

**Appendix E Environmental Assessment**

A large, empty rectangular area, likely a placeholder for a table or detailed content related to the Environmental Assessment. A thin blue vertical line is visible on the left side of this area, extending from the top header down towards the footer.

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

## Appendix E – Environmental Assessment of Policy Options and their Alternatives

**KEY:**

<b>Major Benefit:</b>	+++	<b>Major Adverse:</b>	---
<b>Moderate Benefit:</b>	++	<b>Moderate Adverse:</b>	--
<b>Minor Benefit:</b>	+	<b>Minor Adverse:</b>	-
<b>Negligible</b>	0	<b>Uncertain:</b>	?
<b>Uncertain Benefit:</b>	? / +	<b>Uncertain Adverse:</b>	? / -
<b>Mixed Effects:</b>	+ / -		

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<b>GLASGOW PRESTWICK AIRPORT.</b>			
<p>Preferred Option: An Action Plan shall be prepared for the Airport and the surrounding area to link future Airport and non-Airport development, and to promote the expansion of Airport and runway facilities. The Action Plan will be prepared by an Airport Working Group, consisting of representation from the Council, the airport, public transport bodies, Scottish Enterprise, and the Ayrshire Joint Planning Unit. While housing growth within Monkton will not be delivered through the Action Plan, the Airport Working Group will be consulted on the allocation of land for housing, where it affects the Airport, particularly in relation to Monkton.</p> <p>Taking cognisance of the Glasgow Prestwick Airport Masterplan, the Action Plan will deliver a policy detailed policy framework, which will seek to: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop a Surface Access Strategy for the Airport, to increase effective and efficient transport access to the Airport, via, road, rail and foot;</li> <li>- Support the retention of the existing business park for commercial uses that are directly or indirectly connected with the operation of the Airport, and identify additional land for expansion in business/commercial land available for Airport related uses;</li> <li>- Relax at restrictions on permitted uses within the existing business park, to allow commercial uses that may complement the function of the Airport (e.g. general office, industry);</li> <li>- Promote the Airport and surrounding land as a location for the development of office/industrial uses connected with the renewable energy sector;</li> <li>- Retain the second runway for airport related use;</li> <li>- Secure land within, or nearby the Airport for hotel accommodation; and,</li> <li>- Preserve the natural setting and landscape character of around the Airport.</li> </ul> <p>It is noted that some areas in and around the Airport fall within flood risk areas. Detailed development of the Action Plan will explore flood risk issues, where the development impacts on flooding, or vice versa.</p>			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: Effects on biodiversity are considered uncertain at this stage, but likely to include some adverse effects. The land surrounding the airport is considered, as stated in the Airport Masterplan, to be of low ecological value however there is still likely to be some species present. At a more detailed project-level stage, it would be appropriate to look at the potential effects on biodiversity.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: The Glasgow Prestwick Airport Masterplan recognises that there are two cultural heritage assets listed on the National Monuments Record of Scotland. These are Pow Burn Bridge situated to the SE of the airport (also a Listed Building) and secondly, the Airport terminal building. When undertaking the development it has been stipulated that these monuments will not be adversely affected and work will be undertaken in consultation with The Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland. This would ensure that the integrity of these historic features are protected from any adverse effects of development, however it must be recognised that any new development can harm their historic setting. This can only be mitigated at the project level.
<b>Water</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: As stated in the policy option, some areas around the airport are at risk of flooding. It is further detailed that the Action Plan will explore flood risk issues where development impacts on flooding and visa versa and so this should ensure that flood risk is addressed sufficiently before development takes place.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	+ / -	+ / -	Mixed effects: Retaining the second runway for airport-related use utilises brownfield land and therefore is considered to benefit soils. However in contrast, it is likely that expansion will have an impact on agricultural land through new development, including any associated infrastructure.
<b>Landscape</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: The policy option states that the natural setting and landscape character around the airport will be preserved. However, this policy can only be implemented effectively at the project level, and at this stage it is uncertain whether design of any new development (including any associated infrastructure demands such as increased transport capacity, if needed) would entirely avoid adverse effects upon the landscape.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<b>Air Quality</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: Promoting the development of the airport along with access improvements could lead to air quality issues although this depends to an extent on the transport measures proposed. More efficient and effective transport access could reduce any congestion although it is uncertain.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	+ / -	+ / -	Mixed effects: Promoting airport expansion could have adverse effects with regards the potential for increased GHG emissions, however promoting the airport and surrounding land as a location for the development of office / industrial uses connected with the renewable energy sector could lead to some benefits in terms of climatic factors and so it is considered that there would be mixed effects.
<b>Noise</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: The measures for the airport could lead to increased noise emissions for local residents. The Airport Working Group will however be consulted on the allocation of land for housing in Monkton where it affects the airport, particularly in relation to Monkton. This could ensure that any new housing is directed to locations where there will be minimal noise effects resulting from the airport however this is not certain at this stage.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	+++	+++	Major long-term local and regional benefits: This policy option is considered to have many benefits to the population through improved employment opportunities within the airport itself and through the promotion of new businesses in and around the airport including a new hotel. Furthermore, indirect benefits include the potential for increased tourism to South Ayrshire as a result of the airport improvements which has the potential to boost the local economy. Consulting the Airport Working Group with regards housing allocations near to the airport could also further benefit the population and potentially improve quality of life for new residents if new housing is appropriately sited as to avoid any adverse effects which may be associated with the airport such as noise emissions. The policy option further aims to make access to the airport by rail, road and foot more efficient and effective thereby promoting sustainable access.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: There is no relationship between this policy and issues regarding sustainable design and construction and drainage infrastructure.
<b>Summary</b>	+ / -	+ / -	Mixed Effects: It is anticipated that the airport expansion could have adverse effects on several of the environmental parameters. Significant benefits are thought achievable to the local and regional population. The promotion of new industry in and around the airport along with the general support for airport growth is likely to boost local and regional economic growth, providing additional employment opportunities. Mitigation at project level would allow for the determination of effects on many of the environmental parameters.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No proposed mitigation. Project-level mitigation is identified as important to avoid or minimise uncertain adverse effects, but this is a detailed design matter that cannot be recommended by the SEA.		
Alternative 1: A number of sites within and surrounding the airport and Monkton have been promoted as opportunity sites for residential and commercial uses. The LDP would seek to manage integration of housing needs and Airport growth. Alternatively, the LDP may meet Airport and housing needs separately. It is considered that separating the processes of meeting demands will restrict the best integration of airport and residential uses, and this may harm the relationship between the airport and Monkton, and the wider natural environment, including the greenbelt and surrounding prime quality agricultural land.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: Increasing housing development around Monkton could have adverse effects even with an integrated approach. Exact effects are however uncertain at this stage as it is dependant on the exact location of any housing proposed.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: Monkton is established as a Conservation Area, and therefore the new development proposed has the potential to adversely affect its setting, or even integrity. Cultural heritage effects are largely dependant on the exact location of any new housing development. Care should be taken to ensure that any development occurring within the Conservation Area boundary or within view of the Conservation Area is in keeping with its surroundings.
<b>Water</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Effects on the water environment are again largely dependant on the location of new development, however Monkton is not at risk of flooding according to the SEPA flood map and therefore there should not be any flooding issues. This should be investigated further at a later stage, however.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: Prime agricultural land could be affected if these processes are separated and furthermore, greenfield land may be utilised for development thereby leading to adverse effects. It is however dependant on the exact location of any development to be able to determine the extent of effects.
<b>Landscape</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: The effects on the surrounding landscape are dependant on the location of development and therefore effects are uncertain at this stage.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	+	+	Minor long-term local benefits: It is thought that increasing the housing around Monkton would benefit the population and potentially improve the quality of the community environment.
<b>Material Assets</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Effects on material assets is considered uncertain at this stage as insufficient information on the development is available to assess the extent of any effect.
<b>Summary</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: Overall, it is considered that this alternative would have uncertain adverse effects due to the potential for uptake of prime agricultural land and use of greenbelt which could lead to adverse effects on soils as well as biodiversity. Effects however are dependant to an extent on where development would be located. It is thought however that there would still be some benefits to the population through this policy alternative.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	The LDP would benefit from policy which stipulates for the protection of the integrity and setting of the Monkton Conservation Area. Project-level mitigation is identified as important to avoid or minimise uncertain adverse effects, but this is a detailed design matter that cannot be recommended by the SEA.		
Alternative 2: In terms of commercial uses surrounding the Airport, an alternative approach would be to require future development within the business areas surrounding the airport to be airport related, as is currently the case. This may continue the current trend of under utilisation of airport related industrial land; whilst increasing pressure on existing industrial areas, especially Shawfarm and Newton. Long-term, this could require development of more Greenfield land for industrial use.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: If greenfield land is developed elsewhere then this could have adverse effects on biodiversity however as it is uncertain as to where this development would occur it is not possible to ascertain any effect on biodiversity.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Similar to the summary of biodiversity effects, it is uncertain as to where additional development would occur and therefore it is not possible to assign significance to any effect which could occur to cultural heritage assets.
<b>Water</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Dependant on where additional development for industrial use would occur there could be effects on the water environment but this is dependant on the location.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	-	-	Minor long term local adverse effects: In the long term this policy alternative specifies that development could be required on greenfield land. This does not take advantage of vacant land at the airport and therefore is considered to have adverse effects.
<b>Landscape</b>	-	-	Minor long term local adverse effects: Similar to the soils summary above, potentially requiring development on Greenfield land does not achieve the SEA objective of maintaining and protecting greenbelt areas in South Ayrshire and so it can be considered to have adverse effects.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: No significant effects to air quality are considered likely through this alternative policy option.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: No significant effects to climatic factors are envisaged.
<b>Noise</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Dependant on where the future industrial development is located, it could bring in new noise sources however as the location is not known, effects cannot be ascertained at this stage.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: No significant effects on human health through this alternative policy.
<b>Population</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Dependant on if required industrial development proceeds; there may be effects on the number of additional jobs. Any effect on the population however is uncertain at this stage.
<b>Material Assets</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: Only allowing airport-related development to occur on airport land does not make efficient use of resources and so this may lead to adverse effects on material assets although the extent of this is uncertain. There is also uncertainty as to whether there would be a large demand for airport related infrastructure in the future.
<b>Summary</b>	-	-	Minor local adverse effects: This alternative policy option is considered to lead to minor adverse effects on the landscape and soils through the possible need to utilise greenfield land in the long term for industrial development. There are further uncertain effects on other SEA parameters dependant on where the development would be directed to.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation is proposed for this option.		
Alternative 3: Releasing the second runway for non-airport related development is not favoured as this will result in the loss of an irreplaceable asset to the airport. This may harm the Airport's potential to capture future growth in aviation development or its ability to service the growth in the renewable energy sector. In addition, the Airport cannot commit to delivering the land within the plan period. Therefore, irrespective of the LDP visioning process, it would not be appropriate to release this site for housing, as the site may be ineffective and long-term, this may undermine the Council's effective housing land supply.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: It has been ascertained through the Airport Masterplan that biodiversity in the vicinity of the airport is of low value and therefore development in this area should not affect biodiversity. It is also noted however in the Masterplan that the change in use for the second runway should improve bird and other wildlife management and therefore could have benefits to biodiversity. The extent of effect however is uncertain at this stage as it is largely dependant on how this would be carried out.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: There are two cultural heritage features on the National Monuments of Scotland register however it is unlikely that development of the runway would affect these.
<b>Water</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: The land surrounding the airport is at risk of flooding according to the SEPA flood map and so there is the potential that further development could increase the risk of flooding.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	+	+	Minor long term local benefits: Developing on this land will utilise a brownfield area and so be of benefit to soils and geology.
<b>Landscape</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: The effects on the surrounding landscape are dependant on the location of development and therefore effects are uncertain at this stage.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	+	+	Minor long term local benefits: The change of use for the second runway would reduce the noise foot print over built up areas to the south of the airport and so this leads to minor noise benefits.
<b>Human Health</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: The reduction in noise emissions through the change in use for the runway could indirectly lead to health benefits however the extent of these benefits is uncertain.
<b>Population</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: This alternative policy may have effects on the population such as increased job opportunities. This depends however on the type of development which is proposed and so effects are uncertain at this stage.
<b>Material Assets</b>	? / +	? / +	Minor long term local benefits: Developing on brownfield land makes efficient use of resources and therefore it is considered that there may be benefits to material assets although the extent is uncertain.
<b>Summary</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: The change in use for the second runway is thought to have benefits to several of the environmental parameters. Effects on the population however are uncertain as it is dependant to an extent on what development would be proposed and if this would lead to increased employment opportunities.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No proposed mitigation.		

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<b>HOUSING.</b>			
Meeting Housing Needs.			
Preferred Option: Use the higher threshold target contained within the Housing Needs and Demand Assessment, of 559 units per annum (2795 over the 5 year period to 2014), as a guide for meeting identified overall housing needs and demand. The 2009 Housing Land Audit (HLA) identifies an effective land supply to 2014 of 2005 units. This includes 620 units across the three strategic release sites at Greenan, North East Troon and South East Ayr. The residual requirement is therefore 745 units, onto which must be added a 25% flexibility margin, giving a final requirement of 931 units to 2014, which would need to be provided through additional housing sites identified in the LDP. Over the second half of the 10 year plan period, the requirement increases, in line with the Structure Plan figures, to 717 units per annum, or 3585 over the 2014-19 period. 2009 HLS figures indicate that the land supply could deliver 3073 units over the period, which would leave a shortfall, plus 25% flexibility, of 640 units to be met through LDP allocations.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	Negligible effects: This policy deals with the method of how housing needs are going to be met, not the actual development of sites. When sites are allocated further assessment is likely to be required.
Cultural Heritage	0	0	Negligible effects.
Water	0	0	Negligible effects.
Soils and Geology	0	0	Negligible effects.
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects.
Population	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: Utilising the higher threshold target contained within the Housing Needs and Demands Assessment is likely to direct housing development to those areas that require it most, benefiting quality of life and avoiding a shortfall in housing.
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor regional, long term direct benefits: Utilising the higher threshold target contained within the Housing Needs and Demands Assessment is likely to direct housing development to those areas that require it most and avoiding a shortfall in housing, benefiting quality of life for the population across South Ayrshire. Benefits are likely to be long term – the housing requirements stretch over the ten years of the plan period.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		
Alternative a: Using the middle threshold target contained within the Housing Needs and Demand Assessment, as a guide for meeting identified overall housing needs and demand and Alternative b: Using the lower threshold target contained within the Housing Needs and Demand Assessment, as a guide for meeting identified overall housing needs and demand.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	Negligible effects: This alternative deals with the method of how housing needs are going to be met, not the actual development of sites. When sites are allocated further assessment is likely to be required.
Cultural Heritage	0	0	Negligible effects.
Water	0	0	Negligible effects.
Soils and Geology	0	0	Negligible effects.
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects.
Population	+ / -	+ / -	Mixed effects: Utilising a middle threshold target or lower threshold target to guide overall housing needs and demand is likely to assist in meeting the housing requirements but will also allow for uncertainties within the housing market, this is likely to benefit the population through aiming to assist in meeting housing requirements, but may also allow for a more uncertain housing market where lower build rates may be necessary to avoid surplus housing land. This option may however limit the range of sites available and limit the size and geographic location of sites. In addition if economic circumstances improve, this may limit the number of homes being developed.
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<b>Summary</b>	+ / -	+ / -	Mixed, long term, regional effects: Utilising a middle threshold target or lower threshold target to guide overall housing needs and demand is likely to assist in meeting the housing requirements but will also allow for uncertainties within the housing market, this is likely to benefit the population through aiming to assist in meeting housing requirements, but may also allow for a more uncertain housing market where lower build rates may be necessary to avoid surplus housing land. This option may however limit the range of sites available and limit the size and geographic location of sites. Effects are likely to be long term, and occur throughout the South Ayrshire area.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		
Addressing Lower Build Rates.			
Preferred Option: Incorporate the scenarios set out in the table below in to housing allocation calculations, so that any potential shortfall arising from a lower build rate than forecast in the Housing Land Audit can be addressed through additional housing allocations. This will help to ensure that the Council is able to maintain a 5-year effective land supply at all times. In particular, it is proposed to base the lower forecast on a reduction in build rate to 2014 of 50%, compared to the HLA figures. This scenario assumes an annual build rate at the 2009 level of 200 units pa. An annual assessment of development rates will be made, measured by the Housing Land Audit, which will decide whether additional housing allocations are justified to encourage increased development.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: This policy deals with the method of how housing allocation calculations are going to be made, not the actual development of sites. When sites are allocated further assessment is likely to be required.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Water</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Landscape</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	+	+	Minor short to long term regional benefits: This policy option is likely to benefit the population through addressing housing requirements over the plan period, providing an increased quality of life to the population and increasing economic development. The option allows for the current economic situation and a slower rise in housing completions over the short term, with a higher build rate in the longer term. This may better meet housing demand in South Ayrshire in the short term and longer term, with any shortfall being addressed by additional allocations.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor long term short to long term regional benefits: This policy option is likely to benefit the population through addressing housing requirements over the plan period, providing an increased quality of life. The option allows for the current economic situation and a slower rise in housing completions over the short term, with a higher build rate in the longer term. This may better meet housing demand in South Ayrshire in the short term and longer term, with any shortfall being addressed by additional allocations. This is anticipated to benefit the population throughout South Ayrshire.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		
Alternative: Use only the 2009 forecast of effective land supply as the basis for calculating the shortfall in housing requirements. This would not allow the LDP to respond to a more sustained downturn in the housing market and significantly lower build rates, which could create a shortfall in allocations against the housing requirement.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: This alternative deals with the method of how housing allocation calculations are going to be made, not the actual development of sites. When sites are allocated further assessment is likely to be required.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Water</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Landscape</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	-	-	Minor short to long term regional adverse effects: The alternative is anticipated to result in a minor adverse effect on the population as housing requirements may not be met. This alternative may not allow for lower and future higher build rates. This may have a detrimental effect on the community environment and quality of life throughout South Ayrshire.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	-	-	Minor short to long term, regional direct adverse effects: The alternative is anticipated to result in a minor adverse effect on the population as housing requirements may not be met. This alternative may not allow for lower and higher future builds rates. This may have a detrimental effect on the community environment and quality of life throughout South Ayrshire in the short and longer term.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		
Housing Growth Strategy (North / South of area).			
Initial Policy Option: To distribute new residential development around Ayr, Prestwick and Troon; but also to other existing settlements (such as Dundonald, Symington, Monkton, Tarbolton, Mossblown, Annbank and Coylton) in the north of South Ayrshire, that benefit from access to South Ayrshire's transport network.			
Amended Policy Option: To distribute new residential allocations around Ayr, Prestwick and Troon; but also to other existing settlements (Dundonald, Symington, Monkton, Tarbolton, Mossblown, Annbank, Coylton, Fisherton/Dunure, Maybole and Minishant) in the north of South Ayrshire, that benefit from good access to South Ayrshire's transport network (Map ...) The selection of sites within these search areas will be guided by the Land Assessment Framework, and the location of a particular site within a search area does not imply automatic selection of that site for development. The Framework will reflect the need to protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity, water quality, cultural heritage, soils and geology and the local landscape character when developing housing around existing settlements. Areas of flood risk and prime agricultural sites should also be avoided where possible. Use of existing transport, waste and drainage infrastructure will be promoted where possible. The Council will also prioritise housing development on infill and derelict and vacant sites within towns, and particularly within Ayr Town Centre, in line with the Ayr Renaissance Strategy.			
This will meet identified housing demand by guiding new housing to those areas that are best served by existing amenities and infrastructure, particularly established key transport nodes within South Ayrshire. This will also allow strategic transport network improvements to be best placed to offer maximum connectivity. The preferred option accords with the provisions of NPF2. New housing sites will not be located close to the major housing release sites allocated through the current South Ayrshire Local Plan, which are at North East Troon, South East Ayr, and Greenan. This will help avoid any potential competition with these sites, which could adversely impact on their delivery.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	?	+	Uncertain effects: New residential development may affect the biodiversity of South Ayrshire; in particular there is a designated SSSI to the north of Monkton. It should be ensured that development is sited appropriately as to avoid loss and/or fragmentation of designated sites and/or priority species and habitats. The amended policy incorporates the initial SEA recommendations and therefore it is thought that there would be minor benefits achieved as a result.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	?	+	Uncertain effects: New residential development should ensure that the setting and integrity of cultural heritage features are not affected. There are a number of cultural heritage features including Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings and Historic Gardens and Designed Landscapes within close proximity to the settlements. The amended policy option states that the land assessment framework reflects the need to protect and where possible enhance cultural heritage assets and therefore it is envisaged that minor benefits to historic assets would result.
<b>Water</b>	?	+	Uncertain effects: Effects are uncertain until the exact location of development is known. The SEPA flood map identifies flooding at a number of locations surrounding settlements, including coastal areas at Ayr and Troon and areas surrounding Ayr. The amended policy option states that the land assessment framework will reflect the need for water quality to be protected and areas of flood risk avoided so leading to minor long term benefits to the water environment.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	?	+	Uncertain effects: Effects are uncertain until the exact location of development is known. The amended policy option states that the Council will prioritise housing development on infill and derelict land and vacant sites within towns, particularly within Ayr Town Centre thereby leading to minor long term regional benefits to soils and geology.
<b>Landscape</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Locating new residential development around existing settlements is likely to be beneficial to the landscape as it is likely to limit development to existing urban areas limiting encroachment to the greenbelt. The exact effect will be dependant on the location of the new development and if greenbelt land will be utilised.
<b>Air Quality</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: The distribution of residential development within close proximity to existing settlements is likely to limit the requirement for car travel to access amenities and services.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	+	+	Minor long term national benefits: The distribution of residential development within close proximity to existing settlements is likely to limit the requirement for car travel to access amenities and services.
<b>Noise</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Effects on noise sensitive receptors are uncertain until the exact location of development is known. Development should be carefully sited to avoid the positioning of residential properties within areas of noise level exceeding Noise Exposure Category C.
<b>Human Health</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional direct benefits: Locating new development within close proximity to existing settlements and amenities is likely to have a minor benefit to human health through being sited in close proximity to health services, social and recreational facilities.
<b>Population</b>	++	++	Moderate long term regional benefits: Ensuring new development is located around existing towns and settlements is likely to benefit the population through providing new housing in areas that have easy access to amenities and that are within close proximity to existing transport options. In addition distributing residential development close to the existing centres is likely to ensure access to services, amenities and employment opportunities.
<b>Material Assets</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: Locating new housing within close proximity to existing settlements and transport routes is likely to maximise use of existing transport infrastructure, drainage and waste management facilities.
<b>Summary</b>	?	++	Uncertain effects: This policy is likely to have benefits to the population throughout South Ayrshire, with development located close to existing centres and amenities, as well as existing transport links. Effects on the natural environment are largely uncertain until the exact location of development is known. The SEA recommendations were addressed and taken on board with additional information provided to the policy option as stated above. This has lead to potential moderate, regional, long term direct beneficial effects as uncertain effects on the environment are anticipated to be largely avoided.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	Care should be taken to protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity, water quality, cultural heritage, soils and geology and the local landscape character when developing housing around existing settlements. Areas of flood risk, prime agricultural sites should be avoided and areas of vacant and derelict sites promoted.		

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
Alternative: 1 a) Concentrate new housing land releases to Ayr, Prestwick and Troon. This is not favoured since it could create competition with the major housing release sites and potentially affect the delivery of these key sites.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	?	+	Uncertain effects: New residential development may affect the biodiversity of South Ayrshire. Exact effects will be dependant on the location of development. It should be ensured that development is sited appropriately as to avoid loss and/or fragmentation of designated sites and/or priority species and habitats. Mitigation should ensure that biodiversity is protected with minor long term benefits.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	?	+	Uncertain effects: New residential development should ensure that the setting and integrity of cultural heritage features are not affected. There are a number of cultural heritage features including Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings and Historic Gardens and Designed Landscapes within close proximity to the settlements, particularly surrounding Ayr. Mitigation should ensure that cultural heritage features are protected with minor long term benefits.
<b>Water</b>	?	+	Uncertain effects: Effects are uncertain until the exact location of development is known. The SEPA flood map identifies flooding at a number of locations surrounding settlements, including coastal flooding at Ayr, Prestwick and Troon and river flooding to the north of Prestwick and around Ayr. Mitigation should ensure that water quality is protected and areas of flood risk are avoided with minor long term benefits to the water environment.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	?	+	Uncertain effects: Effects are uncertain until the exact location of development is known. If development was to promote vacant and derelict land within Ayr, Prestwick and Troon this may have benefits to soils and geology. Development should be sited to avoid areas of prime agricultural soils. Mitigation should ensure that vacant and derelict land is promoted and areas of prime agricultural land are avoided, this may have benefits to soils and geology.
<b>Landscape</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Locating new residential development around existing settlements is likely to be beneficial to the landscape as it will limit development to existing urban areas limiting encroachment to the greenbelt. The exact effect will be dependant on the location of the new development and if greenbelt land will be utilised.
<b>Air Quality</b>	+	+	Minor long term local to regional benefits: The distribution of residential development within close proximity to existing settlements is likely to limit the requirement for car travel to access amenities and services thereby having the potential to lead to a reduction in air pollution.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	+	+	Minor national long term benefits: The distribution of residential development within close proximity to existing settlements is likely to limit the requirement for car travel to access amenities and services.
<b>Noise</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Effects on noise sensitive receptors are uncertain until the exact location of development is known. Development should be carefully sited to avoid the positioning of residential properties within areas of noise level exceeding Noise Exposure Category C. In particular high noise levels are experienced surrounding Prestwick Airport.
<b>Human Health</b>	+	+	Minor local and regional long term indirect benefits: Locating new development within close proximity to existing towns and amenities is likely to have a minor benefit to human health through being sited in close proximity to health services, social and recreational facilities.
<b>Population</b>	++	++	Moderate local long term benefits: Ensuring new development is located around existing towns is likely to benefit the population through providing new housing in areas that have easy access to amenities and that are within close proximity to existing transport options. In addition distributing residential development close to the existing centres is likely to ensure access to services, amenities and employment opportunities.
<b>Material Assets</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: Locating new housing within close proximity to existing settlements and transport routes is likely to maximise use of existing transport infrastructure, drainage and waste management facilities.
<b>Summary</b>	++	++	Moderate long term local and regional benefits: This alternative is likely to have beneficial effects on the human environment, with the population benefiting from locating housing development in close proximity to existing towns. Effects on the natural environment are largely uncertain until the exact location of development is known. Moderate, regional, long term direct beneficial effects are likely after mitigation as uncertain effects on the environment are anticipated to be largely avoided.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	Care should be taken to protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity, water quality, cultural heritage, soils and geology and the local landscape character when developing housing around existing settlements. Areas of flood risk and prime agricultural sites should be avoided and areas of vacant and derelict sites promoted.		
Alternative 1 Disperse new housing land releases to smaller existing settlements in the north of South Ayrshire (i.e. Dundonald, Symington, Monkton, Tarbolton, Mossblown, Annbank and Coylton) so as to retain accessibility to amenities and key transport infrastructure. This would not meet long established housing needs for growth in housing in the Ayr, Prestwick and Troon areas; and, may harm the environment by placing a significant burden on smaller settlements to accommodate significant volumes of housing.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	?	+	Uncertain effects: New residential development may affect the biodiversity of South Ayrshire. Exact effects will be dependant on the location of development. It should be ensured that development is sited appropriately as to avoid loss and/or fragmentation of designated sites and/or priority species and habitats. Mitigation should ensure that biodiversity is protected with minor long term benefits.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	?	+	Uncertain effects: New residential development should ensure that the setting and integrity of cultural heritage features are not affected. There are a number of cultural heritage features including Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings and Historic Gardens and Designed Landscapes within close proximity to the settlements. Mitigation should ensure that cultural heritage features are protected with minor long term benefits.
<b>Water</b>	?	+	Uncertain effects: Effects are uncertain until the exact location of development is known. The SEPA flood map identifies flooding at a number of locations surrounding settlements, including around Monkton, Coylton and Annbank. Mitigation should ensure that water quality is protected and areas of flood risk are avoided with minor long term benefits to the water environment.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	?	+	Uncertain effects: Effects are uncertain until the exact location of development is known. If development was to promote vacant and derelict land this may have benefits to soils and geology. Development should be sited to avoid areas of prime agricultural soils. Mitigation should ensure that vacant and derelict land is promoted and areas of prime agricultural land are avoided, this may have benefits to soils and geology.
<b>Landscape</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Locating new residential development around existing settlements is likely to be beneficial to the landscape as it will limit development to existing settlements limiting encroachment to the greenbelt. The exact effect will be dependant on the location of the new development and if greenbelt land will be utilised.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<b>Air Quality</b>	-	0	Minor local to regional long term adverse effects: Locating new housing development to smaller settlements, with only local services is likely to encourage the use of the private car for access to services, retail and employment. This may have a slight adverse effect on air quality. Mitigation to improve public transport linkages to these areas is likely to reduce these effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	-	0	Minor long term national adverse effects: As with air quality, locating new housing development to smaller settlements, with only local services is likely to encourage the use of the private car for access to services, retail and employment. This may result in a slight increase in greenhouse gas emissions. Mitigation to improve public transport linkages to these areas is likely to reduce these effects.
<b>Noise</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Effects on noise sensitive receptors are uncertain until the exact location of development is known. Development should be carefully sited to avoid the positioning of residential properties within areas of noise level exceeding Noise Exposure Category C.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: No significant effects on human health are considered likely.
<b>Population</b>	+	+	Minor long term local benefits: Ensuring new development is located around existing settlements is likely to benefit the population through providing new housing in areas that have easy access to amenities. Benefits are considered minor as development will only be focused towards local centres; however these centres are within reasonable distance from the main centres of South Ayrshire.
<b>Material Assets</b>	+	+	Minor long term local and regional benefits: Locating new housing within close proximity to existing settlements and transport routes is likely to maximise use of existing transport infrastructure, drainage and waste management facilities.
<b>Summary</b>	?	+	Uncertain effects: Overall effects of this alternative are considered to be uncertain as many exact effects will be dependant on the exact location of development. Minor long term regional, direct benefits are likely after mitigation to the natural and built environment.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	Care should be taken to protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity, water quality, cultural heritage, soils and geology and the local landscape character when developing housing around existing settlements. Areas of flood risk, prime agricultural sites should be avoided and areas of vacant and derelict sites promoted. Improved public transport linkages to these areas should be assured.		
Alternative: 1 c) Meet the demand for housing by locating new housing land releases primarily within existing settlements in the south of South Ayrshire. This would not meet long established housing needs for growth in housing in the Ayr, Prestwick and Troon areas; may harm the environment by placing a significant burden on smaller settlements to accommodate significant volumes of housing; and will place land for new housing in locations that are remote and disconnected from existing transport infrastructure and amenities, and will not serve employment opportunities that NPF2 recognises as being likely to be attracted to the more populated Ayr, Prestwick and Troon areas.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	?	+	Uncertain effects: New residential development may affect the biodiversity of South Ayrshire. There are a number of designated biodiversity sites within the south of South Ayrshire. Exact effects will be dependant on the location of development. It should be ensured that development is sited appropriately as to avoid loss and/or fragmentation of designated sites and/or priority species and habitats. Mitigation should ensure that biodiversity is protected with minor long term benefits.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	?	+	Uncertain effects: New residential development should ensure that the setting and integrity of cultural heritage features are not affected. There are a number of cultural heritage features including Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings and Historic Gardens and Designed Landscapes scattered around the south of South Ayrshire. With mitigation, cultural heritage features in these areas should be protected with minor long term benefits.
<b>Water</b>	?	+	Uncertain effects: Effects are uncertain until the exact location of development is known. The SEPA flood map identifies flooding at a number of locations surrounding settlements to the south of the area including Girvan, Crosshill, Dailly, and Ballentrae. In addition the coastal areas are prone to flooding from the sea. Mitigation should ensure that water quality is protected and areas of flood risk are avoided with minor long term benefits to the water environment.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	?	+	Uncertain effects: Effects are uncertain until the exact location of development is known. If development was to promote vacant and derelict land this may have benefits to soils and geology. Development should be sited to avoid areas of prime agricultural soils. Mitigation should ensure that vacant and derelict land is promoted and areas of prime agricultural land are avoided, this may have benefits to soils and geology.
<b>Landscape</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: The exact effect will be dependant on the location of the new development and if greenbelt land will be utilised.
<b>Air Quality</b>	-	0	Minor long term adverse effects: Locating new housing development to smaller settlements to the south of the area, with only local services and infrequent access to public transport is likely to encourage the use of the private car for access to services, retail and employment. This may have a slight adverse effect on air quality. Mitigation to improve public transport linkages to these areas in the south of the area is likely to reduce these effects to negligible.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	-	0	Minor long term national adverse effects: As with air quality, locating new housing development to smaller settlements to the south of the area, with only local services and infrequent access to public transport is likely to encourage the use of the private car for access to services, retail and employment. This may result in a slight increase in greenhouse gas emissions. Mitigation to improve public transport linkages to these areas in the south of the area is likely to reduce these effects.
<b>Noise</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Effects on noise sensitive receptors are uncertain until the exact location of development is known. Development should be carefully sited to avoid the positioning of residential properties within areas of noise level exceeding Noise Exposure Category C.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: No significant effects on human health are considered likely.
<b>Population</b>	+	+	Minor long term local benefits: Ensuring new development is located around existing settlements is likely to benefit the population through providing new housing in areas that have easy access to local amenities. Benefits are considered minor as development will only be focused towards local centres in the south of the region.
<b>Material Assets</b>	+	+	Minor long term local benefits: Locating new housing within close proximity to existing settlements and transport routes is likely to maximise use of existing transport infrastructure, drainage and waste management facilities.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<b>Summary</b>	?	+	Uncertain effects: Overall this alternative is likely to have uncertain effects, as there are likely to be uncertain effects on the natural environment as effects are dependant on the exact location of development. Minor benefits are likely for the population and material assets through siting development within close proximity to existing settlements and minor adverse effects likely to air quality and climatic factors as a result of development being sited closer to smaller settlements with more infrequent transport opportunities. After mitigation minor regional, long term, direct benefits are envisaged as mitigation aims to protect and enhance the natural environment and improve public transport.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	Care should be taken to protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity, water quality, cultural heritage, soils and geology and the local landscape character when developing housing around existing settlements. Areas of flood risk, prime agricultural sites should be avoided and areas of vacant and derelict sites promoted. Improved public transport linkages to these areas should be ensured.		
Preferred Option: Support housing development within Girvan; and explore the housing issues for each village in the southern area and, within Supplementary Guidance will review village boundaries, so as to accommodate, where appropriate, a range of potential housing sites and allow for sustainable expansion of the village, whilst protecting the landscape setting. Given the difficulties often faced in developing housing sites in such areas, and the additional uncertainty of the current market conditions, a flexible approach will be adopted that allows a number of potential sites for housing in and around villages to be included, subject to acceptability in terms of environmental, setting and infrastructure issues. In doing so the Guidance will take note of the sites put forward through the 'Call for Sites' exercise. This should provide a range of options for house builders to facilitate development, in the expectation that not all sites will come forward. The Guidance will also explore, where appropriate, potential sites for business opportunities and rural enterprises, as well as sites for community facilities.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Water</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Landscape</b>	+	+	Minor long term local and regional benefits: The policy aims to protect the landscape setting and so leading to minor benefits.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	+	+	Minor long term local and regional benefits: Benefits are envisaged due to the provision of appropriately sited housing within the villages with further potential for business opportunities and rural enterprises as well as sites for community facilities thereby potentially improving the community environment and quality of life.
<b>Material Assets</b>	+	+	Minor long term local benefits: Existing infrastructure may be utilised in the villages.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor long term, local and regional direct benefits: This policy option is likely to benefit the local population within villages in South Ayrshire through increased housing and opportunities for economic development and community facilities within the villages. In addition existing infrastructure may be utilised. The policy aims to protect environmental factors and landscape setting so providing benefits to these topics.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		
Alternative: Alternatively, the Council could restrict housing development to Girvan and to infill sites within existing village boundaries. This approach would likely constrain necessary growth of villages and may fail to meet localised housing needs.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: The alternative retains existing village boundaries, so no significant effects as likely.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: as above.
<b>Water</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Landscape</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	-	-	Minor long term local to regional adverse effects: This alternative may have minor adverse effects on the population through limiting housing, economic opportunities and new community facilities within the villages.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<b>Summary</b>	-	-	Minor long term, local to regional direct adverse effects: This alternative is unlikely to allow for sufficient housing, localised economic growth and new facilities for the community in villages within South Ayrshire. This is not likely to be beneficial for those within these areas as localised growth and the community environment may not be improved.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		
Alternative: A further alternative would be to consider future village housing sites on a case-by-case basis, rather than within a co-ordinated review of appropriate boundaries and sites. This may result in piecemeal development and limit opportunities for growth.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: Piecemeal development could result in increased habitat fragmentation and / or loss thereby leading to adverse effects to biodiversity. The exact extent of effects however is uncertain as it is dependant on the exact location of housing sites in the villages.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Piecemeal development may result in adverse effects to historic features and archaeological sites dependant on the exact location.
<b>Water</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: Piecemeal development may not effectively consider use of vacant and derelict land thereby having adverse effects to soils and geology. The exact extent of effect however would largely be dependant on the location of development.
<b>Landscape</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: This alternative could lead to adverse effects to the local landscape character around the villages although the exact extent would depend on the location of development.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	-	-	Minor long term local adverse effects: This alternative is not considered to allow for growth within the villages of South Ayrshire, this may be detrimental as opportunities for growth and economic development may be limited.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	-	-	Minor local, long term direct adverse effects: This alternative is likely to have localised adverse effects on the population of villages within South Ayrshire as it may limit growth and renewal in these areas. Furthermore, adverse effects are anticipated to local biodiversity, landscape and soils and geology through piecemeal development although the exact extent of effect would largely depend on the location of the sites.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		
Preferred Option: The Guidance should aim to protect and where possible enhance biodiversity interest, cultural heritage, the water environment, and landscape character. The Guidance should aim to utilise vacant and derelict land, safeguard prime agricultural land and avoid development within close proximity to noise sensitive receptors.*			
<i>*This is a new policy option developed in response to the provision of mitigation measures to South Ayrshire Council to minimise or eliminate adverse effects on the natural and built environment.</i>			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits (minor long-term regional benefits): This policy option requires the guidance to protect and where possible enhance biodiversity and therefore minor benefits are thought achievable, however there is no certainty without a stronger policy on ensuring developer contributions are made.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits (minor long-term regional benefits): As above, the commitment to protecting and where possible enhancing cultural heritage features could provide minor benefits, however there is no certainty without a stronger policy on ensuring developer contributions are made.
<b>Water</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits (minor long-term regional benefits): Protecting and where possible enhancing the water environment within the guidance should lead to minor benefits, however there is no certainty without a stronger policy on ensuring developer contributions are made.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	+	+	Minor long-term regional benefits: The guidance states an aim to utilise vacant and derelict land along with safeguarding prime agricultural land. Where development occurs, this would have minor benefits to soils and geology (against a baseline of not having such guidance in place).
<b>Landscape</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits (minor long-term regional benefits): The landscape character should be protected and enhanced where possible within the guidance, therefore minor benefits are thought achievable. However there is no certainty without a stronger policy on ensuring developer contributions are made.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	+	+	Minor long-term regional benefits: The guidance states an aim to avoid development within close proximity to noise sensitive receptors. Where development occurs, this would have minor benefits to the noise environment (against a baseline of not having such guidance in place).
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<b>Summary</b>	++	++	Moderate long-term regional benefits: The policy option states that the guidance should aim to protect and where possible enhance several of the SEA topics and therefore moderate benefits are thought achievable.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	In order to increase the certainty of long-term benefits, the LDP should include policy setting out a requirement to obtain a contribution from developers towards biodiversity, cultural heritage, water environment and landscape enhancements. Where feasible, this should form part of other developing policies, existing initiatives and programmes in order to maximise the benefit of such contributions.		
Affordable Housing.			
Preferred Option: Within the area defined by the Housing Market Sub-Areas of Ayr, Prestwick, Troon and Rural North, the Council will seek a contribution of 25% of the total number of units on site, from new developments by private builders, towards the provision of affordable housing. Detailed guidance on the collection and management such contributions will be contained within statutory Supplementary Guidance, as set out in the 'Meeting Infrastructure Needs' section. This option will help to address the identified housing need and shortfall in the provision of affordable housing in the north of the area.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: this policy deals with the provision of affordable housing and not the actual development of it.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: as above.
<b>Water</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Landscape</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	+	+	Minor long term local benefits: Affordable housing provision is thought to benefit the quality of life of those in need of housing.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor long term local benefits: Affordable housing provision is thought to benefit the quality of life of those in need of housing.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		
Preferred Option: The Council will investigate more innovate and flexible forms of affordable housing provision, through the Supplementary Guidance, that can be used to meet this target contribution. We will await completion of the ongoing review of PAN74: Affordable Housing before exploring these issues further.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: This policy option is concerned with awaiting PAN74 and is not likely to affect the environmental parameters.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: as above.
<b>Water</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Landscape</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	+	+	Minor long term local benefits: More innovative and flexible forms of housing provision is thought to benefit the quality of life of those in need of housing.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor long term local benefits: More innovative and flexible forms of housing provision is thought to benefit the quality of life of those in need of housing.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
Alternative: Alternatively, the Council could maintain the current policy approach which seeks a 25% contribution on new developments over a size threshold across the whole of South Ayrshire. It is considered that this approach does not reflect the different need requirements in different areas, and could potentially constrain development of marginal sites in the southern towns and villages.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	Negligible effects: This alternative deals with the provision of affordable housing and not the actual development of it.
Cultural Heritage	0	0	Negligible effects: as above.
Water	0	0	Negligible effects.
Soils and Geology	0	0	Negligible effects.
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects.
Population	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: This alternative could detrimentally affect those people most at need of affordable housing and could constrain development in marginal areas therefore adverse effects are predicted although the extent of effects is uncertain at present.
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: This alternative could detrimentally affect those people most at need of affordable housing and could constrain development in marginal areas therefore adverse effects are predicted although the extent of effects is uncertain at present.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		
Preferred Option: To address the above issues and in order to meet identified needs, affordable housing provision will be supported through two key elements: i) A developer contribution from new private housing. To reflect lower levels of housing need and to help stimulate development of housing sites a contribution of 15% is proposed in the Girvan and South Carrick HMA sub-areas. Further details of the collection mechanisms and options for more innovative types of provision will be set out in Supplementary Guidance. ii) The Council will allocate a number of sites specifically for affordable housing. These will be in villages where the HNDA, or further local analysis, indicates a particular unmet need, or where a village is significantly constrained in terms of available land for new housing. These sites will be identified as part of the review of village boundaries within Supplementary Guidance. It is considered these two measures, in tandem, could deliver higher levels of affordable housing than currently being achieved, where it is most required, and could also help unlock development of private housing sites in the southern area to stimulate local economies.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	Negligible effects: this policy deals with the provision of affordable housing and not the actual development of it.
Cultural Heritage	0	0	Negligible effects: as above.
Water	0	0	Negligible effects: as above.
Soils and Geology	0	0	Negligible effects: as above.
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects: as above.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects: as above.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects: as above.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects: as above.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects: as above.
Population	+	+	Minor long term local to regional benefits: Varied allocation of affordable housing contribution will benefit the quality of life of those in need of housing. It will ensure that housing will be provided to areas that require it and are in need of it most.
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects: as above.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor long term local benefits: It is thought that this option would provide benefits to the population through delivering high levels of affordable housing.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
Alternative: Alternatively, the current policy measure of a 25% developer contribution target could be maintained. However, this does not reflect the weight of evidence in the HNDA in terms of housing needs, and may not necessarily result in higher contributions, given that recent housing developments have not able to meet the target. This may hamper future housing and economic development.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	Negligible effects: This alternative deals with the provision of affordable housing and not the actual development of it.
Cultural Heritage	0	0	Negligible effects: as above.
Water	0	0	Negligible effects: as above.
Soils and Geology	0	0	Negligible effects: as above.
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects: as above.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects: as above.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects: as above.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects: as above.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects: as above.
Population	?	?	Uncertain effects: Although this could still benefit people through affordable housing provision, it may affect future housing provision and economic development so leading to uncertain effects.
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects: as above.
Summary	?	?	Uncertain effects: Although this could still benefit people through affordable housing provision, it may affect future housing provision and economic development so leading to uncertain effects.
Proposed Mitigation	No mitigation proposed.		
Rural Housing – Settlement Strategy.			
Initial Preferred Option: The preferred option is for the LDP to remove the RPA and RDA distinctions and for rural development policies to apply across South Ayrshire. This would align more closely with national policy and guidance and would allow for a more flexible approach to support rural communities. While this may place the north of the area under slightly greater pressure for development of houses in the countryside, this is not expected to undermine the strategic direction of the LDP.			
Amended Preferred Option: The preferred option is for the LDP to remove the RPA and RDA distinctions and for existing rural development policies to apply across South Ayrshire. This would align more closely with national policy and guidance and would allow for a more flexible approach to support rural communities. While this may place the north of the area under slightly greater pressure for development of houses in the countryside, this is not expected to undermine the strategic direction of the LDP.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	?	+	Uncertain effects: Effects on biodiversity are considered uncertain as it is largely dependant on what rural development policies are applied. The amended option taking into account the acceptance of mitigation means that this policy is likely to result in existing rural policies applying across the whole of rural South Ayrshire with the environment and natural resources safeguarded throughout rural areas.
Cultural Heritage	?	+	Uncertain effects: Effects on cultural heritage features are considered uncertain as it is largely dependant on what rural development policies are applied. The amended option taking into account the acceptance of mitigation is likely to lead to minor benefit due to the safeguarding of cultural heritage assets in South Ayrshire.
Water	?	+	Uncertain effects: Effects on the water environment are considered uncertain as it is largely dependant on what rural development policies are applied. The amended policy option is likely to lead to minor long term regional benefits as is likely to result in existing rural policies applying across the whole of rural South Ayrshire with the environment and natural resources safeguarded throughout rural areas.
Soils and Geology	?	+	Uncertain effects: Effects on soils and geology are considered uncertain as it is largely dependant on what rural development policies are applied. Minor benefits through the amended option: This policy is likely to result in existing rural policies applying across the whole of rural South Ayrshire with the environment and natural resources safeguarded throughout rural areas.
Landscape	?	+	Uncertain effects: Effects on the landscape are considered uncertain as it is largely dependant on what rural development policies are applied. The amended policy option is likely to have minor benefits through safeguard the rural landscape from inappropriate development avoiding detrimental effects throughout rural South Ayrshire if existing rural development policies are applied.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects.
Population	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: This policy is likely to benefit the rural population through ensuring that rural housing, services and employment are located in accessible locations. In addition, development that benefits the rural economy including farm diversification is likely to be encouraged. As this policy is to be applied across the whole of rural South Ayrshire this is likely to benefit a larger population.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<b>Material Assets</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: This policy is likely to encourage rural development and housing in areas that are within close proximity to existing infrastructure, with minor benefits through the use of existing infrastructure.
<b>Summary</b>	?	+	Initial Policy Option: Uncertain effects: Effects are considered to be dependant on whether existing rural development policies are to be applied across South Ayrshire. Amended Policy Option: Minor regional, long term benefits: This policy is likely to benefit the whole of the rural population of South Ayrshire as existing RPA and RDA distinctions are to be removed and the existing policies to apply across the rural area. This is likely to benefit the rural economy and population over a wider area than the previous policies and safeguard the environment and natural resources.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	Preferred Option: The preferred option is for the LDP to remove the RPA and RDA distinctions and for <b>existing</b> rural development policies to apply across South Ayrshire. This would align more closely with national policy and guidance and would allow for a more flexible approach to support rural communities. While this may place the north of the area under slightly greater pressure for development of houses in the countryside, this is not expected to undermine the strategic direction of the LDP.		
Alternative: The LDP will retain Rural Protection Area/Diversification Areas, currently identified in the SALP, in order to promote investment opportunities in the south of the area and to recognise the greater pressures on the in north of the area, outwith the Greenbelt. However, the Council will undertake a review of the boundaries of these areas and the policies and guidance applying to each area.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	+	+	Minor long term local to regional benefits: This alternative aims to safeguard the environment and natural resources from development through retaining the RPA/RDA thereby having the potential to protect areas of important ecological value.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	+	+	Minor long term local to regional benefits: This alternative aims to safeguard the environment and natural resources from development through retaining the RPA/RDA and so it is thought that the cultural heritage assets within rural areas of South Ayrshire could be protected from the effects of development.
<b>Water</b>	+	+	Minor long term local to regional benefits: This alternative aims to safeguard the environment and natural resources from development through retaining the RPA/RDA thereby potentially protecting water quality.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	+	+	Minor long term local to regional benefits: This alternative aims to safeguard the environment and natural resources from development through retaining the RPA/RDA and so could safeguard areas of prime agricultural land and important geological sites from development.
<b>Landscape</b>	+	+	Minor long term local to regional benefits: This alternative is likely to safeguard the landscape from inappropriate development avoiding detrimental effects.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	+	+	Minor local to regional long term benefits: This alternative is likely to benefit the rural population through ensuring that rural housing, services and employment are located in accessible locations within the RDA and RPA areas. In addition development that benefits the rural economy including farm diversification is likely to be encouraged.
<b>Material Assets</b>	+	+	Minor long term local to regional benefits: This alternative is likely to encourage the use of existing infrastructure through encouraging some rural housing where there are existing clusters of development.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor local, long term, benefits: This alternative is likely to have minor localised benefits to the natural environment as the RPA and RDA policies aim to protect the natural resources and the environment. In addition, the alternative is likely to encourage rural investment and economy as well as promoting development in accessible locations.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		
Housing Clusters.			
Preferred Option: In the rural areas of South Ayrshire, limited extensions to existing clusters or groups of houses outwith settlement boundaries will be viewed favourably, based on their acceptability in terms of the built form, landscape impact and access to amenities and infrastructure. Development would be resisted if, for instance, it would result in unacceptable 'ribbon development', damage to landscape value or cumulative harm to the character of the area.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Water</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Landscape</b>	+	+	Minor long term local benefits: Ensuring that extensions do not damage the landscape value or character of the area should provide minor benefits.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	+	+	Minor long term local benefits: Allowing extensions to groups of houses outwith settlements which have access to amenities and infrastructure should provide minor population benefits.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor long term local benefits: Benefits are envisaged due to the potential effects on the local landscape and population through this policy option.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation is proposed.		
Alternative: One alternative is for housing to be permitted only within identified settlement boundaries, or where it supports the needs of agriculture and rural businesses. This would place the LDP at odds with government policy and could overlook opportunities to meet rural housing needs in sustainable locations.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Water</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	+	+	Minor long term local to regional benefits: This alternative should avoid development on the greenbelt, and on prime agricultural and designated geological land.
<b>Landscape</b>	+	+	Minor long term local to regional benefits: This alternative is likely to be beneficial for the greenbelt through directing development to already identified settlement boundaries.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	+	+	Minor long term local to regional benefits: This policy option should be beneficial as housing is anticipated to be directed to areas with access to existing facilities.
<b>Material Assets</b>	+	+	Minor long term local to regional benefits: Directing development to areas of existing access and infrastructure is considered beneficial as limited further infrastructure will be required.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor local to regional, long term, direct benefits: This alternative is likely to avoid development within the greenbelt through encouraging the use of vacant and derelict sites. In addition benefits are likely to be seen for the population and material assets as development should be directed to areas with existing facilities and infrastructure.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		
Alternative: A second alternative is for Individual houses in the countryside to be viewed favourably where they meet Council guidelines on setting and design. This would also not align with government policy and guidance and could undermine the LDP's strategic objectives for enhancing the environment and maximising sustainability.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Effects are dependant on the location of housing development.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: The alternative outlines that houses will be viewed favourable if policies on setting and design are met. There should be no significant effects on cultural heritage.
<b>Water</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Effects are dependant on the location of housing development.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Effects are dependant on the location of housing development and if brownfield land is utilised.
<b>Landscape</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: Whilst the housing development may not be siting well for access to sustainable transport, individual houses are not likely to have a significant effect on the air quality of South Ayrshire.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Effects are dependant on the location of the development. This alternative could encourage development in locations that do not have easy access to services and amenities.
<b>Material Assets</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: Effects are dependant on the location of development. Adverse effects are possible if development requires new infrastructure.
<b>Summary</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: Effects are dependant on the location of development. Adverse effects are possible as development may require new infrastructure and the location may not encourage the use of sustainable transport.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
Conversion, Replacement and Extensions to Houses in the Countryside.			
Initial Preferred Option: The LDP will set out policies that are supportive of proposals for the conversion of redundant buildings, with key consideration being given to whether the buildings are of traditional design and capable of repair or restoration.			
Amended Preferred Option: The LDP will set out policies that are supportive of proposals for the conversion of traditional buildings that are genuinely redundant, in particular facilitating the restoration of Listed buildings. Key consideration will be given to whether the buildings are of traditional design and capable of repair or restoration, and the impact of the proposal on the overall character of the building.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	?	+	Uncertain effects: Policies which are supportive of proposals for the conversion of redundant buildings may result in the restoration of listed buildings or enhancement of Conservation Areas. Conversely, it could adversely affect these features. It is therefore considered appropriate to propose mitigation to ensure the restoration of listed buildings where appropriate. Minor long term local benefits: The amended policy option takes into consideration the initial SEA assessment findings as detailed in the proposed mitigation below. The changes are thought to result in minor benefits to cultural heritage as the policy facilitates the restoration of listed buildings.
<b>Water</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	+	+	Minor long term local benefits: This policy encourages the use of vacant land and buildings which will be beneficial to the soils and geology
<b>Landscape</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: This option may enhance the local landscape character through the utilisation of vacant buildings however the extent of the effect is uncertain at this stage.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Initial Preferred Option - Minor local long term direct benefits: This policy encourages the use of redundant buildings; this is likely to be beneficial to the soils and geology of the area through encouraging development of land that has already been utilised. Amended Preferred Option – It is envisaged that there will be minor benefits to cultural heritage however it is not considered that the overall assessment weighting will alter significantly.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	The LDP will set out policies that are supportive of proposals for the conversion of redundant buildings, with key consideration being given to whether the buildings are of traditional design and capable of repair or restoration. <b>In particular facilitating the restoration of Listed buildings.</b>		
Alternative: Alternatively, the LDP could not include any policies for conversion of buildings. This could create considerable uncertainty and variability for decision making and quality of outcomes. It would leave the Council without a robust position on this type of developments.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Without any policies for the conversion of buildings, this could result in the deterioration of any historic buildings that may otherwise have been restored.
<b>Water</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: This could result in the continuation of vacant buildings in South Ayrshire and potentially lead to development in other locations such as greenfield land.
<b>Landscape</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Without policies for the conversion of buildings, there is the potential that these could continue to lay vacant and deteriorate in quality thereby potentially affecting the landscape character however these effects are uncertain at this stage.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Without a policy for the conversion of buildings, these buildings could lay vacant and potentially deteriorate which could affect the landscape character. If these buildings are of historic interest then this could have effects on cultural heritage.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		
Preferred Option: The LDP will set out policies outlining the acceptability of proposals for house extensions and replacements and will be broadly supportive of such developments. A key consideration would be the limit for extensions and this is proposed as a maximum of 50% of the original floor space or more if it is sympathetic to the scale and character of the original building.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: This policy may have detrimental effects on cultural heritage including conservation areas and Listed Buildings. Care should be taken to avoid development that may have a detrimental effect on the setting and integrity of cultural heritage features.
<b>Water</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Landscape</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: This policy may have effects on cultural heritage depending on the type of extension or replacement that is carried out. Care must be taken in the design of extension as to avoid detrimental effects.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		
Alternative: The alternative would be to resist proposals for house extensions and replacements in the countryside. This could be seen as an unjustifiably restrictive approach that could limit growth, adaptation and investment in rural areas.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Water</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Landscape</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		
Housing to Support Agriculture and Rural Businesses.			
Preferred Option: The LDP shall contain policies that are supportive of housing to support the needs of agriculture and other rural businesses. In particular, it will set out the acceptability of proposals for new and replacement farmhouses and new agricultural workers' homes, including the instances where the submission of a business plan would be required and the means of securing properties to businesses.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
Water	0	0	Negligible effects.
Soils and Geology	?	?	Uncertain effects: Housing to support the needs of agriculture could have the potential to avoid building on prime agricultural land however this is uncertain at present.
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects.
Population	+	+	Minor long term local benefits: This policy option encourages housing for agricultural and rural businesses, promoting the rural economy of South Ayrshire.
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>+</b>	Minor local, long term direct benefits: This policy option encourages housing for farming and rural businesses, encouraging the promotion of the rural economy in South Ayrshire.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		
Preferred Option: The Council will explore options for how to secure the delivery of rural business residences in terms, ensure that development takes place as consented, and ensure the robustness of the business proposal.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	Negligible effects.
Cultural Heritage	0	0	Negligible effects.
Water	0	0	Negligible effects.
Soils and Geology	0	0	Negligible effects.
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects.
Population	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: Ensuring the delivery of rural business residences is thought to benefit the population through the potential to enhance rural economic growth.
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>+</b>	Minor long term regional benefits: Ensuring the delivery of rural business residences is thought to benefit the population through the potential to enhance rural economic growth.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		
Alternative: An alternative is to view proposals for houses associated with agriculture and rural businesses in the same way as other housing in the countryside. This would be more restrictive for such housing and may constrain rural businesses to the detriment of communities and the economy. It would also be significantly out of step with government policy.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	Negligible effects.
Cultural Heritage	0	0	Negligible effects.
Water	0	0	Negligible effects.
Soils and Geology	0	0	Negligible effects.
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	-	-	Minor local long term adverse effects: This policy option may have detrimental effects on the local economy of rural communities in South Ayrshire through limiting the opportunity for housing development associated with farming and other rural businesses.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	-	-	Minor adverse long term local direct effects: This policy option may have long term detrimental effects on the local economy of rural communities in South Ayrshire through limiting the opportunity for housing development associated with farming and other rural businesses.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		
Alternative: A second alternative would be to not require a business plan for such housing, which may permit housing that is not strictly required for business purposes, which may begin to undermine the strategy of the LDP.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Water</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Landscape</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		
<b>AYR AND TROON PORTS.</b>			
Preferred Option: The Council will seek to ensure the retention and continued development of existing sea port facilities at Ayr, Troon and Girvan.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	?	? / +	Uncertain effects: There is little biodiversity of value in these locations. There may however be some effects on the marine ecology dependant on what development is proposed. With mitigation in place, it is likely that there would be benefits to marine ecology however the extent of effects is uncertain at this stage.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	?	+	Uncertain effects: Both Troon and Ayr harbours are B Listed Buildings with further listed buildings and other features on the National Monuments Record of Scotland in the vicinity. Girvan port is not on the listed building register however several features on the National Monuments Record of Scotland and Scottish Sites and Monuments Record are present. It is therefore important that any development in the port locations take heed of these cultural heritage assets. Mitigation should ensure that cultural heritage features are protected and therefore minor benefits are envisaged.
<b>Water</b>	?	+	Uncertain effects: The ports and the surrounding areas are at risk of flooding from the sea and therefore care should be taken when developing in these locations that it does not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. Development should be sited appropriately in accordance with this. Mitigation as proposed below should lead to minor benefits through maintaining or enhancing water quality of the coastal areas and avoiding areas of high to moderate flood risk.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: There is some vacant and derelict land in the vicinity of Ayr harbour which could be utilised for development however use of this land is not specified in the policy option.
<b>Landscape</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: It is likely that retaining and continuing development of sea port facilities will benefit the local landscape however the extent of any effect is uncertain at this stage.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: No significant effects on air quality are likely as a result of this policy option.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: There are not anticipated to be any significant effects on noise as a result of this policy.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<b>Population</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: It is thought possible that increasing development in the port areas could increase employment opportunities and therefore could be of benefit to the population. The ports are an integral part of South Ayrshire's economy and therefore promoting development in these locations could enhance economic growth.
<b>Material Assets</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: This policy option is thought to be of benefit to material assets through efficient use of resources in ports development.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor long term, local and regional benefits: The benefits in the main stem from the potential effects on the economy and subsequently the population of South Ayrshire which could see an increase in the working age population attracted by the additional job opportunities. There are however several uncertain effects including those to cultural heritage assets, the water environment and soils and geology. With mitigation, these uncertain effects are envisaged to change to minor beneficial.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	Care should be taken to protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity, marine water quality, cultural heritage assets and the local landscape character when developing in and around the ports. Development should also be sited appropriately to avoid the risk of flooding.		
Preferred Option: The LDP shall recognise the intention of ABP to develop Masterplans for the development and future management of Ayr and Troon Ports; and will work in consultation with ABP in the preparation of the Masterplan. An Action Plan/Supplementary Guidance will be developed following the completion of a Masterplan to deliver aspirations of the Masterplan, where they meet Council objectives. Through the Action Plan, the LDP will adopt a flexible approach to encourage a wide range of appropriate uses within the port boundaries (particularly to encourage tourism and leisure uses).			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	?	+	Uncertain effects: There is little biodiversity of value in these locations. There may however be some effects on the marine ecology dependant on what development is proposed. Mitigation is thought to lead to minor benefits to marine ecology.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	?	+	Uncertain effects: Both Troon and Ayr harbours are B Listed Buildings with further listed buildings and other features on the National Monuments Record of Scotland in the vicinity. It is therefore important that any development in the port locations take heed of these cultural heritage assets. Mitigation is anticipated to lead to minor benefits to cultural heritage features.
<b>Water</b>	?	+	Uncertain effects: The ports and the surrounding areas are at risk of flooding from the sea and therefore care should be taken when developing in these locations that it does not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. Development should be sited appropriately in accordance with this. Water quality of coastal areas could also be affected depending on what development is proposed. With mitigation, areas at risk of flooding should be avoided and water quality maintained or improved thereby leading to minor local long term benefits.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: There is some vacant and derelict land in the vicinity of Ayr harbour which could be utilised for development however use of this land is not specified in the policy option.
<b>Landscape</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: It is likely that retaining and continuing development of sea port facilities will benefit the local landscape however the extent of any effect is uncertain at this stage.
<b>Air Quality</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: Expansion of the ports including development for tourism and leisure uses could affect air quality if it leads to increased shipping and boating activities around the coast.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: For the same reasons as above, increased boating etc could result in a rise in GHG emissions however it is not certain as to the extent of any effect.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: There are not anticipated to be any significant effects on noise as a result of this policy.
<b>Human Health</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: It is thought that improving leisure uses at the two ports could improve human health however the exact extent of any effect depends on what development would be put in place.
<b>Population</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: Encouraging a wide range of appropriate uses within the port boundaries, particularly tourism and leisure uses is thought to be of benefit to the population as it could lead to increased job opportunities and also enhance access to services.
<b>Material Assets</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: This policy option is thought to be of benefit to material assets through efficient use of resources in the ports development.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: Recognising the intention of ABP to develop Masterplans for development within the port boundaries is likely to benefit the population and material assets with potential further benefits to the landscape and human health. With mitigation it is considered that there will be benefits to cultural heritage, the water environment and biodiversity however these benefits are not thought to change the overall rating of minor long term beneficial effects.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	Care should be taken to protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity, marine water quality, cultural heritage assets and the local landscape character when developing in and around the ports whilst avoiding areas of high to moderate flood risk.		
Alternative: The Council may continue to operate a hands-off approach to managing the land use aspects of the port operations. This is not preferred, as Associated British Ports has identified, through consultation, its intention to Masterplan for management of Ayr and Troon ports. Therefore, where possible, the Council will seek to work with, and to assist in the delivery of the growth aspirations the ports have, in a flexible manner.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	?	+	Uncertain effects: There is little biodiversity of value in these locations. There may however be some effects on the marine ecology dependant on what development is proposed. Mitigation is thought to lead to minor benefits to marine ecology.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	?	+	Uncertain effects: Both Troon and Ayr harbours are B Listed Buildings with further listed buildings and other features on the National Monuments Record of Scotland in the vicinity. It is therefore important that any development in the port locations take heed of these cultural heritage assets. With mitigation it is anticipated that there will be minor benefits to cultural heritage assets through protection of historic port features ensuring of long term regional minor benefits.
<b>Water</b>	?	+	Uncertain effects: The ports and the surrounding areas are at risk of flooding from the sea and therefore care should be taken when developing in these locations that it does not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. Development should be sited appropriately in accordance with this. Mitigation should ensure that water quality does not deteriorate and areas of high to moderate flood risk will be avoided thereby leading to long term regional benefits to the water environment.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: There is some vacant and derelict land in the vicinity of Ayr harbour which could be utilised for development however use of this land is not specified in the policy option.
<b>Landscape</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: It is likely that retaining and continuing development of sea port facilities will benefit the local landscape however the extent of any effect is uncertain at this stage.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: No significant effects on air quality are considered likely through this alternative policy.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Effects on human health are uncertain as it is dependant on whether tourism and leisure uses would be promoted within the Masterplans.
<b>Population</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: The delivery of the Masterplans without Council support could still have benefits to the population through increased development leading to more employment opportunities however this is uncertain depending on the development that is proposed.
<b>Material Assets</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: This policy option is thought to be of benefit to material assets through efficient use of resources in the ports development.
<b>Summary</b>	? / +	+	Uncertain benefits: It is thought that with Council assistance, the delivery of the port aspirations would be realised more effectively. Uncertain effects are present particularly with regards effects on cultural heritage assets and the water environment however these should be looked at in more detail at a later stage of assessment when more information on the type of development proposed is available. Mitigation, if accepted, is envisaged to change the overall rating from uncertain beneficial to minor long term regional benefits. This is through the likely benefits to biodiversity, the water environment and cultural heritage assets that the mitigation would bring.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	Care should be taken to protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity, marine water quality, cultural heritage assets and the local landscape character when developing in and around the ports whilst avoiding areas of high to moderate flood risk.		
Preferred Option: In relation to Ayr Port, the LDP, Port Masterplan, and Action Plan will identify a traffic management plan to allow vehicles to enter and leave the port in the most efficient manner, while minimising the potential impact on residential properties in the Newton area.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: This preferred policy option is unlikely to have any significant effects on biodiversity.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	?	+	Uncertain effects: Ayr Harbour is classified as a B Listed building with other cultural heritage features listed on the National Monuments Record of Scotland and therefore care should be taken when devising the traffic management plan that these assets are not adversely affected. With mitigation there are envisaged to be minor long term local benefits to the historic assets around Ayr port.
<b>Water</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: The water environment is unlikely to be affected as a result of these measures.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Landscape</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Air Quality</b>	+	+	Minor long term local benefits: Improving the flow of vehicles entering and leaving the port will reduce congestion and therefore could reduce emissions.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Effects on the population are dependant on what the effects on the residential properties in the Newton area would be as a result of the traffic management initiative.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor long term local benefits: It is envisaged that this policy option will lead to improved air quality through reduced congestion at Ayr port. The traffic management plan may affect cultural heritage features however these effects are uncertain at this stage of the planning process. Mitigation proposed should alter the assessment of effects on cultural heritage to minor beneficial.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	Protection should be given to cultural heritage features when developing a traffic management plan at Ayr port.		
Preferred Option: In relation to Ayr Port, the LDP, Port Masterplan, and Action Plan will identify a landscape buffer/edge to the eastern side of the port, along the boundary with Newton.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	? / +	+	Uncertain benefits: Creating a landscape buffer may enhance biodiversity in this area as the buffer could act as a wildlife corridor however as the exact extent and details of the buffer are not known at present this benefit is uncertain. With mitigation to commit to the creation of a wildlife corridor this would alter the assessment to minor beneficial in terms of effects on local biodiversity.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Water</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Landscape</b>	+	+	Minor long term local benefits: Creating a landscape buffer / edge along the eastern side of the port would likely reduce any visual impacts for residents living in Newton and therefore minor landscape benefits are envisaged.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects. No significant effects are considered likely through this policy.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects.
Population	+	+	Minor long term local benefits: Creating a buffer along the boundary with Newton may improve the community environment of this area through reducing any visual effects of development.
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor long term local benefits: Overall it is thought that there would be minor long term benefits resulting from this policy option through protecting Newton residents from the visual effects of port development whilst also benefiting the local landscape character. In addition, with mitigation there could be additional benefits to biodiversity through the development of a wildlife corridor however the overall score remains minor beneficial.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	The preferred option could include a commitment to creating a landscape buffer which would also act as a wildlife corridor for local biodiversity.		
Preferred Option: In relation to Ayr Port, the LDP, Port Masterplan, and Action Plan will identify opportunities for a port extension to the east of Saltpans Road, Ayr (opposite Scottish Water depot).			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	Negligible effects: Biodiversity is generally low in this area and therefore there are unlikely to be any significant effects.
Cultural Heritage	?	+	Uncertain effects: There are several cultural heritage features listed on the National Monument Record of Scotland and Scottish Sites and Monuments Record which are located in this area and care should be taken to ensure that development does not adversely affect these assets. Mitigation to protect historic features would likely change this rating to minor beneficial.
Water	0	0	Negligible effects. Due to the location of the proposed extension it is not thought likely that there would be any significant effects to water quality and this location is not at significant risk of flooding according to the SEPA flood map.
Soils and Geology	?	?	Uncertain effects: It is uncertain as to whether this land is currently classified as vacant and derelict land and so effects on soils and geology are uncertain at this stage.
Landscape	?	?	Uncertain effects: The effects on the landscape are uncertain at this stage as it is dependant on what type of development is proposed and if the land is currently vacant.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects: The only residential areas in the vicinity of this site are across the rail line and it is unlikely that any development in this location would therefore adversely affect these areas.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects.
Population	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: Development may increase employment opportunities for the local people and therefore are potential benefits to the population although the extent of these effects is uncertain at this stage depending on the type of development.
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: It is thought that developing in this location will bring overall benefits to the natural and built environment however the extent of these effects can be considered to be uncertain until more information is available on the type of development proposed. With mitigation it is envisaged that there will be minor cultural heritage benefits however the overall score remains uncertain beneficial.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	Development in this location should avoid adverse effects on those historic features in close proximity.		
<b>CRAIGIE ESTATE</b>			
Preferred Option: The Council will safeguard land at Craigie Estate for education, tourist, recreational and community purposes to reflect the current and future active uses within the estate. The indicative master plan highlights existing and potential land uses.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	? / -	? / +	Uncertain adverse effects: There are no designated biodiversity sites in the vicinity of the campus however there may be effects on local biodiversity. The River Ayr is a wildlife corridor and so this should be taken into consideration if developing to the south of the Estate. Furthermore, the European protected species – Soprano Pipistrelle bat is found south of Ayr racecourse in proximity to the Estate and therefore there may be additional ecological surveys which would be required before development proceeded. With mitigation, if accepted, it is proposed that there would be uncertain benefits through ensuring that biodiversity is not adversely affected. It is stated in the description of the amended policy options that development needs to be sympathetic to the surrounding ecology.
Cultural Heritage	?	? / +	Uncertain effects: There are several cultural heritage features in the vicinity of the Estate that are listed on the National Monuments Record of Scotland and the Scottish Sites and Monuments Record. There is also one listed building – category A listed and group B listed Craigie, Ayrshire management centre. Care should be taken to ensure that these assets are not adversely affected through any development that may occur in the area. Mitigation ensuring the protection of historic features surrounding the Craigie Estate should result in potential benefits to cultural heritage.
Water	?	? / +	Uncertain effects: The southern boundary of the Craigie Estate campus runs along side the River Ayr and as such part of the grounds are within an area of flood risk as identified on the SEPA flood map. The actual campus buildings however are outwith the flood risk area. When developing the Estate, consideration should be given to flood risk to ensure that these areas remain either undeveloped or are mitigated to alleviate the risks. Mitigation to avoid areas of flood should avoid any effects due to flooding and so lead to potential benefits.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Landscape</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Developing the Estate could affect the landscape however it depends on what further development would be required for the additional educational, recreational and community facilities and therefore effects cannot be ascertained at this stage. It is stated in the description of the final policy options document that development should be sympathetic to the designed landscape and therefore effects should be minimal.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	+	+	Minor long term local benefits: Promoting recreational uses for the Craigie Estate could enhance human health and encourage people to participate in physical exercise. It is therefore thought that there would be minor benefits resulting from this policy.
<b>Population</b>	++	++	Moderate long term regional benefits: Safeguarding land at Craigie Estate for educational, recreational and community purposes is thought to have moderate benefits to the wider population. Additional facilities could provide further employment opportunities as well as the provision of education. These could retain the working age population in the area and improve their quality of life.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor long term local and regional benefits: Overall, this preferred policy option is anticipated to benefit the population and its health through the safeguarding of land at Craigie Estate for continued and future use as an educational, recreational and community facility. It is anticipated that additional surveys would be required at a later stage of development to assess the effects that development may have on the surrounding ecology. With mitigation, it is envisaged that there may be uncertain benefits to local biodiversity, the water environment and cultural heritage assets. It is not thought however that these benefits would be significant enough to alter the overall rating occurring through this policy option.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	Development on the Craigie Estate should ensure the protection of local biodiversity, cultural heritage assets and the avoidance of flooding from the River Ayr.		
Alternative: There are no reasonable alternatives that the LDP may deliver since the estate currently contains education facilities, a sports ground, a caravan park; and planning permissions has been granted for the University of the West of Scotland Campus and for a medical centre at Station Road adjacent to Ayr College.			
Initial Preferred Option: The Council will develop a Master plan for the Craigie / Dam Park area in partnership with University of the West of Scotland, Ayr College, NHS Ayrshire and Arran and Craigie Caravan Park. In particular the Masterplan will focus on: - Future education and residential accommodation for Ayr College and University of the West of Scotland; Traffic management and car parking facilities; Future use of Craigie Caravan Park; and, Potential siting of Ayr Academy within Craigie Estate. – This will only be in MIR subject to the agreement of education services.			
Amended Preferred Option: The Council will develop a master plan for the Craigie/ Dam Park area in partnership with University of the West of Scotland, Ayr College, NHS Ayrshire and Arran, Craigie Caravan Park and Craigie Community Council. In particular the master plan will focus on: - Future education and residential accommodation for Ayr College and University of the West of Scotland; Traffic management and car parking facilities (Plan of new Estate road layout included); Future use of Craigie Caravan Park; and, Potential siting of Ayr Academy within Craigie Estate. Sharing and enhancement of recreational facilities Protection and enhancement of cultural heritage Protecting and enhancing biodiversity as an integral part of the South Ayrshire's green network Ensuring that Flood considerations are taken into account in any development proposals.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	? / -	+	Uncertain adverse effects: There are no designated biodiversity sites in the vicinity of the campus however there may be effects on local biodiversity. The River Ayr is a wildlife corridor and so this should be taken into consideration if developing to the south of the Estate. Furthermore, the European protected species – Soprano Pipistrelle bat is found south of Ayr racecourse in proximity to the Estate and therefore there may be additional ecological surveys which would be required before development proceeded. The amendments to the initial preferred option commit to the protection and enhancement of biodiversity and so this is envisaged to lead to minor long term local benefits.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	?	+	Uncertain effects: There are several cultural heritage features in the vicinity of the Estate that are listed on the National Monuments Record of Scotland and the Scottish Sites and Monuments Record. There is also one listed building – category A listed and group B listed Craigie, Ayrshire management centre. Care should be taken to ensure that these assets are not adversely affected through any development that may occur in the area. The amendments to the initial preferred option commit to the protection and enhancement of cultural heritage assets is thought to lead to minor long term local benefits.
<b>Water</b>	?	+	Uncertain effects: The southern boundary of the Craigie Estate campus runs along side the River Ayr and as such part of the grounds are within an area of flood risk as identified on the SEPA flood map. The actual campus buildings however are outwith the flood risk area. When developing the Estate, consideration should be given to flood risk to ensure that these areas remain either undeveloped or are mitigated to alleviate the risks. The amended preferred option ensures that flood considerations are taken into account in any development proposals and therefore this should lead to minor benefits to the water environment.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Landscape</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Effects on the landscape character is largely dependant on the location and extent of development proposed. Effects at this stage are therefore considered to be uncertain.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: There may be very minor improvements to air quality through traffic management however it is not thought to be significant enough to be of any benefit.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: There are not thought to be any significant climatic effects as a result of this policy option.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	+	+	Minor long term local benefits: Developing future education and residential accommodation is thought to have minor benefits to the local population.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	?	+	Initial Preferred Option – Uncertain effects: Effects overall are considered to be dependant on the exact location of any development which would be proposed in the Masterplan. It is anticipated that additional surveys would be required at a later stage of development to assess the effects that development may have on the surrounding ecology. Amended Preferred Option – Minor long term local benefits: The amended policy, taking into consideration recommendations from the initial SEA assessment, commits to the protection and enhancement of biodiversity, cultural heritage features and the consideration of flooding through development proposals and therefore minor benefits are thought achievable.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	Development arising from the Masterplan should avoid adverse effects on local biodiversity and ensure that cultural heritage assets are not adversely affected. In addition, development should avoid flood risk areas.		
Alternative: A piecemeal approach to the development of Craigie Campus which could potentially raise infrastructure issues and timescales conflicts which will have an environmental, social and economic impact and lead to a less well integrated further education campus.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	? / -	? / +	Uncertain adverse effects: There are no designated biodiversity sites in the vicinity of the campus however there may be effects on local biodiversity. The River Ayr is a wildlife corridor and so this should be taken into consideration if developing to the south of the Estate. Furthermore, the European protected species – Soprano Pipistrelle bat is found south of Ayr racecourse in proximity to the Estate and therefore there may be additional ecological surveys which would be required before development proceeded. With mitigation, there may be benefits to biodiversity although these are considered to be uncertain at present.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	?	? / +	Uncertain effects: There are several cultural heritage features in the vicinity of the Estate that are listed on the National Monuments Record of Scotland and the Scottish Sites and Monuments Record. There is also one listed building – category A listed and group B listed Craigie, Ayrshire management centre. Care should be taken to ensure that these assets are not adversely affected through any development that may occur in the area. With mitigation accepted there may be benefits to historic features around the Estate.
<b>Water</b>	?	? / +	Uncertain effects: The southern boundary of the Craigie Estate campus runs along side the River Ayr and as such part of the grounds are within an area of flood risk as identified on the SEPA flood map. The actual campus buildings however are outwith the flood risk area. When developing the Estate, consideration should be given to flood risk to ensure that these areas remain either undeveloped or are mitigated to alleviate the risks. Mitigation should ensure that development avoids areas of flood risk leading to potential benefits to the water environment.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Landscape</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Effects on the landscape character is largely dependant on the location and extent of development proposed. Effects at this stage are therefore considered to be uncertain.
<b>Air Quality</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: A piecemeal approach to the development at Craigie Campus is stated to potentially raise infrastructure issues. This could have effects on the local air quality depending on what the infrastructure issues would be.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: A less integrated further education campus could mean that the population does not benefit as significantly as with the preferred policy option. Effects on the population however are uncertain at this stage as it is largely dependant on what development would be undertaken.
<b>Material Assets</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: A less integrated education campus could mean that the population does not benefit as significantly as within the preferred option. It is however thought that there would still be benefits although the extent is considered to be uncertain.
<b>Summary</b>	?	? / +	Uncertain Effects: Many of the possible effects on the natural and built environment are uncertain through this alternative policy option. Exact effects are dependant on how the development of the campus would proceed and what would be put in place. Further information would be required to make a more informed decision. With mitigation in place, it could lead to benefits to the natural and built environment however the extent of these effects is considered to be uncertain.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	Development arising from the Masterplan should avoid adverse effects on local biodiversity and ensure that cultural heritage assets are not adversely affected. In addition, development should avoid flood risk areas.		

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<b>CREATING AN EFFECTIVE TRANSPORT NETWORK.</b>			
A77 Corridor Study.			
<p>Preferred Option: South Ayrshire Council will adopt Supplementary Guidance to provide detailed guidance on the improvement required to cater for the housing growth expected within the lifetime of the Plan. In particular, the road interventions required to improve the A77 corridor are: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Signalisation of Monktonhill Roundabout;</li> <li>- Signalisation of Dutch House Roundabout and creation of filter lane;</li> <li>- Widening and signalisation Bankfield Roundabout and creation of filter lane; and,</li> <li>- Dual Whitletts to Holmston including River Ayr crossing, grade separation of Whitletts Roundabout and compact grade separation of Holmston Roundabout.</li> </ul> <p>The Council seek to establish, through supplementary guidance, a mechanism for delivery of these improvements to the A77. The total cost of the road improvements is estimated at £50-£80 million. As discussed under the Main Issues Topic "Meeting Infrastructure Needs" the Supplementary Guidance will explore funding the improvements; however the Guidance will address the management of funds for these improvements and establish who will implement the road improvements. This will require consultation with Transport Scotland, as the responsible authority for trunk roads. In addition to the road measures, the wider transport network would require further interventions to support the road improvements to handle future housing development. The A77 corridor study indicates that further improvement required would involve: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provision of a rail halt with Park-&amp;-Ride facilities at SE Ayr;</li> <li>- Park-&amp;-Ride facilities near Dutch House Roundabout and at Monkton, with connection to the rail network at Monkton if feasible; and</li> <li>- Provision of feeder bus services from the development sites linking into the strategic public transport network at the Park-&amp;-Ride sites.</li> </ul> <p>In developing an effective transport networks, the Council will exercise care to protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity, water quality, cultural heritage features, soils and geology and the local landscape character when siting development. Development shall seek to minimise impacts on areas of greenbelt and proximity to noise sensitive receptors.</p>			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	?	? / +	Uncertain effects: The policy option includes for the protection of biodiversity, and enhancement where possible. The extent of measures proposed however could make it difficult to prevent adverse effects, therefore effects are deemed uncertain at this stage.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	?	? / +	Uncertain effects: The policy option includes for the protection of cultural heritage features, and enhancement where possible. The extent of measures proposed however could make it difficult to prevent adverse effects therefore effects are deemed uncertain at this stage.
<b>Water</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain beneficial (minor long-term local benefits): It is more feasible that water quality could be protected through the various transport network improvements through for example, the implementation of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) where original construction of the road has no such measures, and therefore benefits are probable.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: The policy states that soils and geology will be protected and therefore effects are considered negligible.
<b>Landscape</b>	?	? / +	Uncertain effects: As with biodiversity, although it states that local landscape character will not be adversely affected and impacts on greenbelt land minimised, it may be difficult to avoid visual impacts through the siting of development and so effects are considered uncertain.
<b>Air Quality</b>	+ / -	+ / -	Mixed effects: The A77 improvements could result in increased road speeds thus increasing emissions however the park and ride facilities could encourage modal shift from the car to public transport thereby potentially reducing the number of vehicles on the road and so indirectly reducing emissions.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	+ / -	+ / -	Mixed effects: The A77 improvements could result in increased road speeds thus increasing emissions however the park and ride facilities could encourage modal shift from the car to public transport thereby potentially reducing the number of vehicles on the road and so indirectly reducing emissions.
<b>Noise</b>	+ / -	+ / -	Mixed effects: Widening of junctions and segments of the road could bring traffic in closer proximity to receptors, but there could be benefits in terms of both seeking to minimise impacts on noise sensitive receptors and improving traffic flow.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	+	+	Minor long-term regional benefits: The policy is likely to enhance accessibility with particular benefits achieved through park and ride facilities allowing for sustainable access to key services, amenities and employment.
<b>Material Assets</b>	+	+	Minor long-term regional benefits: The policy makes efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure and so minor benefits are thought achievable to material assets.
<b>Summary</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: It is likely that this preferred option would have benefits to the natural and built environment however several effects are considered uncertain at this stage as it is not clear as to the extent to which the protection of specified environmental assets is achievable.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	Benefits could be ensured and increased by introducing a requirement for net biodiversity, cultural heritage, water environment and/or landscape benefits, which would have to be demonstrated through project-level environmental impact assessment.		
<p>Alternative: The LDP vision for growth is founded on the basis of utilising the capacity of the environment that exists within South Ayrshire, and utilising capacity in existing transport networks to grow. An alternative vision may lead to development being guided to larger Greenfield sites, with significant infrastructure requirements having to be met in order to deliver the sites. This would be a similar approach to the South Ayrshire Local Plan. This is not preferred as it may undermine the SALP release sites at SE Ayr, Greenan and NE Troon. It is further considered that given the current economic uncertainty, this may prove an undeliverable vision for growth. Additionally this alternative is not preferred as the strategic transport improvements emanate from the Kay transport strategy documents as above. To not deliver on these objectives would conflict with national and regional planning and transport policy.</p>			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: Development on larger greenfield sites could have a greater potential for adverse effects on ecology, however as the location of development is not known, effects are considered uncertain. They could be major adverse if sites could have secondary effects upon any SACs or SSSIs, or negligible if no LBAP priority would be affected.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: There is a general greater concentration of historic assets in and around the towns and these could have additional pressures placed on them through this alternative.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<b>Water</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: Development on larger greenfield sites can convert substantial permeable land into impermeable, artificial surfaces which increase runoff with possible impacts on pollution levels and flood risk. It can also place added pressure on developers to modify watercourses, which goes against the Water Framework Directive objectives. These impacts are still possible with any new development, but focusing on existing developed areas increases use of brownfield land and may be in areas where watercourses are already modified (and can even be de-modified by developers).
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	-	-	Minor long-term local to regional adverse effects: Guiding development to larger greenfield sites does not make efficient use of brownfield land, and could increase the likelihood of utilisation of prime quality agricultural land.
<b>Landscape</b>	-	-	Minor long-term local to regional adverse effects: Developing on greenfield land is in conflict with the landscape SEA objectives.
<b>Air Quality</b>	-	-	Minor long-term local to regional adverse effects: The requirement for significant infrastructure to serve developments is thought to lead to a potential increase in air pollution thereby having adverse effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	-	-	Minor long-term national adverse effects: The alternative states that significant additional infrastructure would be required which could increase GHG emissions and therefore lead to adverse effects to climatic factors.
<b>Noise</b>	-	-	Minor long-term local adverse effects: Requirements for additional infrastructure to serve new development would likely increase noise emissions for existing and new residents therefore having adverse effects to noise.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: It is uncertain as to the effects that this alternative would have on the population.
<b>Material Assets</b>	-	-	Minor long-term local adverse effects: This alternative does not make efficient use of existing resources and so adverse effects on material assets are thought possible.
<b>Summary</b>	--	--	Moderate long-term local adverse effects: This alternative policy option is thought to have moderate adverse effects due to the utilisation of greenfield land and the requirement for significant infrastructure to meet the needs of these developments.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		
Alternative: Alternatives include serving South East Ayr with a rail station and provide additional stations at St. Quivox, Heathfield and Mossblown; serving south of Ayr with increased diesel service, and electrifying rail service south of Ayr. These options are unlikely to be delivered in the foreseeable future, including the lifespan of the LDP and are therefore not favoured options.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Effects on biodiversity would be dependant on which of these station developments would go ahead and so effects are considered uncertain.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Effects on cultural heritage would be dependant on which of these station developments would go ahead and so effects are considered uncertain.
<b>Water</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Effects would be dependant on the type of land proposed for development of stations. If vacant land was utilised then this could lead to benefits.
<b>Landscape</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Effects on the landscape would largely be dependant on the extent of development. Electrification could provide some adverse visual effects.
<b>Air Quality</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: Electrification of rail services south of Ayr along with additional rail stations reduces emissions from engines as well as promoting the train as a viable alternative to the private vehicle thereby promoting modal shift. All these could lead to enhanced air quality.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	+	+	Minor long term national benefits: As above, the measures proposed could help to reduce GHG emissions and thereby benefiting climatic factors.
<b>Noise</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Additional stations could lead to increased noise emissions through trains entering and leaving the stations although these are largely dependant on whether any noise sensitive receptors would be in proximity to the stations.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: It is thought that these measures would be of benefit to the population through an improved rail service, providing a viable alternative to the car and potentially encouraging modal shift.
<b>Material Assets</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: The alternative policy option makes efficient use of the existing train line thereby having minor benefits to material assets.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional to national benefits: This alternative for rail enhancements with the introduction of new stations could have benefits to several SEA parameters however there is some uncertainty as to the effects the measures could have on factors such as biodiversity, cultural heritage, soils, landscape and noise.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation measures are proposed.		

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<b>GREEN AND RURAL ECONOMY.</b>			
<b>Central Scotland Green Network (CSGN).</b>			
Preferred Option: The Council will utilise appropriate existing green networks, active travel routes and environmental and economic assets to support sustainable economic development in South Ayrshire, in line with the Vision and priorities for the Central Scotland Green Network set out by the CSGN Partnership Board. By providing an accessible, high quality environmental setting the CSGN can enhance the existing tourism asset and attract new businesses to the area. For instance, it could support improvements in environmental quality around key transport links such as Prestwick Airport, railway stations and the A77 corridor, enhance active travel routes, attract new business to brownfield sites and encourage rural enterprises. Given the significant role, and government support for the Green Network the Council proposes to address key issues relating to access, renewable energy, tourism, the Galloway and Southern Ayrshire Biosphere, Galloway Forest Dark Sky Park, the coast and the greenbelt within the context of the opportunities offered by the integrated approach of the Central Scotland Green Network.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	+	+	Minor long-term regional benefits: The policy aims to provide a high-quality environmental setting with improvements to the environmental quality around key transport links. This is thought to be of benefit to biodiversity as it could improve connectivity between habitats and facilitate species movements. Benefits could be of greater magnitude, depending upon implementation (including in combination with other policy areas – e.g. on location of development and developer contribution requirements).
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Water</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: The policy could result in an improved water environment through the measures proposed however the extent of improvements is uncertain at this stage.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	+	+	Minor long-term regional benefits: The policy states that the CSGN could attract new business to brownfield land and so has the potential to be of benefit to soils and geology.
<b>Landscape</b>	+	+	Minor long-term regional benefits: Improving the environmental quality around key transport links with the enhancement of active travel routes along with the utilisation of brownfield sites could lead to minor landscape benefits.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	+	+	Minor long-term regional benefits: The enhancement of active travel routes is likely to encourage physical activity and so has the potential to lead to health improvements.
<b>Population</b>	++	++	Moderate long-term regional benefits: It is envisaged that the measures proposed would have moderate population benefits through the enhanced sustainable access to services and amenities. Furthermore, attracting new businesses and rural enterprises is thought to lead to economic growth. The general improvements to the environmental setting could also go some way to improving the community environment and quality of life for local people.
<b>Material Assets</b>	+	+	Minor long-term regional benefits: This policy option utilises existing green networks and active travel routes as well as encouraging businesses to develop brownfield land thus leading to potential minor benefits.
<b>Summary</b>	++	++	Moderate long-term regional benefits: It is envisaged that this policy option would have significant benefits to the majority of the SEA topics through the commitment to improving the environmental setting, enhancing business opportunities and utilising brownfield land where appropriate.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation measures proposed.		
Alternative: The Council could alternatively seek to promote environmental and economic development objectives independently of the CSGN framework. This is not favoured as it would not align with NPF2 and may result in a less co-ordinated approach.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: Without input from the CSGN Framework, the benefits to biodiversity are uncertain as the most appropriate sites may not be selected for inclusion.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Water</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: It is possible that waterbodies in South Ayrshire could still be enhanced however they may not be key sites for improvement and therefore benefits are uncertain.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: It is likely that there will still be benefits to soils and geology through the use of vacant and brownfield sites however a less co-ordinated approach could lead to a reduced amount being developed.
<b>Landscape</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: Like soils and geology, it is anticipated that there will be improvements to the landscape through the policy option however the areas of the landscape most at need of enhancement may be overlooked.
<b>Air Quality</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: There may be some benefit to air quality however once again if key sites in need of improvement are not included then the extent of any benefits would be uncertain.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: As with air quality, there may be some benefit however this may not be as great as with the preferred option.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: There are still likely to be benefits to human health as active travel and recreational opportunities are still possible however these may not be directed to the most appropriate areas and so the extent of the effect is uncertain at this stage.
<b>Population</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: This option is still thought to benefit the population through an improved community environment and quality of life as well as the potential for additional employment opportunities. These effects are considered to be uncertain however as development may not be located in the most appropriate area.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: It is anticipated that there will still be benefits to the natural and built environment through this policy option however as key sites of economic, social and environmental importance may be overlooked it is not thought to be as great as with the preferred option.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No proposed mitigation.		
Galloway and Southern Ayrshire Biosphere.			
Preferred Option: To support the re-designation process for the Galloway and Southern Ayrshire Biosphere, through the Steering Group, and to support the framework of objectives set out for the proposed zones, in line with the wider objectives of the Central Scotland Green Network.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	+++	+++	Major long-term local benefits (minor global benefits): Biospheres aim to conserve areas of excellence. The Galloway and Southern Ayrshire Biosphere is proposed to include the Cairnsmore of Fleet National Nature Reserve (NNR), the Silver Flowe NNR and the core of the Merrick Kells SSSI. A small part of the Biosphere falls within South Ayrshire and the whole area represents significant examples at a global scale of a type of landscape associated with temperate broadleaf forests and woodland ecosystems. Their protection therefore is envisaged to be of significant benefit to biodiversity.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Water</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: There may be benefits to the watercourses within this area however the extent of effect is uncertain at present.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: There may be benefits to soils and geology within this area however the extent of effect is uncertain at present.
<b>Landscape</b>	++ / +++	++ / +++	Moderate to major long-term local benefits (minor global benefits): As stated in the biodiversity section, the whole proposed Biosphere area represents significant examples at a global scale of a type of landscape associated with temperate broadleaf forests and woodland ecosystems. Its protection therefore is envisaged to be of moderate benefit to the local landscape.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	+	+	Minor long-term regional benefits: The creation of a Biosphere in this area could attract people to visit and walk around the forest therefore leading to potential minor benefits to human health.
<b>Population</b>	++	++	Moderate long-term regional benefits: The Biosphere Reserve offers the potential for economic regeneration through the co-operative marketing of nature based tourism, food and crafts and through contributing to the development of strategies for local small towns, or rural community based initiatives and so leading to possible increased employment opportunities and enhanced quality of life.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	++ / +++	++ / +++	Moderate to major long-term local to regional benefits: It is thought that supporting the re-designation process could lead to many benefits, particularly with regards biodiversity, landscape and population.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation is proposed.		
Alternative: Alternatively, the Council could wait until a decision is made on whether to confirm the designation of Biosphere Reserve status before aligning the LDP to support the range of Biosphere objectives; or else the Council could choose not to support the social and economic aspects of the Biosphere objectives and uphold only the existing statutory habitat and wildlife designations. These options may mean that the Council would not capitalise on the opportunities offered by the Biosphere Reserve designation and the new range of objectives proposed for the wider 'Transition' area.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	+	+	Minor long term local to regional benefits: Upholding existing statutory habitat and wildlife designations is considered to be of minor benefit to biodiversity.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Water</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Landscape</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor long term local to regional benefits: This alternative is only considered to be of benefit to biodiversity through the commitment to upholding existing statutory habitat and wildlife designations.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation is proposed.		
Dark Skies.			
Preferred Option: The Council will support the objectives of the Dark Sky Park in the Galloway Forest Park, and will seek to integrate and co-ordinate these objectives with the wider aim of the Central Scotland Green Network and LDP.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	+	+	Minor long term local benefits: The Dark Sky Park aims to 'look after nature' and so it is considered that this could provide some benefits to the biodiversity within the Forest Park.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Water</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Landscape</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	+	+	Minor long term national benefits: The Dark Sky Park aims to conserve energy and reduce light pollution thereby having the potential to contribute to reduced GHG emissions.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: Encouraging tourism and sustainable economic development could increase employment opportunities in southern South Ayrshire thereby leading to minor population benefits.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor long term local and regional benefits: Supporting the objectives of the Dark Sky Park is thought to have minor benefits to biodiversity, climatic factors and population through encouragement of economic growth and promotion of employment opportunities.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation is proposed.		
Alternative: Not recognise or support the Dark Sky Park objectives through the LDP. This is not favoured as it would fail to optimise a potential asset for developing sustainable economic and tourism development and other LDP objectives.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: No significant effects are thought likely as a result of this alternative.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Water</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Landscape</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: No significant effects are thought likely as a result of this alternative.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation measures proposed.		

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
Access.			
Preferred Option: Develop an LDP policy which ensures that proposals will not impact adversely on public rights of way, core paths and long distance routes. Where such infrastructure is affected by a development during construction and upon completion, the developer should incorporate appropriate alternative or modified public access provision, approved by the Council. Development proposals on land where the Core Paths Plan has identified an aspirational core path will be expected to incorporate it into the overall design layout of the site and build the path to a standard agreed with the Council.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	Negligible effects: No significant effects are thought likely as a result of this alternative.
Cultural Heritage	0	0	Negligible effects.
Water	0	0	Negligible effects.
Soils and Geology	0	0	Negligible effects.
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: This policy aims to protect public rights of way, core paths and long distance routes from adverse effects. This is likely to maintain opportunities for open-air recreation within South Ayrshire.
Population	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: This policy option is likely to maintain sustainable access through ensuring proposals do not adversely effect public rights of way, core paths and long distance routes resulting in minor benefits to the population.
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.
Summary	+	+	Minor long term direct regional benefits: This policy option is likely to maintain sustainable access through ensuring proposals do not adversely affect public rights of way, core paths and long distance routes resulting in minor benefits to the population and human health.
Proposed Mitigation	No mitigation measures proposed.		
Alternative: The Council is not aware of any alternative to the preferred option, since any alternative would involve not having regard to national policy on public rights of way, core paths and long distance routes.			
Coast.			
Preferred Option: Review current SALP policy & strategy relating to coastal planning to ensure that the Council's strategy for coastal development remains robust, deliverable and sustainable. The strategy will seek to protect and enhance the coastal asset whilst optimising the opportunities for sustainable coastal development. The Council will also seek to optimise linkages with other assets within the Central Scotland Green Network.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	+ / -	+ / -	Mixed effects: This policy option can result in minor benefits to biodiversity as the policy seeks to protect and enhance the coastal asset. Designated sites including Troon Golf Links and Foreshore SSSI and Turnberry Dunes SSSI are situated within coastal South Ayrshire. European Protected Species and Priority Species have also been identified within the coastal areas of South Ayrshire including the Great-Crested Newt, Northern Brown Argus and the Oyster Plant. However, coastal development can have adverse effects, including cumulative local-level impacts. Care must be taken in how the goal of sustainable development is implemented, including with regard to the Water Framework Directive (see below).
Cultural Heritage	0	0	Negligible effects.
Water	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: Much of the coastal area of South Ayrshire is at risk of flooding from the sea. The Water Framework Directive has introduced objectives relating to restoring natural coastal geomorphology. Sea level rise combined with new coastal development can generate pressure to increasingly modify the coastline with flood and/or erosion defences. Coastal development should be sited appropriately to avoid effects associated with the management of current and projected flood and erosion risk. Water quality of coastal areas could also be affected depending on the type of development proposed/location of development.
Soils and Geology	+	+	Minor long-term regional benefits: This policy aims to protect and enhance coastal assets and is therefore likely to protect designated geological sites. Stretches of the South Ayrshire coast are designated as geological SSSIs including the Girvan to Ballentrae Coast SSSI, Turnberry Lighthouse to Port Murray SSSI and Maidens to Doonfoot SSSI.
Landscape	+ / -	+ / -	Mixed effects: The policy both includes for new coastal development and aims to protect and enhance coastal assets. It is not possible at this level to determine the level of protection and enhancement the area's landscape and designated Scenic Areas that will be guaranteed, as much is up to specific development locations and detailed design. Much of South Ayrshire's coast is designated as a Scenic Area. Landscape Character Areas include Coastal Raised Beaches and Terraces and Low Coastal Farmlands.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	+	+	Minor long-term regional benefits: This policy option encourages optimising linkages with other assets of the Central Scotland Green Network, this is likely to have minor benefits to human health through promoting access to outdoor recreational facilities.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<b>Population</b>	+	+	Minor long-term regional benefits: This policy option will protect the coastal environment whilst optimising the opportunities for sustainable coastal development and optimising links with the Central Scotland Green Network. This is likely to have minor benefits to the population through encouraging new sustainable development in appropriate locations.
<b>Material Assets</b>	+	+	Minor long-term regional benefits: This policy aims to optimise opportunity for sustainable coastal development promoting sustainability in the construction of future development with minor benefits likely to material assets.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor long-term direct regional benefits: This policy is likely to benefit coastal assets through protection and enhancement, with associated minor benefits to biodiversity, landscape, and soils and geology. There area also likely to be benefits to the population and material assets through sustainable coastal development.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation measures proposed.		
Alternative: An alternative would be to retain the Council's existing policy and strategy for coastal planning; however this scenario would not provide an opportunity to review the appropriateness of the Council's vision for coastal planning.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	+/-	+/-	Mixed effects: This policy option can result in minor benefits to biodiversity as the policy seeks to protect and enhance the coastal asset. Designated sites including Troon Golf Links and Foreshore SSSI and Turnberry Dunes SSSI are situated within coastal South Ayrshire. European Protected Species and Priority Species have also been identified within the coastal areas of South Ayrshire including the Great-Crested Newt, Northern Brown Argus and the Oyster Plant. However, coastal development can have adverse effects, including cumulative local-level impacts. Care must be taken in how the goal of sustainable development is implemented, including with regard to the Water Framework Directive (see below).
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Water</b>	?/-	?/-	Uncertain adverse effects: Much of the coastal area of South Ayrshire is at risk of flooding from the sea. The Water Framework Directive has introduced objectives relating to restoring natural coastal geomorphology. Sea level rise combined with new coastal development can generate pressure to increasingly modify the coastline with flood and/or erosion defences. Coastal development should be sited appropriately to avoid effects associated with the management of current and projected flood and erosion risk. Water quality of coastal areas could also be affected depending on the type of development proposed/location of development.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	+	+	Minor long-term regional benefits: This alternative aims to safeguard or enhance environmental quality and is therefore likely to safeguard designated geological sites. Stretches of the South Ayrshire coast are designated as geological SSSIs including the Girvan to Ballentrae Coast SSSI, Turnberry Lighthouse to Port Murray SSSI and Maidens to Doonfoot SSSI.
<b>Landscape</b>	+/-	+/-	Mixed effects: The policy both includes for new coastal development and aims to protect and enhance coastal assets. It is not possible at this level to determine the level of protection and enhancement the area's landscape and designated Scenic Areas that will be guaranteed, as much is up to specific development locations and detailed design. Much of South Ayrshire's coast is designated as a Scenic Area. Landscape Character Areas include Coastal Raised Beaches and Terraces and Low Coastal Farmlands.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	+	+	Minor long-term regional benefits: The existing Coastal Strategy identifies the importance of recreational demands on the coast and encourages environmental improvements of recreational areas.
<b>Population</b>	+	+	Minor long-term regional benefits: The existing Coastal Strategy facilitates opportunities for economic regeneration of coastal communities and investment opportunities with likely minor benefits to the population.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor long-term direct regional benefits: This alternative is likely to result in minor benefits to the coastal area. The alternative aims to safeguard or enhance areas of scenic and environmental quality with benefits to biodiversity, soils/geology and landscape. There are also likely to be benefits to human health and the population.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation measures proposed.		
Preferred Option: In preparing the LDP, cognisance of the Firth of Clyde Marine Spatial Plan Draft will be given to enable the Council to set a clearer direction for managing coastal development, clarify objectives and priorities, and direct decision makers and users to a more efficient and coherent approach towards the sustainable development and protection of marine resources.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	+/-	+/-	Mixed effects: The Firth of Clyde Marine Spatial Plan Draft (FCMSPD) aims to maintain and enhance the biodiversity of the Firth of Clyde. New development however is proposed which could lead to adverse effects on local biodiversity therefore mixed effects are considered likely to occur.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	+/-	+/-	Mixed effects: The FCMSPD aims to protect the integrity of maritime heritage of the Firth of Clyde. New development however could still adversely affect the setting of historic features around the coast and therefore mixed effects are thought possible.
<b>Water</b>	?/-	?/-	Uncertain adverse effects: If the Council were to utilise the FCMSPD to direct coastal development and priorities there may be some indirect benefits to water quality through safeguarding biodiversity that may be effected from activities that may also affect water quality. There may also be effects associated with development of ports etc which the FCMSPD encourages. Effects are considered uncertain at this stage. Development should be sited to avoid effects associated with coastal flooding.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Landscape</b>	+/-	+/-	Mixed effects: The FCMSPD aims to maintain and enhance the landscape of the Firth of Clyde. New development could adversely affect the coastal landscape of South Ayrshire and therefore care should be taken to ensure that adverse effects are avoided.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	+	+	Minor long-term regional benefits: The FCMSPD aims to support and improve access to recreation opportunities on the Clyde. If the FCMSPD were to direct the Council in managing coastal development this is likely to result in minor benefits to human health.
<b>Population</b>	+	+	Minor long-term regional benefits: The FCMSPD aims to maximise the potential social and economic benefits to coastal communities as well as maintaining access. This is likely to result in minor benefits to the population if the Council were to take cognisance of the FCMSPD in its development of coastal management objectives and priorities.
<b>Material Assets</b>	+	+	Minor long-term regional benefits: The FCMSPD encourages development of existing port and coastal infrastructure resources with minor benefits to material assets.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor long-term regional benefits: If the Council were to take cognisance of the FCMSPD in preparing the LDP this is likely to result in minor benefits to the coastal biodiversity, landscape and cultural heritage of South Ayrshire, as well as to human health, population and material assets.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation measures proposed.		
Alternative: The Council is not aware of any alternative to the preferred option, since any alternative would not have regard to marine planning system.			
Preferred Option: The LDP will identify coastal areas where potential exists to improve and develop coastal access paths; and ensure that coastal development proposals incorporate design layouts to accommodate coastal access.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	?/-	+	Uncertain adverse effects: There are several areas of biodiversity value in the coastal areas of South Ayrshire. Designated sites including Troon Golf Links and Foreshore SSSI and Turnberry Dunes SSSI are situated within coastal South Ayrshire. European Protected Species and Priority Species have also been identified within the coastal areas of South Ayrshire including the Great-Crested Newt, Northern Brown Argus and the Oyster Plant. There is the potential that developing coastal access paths may result in loss and/or fragmentation of designated sites and/or protected and priority species. There is also the potential that developing coastal access paths may exacerbate coastal erosion with the potential for loss/fragmentation. With mitigation as stated below there are likely to be minor long term benefits to biodiversity.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Many designated and non-designated historic assets are located along the South Ayrshire coast and these could be affected by coastal access improvements although the nature of impact is uncertain at present.
<b>Water</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	?/-	+	Uncertain adverse effects: Stretches of the South Ayrshire coast are designated as geological SSSIs including the Girvan to Ballentrae Coast SSSI, Turnberry Lighthouse to Port Murray SSSI and Maidens to Doonfoot SSSI. There is also the potential that developing coastal access paths may exacerbate coastal erosion with potential adverse effects on soils. With mitigation as stated below there are likely to be minor long term benefits to soils and geology.
<b>Landscape</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: This policy option is likely to benefit the human health in South Ayrshire through promoting opportunities for walking/cycling and other coastal recreation activities.
<b>Population</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	? / -	+	Uncertain adverse effects: There is the potential that developing coastal access paths may result in adverse effects to biodiversity/soils and geology depending on the location of development. This policy option is also likely to lead to minor benefits to human health through increased walking/cycling opportunities and access to recreational activities. Minor beneficial direct regional long term effects with mitigation: Effects are likely to be beneficial as the policy option with mitigation would ensure care is taken to protect and, where possible, enhance coastal biodiversity and soils and geology alongside providing benefits to human health.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	Care should be taken to protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and soils and geology.		
Alternative: The Council is not aware of any alternative to the preferred option as no provision for coastal access would be made within the LDP.			
Tourism.			
Preferred Option: The LDP will seek to promote opportunities for tourism development that will protect, enhance and optimise the environmental assets of South Ayrshire, which support the Vision for the LDP and align with the wider Central Scotland Green Network strategy.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional effects: This policy option promotes development that protects, enhances and optimises environmental assets and is therefore likely to result in minor benefits to biodiversity.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional effects: This policy option promotes development that protects, enhances and optimises environmental assets and is therefore likely to result in minor benefits to cultural heritage.
<b>Water</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional effects: This policy option promotes development that protects, enhances and optimises environmental assets and is therefore likely to result in minor benefits to water.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional effects: This policy option promotes development that protects, enhances and optimises environmental assets and is therefore likely to result in minor benefits to soils and geology.
<b>Landscape</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional effects: This policy option promotes development that protects, enhances and optimises environmental assets and is therefore likely to result in minor benefits to landscape.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional effects: Tourism opportunities will be promoted that align with the Central Scotland Green Network Strategy; this may result in improved opportunities for outdoor recreation and active travel with minor benefits to human health.
<b>Population</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional effects: Promoting opportunities for tourism development is likely to promote economic growth across South Ayrshire with minor benefits to the population.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional effects: This policy option is likely to have minor benefits through promoting tourism development that will protect and enhance environmental assets with benefits to biodiversity, cultural heritage, soils and geology, water and the landscape. Economic opportunities are also likely to arise. Promoting tourism development in line with the Central Scotland Green Network may also result in improved outdoor recreation opportunities with benefits to human health.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation measures proposed.		
Alternative: Tourism proposals are judged on the basis of their economic credentials, with limited consideration of the environment. This could potentially give rise to inappropriate development that could harm the environmental and scenic qualities of the area and would significantly undermine the strategic objectives of the LDP. It would also run counter to Scottish Planning Policy.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse: This alternative does not aim protect or enhance environmental assets and as such could result in adverse effects on biodiversity through loss/fragmentation depending on the location of development.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse: This alternative does not aim protect or enhance environmental assets and as such could result in adverse effects on cultural heritage depending on the location of development.
<b>Water</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse: This alternative does not aim protect or enhance environmental assets and as such could result in adverse effects on water depending on the location of development.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse: This alternative does not aim protect or enhance environmental assets and as such could result in adverse effects on soils/geology depending on the location of development.
<b>Landscape</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse: This alternative does not aim protect or enhance environmental assets and as such could result in adverse effects on landscape depending on the location of development.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional effects: Promoting opportunities for tourism development is likely to promote economic growth across South Ayrshire with minor benefits to the population.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	?/-	?/-	Uncertain adverse effects: This alternative does not aim protect or enhance environmental assets and as such could result in adverse effects on the natural and built environment depending on the location of development. Promoting development on the basis of economic credentials is likely to benefit the population through increased business opportunities.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation measures proposed.		
Greenbelt.			
Preferred Option: The Local Development Plan will retain the Greenbelt designated in the SALP, subject to: - Establishing that the number of housing units required to maintain an effective housing land supply (to be identified through comparison of the Housing Needs and Demands assessment with the Ayrshire Joint Structure Plan) cannot be accommodated without reverting to greenfield sites that are not currently within existing settlements; Establishing that the LDP's growth strategy ("growing South Ayrshire's economy in an outstanding natural environment") is required to manage the growth of South Ayrshire in meeting identified housing needs/demands; and, Appraising the stated purpose of the greenbelt, as set out in the SALP, against SPP21 "Green Belts".			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: Retaining the greenbelt designation is likely to be of benefit to the local biodiversity however as the designated greenbelt areas are only being retained subject to certain conditions and therefore effects are uncertain at this stage.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: There are unlikely to be any significant effects to cultural heritage as a result of this preferred policy option.
<b>Water</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Retaining the greenbelt is envisaged to have potential benefits to soils and geology as some of the greenbelt may be prime agricultural land. The effects are uncertain at this stage as the retention is subject to certain conditions so it is not conclusive that the greenbelt designations will not change at this stage.
<b>Landscape</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: This preferred policy option could benefit the landscape, although as the designation is still subject to certain conditions the exact effects are unknown at this stage. Developing on greenfield land would lead to adverse effects.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: This policy option is likely to bring benefits to the natural environment however as the greenbelt designation is subject to certain conditions there is some uncertainty at this stage as to the extent of any benefit.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No proposed mitigation.		
Alternative: The alternative is to not adopt a greenbelt policy within the LDP. This is not favoured as it would undermine the LDP growth strategy (the preferred vision) and could potentially undermine the effectiveness of major housing release sites contained within the SALP. Further, part of the purpose of greenbelt policy is to provide long-term clarity and certainty on where development will and will not take place, and SPP21 indicates that greenbelt designations should manage settlement growth over a period of at least 20 years. To remove the greenbelt could potentially undermine the strategic purpose of the SALP and the future LDP, and would be contrary to the advice in SPP21.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: Removing the greenbelt could have adverse effects on biodiversity in these out of town locations however it is not possible to ascertain the extent of any effect at this stage.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Water</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	-	-	Minor long term regional adverse effects: This alternative policy option could result in the development of prime agricultural land and reduced development of vacant and derelict land therefore it is considered that there is the potential for minor adverse effects to soils and geology.
<b>Landscape</b>	--	--	Moderate long term regional adverse effects: Removing the greenbelt designation could have significant adverse effects on the landscape and could also affect Scenic Areas in South Ayrshire.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: Ineffective management of settlement growth could detrimentally affect the population of South Ayrshire in terms of addressing housing needs and therefore there are potential adverse effects.
<b>Material Assets</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: Using greenfield land for development could involve building on isolated land which may result in difficulty connecting to public sewerage and drainage infrastructure. Furthermore, developing in these locations could utilise land which may have potential for mineral extraction. These effects however are considered uncertain at this stage.
<b>Summary</b>	-	-	Minor long term regional adverse effects: Removing the greenbelt will likely have significant detrimental effects to the landscape as well as soils and geology. Furthermore the population could be affected through inefficient management of settlement growth.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation is proposed.		
Preferred Option: The boundaries of the existing greenbelt will be reviewed by giving consideration to: - Protecting the growth strategy set out in the preferred vision; Protecting the effectiveness of housing release sites identified in the SALP; and, Retaining and establishing enduring greenbelt boundaries in accordance with Scottish Planning Policy 21 "Green Belts".			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: This option may result in a change to the greenbelt boundaries which may see them being reduced in favour of socio-economic factors. These effects are considered uncertain however dependant on the outcomes of the review.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: There are unlikely to be any significant effects to cultural heritage as a result of this preferred policy option.
<b>Water</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Retaining the greenbelt is envisaged to have potential benefits to soils and geology as some of the greenbelt may be prime agricultural land. The effects are uncertain at this stage as the retention is subject to certain conditions so it is not conclusive that the greenbelt designations will not change at this stage.
<b>Landscape</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: This preferred policy option could benefit the landscape however as the designation is still subject to certain conditions the exact effects are unknown at this stage. Developing on greenfield land would lead to adverse effects however.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: Due to the potential increase in land available for housing there may be minor benefits to the regional population as the working age population may be retained.
<b>Material Assets</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: If greenbelt land is developed, this could lead to building on isolated land with less potential for connection to the public sewerage and drainage infrastructure. Furthermore, there is the possibility that this land has the potential for mineral extraction.
<b>Summary</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: This policy option is likely to bring benefits to the natural environment however as the greenbelt designation is subject to certain considerations there is some uncertainty at this stage.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No proposed mitigation.		
Alternative: Alternatively, the Council could retain the existing greenbelt boundaries without reviewing how they deliver the vision of the LDP, how they affect SALP housing sites, or whether they are durable. This is not favoured as it retains existing boundaries without a robust review of the appropriateness of greenbelt boundaries against strategic objectives of the LDP. This could lead to inappropriate greenbelt boundaries that do not serve their function and undermine strategic growth strategies. Similarly, altering greenbelt boundaries without a sound review is not favoured, or considered to be a reasonable alternative.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: Retaining the greenbelt boundaries is thought to be of benefit to biodiversity through the safeguarding of habitats from loss and fragmentation.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Water</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: Retaining the greenbelt boundaries is likely to benefit soils and geology as prime agricultural land may be protected. It may be however that the greenbelt boundaries could benefit from being altered and therefore effects are uncertain.
<b>Landscape</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: Retaining the greenbelt boundaries is likely to benefit the landscape through protection of greenbelt land. It may be however that the greenbelt boundaries could benefit from being altered and therefore effects are uncertain.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: This policy option could adversely affect the population as housing may not be provided effectively and strategic growth strategies could be undermined.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: Overall, retaining the greenbelt boundaries could benefit the landscape and biodiversity in these areas however there could be adverse population effects due to strategic growth strategies being of lesser consideration.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	There is no mitigation proposed for this option.		
Preferred Option: The LDP shall alter the greenbelt boundaries in accordance with the review set out above.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: This option may result in a change to the greenbelt boundaries which may see them being reduced in favour of socio-economic factors. These effects are considered uncertain however dependant on the outcomes of the review.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: There are unlikely to be any significant effects to cultural heritage as a result of this preferred policy option.
<b>Water</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Retaining the greenbelt is envisaged to have potential benefits to soils and geology as some of the greenbelt may be prime agricultural land. The effects are uncertain at this stage as the retention is subject to certain conditions so it is not conclusive that the greenbelt designations will not change at this stage.
<b>Landscape</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: This preferred policy option could benefit the landscape however as the designation is still subject to certain conditions the exact effects are unknown at this stage. Developing on greenfield land would lead to adverse effects however.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects.
Population	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: Due to the potential increase in land available for housing there may be minor benefits to the regional population as the working age population may be retained.
Material Assets	?	?	Uncertain effects: If greenbelt land is developed, this could lead to building on isolated land with less potential for connection to the public sewerage and drainage infrastructure. Furthermore, there is the possibility that this land has the potential for mineral extraction.
<b>Summary</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: This policy option is likely to bring benefits to the natural environment however as the greenbelt designation is subject to certain considerations there is some uncertainty at this stage as to the extent of any benefit.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation is proposed.		
Alternative: Altering greenbelt boundaries without the benefit of a robust review is discussed above.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: Retaining the greenbelt boundaries is thought to be of benefit to biodiversity through the safeguarding of habitats from loss and fragmentation.
Cultural Heritage	0	0	Negligible effects.
Water	0	0	Negligible effects.
Soils and Geology	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: Retaining the greenbelt boundaries is likely to benefit soils and geology as prime agricultural land may be protected. It may be however that the greenbelt boundaries could benefit from being altered and therefore effects are uncertain.
Landscape	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: Retaining the greenbelt boundaries is likely to benefit the landscape through protection of greenbelt land. It may be however that the greenbelt boundaries could benefit from being altered and therefore effects are uncertain.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects.
Population	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: This policy option could adversely affect the population as housing may not be provided effectively and strategic growth strategies could be undermined.
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: Overall, retaining the greenbelt boundaries could benefit the landscape and biodiversity in these areas however there could be adverse population effects due to strategic growth strategies being of lesser consideration.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation is proposed.		
<b>CLIMATE CHANGE.</b>			
Flooding.			
Preferred Option: Develop an LDP policy which requires developers to produce a flood risk assessment to accompany any planning application in areas within or adjoining areas of unacceptable risk. Once completed, the Flood Risk Management Plan shall identify areas of flood risk on maps to help direct development away from areas at risk from flooding.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	Negligible effects: No significant effects on biodiversity are envisaged through this policy option.
Cultural Heritage	0	0	Negligible effects: No significant effects on cultural heritage are thought likely to occur.
Water	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: Directing development away from areas of flood risk is thought to be of minor benefit to the water environment. This option reduces the risk of flooding to development as well as elsewhere and has indirect benefits to other SEA parameters.
Soils and Geology	0	0	Negligible effects.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: The policy option is thought to promote development resilient to the effects of climate change and therefore minor benefits to climatic factors are envisaged.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: This policy option is anticipated to have indirect benefits to health through the reduction in the likelihood of physical and mental (for example, stress related illness) illness associated with flood events.
Population	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: Benefits to the population are thought possible as reducing the risk of flooding by avoidance of development on flood risk areas may improve the community environment and quality of life of residents.
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: Overall, it is thought that the production of a flood risk assessment and directing development away from areas at risk of flooding could have minor benefits to both the natural and built environment of South Ayrshire.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation is proposed.		
Alternative: The alternative to this option is to disregard district and local flood risk management plans and allow development to take place in areas at risk from flooding; however this scenario would disregard the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009, the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 and government advice set out in SPP17 and is not considered to be a reasonable alternative to the preferred option.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	Negligible effects: No significant effects on biodiversity are envisaged through this policy option.
Cultural Heritage	0	0	Negligible effects.
Water	-	-	Minor long term regional adverse effects: Building on areas of flood risk is considered likely to result in adverse effects to the water environment through the increased risk of flooding that this would bring to the site itself and elsewhere.
Soils and Geology	0	0	Negligible effects.
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	-	-	Minor long term regional adverse effects: This option is thought to have adverse effects to human health as flooding events are likely to increase the risk of physical and mental health issues.
Population	-	-	Minor long term regional adverse effects: It is envisaged that building on flood risk areas could be of detriment to the population's quality of life and also could have effects on the community environment. During significant flood events, people may have to move out of their property for a period of time and there may be additional effects on the local economy.
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	--	--	Moderate long term regional adverse effects: It is thought that developing on land at risk of flooding could have moderate adverse effects to both the natural and built environment particularly with regards to effects on the water environment, human health and the population.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No proposed mitigation.		
Sustainable Construction.			
Preferred Option: Develop LDP policy in line with government guidance seeking a reduction in carbon emissions for new developments.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	Negligible effects.
Cultural Heritage	0	0	Negligible effects.
Water	0	0	Negligible effects.
Soils and Geology	0	0	Negligible effects.
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	+	+	Minor long term national benefits: Promoting a reduction in carbon emissions for new developments could contribute to national targets for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. This option may also lead to more energy efficient development through efforts to reduce carbon emissions thereby further benefiting climatic factors.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor long term national benefits: This option is thought to only have effects on climatic factors though the contribution towards national targets of reducing GHG emissions as well as potentially leading to more energy efficient development.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation is proposed.		
Alternative: The Council has not identified any reasonable alternatives to the Preferred Option on this issue.			
Waste Management.			
Preferred Option: Develop an LDP policy when aware of the findings of the Ayrshire Joint Strategic Waste Management Project Group, in order to ascertain the preferred location for an Ayrshire wide Residual Waste facility.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Effects on biodiversity though this policy are uncertain at present as effects are dependant on where the location of the facility would be.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Cultural heritage features may be affected by a new waste facility but it is largely dependant on the location of the new facility.
<b>Water</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Waste facilities could affect the quality of any nearby watercourses however it is not possible at this stage to ascertain any likely effects as the location of the facility is not known.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: As above, effects on soils and geology are largely dependant on the location of such a facility.
<b>Landscape</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Due to uncertain location.
<b>Air Quality</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: There may be benefits to air quality through this policy option as a residual waste facility aims to reduce dependence on landfill which can increase air pollution. The extent of these effects however is uncertain at present.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: A new residual waste facility may be of benefit to climatic factors due to a reduced dependence on landfill which can produce GHG emissions. The extent of such an effect is uncertain at present.
<b>Noise</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Due to uncertain location.
<b>Human Health</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Due to uncertain location.
<b>Population</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Due to uncertain location.
<b>Material Assets</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional to national benefits: The development of an LDP policy relating to the location of an Ayrshire wide Residual Waste Facility is thought to be of benefit to material assets through the contribution to regional and national waste targets in relation to sustainable waste management.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional to national benefits: It is thought that developing an LDP policy in relation to the location of a new Ayrshire wide Residual Waste Facility could have benefits to the natural and built environment however for many of the environmental parameters; effects are largely dependant on the location of the facility.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	Care should be taken when assessing the location of a new waste facility to ensure that where possible biodiversity, water quality, cultural heritage, soils and geology and the local landscape character are protected and where possible enhanced. Areas of flood risk, prime agricultural sites should be avoided and areas of vacant and derelict sites promoted.		
Alternative: Identify a site within South Ayrshire to accommodate the combined Ayrshire wide Residual Waste facility; however, this option would not take cognisance of the findings of the Ayrshire Joint Strategic Waste Management Project Group.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Effects on biodiversity though this policy are uncertain at present as effects are dependant on where the location of the facility would be.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Cultural heritage features may be affected by a new waste facility but it is largely dependant on the location of the new facility.
<b>Water</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Waste facilities could affect the quality of any nearby watercourses however it is not possible at this stage to ascertain any likely effects as the location of the facility is not known.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: As above, effects on soils and geology are largely dependant on the location of such a facility.
<b>Landscape</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Due to uncertain location.
<b>Air Quality</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: There may be benefits to air quality through this policy option as a residual waste facility aims to reduce dependence on landfill which can increase air pollution. The extent of these effects however is uncertain at present. If the findings of the Ayrshire Joint Strategic Waste Management Project Group are not taken into consideration then this may lead to increased air emissions through potentially the need to transport waste further distances from other parts of Ayrshire to reach the site.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: A new residual waste facility may be of benefit to climatic factors due to a reduced dependence on landfill which can produce GHG emissions. The extent of such an effect is uncertain at present. If the findings of the Ayrshire Joint Strategic Waste Management Project Group are not taken into consideration then this may lead to increased carbon emissions through potentially the need to transport waste further distances from other parts of Ayrshire to reach the site.
<b>Noise</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Due to uncertain location.
<b>Human Health</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Due to uncertain location.
<b>Population</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Due to uncertain location.
<b>Material Assets</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional to national benefits: The development of an LDP policy relating to the location of an Ayrshire wide Residual Waste Facility is thought to be of benefit to material assets through the contribution to regional and national waste targets in relation to sustainable waste management.
<b>Summary</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: The presence of a Residual Waste facility in South Ayrshire is thought to have several benefits however not considering the findings of the Ayrshire Joint Strategic Waste Management Project Group could lead to further travel distances for waste from other parts of Ayrshire if an appropriate site is not selected.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation is proposed.		
Air Quality.			
Preferred Option: Develop an LPD policy which ensures that proposals which may affect air quality are assessed against the National Air Quality Objectives.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Water</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Landscape</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Air Quality</b>	++	++	Moderate long term regional to national benefits: This policy option ensures that development proposals are assessed against National Air Quality Objectives and so promotes development that avoids air quality standards being breached in South Ayrshire and may also help to alleviate air quality issues where objectives are close to being breached.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: Depending on the extent of air quality improvements that may be brought about by this policy, there may be some benefit to human health as improvements to air quality can lead to improved health. These effects are uncertain at present however.
<b>Population</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional to national benefits: Ensuring that proposals which may affect air quality are assessed against National Air Quality Objectives is thought to be of benefit to the air quality SEA parameter as well as potential benefits to human health through possible improved air quality.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation is proposed.		
Alternative: The Council is not aware of any alternative to the preferred option.			
<b>MEETING INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS.</b>			
Preferred Option: The different types of infrastructure are categorised as below, for the purposes of managing developer contributions. Type 1: Physical works/infrastructure required to allow the construction and operation of the development, to the standard of key agencies. Infrastructure of this type may include provision and maintenance of roads, water, drainage, and sewage disposal connections. Infrastructure of this type may be required within the site; or at a location remote from the application site, but in both instances where it is demonstrably associated with the impact of the development. Type 2: Social or community infrastructure required to service the function of the development within the wider community. This type of infrastructure may include provision and maintenance of waste management facilities; affordable housing; education facilities; and play equipment and open space. Developers will be expected to pay for, or contribute to the cost of infrastructure which would not have been necessary without the development. In order to manage the funding of infrastructure through development, funding will differ depending on the type of infrastructure. The cost of providing new or upgraded infrastructure that falls into type 1 and is required as a direct result of development shall be met by the developer. Development viability will not be considered as a justification for not mitigating against the cost of servicing the development. Type 2 infrastructure contributions will be sought from new housing development. Developers will not be expected to fund waste management facilities while the Council's waste management facilities do not currently operate to full capacity. Where the Council cannot cater for the waste management needs of any development by utilising the capacity of its current waste management assets, developer contributions may be required. Viability shall be taken into consideration when seeking contributions for type 2 infrastructure development.			

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<p>In securing contributions for both types of infrastructure, it will be expected that contributions will be made immediately prior to the grant of planning permission, as this is the most efficient way of collecting contributions; however, with both types of infrastructure, the Council may consider deferred or phased payments, where this does not adversely affect the operation of existing infrastructure or the function of the development.</p> <p>It should be noted that allowing potential flexibility on level of contribution and timing of payment of contribution may add less certainty to the funding available to develop infrastructure.</p>			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: The potential for effects on biodiversity is largely dependant on whether infrastructure development would go ahead without developer input. The provision of open space could benefit biodiversity.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: There are unlikely to be any significant effects on cultural heritage assets.
<b>Water</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: Type 1 infrastructure includes water and drainage and so there is the potential that this would lead to benefits to the water environment however the extent of any effect is uncertain at this stage.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Landscape</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: Effects on the landscape are considered to be dependant on whether the infrastructure requirements would go ahead without developer input.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: The provision of children's play areas and open space through developer contributions could benefit human health however it is dependant on if the developers contribute towards these provisions.
<b>Population</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain long term benefits: Ensuring that there is infrastructure in place for new development is likely to improve access for the population however this depends on the location and extent of any new infrastructure and so the extent of any effect is uncertain.
<b>Material Assets</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional benefit: This policy option ensures that there is adequate drainage and sewerage infrastructure in place and so there are likely to be minor regional long term benefits as a result of this.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional benefit: Overall there are likely to be minor long term regional benefits to the natural and built environment due to the commitment for new infrastructure to serve development. Several effects are uncertain however particularly in relation to the landscape, biodiversity and human health as it is dependant on if developers would meet the funding requirements.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation is proposed.		
<p>Alternative: In line with current practice, the LDP need not differentiate between infrastructure types. It is considered that this will continue to manage the expectancy of where and when developers are expected to pay for infrastructure in a fragmented way that reduces developer and third party transparency in the process.</p>			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	? / +	? / +	Potential benefits: This alternative option does not differentiate between infrastructure types and therefore there is the potential that all type 2 issues may be considered within any development through improved areas of open space etc. The extent of this benefit however is uncertain at this stage.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Water</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: Type 1 infrastructure includes water and drainage and so there is the potential that this would lead to benefits to the water environment however the extent of any effect is uncertain at this stage.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Landscape</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: There may be benefits to the landscape through the increased provision of open space as the LDP will not differentiate between infrastructure types making type 2 infrastructure types more likely.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: There is the potential for improvements to human health through this alternative. Without differentiating between the infrastructure types there may be improved provision of play areas in proximity to existing housing and open space. These effects however are uncertain as it cannot be ascertained at this stage exactly what would be proposed.
<b>Population</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain long term benefits: Ensuring that there is infrastructure in place for new development is likely to improve access for the population as well as potential benefits through facilities such as nurseries close to work places. These effects however depend to an extent on the location and type of new infrastructure.
<b>Material Assets</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: This policy option ensures that there is adequate drainage and sewerage infrastructure in place and so there are likely to be minor regional long term benefits as a result of this.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: This alternative could benefit biodiversity, human health, landscape factors and the population through provision of both types of infrastructure without differentiating

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
			between them. This means that there may be increased play areas close to existing housing or nursery facilities near to work places for example. There are also envisaged to be benefits to material assets through this alternative as a result of adequate sewerage and drainage infrastructure being put in place.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation is proposed.		
Alternative 2: It is not a feasible alternative to allow viability to affect the level of payment required for type 1 infrastructure as the Council cannot afford to pay the costs of mitigating against the consequences of development for this type of essential infrastructure.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Water</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: If the council allow viability consideration to affect the level of payment required for Type 1 infrastructure, this could lead to shortfalls if the Council cannot afford to top up costs to bring services up to standards which would be in place with full developer contributions. This could have effects on drainage and sewerage connections for new development.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Landscape</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: There is the potential that if there is not enough funding for Type 1 infrastructure then this could lead to visual impacts however effects are considered to be uncertain at this stage.
<b>Air Quality</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: If there is not adequate funding for Type 1 infrastructure, this could affect the quality of Type 1 infrastructure which could therefore lead to inadequate provision of roads for new development. If current roads are almost or at capacity then this could lead to issues with congestion which in turn could adversely affect air quality. This effect is uncertain however as it is not clear if this would definitely occur.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: If the Council could not afford to put in place appropriate Type 1 infrastructure for new development then this could lead to adverse effects on the population. This could occur through inadequate access to services and amenities if required roads are not put in place for new development. These effects are uncertain at this high level stage however.
<b>Material Assets</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: Without adequate funding for Type 1 infrastructure, it is envisaged that this could lead to adverse effects on material assets through inadequate provision of roads and less assurance for the connection to sewerage and drainage systems. The effects however are uncertain at this stage.
<b>Summary</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: Allowing viability consideration to affect the level of payments required for Type 1 infrastructure is thought to potentially lead to inadequate funding for this type of infrastructure. This could lead to adverse effects on the water environment, air quality, population and material assets however as it is not known the exact extent that this would occur, effects are considered to be uncertain.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation is proposed.		
Alternative 3: In respect of type 2 infrastructure, the Council could also seek provision of contributions from non-residential, commercial developments. This is not preferred as it would be difficult to define whether such development impacts directly on existing type 2 infrastructure, and further the extent of any impact; while it is clear that housing is a primary and direct source of impact on existing infrastructure.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: There is the potential for impacts on Type 2 infrastructure due to these developments which could affect existing areas of open space thereby having possible indirect effects to local biodiversity.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Water</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Landscape</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: This alternative option could have adverse effects to existing open space thereby potentially affecting the local landscape character.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: Impacts on Type 2 infrastructure could deteriorate in quality such as play areas and open space thereby potentially having adverse effects to the population's health.
<b>Population</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: This option could have adverse effects on the quality of life and the community environment due to a potential deterioration in Type 2 infrastructure.
<b>Material Assets</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: There could be effects on the existing infrastructure through this policy, the effects however are uncertain at this stage.
<b>Summary</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: This alternative option has the potential to lead to a deterioration of existing type 2 infrastructure which could lead to adverse effects to biodiversity, the local landscape character, human health and the community environment (thereby affecting the population).
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation is proposed.		

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
Contributions towards the A77.			
Preferred Option: Statutory supplementary guidance shall be prepared on the funding of improvements to the A77 road network (i.e. between Bankfield and Dutchhouse Roundabouts, and the A78 between Dutchhouse and Monktonhead Roundabouts) resulting from the level of housing development allocated in the Ayrshire Joint Structure Plan (2007). The supplementary guidance shall include details on which housing development will be required to contribute to the A77 in terms of: whether contributions will be sought based on proximity of the site to the A77; when in the planning process, a developer should contribute to A77 improvements; the level of contribution sought (should this be defined by development size, or on a tariff basis, where every single house contributes a defined amount); and, how funds will be collected managed and spent (i.e. should this be managed by a relevant transport body, such as Transport Scotland).			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	Negligible effects: This option relates to how the A77 upgrades will be funded and therefore it does not have any direct effects on any of the SEA parameters.
Cultural Heritage	0	0	Negligible effects.
Water	0	0	Negligible effects.
Soils and Geology	0	0	Negligible effects.
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects.
Population	0	0	Negligible effects.
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	This option is unlikely to have any significant effects on the natural or built environment because it relates only to the production of guidance for funding A77 improvements.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation is proposed.		
Alternative: The requirement for a strategic approach to transport planning has been established in the Ayrshire Joint Structure Plan in consultation with the Government Agency, Transport Scotland. This is reflected in NPF2 and Transport Scotland's Strategic Transport Project Review. It is therefore not considered reasonable to plan for transport improvements resulting from residential development without having regard to the corridor study			
Education Contributions.			
Preferred Option: That statutory supplementary guidance shall be adopted alongside the LDP on the funding of new or upgraded educational facilities required directly as a consequence of development. The supplementary guidance shall establish that all new housing developments (with the exception of housing for the elderly) will contribute towards the development of new nursery, primary and secondary educational facilities, at a level defined for each catchment. The guidance would also explore the timing of collection of any contribution required.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	Negligible effects.
Cultural Heritage	0	0	Negligible effects.
Water	0	0	Negligible effects.
Soils and Geology	0	0	Negligible effects.
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects.
Population	+	+	Minor long term local and regional direct benefits: This option is likely to increase educational facilities for local and regional populations and therefore is considered to have minor benefits to the population.
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>+</b>	Minor long term local and regional direct benefits: These effects are predicted to occur as a result of this preferred policy option because new or upgraded educational facilities are likely to be put in place as a direct consequence of new development.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation is proposed.		
Alternative: Supplementary guidance may be developed with a standard level of contribution sought for any new residential unit, across South Ayrshire. While this may provide clarity, it may be difficult to justify as certain development in certain locations may place a greater strain on existing education resources than other. It would not be reasonable to predicate the level of contribution on any other basis than the cost of upgrading existing schools within the catchment where the development lies.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Water</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Landscape</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain benefits: This option may result in a lack of funding for upgraded educational facilities in the local authority area and therefore it is possible that this will lead to adverse effects to the population however the extent depends on where the funding is lacking.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: Overall there are potential adverse effects as it is not certain that adequate funding would be available for some educational facility upgrades.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	None proposed.		
Affordable Housing Contributions.			
Preferred Option: The existing draft supplementary planning guidance shall be reviewed in respect of the trigger point for collection of contributions. The Council's preference is that contributions (financial or land) will be collected immediately prior to issuing planning permission. In recognising that in some instances, payment of a financial sum in lieu of on-site affordable housing may not be possible until the developer can secure a financial return on the development; the Council may consider accepting deferred or phased payments. Any transfer of land in lieu of the provision of on-site affordable housing units shall be completed prior to the formal granting of planning permission. PAN74: Affordable Housing sets out government guidance on the calculation and delivery mechanism for affordable housing policies, including the calculation of commuted sums in lieu of on-site housing provision. Given that PAN74 is currently being revised, it is proposed that the outcome of the review is awaited before further options are considered.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Water</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Landscape</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: There may be some benefits to the population through this option as it could lead to more affordable housing in South Ayrshire.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	? / +	? / +	Uncertain benefits: There may be some benefits to the population through this option as it could lead to more affordable housing in South Ayrshire.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	None proposed.		

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
Alternative: Allowing no flexibility for deferring or phasing financial payments in lieu of on site affordable housing is not favoured as this may prohibit development where it might otherwise have been able to proceed. Deferring or phasing financial payments will not be the normal collection point for commuted sums; collection upon issue of planning permission is the most efficient way of ensuring affordable housing planning policies are operating effectively.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	Negligible effects.
Cultural Heritage	0	0	Negligible effects.
Water	0	0	Negligible effects.
Soils and Geology	0	0	Negligible effects.
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects.
Population	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: This alternative policy option may hinder the provision of affordable housing and therefore could potentially lead to adverse effects on the population.
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	<b>? / -</b>	<b>? / -</b>	Uncertain adverse effects: This alternative is considered to only have significant effects relating to the population. It is thought that the option could hinder the provision of affordable housing thereby leading to potential adverse effects.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	None proposed.		
Alternative: The Council could align itself to a preferred method of calculating the level of affordable housing commuted sum required; however in recognising that the Scottish Government are reviewing national advice on this matter, it is preferred to await the amended PAN 74, than to align to any option at this stage.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	Negligible effects.
Cultural Heritage	0	0	Negligible effects.
Water	0	0	Negligible effects.
Soils and Geology	0	0	Negligible effects.
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects.
Population	?	?	Uncertain effects: Affordable housing would likely improve the quality of life of residents however it is not clear what calculation would be used and therefore whether and to what extent it would be beneficial.
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	<b>?</b>	<b>?</b>	Uncertain effects: This policy option may affect the population however as no specific option is considered it is not possible to conclude any effect.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation is proposed.		
Retail Impact.			
Preferred Option: Where a proposed development in an out of centre location is projected to have a detrimental impact on the viability and vitality of a town centre, a contribution will be sought from the developer towards improvements which could help to mitigate the impact of the development on town centres. The mechanisms for calculating and collecting these contributions would be set out within Supplementary Planning Guidance.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	Negligible effects.
Cultural Heritage	0	0	Negligible effects.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
Water	0	0	Negligible effects.
Soils and Geology	0	0	Negligible effects.
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects.
Population	+	+	Minor long term local benefits: This policy option is likely to have minor benefits to the population through the use of developer contributions to assist in improving town centre environments improving the community environment and also assisting to promote economic growth within town centres. In addition developer contributions may also enhance access routes within town centres.
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor local long term direct benefits: This policy option is likely to have minor benefits to the population through the use of developer contributions to assist in improving town centre environments improving the community environment and also assisting to promote economic growth within town centres.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		
Alternative: Maintain the current system where no contribution is sought on consented out of centre development, even if a level of impact on town centres is demonstrated.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	Negligible effects.
Cultural Heritage	0	0	Negligible effects.
Water	0	0	Negligible effects.
Soils and Geology	0	0	Negligible effects.
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects.
Population	-	-	Minor long term regional adverse effects: This alternative is likely to result in minor adverse effects on the population. As developer contributions would not be sought on out of centre development this may be to the detriment of the community environment and economy of the town centre locations as viability and vitality will not be encouraged in these locations.
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	-	-	Minor regional, long term, direct adverse effects: This alternative is likely to result in minor adverse effects on the population. As developer contributions would not be sought on out of centre development this may be to the detriment of the community environment and economy of the town centre locations as viability and vitality will not be encouraged in these locations.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		
<b>AYR RENAISSANCE.</b>			
Defining Ayr Town Centre Boundaries.			
Preferred Option: Option A: Pull back the northern boundary to King Street, recognising that the retail area further north along Main Street is limited to serving local needs, and comprises smaller buildings less capable of supporting town centre uses. The King Street junction marks a clear boundary and change in urban character. The area removed from the existing town centre would be designated as a local centre, to better reflect the function it serves.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	Negligible effects.
Cultural Heritage	0	0	Negligible effects.
Water	0	0	Negligible effects.
Soils and Geology	0	0	Negligible effects.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects.
Population	0	0	Negligible effects: There may be some very minor benefits to the population through this option however it is thought that these would be minimal.
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	Negligible effects: No significant effects on the natural and built environment are envisaged through this policy.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		
Preferred Option: Option B: A small extension to include Ayr Academy and some surrounding associated uses. This option reflects the Council's decision to consider relocate the school. Although a final decision on the building's future has not been made it may be prudent to incorporate it within the town centre to help facilitate a wider range of future uses, such as office space or mixed use development. Town centre designation can also help to secure funding, e.g. for heritage or environmental improvements.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	?	?	Uncertain effects: Securing funding for environmental improvements could be of benefit to biodiversity as improvements could encourage more species to be present in this area.
Cultural Heritage	?	?	Uncertain effects: There may be some benefits to cultural heritage assets in this location if funding is secured for heritage improvements however this is uncertain at present.
Water	?	?	Uncertain effects: Funding for environmental improvements could lead to some improvements to water quality and the general water environment in this location however this is uncertain currently.
Soils and Geology	0	0	Negligible effects.
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects.
Population	+	+	Minor long term local benefits: The expansion of the town centre is likely to encourage retail opportunities and associated employment opportunities. Furthermore the inclusion of the Ayr Academy site within the town centre will further promote economic growth through facilitating further uses such as office space or mixed use development.
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>+</b>	Minor, long term, local, direct benefits: The expansion of the town centre will encourage retail opportunities and associated employment opportunities. Furthermore the inclusion of the Ayr Academy site within the town centre will further promote economic growth through facilitating further uses such as office space or mixed use development. If funding was secured for environmental improvements, this could affect the water environment, cultural heritage features and biodiversity however it is uncertain as to whether this would occur through the policy option.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		
Partially Preferred Option– only along South Harbour St. to recognise Ayr Renaissance/Conservation Area Management Plan.: Option C: Extend along South Harbour Street to the Esplanade to include the Citadel Leisure Centre and development sites on the Esplanade. This could help to promote greater use and regeneration of the riverside area, potentially help to secure future funding for improvements and would incorporate a significant development site, currently being progressed for office development, within the town centre.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	?	? / +	Uncertain effects: Development near to waterbodies could adversely affect their water quality which could indirectly have impacts on river or coastal ecology. It is unclear however at this stage what development is proposed. With mitigation in place it is thought that there may be some benefits to the local ecology however this is uncertain at present.
Cultural Heritage	0	0	Negligible effects.
Water	?	+	Uncertain effects: The coastal and riverside area in Ayr is at risk of flooding from the sea and the River Ayr. New development in this area should therefore be sited appropriately and it should be ensured that flooding is not exacerbated in other areas. Further study should be carried out at a more detailed stage. With mitigation, if accepted, there are thought to be minor benefits to the water environment in the vicinity of the development sites.
Soils and Geology	0	0	Negligible effects.
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects: As this area is already largely built up, it is not thought that further development would have any significant effect on the local landscape character.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects.
Population	+	+	Minor long term local benefits: The expansion of the town centre is likely to encourage retail opportunities and associated employment opportunities. Furthermore the inclusion of the Esplanade area within the town centre will further promote economic growth through facilitating regeneration in this area. There is also a significant development site within this location.
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor local, long term, direct benefits: This policy option is anticipated to benefit the population through enhancing employment opportunities and facilitating economic growth. It should be ensured that new development is sited appropriately to take into account potential effects of flooding. With mitigation, although the overall significance rating is not altered, it is thought that there would be further benefits to biodiversity and the water environment.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	Care should be taken to protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and water quality when developing in and around the development area whilst avoiding areas of high to moderate flood risk.		
Alternative: Option D: Include the office area based around Wellington Square, Barns Street, Miller Road and Dalblair Road. Offices are a town centre use and by incorporating this area with the town centre the area's future can be more strategically directed through more detailed town centre policy.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	Negligible effects. There is little biodiversity interest within Ayr town centre.
Cultural Heritage	0	0	Negligible effects.
Water	0	0	Negligible effects.
Soils and Geology	0	0	Negligible effects.
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects.
Population	+	+	Minor long term local benefits: The expansion of the town centre is likely to encourage retail opportunities and associated employment opportunities.
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor local, long term, direct benefits: This policy option is anticipated to benefit the population through enhancing employment opportunities and facilitating economic growth.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		
Alternative: Retain current town centre boundaries. This would not enable the Council to make any changes to reflect changes and opportunities in land uses and commercial patterns.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	Negligible effects: No significant effects are likely as a result of this alternative as existing boundaries will remain.
Cultural Heritage	0	0	Negligible effects.
Water	0	0	Negligible effects.
Soils and Geology	0	0	Negligible effects.
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects.
Population	0	0	Negligible effects.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		
South Ayrshire's Network of Town Centres.			
Preferred Option: It is proposed to retain the existing network of centres identified within the South Ayrshire Local Plan, seeking to guide large scale retail development to Ayr, Prestwick and, Troon, Maybole and Girvan.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	Negligible effects.
Cultural Heritage	0	0	Negligible effects.
Water	0	0	Negligible effects.
Soils and Geology	0	0	Negligible effects.
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects.
Population	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: Retaining the existing network of centres t is likely to have beneficial effect on the population of South Ayrshire. As large scale retail development opportunities will be directed towards the larger centres, Ayr, Prestwick and Girvan, the living and working population of these centres are likely to benefit through the promotion of economic growth. Development and investment opportunities are likely to be directed to the most beneficial areas.
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor long term, regional, direct effects: Retaining the existing network of centres t is likely to have beneficial effect on the population of South Ayrshire. As large scale retail development opportunities will be directed towards the larger centres, Ayr, Prestwick and Girvan, the living and working population of these centres are likely to benefit through the promotion of economic growth. Development and investment opportunities are likely to be directed to the most beneficial areas.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		
Alternative: Networks can be defined in the form of a hierarchy. This approach offers potential as a strategic guide to development, which could consolidate Ayr as the economic and community centre of South Ayrshire. This also offers potential to ensure that development in all centres is appropriate for the size and function of that centre. The Main Issues Report does not favour a hierarchy given that South Ayrshire has an established natural hierarchy, in which Ayr clearly functions as the district centre. In operational terms, a hierarchy would be effective at guiding proposals for large scale, general retail or commercial development to Ayr by requiring development in other areas to demonstrate that it is not able to be located in Ayr. In the past, larger scale commercial developments tended to locate in Ayr; irrespective of the fact the Development Plan does not currently establish a hierarchy. The significant impact of a hierarchy may therefore be to stifle opportunities in smaller centres such as Troon, Prestwick, Girvan and Maybole.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	Negligible effects.
Cultural Heritage	0	0	Negligible effects.
Water	0	0	Negligible effects.
Soils and Geology	0	0	Negligible effects.
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects.
Population	+	+	Minor local to regional long-term benefits: There may be a minor disadvantage to this option over the preferred (as identified above), but the degree/scale of difference cannot be adequately detected by the SEA. Generally, a hierarchy of development is likely to have beneficial effects on the population of South Ayrshire. As development and investment opportunities will be directed towards the larger centres before the smaller centres, the living and working population of these centres are likely to benefit through the promotion of economic growth. Development and investment opportunities are likely to be directed to the most beneficial and appropriate areas.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor local to regional long-term beneficial effects: A hierarchy of development is likely to have beneficial effect on the population of South Ayrshire. As development and investment opportunities will be directed towards the larger centres before the smaller centres, the living and working population of these centres are likely to benefit through the promotion of economic growth. Development and investment opportunities are likely to be directed to the most beneficial and appropriate areas.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		
Sequential Approach.			
Preferred Option: The sequential approach would apply only to large scale retail development proposals. This, as is currently the case, directs larger retail firstly to town centres, then to edge of town centres, then to local centres (e.g. Heathfield Retail Park) before considering the acceptability of out-of-centre locations for such proposals. Non-retail commercial development would not require to demonstrate that it could not locate within a town centre. This approach may still allow movement of these uses to locations outwith town centre, due to cheaper land and development costs, which may affect the viability of the town centres and could discriminate against non-car users.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	Negligible effects.
Cultural Heritage	0	0	Negligible effects.
Water	0	0	Negligible effects.
Soils and Geology	0	+	Negligible effects: Before mitigation, it is not thought that there would be any significant effects on soils and geology. Minor benefits after mitigation: This policy is likely to benefit soils and geology through directing retail development to town and edge of centre locations, potentially promoting the use of vacant or derelict land.
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects.
Air Quality	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: As the policy directs development to locations easily accessible by walking, cycling and public transport this may be beneficial to air quality through reducing the requirement for the private vehicle. The sequential approach does not encourage out of centre development and therefore does not promote private car use.
Climatic Factors	+	+	Minor long term national benefits: As the policy directs development to locations easily accessible by walking, cycling and public transport this may be beneficial to climate factors through reducing the requirement for the private vehicle and potentially reducing carbon emissions. The sequential approach does not encourage out of centre development and therefore does not promote private car use.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: This policy is likely to have minor, indirect benefits to human health through promoting development to town centres, before edge of town and out of town locations. This is likely to indirectly benefit human health through promoting locations that are easily accessible by walking and cycling.
Population	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: The policy option is likely to benefit the population as retail development will have preference to town centres, promoting accessible locations. Whilst this approach may allow some out of centre locations, preference will be for locations in easily accessible areas by sustainable means.
Material Assets	+	+	Minor long term regional benefits: As development is directed to town and edge of centre locations this is likely to be beneficial through the use of existing transport, drainage and waste infrastructure.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor regional, long term, direct benefits: This policy option is likely to have minor benefits to the human environment through preferred siting of development within town centres allowing easy access, utilising existing infrastructure and promoting walking/cycling opportunities. Mitigation, if accepted, is envisaged to direct development to areas of vacant and derelict land in the first instance benefiting soils and geology.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	Preferred Option: Maintain the current sequential approach to retail development, directing larger retail firstly to town centres, then to edge of town centres, <b>promoting the use of vacant and derelict land</b> , then to Heathfield Retail Park before considering out-of-centre locations against criteria for acceptability. Include 'softer' policies which prioritise development of office, leisure and cultural development in certain locations. This approach may still allow movement of these land uses to locations outwith town centre, due to cheaper land and development costs, which may affect the viability of the town centres and could discriminate against non-car users.		
Alternative: The Council could adopt a sequential approach for retail, office, leisure, tourism, cultural and other commercial development. This approach would direct significant travel-generating uses (particularly for shopping, employment and leisure) to town centres, which are best served by public transport to reduce private car travel. It may also promote the re-use of vacant units and sites. This approach risks constraining development due to a lack of available and effective sites in town centres for these uses.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	Negligible effects.
Cultural Heritage	0	0	Negligible effects.
Water	0	0	Negligible effects.
Soils and Geology	+	+	Minor local to regional long term benefits: This policy is likely to benefit soils and geology through directing development to town centres and encouraging the use of brown field sites.
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects.
Air Quality	+	+	Minor long term local to regional benefits: As the policy directs development to locations easily accessible by walking, cycling and public transport this may be beneficial to air quality through reducing the requirement for the private vehicle.
Climatic Factors	+	+	Minor long term national benefits: As the policy directs development to locations easily accessible by walking, cycling and public transport this may be beneficial to climate factors through reducing the requirement for the private vehicle and potentially reducing carbon emissions.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	+	+	Minor long term local and regional benefits: This policy is likely to have minor, indirect benefits to human health through promoting development to town centres. This is likely to indirectly benefit human health through promoting locations that are easily accessible by walking and cycling. In addition more direct benefits are likely to result from improved leisure facilities.
Population	++	++	Moderate long term local benefits: The policy option is likely to benefit the population as development will have preference to town centres, promoting accessible locations and encouraging economic development within the centres. In addition the promotion of leisure, tourist and cultural development are likely to improve quality of life for residents.
Material Assets	+	+	Minor long term local and regional benefits: As development is directed to town and edge of centre locations this is likely to be beneficial through the use of existing transport, drainage and waste infrastructure.
Summary	+	+	Minor long term, local to regional, direct benefits: This alternative is likely to be beneficial in siting many types of development within town centres. This is likely to encourage accessible locations and economic development to town centres, promoting quality of life, community environments, healthy activity and use of existing infrastructure opportunities.
Proposed Mitigation	No mitigation proposed.		
Town Centre Opportunities.			
Preferred Option: Supplementary Guidance will be developed for Ayr Town Centre, in consultation with Ayr Renaissance LLP, to identify under utilised and vacant listed buildings, vacant and derelict sites as potential development opportunities. The Supplementary Guidance will identify potential future uses of those sites/buildings, and prepare design briefs for the development of opportunity sites, to ensure long term townscape preservation and enhancement, in accordance with the Conservation Area Management Plan and the Council's existing policies on protection of the built environment. The Council will support residential development within the town centre, and will consider the potential of opportunity sites for residential purposes, whether in whole, or as part of a mixed-use development. In consultation with Ayr Renaissance LLP, development opportunities have been identified for Ayr town centre.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	Negligible effects: Care should be taken to ensure planning policy facilitates an appropriate level of ecological survey and assessment of sites and proposals prior to planning applications.
Cultural Heritage	+	+	Minor local long-term benefit: by ensuring preservation and enhancement, this policy option would have slight benefits to the cultural heritage of Ayr by enhancing its built heritage. This assessment presumes care will be taken to preserve both the integrity and setting of the Conservation Area.
Water	+ / -	+ / -	Mixed effects: Certain derelict land may contain contaminants from previous uses. If disturbed by construction activity, contaminants can find a pathway into surface water and affect water quality. However, investigation and remediation can identify and remove existing or future risks. In addition, long-term brownfield sites may be essentially 'greenfield', having a permeable surface. Their development can increase surface runoff, with potential effects on water pollution and flood risk.
Soils and Geology	+	+	Minor local long-term benefits: This policy is likely to result in benefits to soils and geology through promoting vacant and derelict sites as potential development opportunities.
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects.
Air Quality	+	+	Minor long-term local to regional benefits: As the policy directs development to locations easily accessible by walking, cycling and public transport this may be beneficial to air quality through reducing the requirement for the private vehicle.
Climatic Factors	+	+	Minor long-term national benefits: As the policy directs development to locations easily accessible by walking, cycling and public transport this may be beneficial to climate factors through reducing the requirement for the private vehicle and potentially reducing carbon emissions.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects.
Population	++	++	Moderate local long-term benefits: Supporting residential development within Ayr town centre is considered to be beneficial to the population through promoting sustainable access to services and employment, encouraging regeneration and promoting economic growth through increased use of town centre businesses, and improving the quality of life for those that live in town centres through assisting regeneration. In addition promoting development opportunities are likely to encourage economic development.
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.
Summary	++	++	Moderate direct long term local benefits: This policy option is likely to benefit the population of Ayr through increased development opportunity and supporting residential development within the town centre. There are also likely to be benefits to air quality, climatic factors and cultural heritage and soils/ geology.
Proposed Mitigation	Care should be taken to ensure planning policy facilitates an appropriate level of ecological survey and assessment of brownfield / derelict sites and associated development proposals prior to planning applications. Planning policy should ensure that brownfield / derelict sites are given an appropriate analysis for drainage requirements, using the existing land use as a baseline (greenfield vs. brownfield / permeable vs. impermeable).		
Alternative: The Council's Planning Service could respond to individual development applications which could undermine the long term vitality and viability of Ayr and success of the renaissance strategy. Without the clear identification and promotion of town centre sites developers may not be aware of the opportunities available within the centre and opt for out of town sites or other areas which would be firstly detrimental to the town centre but also South Ayrshire. Without more residential development within town centre the area becomes less attractive to commercial investors as there is no captive market for their goods and services. Often developers are prepared to invest new mixed use development providing there is a residential element for a shorter term return. Furthermore residential land uses help provide casual supervision of the centre and tend to reduce crime.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: This alternative may encourage development in areas that could have an effect on biodiversity. Effects would be dependant on the location of development.
Cultural Heritage	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: This alternative may encourage development in areas that could have an effect on cultural heritage. Effects would be dependant on the location of development.
Water	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: This alternative may encourage development in areas that could have an effect on water. Effects would be dependant on the location of development.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	-	-	Minor adverse local long-term effects: This alternative would leave an avenue open for a less efficient land use pattern, and possibly development on greenfield land.
<b>Landscape</b>	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: This alternative may encourage development in areas that could have an effect on landscape. Effects would be dependant on the location of development.
<b>Air Quality</b>	-	-	Minor adverse regional long-term effects: This alternative would leave an avenue open for out-of-centre development, which would likely in turn encourage greater use of private vehicles and eventually significantly greater air pollution, including as a result of congestion.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	-	-	Minor adverse regional long-term effects: This alternative would leave an avenue open for out-of-centre development, which would likely in turn encourage greater use of private vehicles and eventually significantly greater greenhouse gas emissions, including as a result of congestion.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Population</b>	-	-	Minor adverse local long-term effects: This alternative does not encourage the promotion of town centre development opportunities. This may result in an adverse effect on the population through limiting economic development opportunities.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	-	-	Minor adverse local long-term effects: This alternative would likely have adverse effects on soils (indirectly via inefficient land use patterns), air quality, climate change and population. It would likely lead to out-of-centre development, which would in turn encourage greater use of private vehicles with potential effects on air quality and greenhouse gases. In addition, it may have effects on a number of natural environmental parameters as it may encourage development in areas that effect biodiversity, cultural heritage, water and landscape.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		
<b>GIRVAN RENAISSANCE.</b>			
Town Centre Boundary.			
Preferred Option: An extension is proposed to include the land beside the harbour - the former swimming pool and public car park, highlighted in Plan (Insert appropriate number). This is designed to assist in the regeneration of this area which is largely vacant following the closure of the swimming pool. It nonetheless remains the key location in Girvan for a major tourism and community leisure facility to be developed. This area could be designated solely for tourism and leisure development to ensure that the community facility role that the area plays is retained and inappropriate retail uses, that could undermine the core retail area, are resisted. Linkages (physical and visual) and streetscape could be enhanced between the retail core and harbour/ beach area to stimulate development of both areas. It also highlights the importance of the harbour area/ beach area as an asset to the town. This would also help promote the development of the harbour for marine based activities to increase tourism. The Council is working in partnership with local organisations to bring forward appropriate regeneration proposals for this large harbour site. The planning service may produce a development brief if appropriate to ensure a high standard of development.			
<b>Biodiversity, Flora &amp; Fauna</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: There are no protected biodiversity sites within close proximity to proposed extension site and little biodiversity of value in this area, no significant effects are considered likely.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: There are no cultural heritage features within close proximity to the proposed extension site. The area is not within the Girvan conservation area. Girvan harbour is not on the listed building register however several features on the National Monuments Record of Scotland and Scottish Sites and Monuments Record are present.
<b>Water</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: The water quality of the Water of Girvan is of poor to moderate water quality. The coast at Girvan and the area surrounding the harbour is at risk of flooding from the sea, care should therefore be taken when siting development and it should be ensured that development does not exacerbate flooding at other locations.
<b>Soils and Geology</b>	+	+	Minor long term local benefits: There area proposed is that of a largely vacant site. Development at this site could therefore improve the existing quality of the site. There are no designated geological sites are within close proximity to the proposed extension site.
<b>Landscape</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: The SALP designated the coastal areas around Girvan as a Scenic Area of particular landscape quality; care must therefore be taken during development that facilities are sited appropriately as to not have an adverse effect on the scenic area. The area currently is largely vacant and as such development at this site may potentially benefit the local landscape.
<b>Air Quality</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Noise</b>	0	0	Negligible effects. There are residential properties situated to the south of the site however as the site was previously utilised for leisure purposes it is not anticipated that there will be significant effects.
<b>Human Health</b>	+	+	Minor long term local benefits: The promotion of leisure facilities at this location will improve existing facilities within Girvan, facilitating and encouraging healthy lifestyles.
<b>Population</b>	++	++	Moderate long term local benefits: The promotion of tourism and community leisure facilities in Girvan is likely to result in increased employment opportunities. Localised areas of unemployment exist in South Ayrshire including Girvan. The population will also benefit through an improved community environment and quality of life for residents of Girvan with the provision of a new community leisure facility.
<b>Material Assets</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: This policy is not anticipated to have any significant effects on material assets.
<b>Summary</b>	++	++	Moderate local, direct, long term benefits: This policy option will have benefits to the population and human health of the town of Girvan through the provision of community leisure facilities and employment opportunities. In addition the re-use of vacant land is promoted over that of the greenbelt
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed at this stage.		

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
Alternative: Retain existing town centre boundaries. This may fail to capitalise on the potential of the harbour area to contribute to the town centre economy through attracting visitors, as there is significant potential for the harbour area to increase its existing marina facilities for both long term and holiday moorings which would attract sailing fraternity and be an attraction in its own right.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	Negligible effects: This alternative retains the existing boundaries therefore no significant effects are considered likely.
Cultural Heritage	0	0	Negligible effects.
Water	0	0	Negligible effects.
Soils and Geology	0	0	Negligible effects.
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects.
Population	0	0	Negligible effects.
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	0	0	Negligible effects: This alternative retains the existing boundaries therefore no significant effects are considered likely.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		
Managing Uses.			
Preferred Option: The Council will retain its policy to guide new retail and commercial development to existing centre in line with SPP8 sequential approach. However be more flexible in relation to the types of developments allowed within the town centre to reduce vacancy levels which would revitalise the centre.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	Negligible effects: Care should be taken to ensure planning policy facilitates an appropriate level of ecological survey and assessment of sites and proposals prior to planning applications.
Cultural Heritage	? / -	? / -	Uncertain adverse effects: Particular care is needed with regard to the sympathetic design of retail and commercial developments to the setting (and sometimes integrity) of built heritage (e.g. Listed buildings and Conservation Areas). Planning policy should maintain a high minimum standard to protect heritage features.
Water	0	0	Negligible effects.
Soils and Geology	+	+	Minor local long-term benefits: This policy is likely to benefit soils and geology through directing development to the existing centre and potentially encouraging the use of brownfield sites.
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects.
Air Quality	+	+	Minor long-term local benefits: As the policy directs new retail and commercial development to locations easily accessible by walking, cycling and public transport this may be beneficial to air quality through reducing the requirement for the private vehicle.
Climatic Factors	+	+	Minor long-term national benefits: As the policy directs new retail and commercial development to locations easily accessible by walking, cycling and public transport this may be beneficial to climate factors through reducing the requirement for the private vehicle and potentially reducing carbon emissions.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	+	+	Minor long-term local benefits: This policy is likely to have minor, indirect benefits to human health through promoting development to the existing centre. This is likely to indirectly benefit human health through promoting locations that are easily accessible by walking and cycling.
Population	++	++	Moderate long-term local benefits: The policy option is likely to benefit the population as new retail and commercial development (and potentially other types of development) will have preference to the existing centre, promoting accessible locations and encouraging economic development.
Material Assets	+	+	Minor long-term local benefits: As development is directed to the existing centre this is likely to be beneficial through the use of existing transport, drainage and waste infrastructure.
<b>Summary</b>	+	+	Minor long-term local to regional benefits: As the policy directs development to locations easily accessible by walking, cycling and public transport this may be beneficial to air quality through reducing the requirement for the private vehicle.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	Care should be taken to ensure planning policy facilitates an appropriate level of ecological survey and assessment of brownfield / derelict sites and associated development proposals prior to planning applications. Planning policy should uphold a high level of protection of the setting of built heritage features in the town centre.		

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
Alternative: The Council could maintain core and peripheral retail zones within Girvan Town Centre, which restricts uses within certain locations. This could have a negative effect, with vacancies not being filled by other retailer as the demand declines, which could lead to greater vacancy levels as the number of town centre users' declines as the range of services offered diminishes causing a downward spiral. In addition it could limit opportunities within the town centre for new development.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	Negligible effects.
Cultural Heritage	0	0	Negligible effects.
Water	0	0	Negligible effects.
Soils and Geology	+	+	Minor local long term benefits: This alternative is likely to benefit soils and geology through directing development to the existing retail zones and potentially encouraging the use of brownfield sites.
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects.
Population	?/-	?/-	Uncertain adverse effects: This alternative has uncertain effects as certain locations may be restricted in terms of type of use. This may limit development in certain areas and may have adverse effects on the economy development of Girvan.
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.
Summary	?/-	?/-	Uncertain adverse effects: Whilst this alternative may have benefits through potentially encouraging the use of brownfield sites, there is the potential for adverse effects for the population of Girvan through this alternative limiting economic development in certain areas.
Proposed Mitigation	No mitigation proposed.		
<b>MAYBOLE.</b>			
Preferred Option: To retain the existing town centre boundaries and highlight development opportunities within this core area to stimulate regeneration.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	Negligible effects.
Cultural Heritage	0	0	Negligible effects.
Water	0	0	Negligible effects.
Soils and Geology	+	+	Minor local long term benefits: This alternative is likely to benefit soils and geology through highlighting development opportunities within the town centre of Maybole encouraging the use of brownfield sites.
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects.
Population	+	+	Minor local long term benefits: Highlighting development opportunities within Maybole town centre has the potential promote economic growth, resulting in minor benefits to the population.
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.
Summary	+	+	Minor local long term benefits: This policy option is likely to result in benefits to the population of Maybole through economic development and to soils and geology through potentially encouraging the use of brownfield land for new development.
Proposed Mitigation	No mitigation proposed.		
Alternative: Reduce the town centre area to focus uses into a smaller area. This could have long term impact in terms of converting existing shop units into residential which would not be easily converted back which could impact on the long term viability of the centre especially if the bypass stimulates development of housing, increasing population and the need for more services. Furthermore not highlighting opportunities could be detrimental as the market may miss opportunities as they are not clear.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	Negligible effects.
Cultural Heritage	0	0	Negligible effects.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
Water	0	0	Negligible effects.
Soils and Geology	0	0	Negligible effects.
Landscape	0	0	Negligible effects.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects.
Population	-	-	Minor adverse local long term effects: This alternative has the potential to reduce economic opportunities within Maybole through reducing the existing town centre. This may limit opportunities for new business.
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	-	-	Minor adverse local long term effects: This alternative has the potential to reduce economic opportunities within Maybole through reducing the existing town centre. This may limit opportunities for new business.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		
Preferred Option: Develop a Supplementary Guidance for Maybole through a working group including community members. This document will highlight development opportunities for different land uses within the town, protect certain land uses within the town, protect the line of the by-pass from other development and determine the appropriate settlement boundary. This would allow greater flexibility in terms of settlement growth which could assist the earlier implementation by-pass and town centre public realm projects through development contributions.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	?	?	Uncertain effects: This option may result in loss/fragmentation of protected/ priority species and habitats. Ayr - Stranraer disused railway line consists of scrub habitat and is a potential wildlife corridor. This is located to the south of Maybole and may therefore be crossed by the bypass. (294094 - 307106). It is noted however that the bypass has previously been assessed in the LTS and is due to be constructed therefore uncertain effects are predicted at this stage.
Cultural Heritage	?	?	Uncertain effects: This alternative may result in effects on cultural heritage depending on changes to the existing settlement boundary.
Water	?	?	Uncertain effects: This alternative may result in effects on water depending on changes to the existing settlement boundary.
Soils and Geology	?	?	Uncertain effects: This alternative may result in effects on soils and geology depending on changes to the existing settlement boundary.
Landscape	?	?	Uncertain effects: SNH has classified the land surrounding Maybole as improved grassland. The bypass would therefore change the existing landscape and is likely to have a adverse visual affect on this landscape character in the long term. It is noted however that the bypass has previously been assessed in the LTS and is due to be constructed therefore uncertain effects are predicted at this stage. Other effects would be dependent on measures proposed for town centre public realm projects and how the settlement boundary would be altered.
Air Quality	+ / -	+ / -	Mixed effects: There is the potential for minor long term, local, minor benefits as congestion within Maybole town would be significantly reduced by a bypass.
Climatic Factors	+ / -	+ / -	Mixed effects: Locally, the bypass may reduce emissions through reduced congestion on the wider road network and within the town centre which reduces emissions, but increasing road capacity will generate some additional road use and thus emissions.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects.
Population	++	++	Moderate local long-term effects: This policy is likely to result in increased development opportunities for Maybole with the potential for enhanced economic growth. This is likely to have minor benefits to the population. Reducing congestion in Maybole could enhance the community environment and quality of life therefore potentially further benefiting the population.
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: This alternative may result in effects on biodiversity, cultural heritage, water, soils and geology and landscape depending on changes to the existing settlement boundary.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		
Alternative: Have a set settlement boundary with designated areas for certain land uses within the town which could have potentially stifled redevelopment and limited opportunities for growth. This option is reflective of the current South Ayrshire Local Plan which has stimulated residential growth but has seen the decline of the town centre.			
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	?	?	Uncertain effects: This alternative may result in loss/fragmentation of protected/ priority species and habitats depending on changes to the existing settlement boundary.
Cultural Heritage	?	?	Uncertain effects: This alternative may result in effects on cultural heritage depending on changes to the existing settlement boundary.
Water	?	?	Uncertain effects: This alternative may result in effects on water depending on changes to the existing settlement boundary.
Soils and Geology	?	?	Uncertain effects: This alternative may result in effects on soils and geology depending on changes to the existing settlement boundary.

SEA Objectives	Initial Weighting	Weighting after Mitigation	Summary
Landscape	?	?	Uncertain effects: This alternative may result in effects on the greenbelt/landscape depending on changes to the existing settlement boundary.
Air Quality	0	0	Negligible effects.
Climatic Factors	0	0	Negligible effects.
Noise	0	0	Negligible effects.
Human Health	0	0	Negligible effects.
Population	-	-	Minor adverse local long-term effects: This alternative has the potential to limit economic opportunities within Maybole through designating certain areas for certain land uses. This may limit opportunities for new business.
Material Assets	0	0	Negligible effects.
<b>Summary</b>	?	?	Uncertain effects: This alternative has the potential to limit economic opportunities within Maybole through designating certain areas for certain land uses. This may limit opportunities for new business. In addition there may be effects on the natural environment and cultural heritage depending on changes to the existing settlement boundary.
<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	No mitigation proposed.		

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK