

Compatibility Assessment – Preferred Vision and Alternatives

SEA Objectives

Topic	Nu	SEA Objective	SEA Associated Questions
Biodiversity	1	Ensure that the integrity of all internationally designated sites within or in close proximity to the SAC area is preserved.	Could the policy/proposal have a direct or indirect effect on Natura 2000 sites?
	2	Safeguard national and local designated sites and habitats (particularly hedgerows and woodland) from loss and / or fragmentation.	Could the policy/proposal have a beneficial or adverse effect on issues of habitat loss, fragmentation and disturbance?
	3	Biodiversity should be enhanced & protected in line with Local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP) targets including protection of European protected and priority species from loss and / or fragmentation.	Could the policy/proposal have a direct or indirect impact on designated biodiversity sites, habitats, European protected or priority species including those within the LBAP?
Cultural Heritage	1	Safeguard cultural heritage features and their settings through responsible design and positioning of development.	Could the policy/proposal affect any features designated for their cultural heritage value such as Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Listed Buildings, conservation areas or any other archaeologically sensitive sites?
Water	1	Protect, and where necessary, enhance water quality to good chemical and ecological status by 2015 in line with the Water Framework Directive (WFD).	Could the policy/proposal have a beneficial or adverse effect on water quality? Could the policy/proposal help to achieve the WFD target of all waters having "Good" quality by 2015?
	2	Avoid areas of flood risk in the first instance and then ensure mitigation against any potential flood risk from new development.	Does the policy/proposal avoid areas of potential flood risk, and in turn does not contribute to flood risk elsewhere, through appropriate siting of development?
	3	Ensure that all new infrastructure is designed in such a way that it reduces flood risk through the provision of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS).	
Soils & Geology	1	The MIR should promote the use of vacant and derelict brownfield land over greenbelt.	Does the policy/proposal utilise or encourage use of vacant and derelict land? Does the policy/proposal avoid the use of greenbelt land?
	2	Safeguard areas of prime agricultural land and designated geological sites.	Could the policy/proposal have a negative or beneficial effect on protected/valued geological resources? Does the policy/proposal impact on agricultural land or designated geological sites?
Landscape	1	Protect and enhance the area's landscape character and designated Scenic Areas.	Could the policy/proposal have a beneficial or adverse effect on designated Scenic Areas or the landscape character of an area?
	2	Maintain and protect greenbelt areas in South Ayrshire.	Will there be any land take from greenbelt areas as a result of the policy/proposal?
Air Quality	1	Promote development that avoids air quality standards being breached within SAC and adjoining areas.	Could air quality within South Ayrshire be affected by the policy or proposal?
	2	Promote development that assists in alleviating air quality issues in those areas where air quality standards may be breached.	Will the policy/proposal result in the exceedance of any of the National Air Quality Standards? Could the policy/proposal result in increased or decreased exposure to air pollution?
Climatic	1	Contribute towards reduction of greenhouse	Could the policy/proposal make a positive

Topic	Nu	SEA Objective	SEA Associated Questions
Factors		gas emissions in line with Scottish Government targets of 80% by 2050 with interim targets of 34% by 2020 and 18% by 2013.	contribution towards meeting national and local climate change targets through appropriate siting and design of development such as energy efficient housing and reducing the need to travel?
	2	Promote development resilient to the effects of climate change.	
	3	The MIR should promote the use of renewable energy, energy efficient development and increased use of public transport.	Does the policy/proposal make a positive contribution towards renewable energy targets?
Noise	1	The MIR should avoid where possible the positioning of residential properties within areas with a noise level exceeding Noise Exposure Category C.	Is the policy/proposal within close proximity to noise sensitive receptors and could the proposal result in increased noise levels?
	2	The MIR needs to establish and protect quiet areas, and avoid deterioration in the noise regime in noise sensitive areas.	Will any environmentally sensitive areas be impacted upon as a result of development?
Human Health	1	To enhance and protect human health and also promote healthy living through improved active travel opportunities, particularly the quality of and availability to walk and cycle.	Will the policy/proposal encourage walking and cycling thereby increasing existing rates and bringing them in line with the national average? Does the policy/proposal facilitate healthy lifestyles and address safety concerns which may have health effects both physically and mentally, e.g. due to noise and flooding?
	2	Maintain and improve recreational facilities and promote access to health, social and recreational facilities.	Does the policy/proposal include development appropriately sited for access to health, social and recreational facilities and open space?
Population	1	Improve the community environment and quality of life of residents.	Could the policy/proposal enhance the community environment and improve quality of life?
	2	Maintain or enhance sustainable access to key services, amenities and employment particularly for rural communities.	Does the policy/proposal promote sustainable access to essential services and employment opportunities?
	3	Promote economic growth to encourage retention of working age population.	Does the policy/proposal promote economic growth through encouraging new business?
Material Assets	1	Areas important for the production of materials for construction and energy generation should be protected from development.	Would the policy/proposal promote development that would affect areas protected for extraction of construction materials or for energy generation?
	2	Promote sustainable and efficient use of natural resources in the construction of existing and future developments.	Could the policy/proposal promote sustainable design and construction? Does the policy/proposal have the potential to promote reuse and recycle of waste in the construction of new developments?
	3	Ensure that waste management in South Ayrshire is based on the principles of reduce, reuse and recycle, as set out in the Area Waste Plan Best Practical Environmental Option (BPEO).	Could the policy/proposal make a positive contribution towards achieving all European, national, regional and local waste reduction and recycling targets? Would the policy/proposal minimise the production of waste for any new development?
	4	Ensure there is adequate sewerage and drainage infrastructure in place to support new development.	Does the policy / proposal allow for connection to public sewerage and waste water drainage systems?

Vision Options

Vision Option	Details
<p>Preferred Option: The LDP will be a development strategy that maximises sustainable economic growth, underpinned by sound social and environmental objectives.</p>	<p>This strategy would strive, principally, to drive economic growth whilst recognising that appropriate management of how development impacts on communities and the environment play an integral role in supporting the sustainability of the economy. This approach is preferred as it is considered to strike an appropriate balance between economic, social and environmental priorities.</p> <p>Primarily, the LDP will concentrate on increasing opportunities for business development, investment and employment opportunities by: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving the viability and vitality town centres through regeneration; • Promoting an integrated transport strategy to allow regional, national and international linkage to, and within South Ayrshire; • Promoting a spatial strategy to allow the South Ayrshire's rural economy to thrive; • Promoting a strategy to retain and enhance Glasgow Prestwick International Airport as a key economic asset for the area; • Promoting South Ayrshire's key economic assets (in addition to GPIA: tourism, timber production/processing, and port related development); • Developing an economically sustainable strategy for housing development; and, • Capitalising on natural and built heritage resources as an economic asset (i.e. promotion of a niche tourism market and rural diversification including development of green technologies). <p>These key priorities represent the key areas for policy change, and will be discussed further throughout the MIR. In addition to recognising economic benefits of the preferred option, an integral part of this strategy is that it would promote both social and environmental objectives.</p> <p>This strategy would promote the importance of communities by adopting policies that ensure communities are served by improved access to improved amenities, and that housing needs (in terms of private and affordable housing and in terms of housing numbers) are catered for, in both urban and rural parts of South Ayrshire. This strategy would also seek to protect, preserve and enhance natural and built heritage resources within South Ayrshire. This will protect the character of rural areas, while increasing access and sustainability of rural communities.</p>
<p>Alternative Option 1: The LDP shall prioritise the growth of South Ayrshire's economy.</p>	<p>This approach would prioritise the economic objectives as set out in NPF2, the SOA and AJSP over social and environmental benefits.</p> <p>Where social or environmental objectives require to be addressed in the LDP, this strategic option would see that the particular social/environmental objective is achieved in a way that maximises that development as an economic asset for South Ayrshire. In selecting development sites, primary consideration will be given to positive economic attributes arising from the development, with social and environmental implications/constraints being secondary considerations.</p> <p>This would see a less constrained approach to developing a settlement strategy for the area, and may lead to the development of sites that are less well connected and environmentally more damaging than they might be.</p>
<p>Alternative Option 2: The LDP shall strategically focus on achieving social inclusion and integration.</p>	<p>This approach would prioritise social objectives over other wider strategic objectives. Priorities in advocating this policy approach would be integration of housing development within existing communities – in particular integrating different tenure types into existing communities.</p> <p>This approach would seek improved transport links predominantly to serve access for communities in around South Ayrshire to improve access to amenities. Town centre regeneration strategies, through this approach, would be driven for their social benefits, such as access to services and amenities and this would drive site selection. In terms of site selection, locational preferences will be driven by social objectives (i.e. integrated sites) as opposed to the economic potential of the development or whether a particular site will affect an environmentally sensitive area.</p>
<p>Alternative Option 3: Conserve the natural heritage of South Ayrshire and establish environmentally sustainable growth patterns.</p>	<p>This would see Central Scotland Green Network being developed as a LDP priority, with the objective of enhancing rural areas. Rural diversification would be encouraged to ensure the continued viability (and ultimately existence) of rural settlements. Regeneration of town centres will be undertaken and driven with a view to preserving and enhancing the built heritage of the area.</p> <p>Development of the Airport or infrastructure such as transport networks should minimise the impact of the development on the environment. A protection stance will be adopted when selecting sites for development growth, thereby limiting development options during site selection stage. This would be restrictive, particularly on selection of sites for housing in rural areas.</p>

KEY:	✓	Compatible with SEA Objectives	?	Potential Compatibility with SEA Objectives
	X	Incompatible with SEA Objectives	?	Potential Incompatibility with SEA Objectives
	0	No Link	?	Uncertain Link

Vision Options	Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna			Cultural Heritage	Water			Soils and Geology		Landscape		Air Quality		Climatic Factors			Noise		Human Health		Population			Material Assets			
	1	2	3	1	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	4		
Preferred Option																											
The LDP will be a development strategy that maximises sustainable economic growth, underpinned by sound social and environmental objectives.	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	
Summary	<p>Sustainable patterns of development should protect the wider environment in the long term. With regards compatibility with the SEA objectives, is some uncertainty as detailed below however it is considered that overall, the preferred vision would lead to several environmental benefits.</p> <p>Compatibility of this preferred vision option with the biodiversity objectives is uncertain. The description details that the strategy would seek to protect, preserve and enhance the natural and built heritage resources in South Ayrshire however Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) suggested through consultation that, to achieve a balance between development and the environment, the text in the vision statement should be altered to replace the word „underpinned“ to „guided“. This alteration to the preferred vision has been assessed below and the option will be put forward to South Ayrshire Council (SAC) for their consideration.</p> <p>Compatibility with the cultural heritage objective is thought to be uncertain as it cannot be ascertained at this level what effects there could be on the historic assets of South Ayrshire. Further uncertainty lies with the water objectives as increased impermeable surfaces associated with development may increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. New infrastructure should also be designed to incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage systems (SUDs) also.</p> <p>There is potential compatibility with soils objective 1 as the detailed description of the preferred vision states that town centres would be regenerated which has the potential to involve the uptake of currently vacant and derelict land. There is uncertain compatibility with the second soils objective however as, through increased economic growth, uptake of agricultural land for development could occur. This is also the case for landscape objective 2, as greenbelt land could be utilised however there are also envisaged to be benefits to these factors through enhancements to environmental features in South Ayrshire and so compatibility is uncertain.</p> <p>There is potential compatibility with the air quality objectives as there is likely to be a reduction in new physical infrastructure and making more efficient use of existing. This could reduce congestion on the roads thereby having potential benefits to the air quality of South Ayrshire.</p> <p>The vision is compatible with climatic factors objective 3. The detailed text for the vision includes the development of green technologies which can contribute towards renewable energy targets. Compatibility with climatic factors objective 1 is possible but uncertain as the promotion of green technologies could indirectly reduce greenhouse gas emissions however the vision also promotes a transport strategy and enhancement of GPIA which could increase GHG emissions.</p> <p>The vision is compatible with all the population objectives through improvements to the viability and vitality of town centres through regeneration, promoting an integrated transport strategy, increasing access for rural communities and overall promoting economic growth so increasing the likelihood of retaining the working age population in the area. The vision aims to protect and enhance the environment, creating a more attractive place for people to live and work and so further benefiting the population.</p> <p>There is uncertain compatibility with human health objective 1 as it does not specify the facilitation of healthier lifestyles in South Ayrshire however environmental improvements through the vision could lead to benefits although this is uncertain at present. It is thought that there would be compatibility with human health objective 2 due to the potential for improved access to health, social and recreational facilities, particularly for rural communities.</p> <p>As illustrated, there is potential for improvement in this option and an alternative have been proposed in an attempt to fully consider the natural and built environment of South Ayrshire within the vision whilst also ensuring that sustainable economic growth takes place.</p>																										

Vision Options	Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna			Cultural Heritage	Water			Soils and Geology		Landscape		Air Quality		Climatic Factors			Noise		Human Health		Population			Material Assets			
	1	2	3	1	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	4
Alternative 1: The LDP will be a development strategy that maximises sustainable economic growth, guided by sound social and environmental objectives.	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
Summary	<p>Whilst this adaption of the preferred vision gives more weight to environmental and social objectives, there is still uncertainty as to the extent of effects which could occur, both beneficial and adverse, to biodiversity and cultural heritage. It can therefore be seen that, although it is possible that the environmental benefits of this option are enhanced in comparison with the original statement, there is still uncertainty as to the exact type and extent of effects that could occur.</p> <p>Sustainable economic growth, guided by sound social and environmental objectives, means there may be more influence in decisions associated with the type and location of development. It is possible therefore that development may be guided away from prime agricultural and greenbelt land having potential compatibility with soils and landscape objectives 2. Air quality compatibility is also uncertain as it may be that there will be reduced effects on air quality with this option.</p> <p>The re-wording of the vision does not appear to have any significant additional benefits to the natural and built environment and was not considered by SAC to be a reasonable alternative. SAC's response was as follows:</p> <p><i>The word 'underpinned' is intended to convey that the driver of growth is the environment and social factors i.e. economic growth through the potential of the Central Scotland Green Network, the Biosphere, development of renewable energy sources and the integration of transport links for the benefit of communities. This seeks to protect and enhance the environment to create a more attractive place for people to live and work whilst offsetting the current economic instability by realising the potential for growth through the environment.</i></p>																										
Option 1																											
The LDP shall prioritise the growth of South Ayrshire's economy.	?	X	?	X	?	X	X	?	X	X	X	X	X	?	X	X	X	X	?	X	?	?	X	?	?	?	
Summary	<p>This option for the vision prioritises economic objectives with social and environmental objectives being of secondary concern. This is likely to result in development which is less well connected as specified in the vision details and potentially environmentally damaging. If development were to be located near to or within Natura 2000 sites then there would be incompatibility with SEA biodiversity objective 1. As environmental objectives are a secondary concern, development could segregate habitats and species therefore there is incompatibility with biodiversity objective 2. Furthermore there is the potential for adverse effects to other designated biodiversity sites, European and priority species therefore there is potential incompatibility with biodiversity objective 3.</p> <p>The option is incompatible with the cultural heritage objective as any development, particularly within town centres where many Conservation Areas and listed buildings are present, could adversely affect historic features without their consideration. The increase in impermeable surfaces as a result of development and new infrastructure could increase the risk of flooding, therefore potentially incompatible with water objectives 2 and 3, and detrimentally affect water quality and the quality of bathing waters, therefore rendering this option incompatible with water objective 1. It is possible that this vision would lead to development of brownfield land but this would likely not be a primary consideration therefore potential incompatibility lies with soils objective 1.</p> <p>In addition, it is envisaged that there could be possible incompatibility with the noise objectives through increased industry and other development which has the potential to result in a rise in noise emissions. This could have indirect adverse effects on the population as elevated noise levels can result in mental health issues.</p> <p>There is no commitment to preserving the landscape and maximising development as an economic asset could be detrimental to the local landscape character and any Scenic Areas in the vicinity of any development. The vision also does not maintain or protect greenfield sites therefore resulting in incompatibility with landscape objective 2. There is no commitment to encouraging energy efficient housing or reducing the need to travel. Instead, the vision notes that development may be less well connected and therefore there is incompatibility with air quality and climatic factors SEA objectives.</p> <p>Compatibility with human health objective 2 is uncertain as social, recreational and health facilities may be developed through this vision as an economic asset however as development is likely to be less well connected, access to these services may become more difficult. There may be additional indirect effects on human health through possible increased noise emissions and so there is thought to be incompatibility with human health objective 1. This option does however promote economic growth which is envisaged to retain the working age population and therefore it can be seen to be compatible with population objective 3.</p>																										
Option 2																											
The LDP shall strategically focus on achieving social inclusion and integration.	?	?	?	?	?	X	X	?	?	?	?	X	X	X	?	X	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?		
Summary	<p>The focus of this option is on social objectives with environmental and economic objectives considered secondary. Priorities lie with integrating housing development into existing communities. As environmental objectives are secondary considerations, there is potential incompatibility with the biodiversity objectives. Compatibility with the soils objectives are uncertain as developing within existing communities may reduce the uptake of prime agricultural land and could use vacant land for development however this is uncertain at this strategic level. There is no commitment to protecting the surrounding landscape; therefore there is potential incompatibility with the landscape objectives.</p> <p>The vision specifies that transport links will be improved predominately to serve access for communities in South Ayrshire. It does not however specify that this would be public transport and at this stage it can be assumed that this would lead to reduced air quality and potential breaches of air quality standards in areas such as Maybole and Coylton where they are close to exceeding national air quality standards. This is also true in the case of climatic factors objective 1.</p> <p>As the vision is focused towards social objectives, it is likely that noise effects on residential areas would be limited and access to social, recreational and health facilities promoted, therefore being compatible with human health and population objectives. It is envisaged that the community environment and quality of life of residents would be enhanced and economic growth could increase thereby assuring compatibility with the population objectives.</p>																										

Vision Options	Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna			Cultural Heritage	Water			Soils and Geology		Landscape		Air Quality		Climatic Factors			Noise		Human Health		Population			Material Assets			
	1	2	3	1	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	4
<p>Recommendation: Alteration to the vision description to: „.....This approach would seek improved public transport links, predominately to serve access for communities in and around South Ayrshire to improve access to amenities...“</p>	?	?	?	?	?	X	X	?	?	?	?	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	?	?	?
Summary	The slight alteration to the description of this vision option results in compatibility with the air quality and climatic factors objectives. This is due to the commitment to improving public transport links for communities thereby potentially resulting in fewer vehicles on the roads in South Ayrshire and therefore improving air quality and assisting with reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.																										
Option 3																											
Conserve the natural heritage of South Ayrshire and establish environmentally sustainable growth patterns.	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	✓	?	✓	✓	?	✓	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	✓	?	?
Summary	<p>This is the environmentally preferred option for the vision as it commits to the conservation of the natural environment of South Ayrshire with environmentally sustainable growth patterns. This would ensure compatibility or potential compatibility with the biodiversity, water, soils, landscape, air quality, climatic factors and material assets objectives. The Central Scotland Green Network (CSGN) involves the rehabilitation of around 2,500 square miles of land into a network of woodland, green space, foot and cycle paths from Ayrshire to Fife. It also includes the transformation of vacant and brownfield sites into green spaces to improve the quality of life for residents and has the potential to boost the economy by attracting people to live and work in the area thereby leading to compatibility with population objective 1. It also promotes a sustainable transport network thereby having compatibility with population 2 with the potential for improved access to services and employment. The promotion of CSGN could also benefit human health through improved recreational facilities and the increased opportunities for active travel which could increase physical activity.</p> <p>It is thought that there could be uncertain compatibility with cultural heritage features in South Ayrshire as within the detailed description of this option it states that regeneration of town centres will be undertaken and driven with a view to preserving and enhancing the built heritage of the area. However, it is considered that this could be included within the main option to reinforce the commitment to the built environment and therefore a modified option has been proposed.</p> <p>It is uncertain what effects this option would have on noise at this stage.</p>																										
Alternative 1: Conserve the built and natural heritage of South Ayrshire and establish environmentally sustainable growth patterns.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	?	✓	✓	✓	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	✓	?	?
Summary	This alternative to vision option 3 is slightly more compatible overall due to the commitment to conserving not only the natural heritage of South Ayrshire, but also the built heritage as well thereby ensuring compatibility with the cultural heritage objective and the landscape objectives. This should ensure that the local landscape character is protected from adverse effects of development.																										

Updated Vision Assessment

The preferred vision and its alternative options were developed throughout the MIR process taking into consideration the findings of the initial SEA findings. The following assessment is of the final preferred vision and its alternatives taken forward into the MIR. With regards re-assessment, it was considered that only the preferred option required a further environmental assessment and this is laid out in the matrix following the table.

Final Vision Options

Vision Option	Details
<p>Preferred Option: Growing Our Economy in an Outstanding Natural Environment.</p>	<p>This strategy will maximise sustainable economic growth, underpinned by sound social and environmental objectives. That is, maximising economic growth through an environment-led approach, recognising South Ayrshire’s natural environment and cultural heritage as being a key economic asset. This recognises that the make-up of the economy is a likely basis for longer term economic growth, since many of the economic strengths of the local economy remain in place (high skills, international connectivity, English language and flexible labour market); however it seeks to deliver growth in a way that focuses on improving/utilising the environment to facilitate more sustainable development patterns; and on attracting and capitalising on opportunities, particularly where they capitalise on, or enhance the environment. This is intended to support and enhance South Ayrshire’s existing economic strengths to offset the short-medium term unpredictability of the economy, which has arisen from the recession.</p> <p>This approach will seek to: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stabilise and grow the economy by enhancing the quality of South Ayrshire’s natural and built environment for residents, visitors and the commercial sector; • Improve transport infrastructure to enhance local, regional, national and international connectivity; • Support green sector jobs to diversify South Ayrshire’s economy; • Improve town centres through regeneration; • Allow rural areas to thrive through flexible planning policies; • Enhance Glasgow Prestwick Airport as a key economic asset for the area; • Promote the role of Ayr and Troon Ports as a key economic asset for the area; • Achieve housing growth in a volatile market whilst protecting the environment; and, • Responding to climate change. <p>The preferred approach is not a protectionist approach to the environment. While protection of the environment is part of the preferred vision, the preferred vision seeks to capture the development of the environment as a driver of more sustainable patterns of economic growth. This will therefore inherently be more mindful of the impact of development on the environment.</p>
<p>Alternative Option 1: The LDP shall prioritise the growth of South Ayrshire’s economy.</p>	<p>This approach would prioritise economic objectives set out in NPF2, the SOA and AJSP over social and environmental benefits. Where social or environmental objectives require to be addressed in the LDP, this strategic option would see that the particular social/environmental objective is achieved in a way that maximises that development as an economic asset for South Ayrshire. In selecting development sites, primary consideration will be given to positive economic attributes arising from the development, with social and environmental implications/constraints being secondary considerations. This would see a less constrained approach to developing a settlement strategy for the area, and may lead to the development of sites that are less well connected and environmentally more damaging than they might be.</p>
<p>Alternative Option 2: The LDP shall strategically focus on achieving social inclusion and integration.</p>	<p>This approach would prioritise social objectives over other wider strategic objectives. Priorities in advocating this policy approach would be integration of housing development within existing communities – in particular integrating different tenure types into existing communities. This approach would seek improved transport links predominantly to serve access for communities in around South Ayrshire to improve access to amenities. In particular, this approach would focus on increased use and integration of public transport nodes into existing communities and town centres, as well as new residential developments. Town centre regeneration strategies, through this approach, would be driven for social benefits, such as access to services and amenities and this would drive site selection. In terms of site selection, locational preferences will be driven by social objectives (i.e. integrated sites) as opposed to the economic potential of the development or whether a particular site will affect an environmentally sensitive area.</p>
<p>Alternative Option 3: Conserve the natural heritage of South Ayrshire and establish environmentally sustainable growth patterns.</p>	<p>This would see Central Scotland Green Network being developed as a LDP priority, with the objective of enhancing rural areas. Rural diversification would be encouraged to ensure the continued viability (and ultimately existence) of rural settlements. Regeneration of town centres will be undertaken and driven with a view to preserving and enhancing the built heritage of the area. Development of the Airport or infrastructure such as transport networks should minimise the impact of the development on the environment. A protection stance will be adopted when selecting sites for development growth, thereby limiting development options during site selection stage. This would be restrictive, particularly on selection of sites for housing in rural areas.</p>

Updated Compatibility Assessment Matrix

KEY:

✓	Compatible with SEA Objectives	?	Potential Compatibility with SEA Objectives
X	Incompatible with SEA Objectives	?	Potential Incompatibility with SEA Objectives
0	No Link	?	Uncertain Link

Vision Options	Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna			Cultural Heritage	Water			Soils and Geology		Landscape		Air Quality		Climatic Factors			Noise		Human Health		Population			Material Assets			
	1	2	3	1	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	4		
Preferred Option																											
Growing Our Economy in an Outstanding Natural Environment.	?	?	?	✓	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	
Summary	<p>Although this final preferred vision option still provides some uncertainty with regards several of the SEA topics, this is generally to be expected at this strategic level. The updated vision is thought to provide additional benefits to the natural and built environment.</p> <p>Compatibility with the biodiversity SEA objectives is still considered to be uncertain at this level as effects generally are dependant on where development is situated. This is similar with regards compatibility with the water objectives. The commitment to enhancing the natural and built environment of South Ayrshire however could go some way to providing benefits. It is envisaged that there would be compatibility with the cultural heritage objective as it recognises cultural heritage as being a key economic asset with a further commitment to improving town centres through regeneration, potentially benefiting Conservation Areas, where present.</p> <p>The final preferred vision option is considered to be compatible with climatic factors objectives 2 and 3 as the approach seeks to respond to climate change and support green sector jobs which could mean a growth of the renewable energy sector. Compatibility with climatic factors 1 is uncertain as the support for the growth of Prestwick airport could increase GHG emissions.</p> <p>The compatibility with the soils and geology, landscape, air quality, noise, health and population SEA objectives are anticipated to be the same as within the initial assessment in the previous matrix.</p> <p>There is thought to be compatibility with the material assets objective 2 through this vision option due to the efficient use of existing resources such as the existing transport infrastructure for local, regional, national and international connectivity along with more sustainable development patterns.</p>																										

Compatibility Assessment – Land Assessment Framework

Key:

✓	Compatible with SEA Objectives	?	Potential Compatibility with SEA Objectives		Preferred Environmental Option
X	Incompatible with SEA Objectives	?	Potential Incompatibility with SEA Objectives		
0	No Link	?	Uncertain Link		

Checklist Components	Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna			Cultural Heritage	Water			Soils and Geology		Landscape		Air Quality		Climatic Factors			Noise		Human Health		Population			Material Assets						
	1	2	3	1	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	4			
1. Landscape Assessment																														
Development of land will have no adverse effect on landscape setting (this may include land that may have minimal result on landscape as a result of mitigation).	0	0	0	?	✓	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
<i>Overall Summary</i>	This option is compatible with Landscape objective 1 through the preservation of the landscape setting. It is also potentially compatible with the cultural heritage objective because preserving the setting of the landscape may indirectly also avoid effects on the setting of cultural heritage assets. The option has no links with any of the other SEA objectives.																													
Development of land will result in minor or moderate landscape impact, site not capable of landscape mitigation.	0	0	0	?	X	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	X	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Overall Summary</i>	The option will have a minor landscape impact and so can be seen to be incompatible with the landscape objective 1. There may also be incompatibility with the cultural heritage objective as heritage features may also be detrimentally affected. Moderate adverse effects on the landscape may also affect the community environment as the quality of their surroundings may reduce. There are no links with any of the other SEA objectives.																													
Development of land will result in significant landscape impact, site not capable of landscape mitigation.	0	0	0	?	X	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	X	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Overall Summary</i>	Significant landscape effects would produce results similar to that of the above option.																													
2. Coalescence																														
No coalescence issues raised.	0	0	0	?	✓	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Overall Summary</i>	Ensuring that development does not raise any coalescence issues will likely benefit the landscape setting and therefore is compatible with landscape objective 1. It is also likely to benefit cultural heritage as ensuring that separate settlements do not join physically or visually will preserve the setting of any conservation areas and other historic features in the separate settlements. It would also be likely to preserve the community environment in each of the settlements thereby potentially being compatible with population objective 1. There are no links with any of the other SEA objectives.																													
Development would narrow the separation between settlements though there would be no physical coalescence; however, the development of the site may result in visual coalescence.	0	0	0	?	X	0	0	0	0	0	?	X	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Overall Summary</i>	Narrowing the separation between settlements without physical coalescence has uncertain links with the landscape objective 2 as there may be uptake of greenbelt land although this is not known at this stage. There is the potential for visual effects on the landscape due to potential visual coalescence and so potential incompatibility is recorded. Furthermore, visual coalescence could affect the setting of cultural heritage features thereby resulting in potential incompatibility with this objective. There are also uncertain links with population objective 1 as the community environment in either settlement could be affected even if there is no actual coalescence occurring. There may be compatibility with population objective 2 as reducing the gap between settlements could benefit people wishing to access services and amenities in another settlement.																													

Checklist Components	Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna			Cultural Heritage	Water			Soils and Geology		Landscape		Air Quality		Climatic Factors			Noise		Human Health		Population			Material Assets			
	1	2	3	1	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	4
Development would result in the coalescence of neighbouring settlements.	0	?	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	X	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	?	0	0	0	0	
Overall Summary	Development which results in the coalescence of neighbouring settlements is likely to be incompatible with landscape objective 1 with potential incompatibility with landscape objective 2 through potential uptake of greenbelt land. It is possible that the coalescence would result in the removal of hedgerows and woodland which can be important habitats for species and therefore there is potential incompatibility with biodiversity objective 2. Furthermore, there is potential incompatibility with biodiversity objective 3 as protected and priority species may be affected. Coalescence is likely to affect the setting of the villages or towns in question and therefore there is possible incompatibility with the cultural heritage objective as Conservation Areas and other important historic and archaeological features may be impacted upon. The option is incompatible with population objective 1 as the joining of two settlements is envisaged to detrimentally affect the community environments.																										
3. Ribbon development.																											
No ribbon development issues.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	0	0	
Overall Summary	Without ribbon development, it is possible that there would be compatibility with the soils objectives because it is likely that any new development would be within the settlements themselves thereby potentially utilising vacant and derelict land whilst possibly avoiding prime agricultural land outwith settlements. Furthermore, it is thought that avoidance of this type of development would be beneficial to the landscape thereby being compatible with landscape objective 1 and leading to possible compatibility with landscape objective 2 as it is less likely that uptake of greenbelt land would be required. Ribbon development can elongate settlements, stretching housing away from settlement centres and services. This could increase traffic on the roads as people require transport to access amenities and therefore avoiding ribbon development could lead to compatibility with the air quality objectives as well as climatic factors objective 1. It is also thought that this could benefit the community environment and quality of life of residents as well as ensuring easy access to recreational and health facilities in the settlement centres.																										
Minor - moderate issues.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	0	?	
Overall Summary	New development which results in minor to moderate ribbon development issues has the potential to lead to incompatibility with several of the SEA objectives including soils, landscape, air quality, climatic factors, and health, population and material assets. Ribbon development spanning outwith settlement centres does not constitute efficient use of resources and also reduces accessibility to settlement centres for those living on the settlement edge. Furthermore, it is envisaged that this would lead to increased car use thereby potentially detrimentally affecting air quality. Ribbon development can also be visually displeasing and therefore could have adverse landscape effects as well as potentially reducing the amount of greenbelt and prime agricultural land between settlements.																										
Significant issues.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	X	?	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	X	X	0	?	
Overall Summary	Significant ribbon development could have adverse effects on several environmental parameters including the landscape, community environment and access to services and amenities. It is further likely to lead to increased car use to access settlement centres and therefore air quality may deteriorate. Ribbon development can have adverse effects on the landscape setting and it is likely that significant ribbon development would utilise greenspace and possibly prime agricultural land.																										
4. Settlement Pattern / Boundary.																											
Site / location contained within an existing settlement.	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	0	0		
Overall Summary	Matching or improving the existing settlement pattern and edge is envisaged to improve the townscape as well as the surrounding landscape thereby it is seen to be compatible with landscape objective 1. There may be additional benefits to the cultural heritage assets through improvements and therefore is compatible with this objective. New development undertaken in this way may also be of benefit to the community environment and so there is potential compatibility with population objective 1.																										
Minor – moderate issues.	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	0	0		
Overall Summary	Minor to moderate issues with new development fitting with the existing settlement may have adverse effects to the historic features of the affected settlements and therefore there is potential incompatibility with the cultural heritage objective. There is also possible incompatibility with landscape objective 1. Minor to moderate issues may also have an impact on the quality of life and community environment thereby potentially being incompatible with population objective 1.																										

Checklist Components	Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna			Cultural Heritage	Water			Soils and Geology		Landscape		Air Quality		Climatic Factors			Noise		Human Health		Population			Material Assets				
	1	2	3	1	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	
Site totally disconnected from existing settlement.	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	X	0	0	0	0
Overall Summary	Development disconnected from the existing settlement is thought to be incompatible with the cultural heritage and landscape objective 1 as it is likely that the new development would adversely affect the setting of these. Furthermore, there may be additional adverse effects on the community environment and so there is potential incompatibility with the population objective 1.																											
5. Site Access																												
No issues.	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	?	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0
Overall Summary	Developing on a site with no access issues is anticipated to have beneficial effects to the water environment as it does not necessitate the building of a new access road which could affect any nearby watercourses. There may be some benefits to air quality and climatic factors through the use of existing access road.																											
Minor or moderate problems with achieving safe site access; minor mitigation measures (including provision of infrastructure) likely to overcome access issues.	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	?	?	?	?	0	?	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	
Overall Summary	Problems achieving safe site access may put people working on the site at risk however mitigation to overcome issues should resolve this. The link therefore with human health objective 1 is uncertain. New infrastructure could introduce new noise sources to the area thereby having potential incompatibility with noise objective 2 as well as to air quality and climatic factors. Developing new access to sites could have adverse landscape effects and therefore there could be incompatibility with landscape objective 1.																											
Severe problems; unlikely to be resolvable.	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	X	0	X	X	X	0	X	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	
Overall Summary	Severe problems with access are likely to mean incompatibility with several of the SEA objectives as mitigation is unlikely to be possible.																											
6. Public Transport Access																												
No significant issues with quality of bus / rail service, or accessibility to public transport; in some instances, there will be potential for development to improve service and accessibility.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	0	0	0	
Overall Summary	This option is envisaged to benefit the local population as it would maintain and potentially enhance sustainable access to services, amenities and employment as well as recreational and health facilities for the local population. It is anticipated therefore that this option would be compatible with population objectives 1 and 2 as well as human health objective 2. Ensuring access to and improving public transport services could improve air quality in the local area as well as contribute towards a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and so is compatible with air quality objectives and climatic factors objective 1.																											
Limited or no bus / rail service, limited / more remote accessibility, improvements unlikely as a result of development.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	0	0	0	
Overall Summary	More limited or no public transport services for new development has uncertain links with human health objective 2 and population objectives 1 and 2 as it is uncertain as to the extent of access to services and amenities. In addition, there is a greater likelihood that people will use their cars to drive to amenities and employment and so the link with air quality objectives and climatic factors 1 and 3 are also uncertain.																											
No bus / rail services, no potential for services as a result of the development / other likely developments in the area.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	X	X	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	X	?	X	X	0	0	
Overall Summary	This option is incompatible with the air quality objectives as well as climatic factors objectives 1 and 3 as if there is no possibility of public transport access for new developments then people will have to use private forms of transport which could have detrimental effects on local air quality. In addition, this is incompatible with population objective 2 as it does not maintain or enhance sustainable access to key services, amenities and employment. It is also more likely to have an affect on the quality of life of the residents.																											

Checklist Components	Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna			Cultural Heritage	Water			Soils and Geology		Landscape		Air Quality		Climatic Factors			Noise		Human Health		Population			Material Assets				
	1	2	3	1	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	
7. Road Network																												
No issues.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Overall Summary	If there are no issues with capacity on the existing road network then current conditions will prevail and therefore it is unlikely that there will be any significant effects on any of the SEA objectives. It is therefore considered that there are no links with any of the objectives.																											
Minor to moderate issues.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	X	X	0	0	?	?	?	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Overall Summary	This option is envisaged to be incompatible with the air quality objectives and climatic factors objective 1 as minor to moderate capacity issues is thought to result in congestion on the local roads which will increase local emissions. This may lead to increased emissions and therefore is potentially incompatible with the air quality objectives and climatic factors. Congestion on the roads elevates noise levels and could indirectly affect human health. This means that there is also possible incompatibility with the noise objectives and human health objective 1. Quality of life of residents may also be marginally affected and so there is potential incompatibility with population objective 1.																											
Major issues.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	X	X	0	0	X	X	?	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Overall Summary	Major capacity issues on the local road network have high potential to lead to significant congestion problems once new development is in place. Emission levels are likely to rise and so could reduce local air quality. This option is therefore considered to be incompatible with air quality objectives as well as climatic factors objective 1. Traffic noise levels could increase significantly with indirect effects on human health such as increased stress levels and so it is incompatible with noise objectives 1 and 2 and potential incompatibility with human health objective 1.																											
8. Distance to Public Transport Node																												
10 minute walk (= up to 750m).	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	0	?	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	0
Overall Summary	Locating development within 10 minutes walk of public transport provides sustainable access to services, amenities and employment thereby being compatible with population objective 2. There is also potential compatibility with population objectives 1 and 3 as, indirectly, the local resident's quality of life may improve as people with no access to a car. Encouraging use of sustainable modes of transport could reduce the number of cars on the road and thereby reduce air pollution thereby being potentially compatible with air quality objectives and climatic factors objective 1. It also could provide easier access to recreational, social and health facilities thereby having potential compatibility with human health objective 2.																											
15 minute walk (= up to 1125m) – 20 minute walk (= up to 1400m).	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	0	?	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	0
Overall Summary	Again, this option is likely to benefit the population through accessible public transport nodes. People are still likely to use public transport which is a 15 to 20 minute walk away and therefore the option can still be seen to be compatible with population objective 2. It may be an issue for elderly or less able people to access the available transport options however. It is still likely that there would be benefits to air quality through reduced car use hence potential compatibility with the air quality objectives and climatic factors objective 1.																											
More than a 20 minute walk	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	0	?	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	0
Overall Summary	Public transport which is more than a 20 minute walk away from the new development is likely to be incompatible with the air quality objectives as people are more likely to choose private forms of transport to travel. There are uncertain links with the population objectives as sustainable access to services etc is still available but it is people are less likely to utilise the services.																											
9. Distance to Local Amenities – e.g. Town Centre, Local Shops, GP Services																												
10 minute walk (= up to 750m).	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	0
Overall Summary	Ensuring that there are adequate local amenities within a 10 minute walk of new development is likely to be compatible with the population objective 2 as well as human health objective 2. Furthermore, it is envisaged that there would be possible compatibility with air quality objectives 1 and 2 as well as climatic factors objective 1 as providing amenities within walking distance reduces the need to use private transport. It also means that access to employment is easier and could indirectly benefit the town centres and local shops through increased trade.																											

Checklist Components	Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna			Cultural Heritage	Water			Soils and Geology		Landscape		Air Quality		Climatic Factors			Noise		Human Health		Population			Material Assets			
	1	2	3	1	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	4
15 minute walk (= up to 1125m) – 20 minute walk (= up to 1400m).	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	0	0	0	0	?	✓	?	✓	?	0	0	0	0
Overall Summary	Situating development within 15 to 20 minutes of a town centre or local shops is anticipated to have similar effects to it being 10 minutes away. It is envisaged that people would still walk to services and amenities and this is reflected in the assessment.																										
More than a 20 minute walk.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	0	0
Overall Summary	Having amenities more than 20 minutes walk away means that people are more likely to use their car to access shops etc, dependant on the public transport options available. Compatibility with several of the SEA objectives is therefore uncertain.																										
10. Flood Risk																											
Little or no risk / low to medium risk – annual probability of watercourse, tidal or coastal flooding: less than 0.1% (1:1000), i.e. less frequently than the so-called 1:1000 year flood; or in the range of 0.1% - 0.5% (1:1000 – 1:200) and not suitable for essential civil infrastructure (e.g. hospitals, fire stations, emergency depots).	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overall Summary	Developing in areas at no to low risk of flooding means that this option is compatible with water objective 2. Indirectly, it is also compatible with human health objective 1 as developing areas at minimal risk of flooding prevents potential health issues that stem from flood events.																										
Medium to high risk area – annual probability of watercourse, tidal or coastal flooding: greater than 0.5% (1:200). Generally not suitable for essential civil infrastructure, such as hospitals, fire stations, emergency depots etc. schools, ground based electrical and telecommunications equipment. The policy for development on functional flood plains applies. Land raising may be acceptable.	0	0	0	0	?	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overall Summary	This option is likely to be incompatible with the water objective 2 due to development being in a medium to high risk area and this also leads to potential incompatibility with human health objective 1.																										
Within areas already built up – these areas may be suitable for residential, institutional, commercial and industrial development provided flood prevention measures to the appropriate standard already exist, are under construction or are planned as part of a long term development strategy in structure plan context.	0	0	0	0	?	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overall Summary	Developing in these areas where flood prevention measures are in place or under construction could be compatible with water objective 2 dependant on the mitigation measures which are put in place.																										
Undeveloped and sparsely developed areas – these areas are generally not suitable for additional development, including residential, institutional, commercial and industrial development. Exceptions may arise if a location is essential for operational reasons, e.g. for navigation and water-based recreation uses, agriculture, transport or some utilities infrastructure, and an alternative lower risk location is not achievable.	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overall Summary	Developing these areas only for essential operational reasons is thought to have uncertain links with water objective 2 and health objective 1 as it is dependant on the location and type of development proposed.																										
11. Sewerage Infrastructure and Water Infrastructure																											
No constraints	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓
Overall Summary	Developing where there are no sewerage and water infrastructure constraints is compatible with water objective 1 as it is likely to minimise the risk of water pollution and is also compatible with material assets objective 4.																										

Checklist Components	Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna			Cultural Heritage	Water			Soils and Geology		Landscape		Air Quality		Climatic Factors			Noise		Human Health		Population			Material Assets				
	1	2	3	1	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	
Plant constrained and sensitive to significant new connections, could be either an issue of capacity or of discharge to a watercourse.	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?
Overall Summary	Locating development where there is constrained sewerage and water infrastructure could lead to pollution issues in nearby watercourses and so is potentially incompatible with water objective 1. There are uncertain links with material assets objective 4 as there may not be adequate capacity for the development.																											
Plant at capacity and unable to accept further connections.	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X
Overall Summary	If the plant is at capacity and will not accept further connections then this will not be compatible with material assets objective 4 and it would have potential incompatibility with water objective 1 also.																											
12. Quality of Agricultural Land																												
The land is not prime quality agricultural land; and its development will not impact on any adjacent / nearby prime agricultural land.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overall Summary	This option safeguards prime agricultural land and is therefore compatible with soils objective 2. There are no other links with any of the other SEA objectives.																											
The land is prime quality agricultural land.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overall Summary	Developing on prime agricultural land is directly incompatible with the soils objective 2. There are no links with any of the other SEA objectives.																											
13. Scheduled Monuments																												
The development of the land will not result in the loss of a scheduled monument; nor will it impact adversely on the setting of a scheduled monument.	0	0	0	?	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overall Summary	This option safeguards scheduled monuments however it is uncertain as to if any other historic features would be affected and therefore it is considered that there is potential compatibility with the cultural heritage objectives.																											
The development will adversely impact on the setting of a scheduled monument, although mitigation may reduce the impact on the monument.	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overall Summary	Adversely affecting the setting of a monument is considered to be incompatible with the cultural heritage objective. There are no links with any other SEA objectives.																											
The development of identified area of land is likely to result in the loss of a scheduled monument.	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overall Summary	This option again is incompatible with the cultural heritage objective.																											
14. Archaeology																												
The land does not contain any archaeological remains.	0	0	0	?	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overall Summary	Developing on land which does not contain any archaeological remains is likely to be compatible with the cultural heritage objective however there are no links with any of the other SEA objectives.																											
The land contains archaeological remains; mitigation may be possible to preserve the remains.	0	0	0	?	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overall Summary	This option is potentially incompatible with the cultural heritage objective as it is uncertain as to whether mitigation would prevent any adverse effects.																											
The land contains archaeological remains and its development will damage or result in the loss of those remains.	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overall Summary	Damage or loss to archaeological remains means that this option is incompatible with the cultural heritage objective.																											

Checklist Components	Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna			Cultural Heritage	Water			Soils and Geology		Landscape		Air Quality		Climatic Factors			Noise		Human Health		Population			Material Assets			
	1	2	3	1	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	4
15. Historic Gardens and Designed Landscapes																											
The development of land at this location will not directly adversely affect any historic garden or designed landscape.	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overall Summary	As development will not directly adversely affect any historic garden or designed landscape it is likely to be compatible with the cultural heritage objective.																										
The development land at this location will affect the setting of a historic garden or designed landscape; however mitigation measures may prevent significant adverse impacts upon the garden / landscape.	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overall Summary	This option is likely to be incompatible with the cultural heritage objective however mitigation should ensure that there are no adverse landscape effects.																										
The development at this location would involve the loss of a historic garden or designed landscape.	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overall Summary	Locating development where there would be the loss of a historic garden or designed landscape is envisaged to be incompatible with the cultural heritage objective and landscape objective 1.																										
16. Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs)																											
The land is not affected by an SSSI and its development will not affect any SSSI.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overall Summary	Having no impact on any SSSIs means that there are no links with any of the SEA objectives.																										
Development will impact on the SSSI. Mitigation may overcome any adverse impact on the SSSI.	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overall Summary	Having a minor effect on a SSSI site is likely to be incompatible with biodiversity objective 2 depending on the mitigation which may be put forward to eliminate the impacts and potentially incompatible with biodiversity objective 3 as there may be adverse effects to protected and priority species within the SSSIs.																										
The land contains a SSSI, which will be adversely affected by any development. Mitigation will not minimise the impact of the development of this land.	0	X	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overall Summary	Development adversely affecting a SSSI is considered to be incompatible with biodiversity objective 2 and potentially incompatible with biodiversity objective 3 as there may be adverse effects to protected and priority species within the SSSIs.																										
17. Natura 2000 Sites																											
The land is not affected by any Natura 2000 site; development will not affect any nearby Natura 2000 site.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overall Summary	Developing where there are no Natura 2000 sites present will mean that there is no effect on biodiversity and so it is considered that this option would have no links with any of the SEA objectives.																										
The land is affected by a Natura 2000 designation; mitigation may overcome significant adverse impacts of development.	X	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overall Summary	Development adversely affecting a Natura 2000 designation is considered to be incompatible with biodiversity objective 1 and potentially incompatible with biodiversity objectives 2 and 3 as there may be adverse effects to the protected and priority species within the sites.																										
The land contains Natura 2000 designations, which will be adversely affected by development; mitigation measures will not overcome significant adverse impacts of development.	X	?	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overall Summary	Development adversely affecting a Natura 2000 site with no mitigation available is considered to be incompatible with biodiversity objective 1 and also incompatible with biodiversity objective 3 as there is likely to be adverse effects to protected and priority species within these designations. Where there are national and local designations also assigned to these sites, there will be incompatibility with biodiversity objective 2 also.																										

Checklist Components	Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna			Cultural Heritage	Water			Soils and Geology		Landscape		Air Quality		Climatic Factors			Noise		Human Health		Population			Material Assets			
	1	2	3	1	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	4
18. Local Natural Heritage Value (LNHV) Sites (Wildlife Sites, Provisional Wildlife Sites, Local Nature Reserves, Protected Species Sites and Ornithological Sites)																											
The land is not affected by any LNHV site; development will not affect any nearby LNHV site.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overall Summary	Developing on land which will not affect any local sites is considered to have no links with any of the SEA objectives.																										
The land is affected by a LNHV designation; mitigation may overcome significant adverse impacts of development.	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Overall Summary	This option is likely to be incompatible with biodiversity objective 2 unless mitigation measures eliminate any adverse effects.																										
The land contains LNHV designations which will be adversely affected by development; mitigation measures will not overcome significant adverse impacts on the designation.	0	X	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Overall Summary	Adverse effects on LNHV designations which cannot be mitigated will be incompatible with biodiversity objective 2 and may also be incompatible with biodiversity objective 3 depending on whether any protected or priority species are located in these areas.																										
19. Human Health.																											
No human health issues.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Overall Summary	This option has no links with any of the SEA objectives.																										
Minor issues (limited access to open space and Core Paths).	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Overall Summary	Minor issues limiting access to open space and Core Paths is envisaged to have potential incompatibility with the human health objectives as it limits opportunity for physical activity.																										
Significant issues (significantly limited access to open space and Core Paths).	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Overall Summary	Significant issues relating to access is considered to be incompatible with the human health objectives.																										
20. Air																											
Development presents no risk of a breach in EU air quality standards.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Overall Summary	Development which does not present a risk of a breach in EU air quality standards is anticipated to be potentially compatible with air quality objective 1.																										
Risk of minor air quality issues due to slight breaches in EU air quality standards i.e. congestion.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	X	?	X	?	X	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	
Overall Summary	This is anticipated to be potentially incompatible with the air quality objectives and climatic factors 1 due to the potential for increased air pollution in the vicinity of the development due to congestion etc. There may also be effects on human health however these are more uncertain.																										
Risk of significant air quality issues due to serious breaches in EU air quality standards i.e. congestion.	0	0	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	X	X	X	0	0	0	0	?	X	?	0	X	0	0	
Overall Summary	Significant air quality issues are not only thought to be incompatible with the air quality objectives but also climatic factors objective 1. Furthermore there is the potential for adverse effects to human health as a result of increased air pollution. It may also affect people's quality of life thereby presenting potential incompatibility with the population objective 1. There is the potential for indirect effects to cultural heritage features and water quality however the link between these objectives is more uncertain.																										

Checklist Components	Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna			Cultural Heritage	Water			Soils and Geology		Landscape		Air Quality		Climatic Factors			Noise		Human Health		Population			Material Assets			
	1	2	3	1	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	4
21. Climatic Factors																											
No climatic issues.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overall Summary	This option is not thought to have links with any of the SEA objectives.																										
Development would lead to a minor contribution of Greenhouse Gases (CO ₂ , methane or Nitrous Oxide) resulting in climate change trends and flooding and storm events.	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	?	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	
Overall Summary	It is thought that having a minor contribution towards GHG emissions could result in potential incompatibility with climatic factors objective 1 and also have indirect effects to human health through the potential for increased flood events. This also means potential incompatibility with water objective 2. The quality of life of the population may also be affected. It is noted however that South Ayrshire's contribution to national GHG emissions is likely to be minimal and therefore adverse effects are not considered to be great.																										
Development would result in a great volume of Greenhouse gases being released.	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	?	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	
Overall Summary	Producing a great volume of GHG emissions through development is considered to be incompatible with climatic factors objective 1. There is also potential incompatibility with the water objective 2 due to possible increased flood risk and indirect effects to human health and the population's quality of life, reflected in the potential incompatible score displayed for these. It is noted however that South Ayrshire's contribution to national GHG emissions is likely to be minimal and therefore adverse effects are not considered to be great.																										
22. Material Assets																											
The land contains material assets.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Overall Summary	No links with any SEA objectives.																										
The land proposed for development contains material assets which are in plentiful supply or of no significant economic or social benefit.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	
Overall Summary	There is the potential for compatibility with material assets objective 1 through this option.																										
The land proposed for development is rich in material assets.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	
Overall Summary	Developing on land rich in material assets is considered to be potentially incompatible with material assets objective 1.																										