people to other areas, Grimsby and Lincoln in particular.</li> <li>iii. Skegness has a range of town centre uses and is first and foremost a leisure and tourism destination.</li> <li>iv. Traffic congestion was considered to be an important issue facing Skegness (cited by 19% of households).</li> <li>v. Increasing the provision of car parking was also considered a priority (cited by 15% of households).</li> <li>vi. For convenience goods, the Household survey indicated that Morrisons and Tesco stores were dominant in 2007 accounting for 86% of convenience trade in zone 1 of the study and 78% of trade in zone 2.</li> <li>vii. Skegness is the dominant shopping destination for comparison goods attracting trips from zones 1 and 2, and a significant number from zones 4, 6 and 8. Skegness attracts fewer trips from areas with larger centres such as Boston. Results indicate that Households from Mablethorpe are more inclined to shop in Grimsby than Skegness.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant edge of centre convenience retailing.</li> <li>• One out-of-centre retail park.</li> <li>• Skegness has considerable potential for growth with relatively few physical constraints on the town centre.</li> <li>• 63 multiple national retailers (35% of units).</li> <li>• Significant number of long standing independent retailers.</li> <li>• Town Focus database (UK retail hierarchy) ranked Skegness at 346 out of 1,500 shopping centres.</li> <li>• Demand for retail floorspace from 26 multi-national retailers in October 2007.</li> <li>• Emphasis on value end of the retail market, examples given are Aldi, Farmfoods, British Heart Foundation, Netto, Poundland and Peacocks.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Shopping rents were circa £60 per square foot in zone A. This compares with Boston at £85, Grimsby at £135 and Lincoln at £140.</li><li>• Shopping rents continued to rise in the 5 years prior to the study.</li><li>• Very low levels of vacant units in the town centre recorded.</li><li>• Skegness' shopping centre yield fell from 7.5 in 2001 to 6.5 in July 2007. Indicating a general improvement in the area. A higher yield is an indication of concern by investors that rental income might grow less rapidly.</li><li>• In comparison, Lincoln's shopping yield increased slightly over the same period from 5 in 2001 to 5.25 in 2007.</li><li>• Boston and Grimsby's shopping centre yields also reduced in line with Skegness. In Boston from 7 to 6.5 and in Grimsby from 6.5 to 6.25.</li><li>• Skegness is remote from other towns and cities but has good rail links, with the railway station close to the town centre. However, links from the railway station to the town centre are poor.</li><li>• Crime was cited as the fifth most important issue by households in Skegness, suggesting there is no negative perception of crime in the town.</li><li>• The importance of Skegness as a tourist destination was also cited by households.</li><li>• The study reviewed zone A rents, shopping centre yields, and retailer demand of 12 other coastal resorts (Bangor, Blackpool, Bognor Regis, Eastbourne, Great Yarmouth, Llandudno, Lowestoft, Margate, Newquay, Rhyl, Weston Super Mare and Weymouth).</li><li>• An analysis of Skegness in comparison with the other coastal resorts indicates that zone A rents are quite low at £60 per square foot (psf). In 2007, the lowest was</li></ul>
--	--	--	---

			<p>Margate at £45 psf and the highest was Blackpool at £125 psf.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Over the period 2001 to 2007 yields improved in 9 of the coastal resorts (including Skegness). Yields remained unchanged in 2 coastal resorts (Bognor Regis and Eastbourne) and worsened in 2 coastal resorts (Great Yarmouth and Weston-Super-Mare).</li> <li>The study indicates that, at that time, Skegness was viewed by investors as less of a risk.</li> <li>Retail health is difficult to analyse in Skegness due to seasonal variations. The study concludes that, judging by analysis at peak season and low season, Skegness was considered to be a healthy, viable town centre in 2007.</li> </ul> <p><b>Quantitative Assessment:</b>  <u>Convenience Goods Expenditure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For convenience shopping, Skegness is largely self-contained attracting few visits from surrounding towns.</li> <li>Convenience goods expenditure per capita is expected to increase to £1,678.75 by 2022 and by £1,760.80 by 2026 according to the results of the study (Source: Mapinfo utilising TargetPro report data).</li> <li>Convenience goods total expenditure is forecast to increase from £38.59 million to £43.13 million by 2022 and £47.06 million by 2026 (Growth in expenditure from 2007 to 2022: £12.51m and for 2007 to 2026: £16.44m).</li> <li>Very little of the expenditure on convenience goods is expected to be spent in the town centre due to the draw of stores on the edge of the centre.</li> <li>However, this expenditure relies entirely on household expenditure and does not account for tourism expenditure. As previously mentioned, there were over 1.4 million tourism trips to the coastal areas in 2003. The Lincolnshire Tourism Model (Geoff Broom Associates) estimated that total visitor spend in coastal areas of East</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---

			<p>Lindsey was over £301m, with retail attracting £68.3m. It is assumed that 50% of this is spent in Skegness given the offer available elsewhere in the coastal area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Growth in tourist spending on convenience goods is forecast to be as follows: 2007 to 2022 £2.6m; 2007 to 2026 £3.38m</li> </ul> <p><u>Comparison Goods Expenditure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expenditure per capita is forecast to increase as follows: by 2022 Zone 1 £5,094.83; Zone 2 £4,993.05; Zones 4, 6 &amp; 8 £5,220.40; and by 2026 as follows: Zone 1 £6,169.24, Zone 2 £6,045.99, Zones 4, 6 &amp; 8 £6,321.29.</li> <li>• Comparison goods total expenditure is forecast to increase to £392.74m by 2022, and to £495.84m by 2026.</li> <li>• In 2007, the town centre's market share was 33% of comparison expenditure.</li> <li>• However, this expenditure relies entirely on household expenditure and does not account for tourism expenditure. As previously mentioned, there were over 1.4 million tourism trips to the coastal areas in 2003. The Lincolnshire Tourism Model (Geoff Broom Associates) estimated that total visitor spend in coastal areas of East Lindsey was over £301m, with retail attracting £68.3m. It is assumed that 50% of this is spent in Skegness given the offer available elsewhere in the coastal area.</li> <li>• Growth in tourist spending on comparison goods is forecast to be as follows: 2007 to 2022 - £26.85m; 2007 to 2026 - £38.07m.</li> <li>• Tourism accounts for a considerable level of expenditure and should be taken into consideration in policy making.</li> <li>• However, tourists are unlikely to buy larger, bulky goods such as furniture and electrical appliances. Tourist shopping patterns are expected to relate to recreational goods, clothing and footwear.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---

			<p><b>Requirement for Retail Floorspace</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The 2008 study concludes that there is considerable scope for further comparison goods floorspace in Skegness, particularly in clothing and recreational goods. With regard to convenience goods floorspace, the study suggests there is no scope for new food stores but there may be some scope for extensions to existing stores.</li></ul> <p><b>Requirement for Leisure Floorspace</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Assessing need for leisure is more subjective than for retail. Leisure includes a wide range of uses including pubs, cinemas and golf courses. The study focusses on commercial leisure.</li><li>• The study is qualitative rather than quantitative, it doesn't seek to identify the area of floorspace required.</li><li>• The study finds there is a lack of a single commercial leisure destination, such as a multiplex cinema with bars and restaurants on site.</li><li>• Most of the leisure provision is fragmented along Grand Parade, South Parade and the eastern end of Lumley Road. The study indicates this the lack of a cohesive leisure destination is likely to be the reason why quality multiple operators don't want to locate in Skegness.</li><li>• Suggestion that the presence of low quality leisure uses harms the profile of Skegness. The study finds that there is a qualitative need for further leisure uses within Skegness. This can only be achieved by delivering a critical mass of development.</li><li>• Several major cinema operators were canvassed about locating in Skegness. It was confirmed that they were not looking to locate in Skegness due to its size, potential catchment and current perception of the town.</li><li>• Competition from Grimsby and Lincoln reduces Skegness' catchment population to a level too low to support such an operation at a viable level.</li></ul>
--	--	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reel cinemas and Apollo confirmed they would consider a smaller complex of up to 6 screens provided it was part of larger leisure development. However, both raised viability concerns.</li> <li>• Other uses, such as a casino, could add to the attraction, particularly in the winter months.</li> </ul> <p><b>Potential Policy Options</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Gyrotory site at the western end of Lumley Road is worth of consideration for allocation/redevelopment. It is a key gateway site, connecting the retail area at Lumley Road to the train station. The site was occupied in 2007 by Iceland, Lumley Hotel, a car showroom and a postal sorting office. Opportunity for Council to consider potential uses for the site in the emerging Local Plan. Suggest production of a design brief.</li> <li>• Also worthy of consideration is Hildreds Shopping Centre. Suggest consideration of extending the Shopping Centre and reconfiguring the units. However, this may not be viable.</li> <li>• Southern Foreshore – a natural extension to the town centre with potential to add to the town’s retail and leisure offer. The site offers the greatest potential for significant enhancement of Skegness’ retail and leisure offer. A design brief linked to the Local Plan would be advantageous, helping to secure the right type of development.</li> <li>• Improve pedestrian links from the town centre to the out of centre main food stores.</li> <li>• Direct convenience food stores to town centre locations (primary shopping area).</li> <li>• Include policies to promote year round activities, in particular leisure uses.</li> <li>• Define the Primary Shopping Area and town centre boundary.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--

<p><b>East Lindsey Strategic Flood Risk Assessment</b></p>	<p>East Lindsey District Council (ELDC)</p>	<p>March 2017</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Planning Policy Framework requires local planning authorities to apply a sequential, risk based approach to the location of development to avoid flood risk to people and property. Where, following a sequential test, there are no sites available, an exceptions test should be undertaken. The two parts of the test require proposed development to demonstrate that it will provide wider sustainability benefits.</li> <li>• Prepared in consultation with Environment Agency (EA) and Lincolnshire County Council (LCC).</li> <li>• Draws on findings from other studies including EA Flood Maps, EA Hazard Mapping (2009); East Lindsey SFRA 2006, Louth Coastal Catchment Flood Management Plan (2009), River Witham Catchment Flood Management Plan (2009), Flamborough Head to Gibraltar Point Shoreline Management Plan 2009, Humber Flood Risk Management Strategy 2008, Wasj Shoreline Management Plan, Joint Lincolnshire Flood Risk and Drainage Management Strategy, Anglian River Basin District Flood Management Plan 2015-2021, Humber River Basin District Flood Management Plan 2015-2021.</li> <li>• EA's Flood Hazard Mapping provides data for 2006 to 2115 flood event scenarios and has been used to establish the boundary of the Coastal Zone in the Local Plan.</li> <li>• The Local Plan uses 2115 flood event scenario (data taken from the EA's Flood Hazard Mapping) to underpin the planning policies and decision making for development management.</li> <li>• ELDC and the EA have agreed an approach for applying the sequential and exceptions tests for dealing with planning applications in the hazard zones.</li> </ul>
--	---	-------------------	--



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hazard Maps categorise risk over 4 zones: Danger to all (Red), Danger to most (Orange), Danger to some (Yellow), and low risk (Green).</li> <li>• Skegness is located in the Coastal Zone which is in the 3 most vulnerable zones (red, orange, and yellow). It is at significant risk from tidal flooding.</li> <li>• The impact of climate change is not expected to increase in the short term. Consequently, temporary planning consents may be granted for holiday caravans in some areas (Core Strategy Policy SP19). This would be applicable to areas to the north of Skegness.</li> <li>• Skegness is covered by the Flamborough Head to Gibraltar Point Shoreline Management Plan.</li> <li>• Management measures are focussed on maintaining current levels of defence. In areas of accretion, currently there is no direct intervention. This applies to the area south of Skegness.</li> <li>• Requirement for new development proposals to assess risk of surface water run-off from schemes. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems required to be incorporated where necessary.</li> <li>• Reference to report of flooding in Skegness in 2007.</li> </ul>
<b>Humber Estuary to Gibraltar Point Shoreline Management Plan (SMP)</b>	Scott Wilson	December 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Skegness is covered by the Lincolnshire coast (Donna Nook to Gibraltar Point) section of the SMP.</li> <li>• Wide sandy beaches, decreasing in width below Mablethorpe.</li> <li>• The beaches are steepening due to sediment build up at the top and less towards the bottom. If this continues, the area of beach exposed between high and low tide will reduce.</li> </ul> <p>Four policy recommendations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hold the line - hold the current line of flood/erosion defence (HTL)</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advance the line - Advance the current flood/erosion defence seawards (ATL)</li> <li>• No Active intervention - allows natural processes to take place. If present, existing flood/erosion defences would not be maintained (NOI)</li> <li>• Managed realignment - moving the flood/erosion defence landwards (MR)</li> </ul> <p><b><u>J5 Baseline Environmental Character</u></b>  <b><u>Area 18a Chapel Point to Skegness and Area</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mainly urbanised coastal hinterland with a virtually continuous belt of settlement along the frontage. Smaller sub-urban settlements of Winthorpe and Seathorne are located between the main towns of Skegness and Ingoldmells, mainly comprising of housing.</li> <li>• Inland from coastal strip is agricultural land (mainly grade 3), both arable and pastoral.</li> <li>• A number of villages and hamlets are interspersed throughout the farmland of the floodplain.</li> <li>• Tourism forms main economic driver for the area. An abundance of caravan parks occupy the coastal areas, the majority in Ingoldmells.</li> <li>• The beaches play an integral role in supporting the tourist industry. They are EC designated bathing beaches used for recreation and angling.</li> <li>• The area is rich in heritage assets, including Grade I Listed buildings: Dobson’s Mill in Burgh Le Marsh; the Church of St Mary at Winthorpe. Scheduled Ancient Monuments at Butler Bump round barrow cemetery between Cumberworth and Willoughby, Manor Farm moated site in Orby, a Motte castle at Castle Hill 250 metres east of Manby Hall Farm, and Bratofft Hall moated site.</li> </ul> <p>Area 18b: Skegness:</p>
--	--	--	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Predominantly urban frontage seaside resort (fifth largest (by visitor number) in the UK.</li> <li>• Skegness is a regional commercial centre with many services and entertainment facilities.</li> <li>• Relatively high density housing.</li> <li>• Inland is mainly grade 2 and 3 agricultural land farmed both arably and pastorally.</li> <li>• Foreshore sand dunes in southern Skegness are designated under the Saltfleetby Theddlethorpe Dunes &amp; Gibraltar Point Special Area of Conservation.</li> <li>• The beaches play an important role in supporting tourism, which is key to the local economy. The EC designated beaches provide an important resource for recreation and angling.</li> <li>• Well developed road network linking Skegness to Horncastle, Mablethorpe and Boston.</li> <li>• Good rail links to Grantham/East Coast Main Line.</li> <li>• Rich in heritage in villages surrounding Skegness.</li> <li>• Potential issues with archaeological sites both on land and offshore.</li> </ul> <p><u>Area 19: Seacroft to Gibraltar Point</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Arable farming forms main economic activity</li> <li>• The coast of designated as the Gibraltar Point Ramsar site Special Protection Area, and Special Area of Conservation. There is a National Nature Reserve at Gibraltar Point.</li> <li>• Low residential density in coastal hinterland with few houses in Seacroft (a suburb of Skegness). A few scattered rural communities and farms.</li> <li>• Approximately 6 miles inland is the slightly larger village of Wainfleet All Saints.</li> <li>• Tourism – mainly walkers and ornithologists</li> <li>• A52 is the main route to Skegness.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rail network links Skegness to Grantham via Wainfleet All Saints.</li> <li>• Heritage: Grade I Listed Building at Magdalen College School (now a library) at Wainfleet All Saints. Scheduled Ancient Monument – Medieval Salt workings at Wainfleet St Mary. Potential for non-designated heritage assets in the area. Potential for unknown archaeological sites.</li> </ul> <p><u>List of Internationally and Nationally designated sites:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gibraltar Point SSSI</li> <li>• Priority Habitat Inventory – Coastal Saltmarsh</li> </ul> <p><b><u>J6 Likely Significant Effects of the Plan</u></b></p> <p><u>Policy Unit O: Viking Gas Terminal (Mablethorpe) to southern end of Skegness</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Propose current standard of protection against flooding is maintained.</li> <li>• Protection for people and property, maintaining viability of the coastal towns.</li> <li>• Anticipate sea levels will rise within Plan period.</li> <li>• Man-made sea defences will become increasingly significant in size resulting in a moderate landscape impact.</li> <li>• Potential for minor negative impact on historic environment assets.</li> <li>• Longer term (epoch 3), accelerating sea level rise could begin to cause problems for defence sustainability as sea levels rise. Managed realignment could be considered locally, in areas where appropriate.</li> <li>• The landward extent of any new defence line would be the minimum required to ensure sustainable defences; minimising the impacts on agricultural land, people, property and the historic environment. There will need to be sufficient planning and time allocated for adaptation if this is undertaken.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This policy could also potentially provide environmental, landscape and tourism benefits if defences are realigned in appropriate areas. There will be a need for further studies to monitor management inputs required to defend the coastline (which will depend on the rate of future sea level rise and increased storminess) and consider potential localised managed realignment sites (where appropriate) and assess the beneficial effects and negative impacts of any potential managed realignment scheme.</li> </ul> <p><u>Policy Unit P: Seacroft to Gibraltar Point</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy within this unit means that the current standard of protection against flooding will be maintained and sustained in response to sea level rise. Currently this area is accreting, partly dependent on material from the Holderness cliffs and this trend is likely to continue in the short and medium term at least. Sand dunes form effective natural defences in this policy unit and these are supplemented by flood embankments around the Steeping River. Due to continued accretion, the existing defences are not under threat from erosion and intervention to maintain the defence standard is unlikely to be necessary in the short term at least.</li> <li>• This policy will provide beneficial effects for local communities as all commercial and domestic properties and settlements in this area will continue to be protected. The policy will also protect the productive agricultural land (best and most versatile land grades 1,2 and 3a) in this area as well as historic environment assets (including a Grade 1 listed building in Wainfleet All Saints) and key infrastructure such as the A52, drainage infrastructure, rail network etc. The important tourism industry in this area will not be adversely affected in terms of flood risk. Since intervention will not be required in the short and</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---

			<p>medium term at least, this policy will have a neutral effect on the natural environment as the habitats and species for which Gibraltar Point is designated (as a SAC, SPA, Ramsar site, SSSI and NNR) will be maintained under natural processes. This includes BAP habitat such as coastal sand dunes and coastal saltmarsh.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the longer term, the current accretion trend may slow and potentially change to an erosion trend. This is dependent on sea level rise and the mechanism used to carry out the policies in updrift frontages. In order to respond to this threat, the policy has identified that there may be a requirement for managed realignment in the longer term (epoch 3). Currently, there is not enough evidence to be able to firmly predict if and when this may be needed. If managed realignment is needed, it is likely to result in the loss of some land directly behind the defences but it would provide more sustainable flood defence for both the people and the high quality agricultural land further inland and the loss of land would be minimal compared to the area of farmland that would be lost if the hold the line policy were not enabled.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Habitats Regulation Assessment</u></b></p> <p><u>Saltfleetby-Theddlethorpe Dunes &amp; Gibraltar Point SAC/ Gibraltar Point SPA/Gibraltar Point Ramsar site</u></p> <p>The Appropriate Assessment concluded that the following adverse effects may result from SMP policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A disturbance impact on waterfowl when defences are being maintained if not appropriately timed.</li> <li>• Adverse effects from Epoch 3 on the dune system and saltmarsh through coastal squeeze as artificial replenishment of sediment up-drift and sediment transported from offshore fails to</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--

			<p>counterbalance the accelerating rate of sea level rise. This will occur as a result of the HTL policy in Units N and P;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An adverse effect from Epoch 3 on the dune system as sediment transport into the SAC declines due to a HTL policy for Policy Unit O.</li> </ul> <p><u>Mitigation - (Saltfleetby-Theddlethorpe Dunes &amp; Gibraltar Point SAC/ Gibraltar Point SPA &amp; Ramsar site - Epoch 3)</u> SMP policy will address a potential decline in sediment supply in Epoch 3 through allowing for the need to adopt MR within Policy Units N, O and P to allow for continued supply of sediment if it proves necessary.</p> <p><b><u>Water Framework Directive</u></b> The Water Framework Directive (Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2000 establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy) was passed into UK law in 2003. The overall requirement of the Directive is that all river basins must achieve “good ecological status” by 2015 unless there are grounds for derogation. The WFD will, for the first time, combine water quantity and quality issues together. An integrated approach to the management of all freshwater bodies, groundwaters, estuaries and coastal waters at the river basin level will be adopted. It will effectively supersede all water related legislation which drives the existing licensing and consenting framework in the UK.</p> <p><u>Conclusions</u> Adverse impacts leading to the potential failure of WFD Environmental Objectives of the Yorkshire South/Lincolnshire coastal water body have been identified in Policy Units O (Viking Gas Terminal (Mablethorpe) to southern end of Skegness) and P (Seacroft to Gibraltar Point). This relates to policies of HTL on the Lincolnshire coastline which could lead to coastal squeeze</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>and beach narrowing and steepening with a consequent impact on benthic habitats of the coastal water body. There is also the possibility in the longer.</p> <p>It is anticipated that any localised managed realignment of the coastline (within Policy Units K, N, O or P) would change the saltwater/freshwater interface (if realignment occurs), which could impact on one or more of the inland water bodies within these policy units. As the extent and nature of any possible retreat has not yet been decided it is not possible to fully assess the extent of the impact and further assessment should be carried out at a later date when further information is available. It is considered that the potential for decline in status/potential of one or more of the inland water bodies does not outweigh the beneficial effect of managed realignment which will potentially improve the status/potential of the coastal and transitional water bodies.</p> <p>Requirements for monitoring and possible mitigation are addressed within the policies and will be taken forward within the SMP Action Plan.</p> <p><u>J7 Mitigation and Enhancement Measures</u>  A) <i>Significant impact</i>: Detrimental effect on landscape character of Bridlington, Hornsea, Mappleton, Withernsea, Grimsby, Cleethorpes, Mablethorpe and Skegness</p> <p><i>Mitigation</i>: Landscape effects are unavoidable as the character will either be changed by the presence of larger defences, the realignment of defences or the loss of frontages due to coastal erosion or flooding. Minimising the effects on the landscape character of an area will need to be considered at the strategy and scheme stage.</p>
--	--	--	---



			<p><i>B) Significant Impact:</i> Negative impact on tourism industry due to e.g. loss of beach frontage or landscape effects</p> <p><i>Avoidance:</i> Negative effects on tourism are unavoidable due to landscape character changes from increased defences and loss of beach frontage in front of the defences.</p> <p><i>Mitigation:</i> Minimise effects on the landscape character of an area by using the existing footprint and nature of defences where possible and minimising visual intrusion where not.</p> <p><i>Compensation Offset:</i> Creation or promotion of alternative tourism features.</p> <p><i>C) Significant Impact:</i> Adverse effect on coastal processes, particularly interruption to longshore sediment transport.</p> <p><i>Mitigation:</i> Policy Units K, N, O and P include consideration of localised managed realignment.</p> <p><i>D) Significant Impact:</i> Loss of agricultural land as a result of potential managed realignment schemes in Policy Units O and P.</p> <p><i>Compensation Offset:</i> Suitable compensation for landowners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compensation will not be appropriate for all impacts, for example where the loss of historic assets results from an SMP policy, there would be no suitable receptor for compensation.</li> <li>• Some impacts are unavoidable. While it may be possible to minimise the effects on landscape and tourism, these cannot be avoided entirely. To defend the frontage at Skegness will involve the reinforcement, strengthening or construction of existing or new defences, which could have a negative visual impact, but to leave the frontages</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---

			<p>of the settlement undefended would cause damage due to erosion. It will be possible to reduce the visual impact through sympathetic design and construction, but negative effects cannot be completely avoided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In addition to the nationally and internationally designated conservation sites there are many areas of local importance for wildlife that need to be taken into should compensatory habitat creation be considered. Semi-natural habitat is limited in the study area and all opportunities for habitat re-creation should be taken, where possible and practical. This could be done via the negotiation of voluntary agreements with individual owners of coastal land.</li> <li>• In order to assess the need and effectiveness of the above suggested mitigations, monitoring has also been suggested in Chapter J8 (below).</li> </ul> <p><u>J8 Monitoring</u></p> <p>The monitoring measures as described below are included within the SMP Action Plan:</p> <p><i>SEA Receptor:</i> Population / human health  <i>SMP topic:</i> Flood and erosion risk / communities  <i>Issue:</i> Loss of property  <i>Monitoring:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring of projected and actual property loss to coastal erosion.</li> <li>• Monitoring of beach profiles and levels along the entire frontage.</li> </ul> <p><i>SEA receptor:</i> Biodiversity / flora / fauna  <i>SMP topic:</i> Natural environment  <i>Issue:</i> Adverse impacts on designated sites  <i>Monitoring:</i></p>
--	--	--	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring of status of sites.</li> <li>• Monitoring size of Humber intertidal areas to increase future understanding of behaviour and linkages with erosion rates.</li> </ul> <p><i>SEA Receptor:</i> Material assets  <i>SMP topic:</i> Agriculture and industry  <i>Issue:</i> Loss of agricultural land  <i>Monitoring:</i> Monitor quantity and grade of agricultural land lost to erosion</p> <p><i>SEA Receptor:</i> Material assets  <i>SMP topic:</i> Tourism  <i>Issue:</i> Adverse impacts on tourism  <i>Monitoring:</i> Monitoring of visitor numbers.</p> <p><i>SEA Receptor:</i> Material assets  <i>SMP topic:</i> Infrastructure  <i>Issue:</i> Adverse impacts on infrastructure  <i>Monitoring:</i> No specific monitoring for Skegness.</p> <p><i>SEA Receptor:</i> Cultural heritage  <i>SMP topic:</i> Historic Environment  <i>Issue:</i> Loss of historic environmental assets  <i>Monitoring:</i> Monitoring of historic environmental assets</p> <p><i>SEA Receptor:</i> Landscape  <i>SMP topic:</i> Landscape  <i>Issue:</i> Increasing size of coastal defences  <i>Monitoring:</i> Monitoring of changes in standard of protection provided by defences as sea levels rise.</p> <p><i>SEA Receptor:</i> Climatic factors/water  <i>SMP topic:</i> Coastal processes  <i>Issue:</i> Sea level rise</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p><i>Monitoring:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring sea level rise</li> <li>• Monitoring bay development within Holderness with particular consideration of defended areas becoming increasingly protruding relative to the undefended areas.</li> </ul>
East Lindsey District Landscape Character Assessment	Ecus Ltd	July 2009	<p>Skegness falls into landscape zone J1: Tetney Lock to Skegness Coastal Outmarsh. Key characteristics include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A low lying, drained coastal plain contained to the east by sea embankments, sand dunes and sea defences.</li> <li>• Mostly flat with some areas of gentle undulations including some saltern mounds.</li> <li>• Some wide open views and big skies. Some views enclosed by landform, embankments, sand dunes or trees.</li> <li>• Extensive network of drains, ditches and dykes with a strong geometric pattern in the northern and central parts of the area.</li> <li>• Rivers and the historic Louth Canal cross from the Lincolnshire Wolds in the west towards the coast.</li> <li>• Predominantly mixed agricultural landuse with both arable and pasture, and some remnants of ridge and furrow.</li> <li>• Several important coastal nature reserves with a high level of nature conservation designation with associated wildlife.</li> <li>• Sparsely scattered settlements set within mature ornamental trees and hedgerows.</li> <li>• A stretch of coastal resorts from Mablethorpe to Skegness with caravan parks, and new residential and commercial developments on their outskirts.</li> <li>• An extensive network of raised minor roads with a few larger A roads serving the coastal resorts.</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A predominantly intact and distinctive rural landscape with some man-made influences including a gas terminal, an oil storage facility and several wind farms.</li> </ul> <p><b>Landscape Description</b></p> <p>Tetney Lock to Skegness Coastal Outmarsh is a narrow area of land extending from the North Lincolnshire boundary down to the Great Steeping River in the south and across to Holton le Clay to Great Steeping Middle Marsh in the west. It forms the hinterland of Donna Nook to Gibraltar Point Naturalistic Coast.</p> <p>With the exception of the coastal strip between Mablethorpe and Skegness, the area is rural in character, with isolated farmsteads and dwellings scattered throughout the area. The area consists mainly of intensively farmed arable land. Traces of medieval ridge and furrow are found throughout the area and smaller areas of pasture is found around villages and along watercourses.</p> <p>Farm diversification has occurred in some areas with several plant nurseries, fishing lakes and small caravan parks. Nature reserves are also present inland and in the sand dunes between Donna Nook and Gibraltar Point.</p> <p>The area is divided by the Great Eau and Long Eau Rivers and the Waithe Beck meandering from west to east towards tidal estuaries along the straighter Louth Canal. These waterways are enclosed by grassed embankments. The extensive drainage system dominates the landscape.</p> <p>Geologically, it is underlain with cretaceous chalk with some bands of Cretaceous mudstone and some clay and limestone at the southern most tip. It is overlain with glacial, marine and estuary deposits of sands, gravels, silts, clays and windblown</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>sands which form the dunes. There are also some areas of saltern mounds.</p> <p>This stretch of land is a mainly flat and drained agricultural coastal plain with some very gentle undulations. Some views are open and extensive with big skies which meet level horizons. Others are more enclosed by landform such as embankments, dunes, sea defences and trees. Views include those to the Wolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and wind farms at Conisholme and offshore from Skegness.</p> <p>Historic references include saltern mounds, church towers, mud and stud buildings at North Somercotes, medieval ridge and furrow, Gayton Pumping Station, old red brick sheds, gun emplacements and pill boxes from WWII, medieval moated sites, relict sea banks, windmills, black and white striped road signage. Former military activities are evident at North Coates airfield. The Roman Bank and water filled sea bank 'borrow pits' are also evidence of past attempts to shore up sea defences.</p> <p>With the exception of a few A roads linking the area to larger towns, it largely consists of minor rural roads and public rights of way.</p> <p><b>Landscape sensitivity</b> Overall landscape character sensitivity of Tetney Lock to Skegness Coastal Outmarsh is considered to be <b>moderate to high</b> but lower in areas influenced by localised industrial and urban areas.</p> <p>Tetney Lock to Skegness Coastal Outmarsh is a largely intact, distinctive rural landscape. It is weaker where there are man-made influences. Development should be sensitively designed to respect small scale localised distinctiveness within the rural areas. It should</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>also be sensitive to any small scale patterns and characteristics, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The drainage network;</li> <li>• Historic features and distinctive small villages;</li> <li>• Development on the edge of coastal towns should take into consideration the character of the rural landscape, possible using tree and hedgerow planting to soften and screen development.</li> <li>• The location of development should take advantage of existing screening.</li> <li>• The landscape sensitivities of adjacent character areas should be taken into account to prevent further loss of the rural landscape.</li> <li>• Development should take into consideration tranquillity and dark skies.</li> </ul>
<b>Sustainability Appraisal</b>	East Lindsay Council	November 2016	<p><u>Baseline Information:</u>  Population of East Lindsey has grown slowly over the past 20 years (approx. 1%) and high outward migration of young adults and inward migration of those in the 50 to 80 year age group. Rural isolation can be an issue.</p> <p>There are a relatively high number of households with one or more residents with a long-term limiting illness (25%). Exacerbated by ageing population and poor or limited access to healthcare facilities. Access to green infrastructure is limited.</p> <p>Incomes within East Lindsey are relatively low and gross weekly pay is below the national average. Crime is relatively low but vandalism and anti-social behaviour are key issues.</p> <p>Housing growth has been driven by in-migration of those at retirement age. Lack of affordable and appropriate housing has made it difficult for first time buyers.</p>

			<p>Lack of brownfield sites in East Lindsey to meet national target of 60% development on these sites.</p> <p>Coastal and fluvial flood risk is an issue.</p> <p>Many areas only served by pre-bookable bus services and so many rely on private cars.</p> <p>Low numbers of full time employees compared to regional and national figures. But higher than national average self-employment and high number of residents classed as non-economically active (39.24%). Reliance on seasonal employment in the tourism industry. Green tourism has a significant role to play in attracting visitors.</p> <p>Need for diversification by attracting investment and diversification of existing sectors.</p> <p>Rich and diverse natural heritage but biodiversity in the district is below the national average. Development should be located away from sensitive sites.</p> <p>95% of EL is rural and land use is predominantly agriculture. Renewable energy/ wind turbines are a key issue.</p> <p>Many unlisted heritage assets of local value.</p> <p>Water resources and availability are key considerations. Initiatives to encourage water saving technologies and SuDS should be encouraged. Water quality of the district's rivers has improved over the past 15 years. Light pollution is also an issue.</p> <p><u>SA Objectives</u> 13 SA objectives arising from the scoping report. These are:</p>
--	--	--	--



			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the areas' biodiversity and geodiversity;</li> <li>2) Protect and enhance the quality distinctiveness of the areas' landscapes, townscapes and historic environment;</li> <li>3) Protect natural resources from avoidable losses and pollution and minimise the impacts of unavoidable losses and pollution.</li> <li>4) Avoid risk of flooding and fully mitigate where possible;</li> <li>5) Promote viable and diverse economic growth that supports communities;</li> <li>6) Prioritise appropriate re-use of PDL and minimise the loss of the best agricultural land and greenfield sites;</li> <li>7) Improve accessibility to key services, facilities, amenities and GI;</li> <li>8) Increase reuse and recycling rates and reduce production of waste;</li> <li>9) Support inclusive, safe and vibrant communities;</li> <li>10) Ensure local housing needs are met;</li> <li>11) Increase energy efficiency and ensure appropriate sustainable design, construction and operation of new development;</li> <li>12) Encourage and provide the facilities and infrastructure for healthy lifestyles;</li> <li>13) Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change.</li> </ol>
<b>Scoping Report Refresh</b>	2011		<p><u>List of studies considered:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ramsar</li> <li>• Joint Nature Conservation Committee's UK SAC Listings;</li> <li>• Lincolnshire Biodiversity Action Plan (2011);</li> <li>• Lincolnshire Biodiversity Action Plan (2000);</li> <li>• Local Air Quality Management Updating and Screening Report, Lincolnshire Pollution Group, June 2006;</li> <li>• The Department of Health Annual Report of the Chief Medical Officer (2002);</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• East Lindsey Crime and Disorder Audit (October 2004);</li> <li>• East Lindsey Housing Strategy/Council Housing Strategy, 2013- 2018.;</li> <li>• Witham Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy</li> </ul> <p>East Lindsey District Council Annual Monitoring Report</p> <p>Plus various website links and ONS Nomis data</p>
<b>Employment Sites Assessment 2016</b>	East Lindsay Council	2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demand for employment sites in Skegness can be met by the development of allocated site G (26.25ha) and the privately promoted 9.5 ha site off Lincoln Road which together provide the necessary capacity to meet demand for the foreseeable future.</li> <li>• Table 1 of report shows there is no additional need for employment sites in Skegness.</li> <li>• Of the two sites named above, there are 8 vacant plots and 12 vacant units available.</li> </ul>
<b>Lincolnshire Coastal Study Summary Report 2009-2010</b>	Atkins	May 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stretch of coastline between Skegness and Mablethorpe is internationally designated.</li> <li>• Coastal erosion is affecting the Lincolnshire coast, particularly between Mablethorpe and Skegness. Vulnerable to flooding from the sea due to low-lying nature of Lincolnshire.</li> <li>• High levels of deprivation, with East Lindsay in the top 25% of the most deprived districts in the country, with severe pockets of deprivation and high levels of unemployment in Skegness.</li> </ul>
<b>England's Smaller Seaside Towns: A Benchmarking Study (2011)</b>			Report focuses on 37 smaller seaside towns all of which have a population of below 10,000. Only relates to Mablethorpe and not Skegness (Mablethorpe is a case study) The report outlines the typical characteristics of these settlements.
<b>Hidden Communities in Caravans Project (2011)</b>	Sheffield Hallam University and East Lindsay District Council	2011	Report outlines more than 200 caravan sites and 25,000 static caravans along the East Lindsay coast. Living in a caravan is a way of avoiding council tax and as such, a substantial number of caravan residents are hidden from view. Suggests a range of

			options for planning for the future of caravan sites and leaves large number of Skegness residents uncouncted.
<b>Skegness Foreshore Development Principles</b>	East Lindsay District Council	Post 2012	<p>Outlines a series of objectives for the development on the foreshore, including broadened offer, improved quality, enhanced public realm, provision of open space and improved access and movement.</p> <p>A green zone and a red zone outline the type of activities they wish to see in each area. These include A3, C1, D1 and D2 in the red zone. These activities will only be considered in the green zone if they have strong linkages with the environment and green tourism.</p> <p>Provides an East Lindsay Place Making Checklist.</p>
<b>Coastal Lincolnshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment: Executive Summary</b>	Opinion Research Services	2012	<p>Imbalance in housing stock with flats considerably less common and bungalows more so in Coastal Lincolnshire than rest of England. Dwelling conditions poorer than compared with England due to energy efficiency standards and difficulties in affordably heating homes exacerbated by below average incomes.</p> <p>Property prices below average for EM region and property transactions down on previous years.</p> <p>East Lindsay requires intermediate housing and there is likely to be a demand for shared accommodation rather than self-contained dwellings. Identifies a need for a greater proportion of 2 bed homes.</p>
<b>East Lindsey Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update</b>	Opinion Research Services	January 2014	Update to reflect new household projections for the period 2011-2031 produced by Edge Analytics. This report outlines a need for a low market housing requirement, intermediate housing and affordable housing.
<b>East Lindsey Affordable Housing</b>	Opinion Research Services	October 2016	There is a need for 2,825 additional affordable dwellings over the 15 year plan period to 2031 (or 188 dwellings per annum) to provide for current unmet need and projected future growth.

<b>Needs Assessment Update 2016</b>			
<b>Updating the Demographic Evidence 2015</b>	Edge Analytics	June 2015	<p>Prepares a revised set of scenarios using POPGROUP using historical evidence for the 2001-2013-time period. Strong net inward migration to 2007, reducing thereafter. Ageing population. Net outflow of young adults with most significant net inflow associated with those aged 50+.</p> <p>Population ageing and retention of young adult's is a key issue in East Lindsay.</p> <p>International migration is not likely to be a significant driver of population growth in the future.</p>
<b>Demographic Forecasts updating the Evidence, Final Report 2016</b>	Edge Analytics	October 2016	Since 2013, East Lindsey has begun to experience an uplift in its population growth. Ageing population remains along with continuing net outflow of young adults. Housing completions averaging 200 per year in Wet Area and 400 in Dry Area.
<b>Local Plan Housing Topic Paper, Revised and Updated March 2017</b>	East Lindsey District Council	March 2017	517 homes per year of 7768 homes over the plan period. Five year housing land supply period of 5.25 years. The report describes one of the main differences between the February 2016 supply calculations and January 2017 is the council has included those planning permissions resolved to be granted but awaiting their S106 agreements.
<b>SHLAA Methodology February 2008</b>	East Lindsey District Council	February 2008	Outlines various stages required to produce SHLAA (8 stages)
<b>East Lindsey Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment</b>	East Lindsey District Council	November 2016	Does not mention Skegness.
<b>East Lindsey Housing Strategy 2013-2018</b>	East Lindsey District Council		Skegness is second largest settlement in terms of housing development between 2004-2012 behind Louth. Identifies the key issues in East Lindsey of affordability, housing demand, access to services, flood risk, ageing population, quality of housing and fuel poverty. Report lists range of priorities including

			delivering more affordable homes, improve quality of housing and prevention of homelessness.
<b>Review and Update of the East Lindsey Economic Viability Assessment</b>	GVA	September 2015	Skegness has an average existing sales value of £1,594psm and new build sales value of £1,833psm and lies within a low value area and not viable with affordable housing.
<b>Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment 2012</b>	Ark Housing Consultancy	November 2012	There is a need for 20 pitches at stopping places. Unauthorised camping locations can be an issue on industrial estates and roadside/laybys.
<b>East Lindsey District Council Gypsy and Traveller Study 2016</b>	East Lindsey District Council	2016	Skegness are especially attractive locations for Gypsy and Traveller community and there is urgent need around the town. Large number of unauthorised encampments in Skegness as it is attractive due to seaside location (29%). Urgent need around Skegness for stopping and transit provision.
<b>East Lindsey Economic Baseline</b>	East Lindsey District Council	2016	Splits East Lindsey into two categories; coast and rural inland areas. Over 65s set to increase in number, 16-64-year olds expected to decline, jobs expected to increase and economically active expected to decrease.
<b>Skegness Car Parking Survey 2012</b>	East Lindsay District Council	July 2011	Survey was carried out over two days to cover weekday and weekend period within the school holiday period. 89% of parking is public car parks and 11% is on street parking with 4,424 spaces in Skegness. 56% of spaces are on the foreshore. Survey showed average use of public car parks of 63% on Thursday and 58% on Saturday and on street parking of 85% Thursday and 83% Saturday.
<b>Lincolnshire Local Plan Tool</b>	Lincolnshire County Council	September 2015	Skegness Western Relief Road between A52 and A158 is an aspirational highway scheme.
<b>Countryside Access and Rights of Way Improvement Plan 2007-2012</b>	Lincolnshire County Council	April 2007	The development of a Lincolnshire Coastal Access Trail has long been talked about between Skegness and Mablethorpe.  Lack of routes for horse riders between Horncastle and Skegness and limited opportunity for circular walking routes around Skegness.
<b>Infrastructure Delivery Plan</b>	East Lindsey District Council	January 2017	Suggests possible need for more GP practices.

