

Appendix 1 Assessment of preferred options and alternatives

Summary of assessment findings

SEA Topic	Aim and Approach Issues Preferred Options		Strategic Policy Issues Preferred Options					Thematic Policy Issues Preferred Options				
	Aim	Approach	Amount	Quality	Location	Impact	Place	Promote	Protect	Places for business and industry	Land for housing	Centres network
Land Use												
Ecology												
Aquatic Environment												
Geology and Soils												
Waste and Resources												
Energy												
Landscape and Visual												
Cultural Heritage												
Air Quality and Noise												
Communities												
Key		Compatible with SEA Objectives				No significant impact				Incompatible with SEA assessment Objectives		

No Preferred Options were assessed as incompatible with Strategic Environmental Assessment Objectives.

Issue 1		Aim
Preferred option		The aim of the Local Development Plan should be regeneration and sustainable growth.
Objectives	Impact	Justification for predicted impact
<i>Land Use</i>	✓	Consistent with the high level objective of sustainable land use through the regeneration of brownfield land. Consistent with the sub-objectives of regenerating derelict, vacant and contaminated land and optimising and promoting development on brownfield sites. Also consistent with the sub-objectives of integrating land use with transportation and other infrastructure requirements, and promoting more sustainable patterns of development.
<i>Ecology</i>		No significant impacts.
<i>Aquatic Environment</i>		
<i>Geology and Soils</i>		
<i>Waste and Resources</i>		
<i>Energy</i>		
<i>Landscape and Visual</i>		
<i>Cultural Heritage</i>		
<i>Air Quality and Noise</i>		
<i>Communities</i>		
Summary		The preferred aim of the Local development Plan continuing to be regeneration and sustainable growth is considered to have a likely significant positive impact on the high level and SEA objective of sustainable land use and the sub-objectives of promoting development on brownfield sites and more sustainable patterns of land use. The preferred option is not considered to significantly impact upon other SEA topic objectives.
Mitigation		None required.

Question 2		Approach to policy
Preferred option		There should be strategic policies addressing sustainability and placemaking that apply to all applications for planning permission. There should also be separate thematic policies to promote developments and protect assets.
Objectives	Impact	Justification for predicted impact
Land Use	✓	Having Strategic Policy that applies to all applications for planning permission means that each application is considered in terms of whether or not it passes policy tests looking at: Amount - supply and demand factors Location - sustainable location criteria Impact - community facility mitigation Quality - environmental performance Place - contributing to community These five policies address each all SEA topics.
Ecology		
Aquatic Environment		
Geology and Soils		
Waste and Resources		
Energy		
Landscape and Visual		
Cultural Heritage		
Air Quality and Noise		
Communities		
Summary		The envisaged approach of applying Strategic Policy brings sustainability and placemaking considerations to all applications for planning permission. This is a presumption in favour of sustainable development and is consistent with the Principal Policies in Scottish Planning Policy.
Mitigation		None required.

Question 3		Amount
Preferred option		There should be a policy considering supply and demand implications of proposed development based on the Amount of Development policy in the current Local Plan.
Objectives	Impact	Justification for predicted impact
Land Use	✓	Particularly consistent with the sub-objective of ensuring a future supply of appropriate land and integrating land use with transportation and other infrastructure requirements. Also consistent with the sub-objective of promoting more sustainable patterns of development.
Ecology		No significant impacts.
Aquatic Environment		
Geology and Soils		
Waste and Resources		
Energy		
Landscape and Visual		
Cultural Heritage		
Air Quality and Noise		
Communities		
Summary		<p>This preferred option would result in the Local Development Plan continuing to consider the merits of proposed housing, retailing, office, business, industrial and construction minerals development on the basis of supply and demand. This would have the effect of restricting development on new locations that may prejudice the development of locations already identified as appropriate and consistent with sustainable development principles.</p> <p>The preferred option is specifically targeted at assessing the appropriate amount of development and would not significantly impact upon other SEA topic objectives.</p>
Mitigation		None required.

Question 4		Quality
Preferred option		There should be a policy aimed at ensuring a good quality of development based on the Quality of Development policy in the current Local Plan.
Objectives	Impact	Justification for predicted impact
Land Use	✓	Consistent with the high level objective of achieving sustainable land use through the, promotion of high quality development. Also consistent with the sub-objective of securing a high quality of design in all new development.
Ecology	✓	The current policy safeguards and enhances the environment through the protection of biodiversity.
Aquatic Environment	✓	Consistent with the sub-objective of promoting and adopting soft or combination Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems.
Geology and Soils		No significant impacts.
Waste and Resources	✓	The policy encourages prevention and reduction of waste.
Energy	✓	The policy promotes energy efficiency in all developments.
Landscape and Visual	✓	The policy encourages good quality urban design and opportunities to promote North Lanarkshire as an attractive place to live, work and visit.
Cultural Heritage	✓	The policy safeguards designated features and their enhancement.
Air Quality and Noise	✓	The policy has a specific assessment criterion relating to air quality.
Communities	✓	The policy promotes safe, integrated and accessible path networks.
Summary		The current Quality of Development policy that this preferred option would continue to operate has specific assessment criteria for new development proposals that have a significant positive impact on each of the SEA topic objectives, with the exception of Geology and soils, where there is no anticipated significant impact anticipated.
Mitigation		None required.

Question 5		Location
Preferred option		There should be a policy considering the sustainable location characteristics of proposed development based on the sustainability indicators approach of economic, social and environmental capital.
Objectives	Impact	Justification for predicted impact
Land Use	✓	Promotes more sustainable patterns of development.
Ecology	✓	Promotes biodiversity through protection, of habitats and species.
Aquatic Environment		No significant impacts.
Geology and Soils		
Waste and Resources		
Energy	✓	The sustainable transport criteria are likely to have a positive impact on the sub-objective of reducing the need to travel and journey length.
Landscape and Visual		No significant impacts.
Cultural Heritage		
Air Quality and Noise	✓	The sustainable transport criteria are likely to have a positive impact on the sub-objective of promoting sustainable forms of transport
Communities		No significant impacts.
Summary		The preferred option of amending the current Location of development policy to be based on the economic, social and environmental capitals approach would continue the generally positive impacts that the current policy is considered to have on objectives and sub-objectives pertaining to the SEA topics of land use, ecology, energy, and air quality and noise.
Mitigation		None required.

Question 5		
Location		
Alternative Policy based on the Location of Development policy in the current Local Plan.		
Objectives	Impact	Justification for predicted impact
Land Use	✓	Promotes more sustainable patterns of development.
Ecology	✓	Promotes biodiversity through protection, of habitats and species.
Aquatic Environment		No significant impacts.
Geology and Soils		
Waste and Resources		
Energy	✓	The sustainable transport criteria are likely to have a positive impact on the sub-objective of reducing the need to travel and journey length.
Landscape and Visual		No significant impacts.
Cultural Heritage		
Air Quality and Noise	✓	The sustainable transport criteria are likely to have a positive impact on the sub-objective of promoting sustainable forms of transport
Communities		No significant impacts.
Summary		<p>The preferred option of amending the current Location of development policy to be based on the economic, social and environmental capitals approach would continue the generally positive impacts that the current policy is considered to have on objectives and sub-objectives pertaining to the SEA topics of land use, ecology, energy, and air quality and noise.</p> <p>It is noted that there is not anticipated to be any significant difference in the likely impacts relating to this alternative option compared to the preferred option.</p>
Mitigation		None required.

Question 6		Impact
Preferred option		There should be a plan-led policy requiring mitigation for the impact of proposed development on community facilities, initially concentrating on the impact of housing development on primary school utilisation.
Objectives	Impact	Justification for predicted impact
Land Use		No significant impacts.
Ecology		
Aquatic Environment		
Geology and Soils		
Waste and Resources		
Energy		
Landscape and Visual		
Cultural Heritage		
Air Quality and Noise		
Communities	✓	Consistent with the sub-objectives of safeguarding existing community facilities and encouraging the provision of new ones, and of integrating existing and new housing with community facilities and services.
Summary		This preferred option relates specifically to the impact of new development upon community facilities and seeks to mitigate the effects of development on communities by requiring facilities to be maintained and provided as required. It therefore is likely to have a positive impact on the SEA topic of communities, but unlikely to have any significant impact on other SEA topic objectives.
Mitigation		None required.

Question 6		Impact
Alternative		Application-led policy for considering the implications of proposed development on community facilities based on the Impact of development policy in the current Local Plan.
Objectives	Impact	Justification for predicted impact
Land Use		No significant impacts.
Ecology		
Aquatic Environment		
Geology and Soils		
Waste and Resources		
Energy		
Landscape and Visual		
Cultural Heritage		
Air Quality and Noise		
Communities	✓	Consistent with the sub-objectives of safeguarding existing community facilities and encouraging the provision of new ones, and of integrating existing and new housing with community facilities and services.
Summary		<p>This preferred option relates specifically to the impact of new development upon community facilities and seeks to mitigate the effects of development on communities by requiring facilities to be maintained and provided as required. It therefore is likely to have a positive impact on the SEA topic of communities, but unlikely to have any significant impact on other SEA topic objectives.</p> <p>It is noted that there is not anticipated to be any significant difference in the likely impacts relating to this alternative option compared to the preferred option.</p>
Mitigation		None required.

Question 7		Place
Preferred option		There should be a new policy aimed at achieving a sense of place through guidance on the types and forms of development appropriate for centres, edge of centre, suburban, urban fringe and rural locations.
Objectives	Impact	Justification for predicted impact
Land Use	✓	Consistent with the sub-objective of promoting more sustainable patterns of development.
Ecology		No significant impacts.
Aquatic Environment		
Geology and Soils		
Waste and Resources		
Energy		
Landscape and Visual	✓	Consistent with the high level objective of protecting, enhance and where necessary restoring local distinctiveness, and the sub-objectives of upgrading the quality of urban form and encouraging good quality urban design, and protecting and enhancing local character.
Cultural Heritage		No significant impacts.
Air Quality and Noise		
Communities	✓	Consistent with the high level objective of developing sustainable communities through a healthy and inclusive population in a high quality built environment.
Summary		This preferred option seeks to introduce a new Strategic Policy that would result in more distinctive, successful places across the transect of centres, edge of centres, suburban, urban fringe and rural locations by over time influence the uses and form of development and protecting amenity. It is therefore considered to have potential significant impacts on the objectives and sub-objectives relating to sustainable patterns of development and community, with no significant impacts on other SEA topic objectives.
Mitigation		None required.

Question 8		Promote
Preferred option		The Local Development Plan should promote the full range of regeneration sites, development land and infrastructure opportunities on a Proposals Map.
Objectives	Impact	Justification for predicted impact
Land Use		Impacts are uncertain until individual sites have been assessed. Refer to the Assessment of potential proposed development sites section 3.4 of this report.
Ecology		
Aquatic Environment		
Geology and Soils		
Waste and Resources		
Energy		
Landscape and Visual		
Cultural Heritage		
Air Quality and Noise		
Communities		
Summary		<p>The Main Issues Report 2015 for the Local Development Plan did not propose final site selections. In terms of sites, the Main Issues Report 2015 included as preferred sites those locations and development proposals that already feature in approved land supplies and policy designations. It proposed to change business and industrial locations in line with the land for business and industry charrette available as a background report. It also proposed to identify additional housing allocations taking into account a range of context factors, including the Site Sustainability and Deliverability Matrix available as an appendix to this Draft Environmental Report. It would only be through engagement on the issues in the Main Issues Report 2015 that the approach to identifying sites would be determined.</p> <p>The Main Issues report 2016 confirmed the site assessment process and individual assessments of each site are included in section 3.4 of this report.</p>
Mitigation		None required at this point.

Question 8		Promote
Alternative A		Continue with the topic-based approach in the current Local Plan with development opportunities and development constraints illustrated on the same map.
Objectives	Impact	Justification for predicted impact
Land Use		Impacts are uncertain until individual sites have been assessed. Refer to the Assessment of potential proposed development sites section 3.4 of this report.
Ecology		
Aquatic Environment		
Geology and Soils		
Waste and Resources		
Energy		
Landscape and Visual		
Cultural Heritage		
Air Quality and Noise		
Communities		
Summary		<p>The Main Issues Report 2015 for the Local Development Plan did not propose final site selections. In terms of sites, the Main Issues Report 2015 included as preferred sites those locations and development proposals that already feature in approved land supplies and policy designations. It proposed to change business and industrial locations in line with the land for business and industry charrette available as a background report. It also proposed to identify additional housing allocations taking into account a range of context factors, including the Site Sustainability and Deliverability Matrix available as an appendix to this Draft Environmental Report. It would only be through engagement on the issues in the Main Issues Report 2015 that the approach to identifying sites would be determined.</p> <p>The Main Issues report 2016 confirmed the site assessment process and individual assessments of each site are included in section 3.4 of this report.</p>
Mitigation		None required at this point.

Question 8		
Promote		
Alternative B		
Amend topic-based approach based on the current Local Plan topics.		
Objectives	Impact	Justification for predicted impact
Land Use		Impacts are uncertain until individual sites have been assessed. Refer to the Assessment of potential proposed development sites section 3.4 of this report.
Ecology		
Aquatic Environment		
Geology and Soils		
Waste and Resources		
Energy		
Landscape and Visual		
Cultural Heritage		
Air Quality and Noise		
Communities		
Summary		<p>The Main Issues Report 2015 for the Local Development Plan did not propose final site selections. In terms of sites, the Main Issues Report 2015 included as preferred sites those locations and development proposals that already feature in approved land supplies and policy designations. It proposed to change business and industrial locations in line with the land for business and industry charrette available as a background report. It also proposed to identify additional housing allocations taking into account a range of context factors, including the Site Sustainability and Deliverability Matrix available as an appendix to this Draft Environmental Report. It would only be through engagement on the issues in the Main Issues Report 2015 that the approach to identifying sites would be determined.</p> <p>The Main Issues report 2016 confirmed the site assessment process and individual assessments of each site are included in section 3.4 of this report.</p>
Mitigation		None required at this point.

Question 9		Protect
Preferred option		The Local Development Plan should protect natural and built environment assets and the character of existing residential, town centre, industrial and rural areas on a Constraints Map.
Objectives	Impact	Justification for predicted impact
Land Use	✓	Consistent with the sub-objectives of ensuring development on Green Belt is appropriate and of protecting and enhancing natural assets.
Ecology	✓	Consistent with the high level objectives of safeguarding and enhancing the environment through the protection of biodiversity, and of protecting, enhancing and where necessary restoring species and habitats.
Aquatic Environment	✓	Consistent with the high level objectives of protecting and enhancing freshwater supplies, waterbodies and their catchments.
Geology and Soils	✓	Consistent with the high level objectives of protecting the geological resource and enhance the quality of soils.
Waste and Resources		No significant impacts.
Energy		
Landscape and Visual	✓	Consistent with the high level objectives of protecting, enhancing and where necessary restoring landscape character, local distinctiveness and scenic value.
Cultural Heritage	✓	Consistent with the high level objectives of preserving and interpreting cultural heritage.
Air Quality and Noise		No significant impacts.
Communities	✓	Consistent with the sub-objectives of enhancing and promoting safe, integrated and accessible path networks and recreational facilities.
Summary		This preferred option proposes to maintain all the current policy protections provided by existing Local Plan Topic policies. It therefore reinforces the high level objectives for SEA topics of ecology, aquatic environment, geology, landscape and cultural heritage, while reinforcing some sub-objectives only for SEA topics of land use and communities. It does not impact upon objectives for waste, energy or air quality as these are more relevant to Strategic Policy only. The preferred option would not alter the effect of current policy, other than to make the depiction of relevant policy measures more coherent and easy to interpret.
Mitigation		None required.

Question 9		Protect
Alternative A		Continue with the topic-based approach in the current Local Plan with development opportunities and development constraints illustrated on the same map.
Objectives	Impact	Justification for predicted impact
Land Use	✓	Consistent with the sub-objectives of ensuring development on Green Belt is appropriate and of protecting and enhancing natural assets.
Ecology	✓	Consistent with the high level objectives of safeguarding and enhancing the environment through the protection of biodiversity, and of protecting, enhancing and where necessary restoring species and habitats.
Aquatic Environment	✓	Consistent with the high level objectives of protecting and enhancing freshwater supplies, waterbodies and their catchments.
Geology and Soils	✓	Consistent with the high level objectives of protecting the geological resource and enhance the quality of soils.
Waste and Resources		No significant impacts.
Energy		
Landscape and Visual	✓	Consistent with the high level objectives of protecting, enhancing and where necessary restoring landscape character, local distinctiveness and scenic value.
Cultural Heritage	✓	Consistent with the high level objectives of preserving and interpreting cultural heritage.
Air Quality and Noise		No significant impacts.
Communities	✓	Consistent with the sub-objectives of enhancing and promoting safe, integrated and accessible path networks and recreational facilities.
Summary		This alternative would maintain all the current policy protections provided by existing Local Plan Topic policies. It therefore reinforces the high level objectives for SEA topics of ecology, aquatic environment, geology, landscape and cultural heritage, while reinforcing some sub-objectives only for SEA topics of land use and communities. It does not impact upon objectives for waste, energy or air quality as these are more relevant to Strategic Policy only.
Mitigation		None required.

Question 9		
Protect		
Alternative B		
Amended topic-based approach based on the current Local Plan topics.		
Objectives	Impact	Justification for predicted impact
Land Use	✓	Consistent with the sub-objectives of ensuring development on Green Belt is appropriate and of protecting and enhancing natural assets.
Ecology	✓	Consistent with the high level objectives of safeguarding and enhancing the environment through the protection of biodiversity, and of protecting, enhancing and where necessary restoring species and habitats.
Aquatic Environment	✓	Consistent with the high level objectives of protecting and enhancing freshwater supplies, waterbodies and their catchments.
Geology and Soils	✓	Consistent with the high level objectives of protecting the geological resource and enhance the quality of soils.
Waste and Resources		No significant impacts.
Energy		
Landscape and Visual	✓	Consistent with the high level objectives of protecting, enhancing and where necessary restoring landscape character, local distinctiveness and scenic value.
Cultural Heritage	✓	Consistent with the high level objectives of preserving and interpreting cultural heritage.
Air Quality and Noise		No significant impacts.
Communities	✓	Consistent with the sub-objectives of enhancing and promoting safe, integrated and accessible path networks and recreational facilities.
Summary		This alternative would be likely to maintain all the current policy protections provided by existing Local Plan Topic policies. It therefore reinforces the high level objectives for SEA topics of ecology, aquatic environment, geology, landscape and cultural heritage, while reinforcing some sub-objectives only for SEA topics of land use and communities. It is unlikely to impact upon objectives for waste, energy or air quality as these are more relevant to Strategic Policy only.
Mitigation		None required.

<p>Question 10 Places for business and industry</p>		
<p>Preferred option The review of the suitability of locations for industry and business based on the placemaking principles and spatial network identified in the places for business and industry charrette should be implemented.</p>		
Objectives	Impact	Justification for predicted impact
Land Use	✓	Consistent with the sub-objectives of ensuring a future supply of appropriate land and promoting more sustainable patterns of development.
Ecology		No significant impacts.
Aquatic Environment		
Geology and Soils		
Waste and Resources		
Energy		
Landscape and Visual		
Cultural Heritage		
Air Quality and Noise		
Communities		
Summary		<p>This preferred option principally relates to identifying business locations that should continue to be supported in line with their marketability.</p> <p>It would involve redesignating some underperforming locations away from unrealistic aspirations for business development to allow for their gradual redevelopment for appropriate uses subject to their locational characteristics.</p> <p>As such the option is likely only to impact on sub-objectives relative to land use in terms of sustainable patterns of development, and unlikely to impact on SEA topic objectives that are more relevant to existing and proposed Strategic Policy measures covering amount, location, impact and quality of development and placemaking.</p>
Mitigation		None required.

Question 10		
Places for business and industry		
Alternative Continue with the industrial designations and protections in the current local Plan.		
Objectives	Impact	Justification for predicted impact
Land Use	x	Would be inconsistent with the sub-objectives of ensuring a future supply of appropriate land and promoting more sustainable patterns of development.
Ecology		No significant impacts.
Aquatic Environment		
Geology and Soils		
Waste and Resources		
Energy		
Landscape and Visual		
Cultural Heritage		
Air Quality and Noise		
Communities		
Summary	This alternative option would see existing business locations continue to be supported. Whilst it would not involve the optimisation of a future supply of appropriate land, it would not involve the allocation of any additional locations. As such the option is likely only to impact on sub-objectives relative to land use in terms of sustainable patterns of development, and unlikely to impact on SEA topic objectives that are more relevant to existing and proposed Strategic Policy measures covering amount, location, impact and quality of development and placemaking.	
Mitigation	Mitigation would only be required if the preferred option of implementing the charrette review was not adopted.	

Question 11		Land for housing
Preferred option		Additional site allocations should be considered to ensure a minimum five years effective supply of land for housing in each sub-market area at all times in the term of the plan. The review should take into account the context assessment factors of existing housing land and industrial land supply, vacant and derelict land, charrette conclusions and sustainability indicators.
Objectives	Impact	Justification for predicted impact
Land Use		Impacts are uncertain until individual sites have been assessed. Refer to the Assessment of potential proposed development sites section 3.4 of this report.
Ecology		
Aquatic Environment		
Geology and Soils		
Waste and Resources		
Energy		
Landscape and Visual		
Cultural Heritage		
Air Quality and Noise		
Communities		
Summary		The Main Issues Report 2015 for the Local Development Plan did not propose final site selections. In terms of sites, the Main Issues Report 2015 included as preferred sites those locations and development proposals that already feature in approved land supplies and policy designations. It proposed to change business and industrial locations in line with the land for business and industry charrette available as a background report. It also proposed to identify additional housing allocations taking into account a range of context factors, including the Site Sustainability and Deliverability Matrix available as an appendix to this Draft Environmental Report. It would only be through engagement on the issues in the Main Issues Report 2015 that the approach to identifying sites would be determined. The Main Issues report 2016 confirmed the site assessment process and individual assessments of each site are included in section 3.4 of this report.
Mitigation		None required at this stage.

Question 11		
Land for housing		
Alternative A		
Consider potential additional site allocations in the Airdrie and Coatbridge sub-market area to address shortfall.		
Objectives	Impact	Justification for predicted impact
Land Use		Impacts are uncertain until individual sites have been assessed. Refer to the Assessment of potential proposed development sites section 3.4 of this report.
Ecology		
Aquatic Environment		
Geology and Soils		
Waste and Resources		
Energy		
Landscape and Visual		
Cultural Heritage		
Air Quality and Noise		
Communities		
Summary		<p>The Main Issues Report 2015 for the Local Development Plan did not propose final site selections. In terms of sites, the Main Issues Report 2015 included as preferred sites those locations and development proposals that already feature in approved land supplies and policy designations. It proposed to change business and industrial locations in line with the land for business and industry charrette available as a background report. It also proposed to identify additional housing allocations taking into account a range of context factors, including the Site Sustainability and Deliverability Matrix available as an appendix to this Draft Environmental Report. It would only be through engagement on the issues in the Main Issues Report 2015 that the approach to identifying sites would be determined.</p> <p>The Main Issues report 2016 confirmed the site assessment process and individual assessments of each site are included in section 3.4 of this report.</p>
Mitigation		None required at this stage.

Question 11		
Land for housing		
Alternative B		
Allocate for housing development all sites that achieve an acceptable sustainable location assessment.		
Objectives	Impact	Justification for predicted impact
Land Use		Impacts are uncertain until individual sites have been assessed. Refer to the Assessment of potential proposed development sites section 3.4 of this report.
Ecology		
Aquatic Environment		
Geology and Soils		
Waste and Resources		
Energy		
Landscape and Visual		
Cultural Heritage		
Air Quality and Noise		
Communities		
Summary	<p>The Main Issues Report 2015 for the Local Development Plan did not propose final site selections. In terms of sites, the Main Issues Report 2015 included as preferred sites those locations and development proposals that already feature in approved land supplies and policy designations. It proposed to change business and industrial locations in line with the land for business and industry charrette available as a background report. It also proposed to identify additional housing allocations taking into account a range of context factors, including the Site Sustainability and Deliverability Matrix available as an appendix to this Draft Environmental Report. It would only be through engagement on the issues in the Main Issues Report 2015 that the approach to identifying sites would be determined.</p> <p>The Main Issues report 2016 confirmed the site assessment process and individual assessments of each site are included in section 3.4 of this report.</p>	
Mitigation	None required at this stage.	

<p>Question 12 Centres network</p>		
<p>Preferred option There should be a review of the centre network to consider potential additions. The types and boundaries of centres should also be reviewed based on retail outlets survey evidence and up to date policy guidance.</p>		
Objectives	Impact	Justification for predicted impact
Land Use		No significant impacts.
Ecology		
Aquatic Environment		
Geology and Soils		
Waste and Resources		
Energy		
Landscape and Visual		
Cultural Heritage		
Air Quality and Noise		
Communities	✓	Consistent with the sub-objective of improving physical fabric and ongoing management of town centres, suburbs and villages to reverse decline and sustain local communities.
Summary		This preferred option relates specifically to reviewing the centre network to identify centres appropriate to fulfilling local requirements. It therefore only impacts upon one sub-objective of the communities topic and does not impact upon other SEA topics that are more relevant to assessment criteria in Strategic Policy and promotion and protection measures in Thematic Policy.
Mitigation		None required.

Question 12		
Centres network		
Alternative Continue the centre network and boundaries identified in the current Local plan.		
Objectives	Impact	Justification for predicted impact
Land Use		No significant impacts.
Ecology		
Aquatic Environment		
Geology and Soils		
Waste and Resources		
Energy		
Landscape and Visual		
Cultural Heritage		
Air Quality and Noise		
Communities		
Summary		This alternative relates specifically to maintaining the existing centre network. It therefore only impacts upon one sub-objective of the communities topic and does not impact upon other SEA topics that are more relevant to assessment criteria in Strategic Policy and promotion and protection measures in Thematic Policy.
Mitigation		Mitigation would only be required if the preferred option of reviewing the centre network was not adopted.

