

Appendix 4 - Summary

Spatial Strategy

Spatial Strategy as a whole

SEA Objective	Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
	Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1	=	+	++	M	+	+
2	+	+	+	M	+	=
3	+	+	+	M	+	++
4	+	++	++	H	+	++
5	=	=	+	L	+	=
6	=	=	+	L	+	=
7	+	+	++	M	+	++
8	=	=	=	L	=	=
9	=	=	=	L	=	=
10	=	-	=	M	-	=
11	=	=	=	L	=	=
12	=	=	+	M	+	=
13	=	+	++	M	+	++
14	=	=	=	L	=	=
15	=	=	=	L	=	=
16	=	+	+	M	+	=
17	=	=	=	L	=	=

Commentary

This is the preferred spatial strategy and the Council have not identified any other reasonable alternatives.

This is the preferred option for the following reasons:

- Sustainable growth of Highland spread throughout the area
- Focus on matching the quality of the built environment with the quality of the natural environment
- Economic and social reasons (not from SEA)
- Expansion of Inverness takes account of physical constraints
- A96 area builds in green framework from outset

- Caithness and north Sutherland will promote use of brownfield land
- Fragile areas will carefully consider the needs of growth and the environment
- Development restricted in the wider countryside to ensure there is not conflict with the environment.

**Spatial Strategy Elements - Inverness City Vision
Preferred Option**

SEA Objective	Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
	Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1	=	=	=	L	=	=
2	=	=	+	L	+	=
3	=	=	+	L	+	=
4	=	+	++	L	++	+
5	=	+	++	L	++	+
6	=	+	++	L	++	+
7	=	+	+	L	+	+
8	=	=	=	L	=	=
9	=	=	=	L	=	=
10	=	=	=	L	=	=
11	=	+	++	L	++	+
12	=	=	=	L	=	=
13	=	+	+	L	+	+
14	=	+	++	L	++	+
15	=	+	+	L	+	=
16	=	+	+	L	+	=
17	=	+	+	L	+	=

Alternative

SEA Objective	Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
	Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1	=	=	=	L	=	=
2	=	=	=	L	=	=
3	=	=	=	L	=	=
4	=	-	--	H	-	--
5	=	=	=	L	-	=
6	=	=	-	L	-	=
7	=	-	--	H	--	-
8	=	=	=	L	=	=
9	=	=	=	L	=	=
10	=	=	=	L	=	=
11	=	-	--	H	--	-
12	=	=	=	L	=	=
13	=	-	--	M	--	-
14	=	-	--	H	--	-
15	=	-	--	H	--	-
16	=	-	--	H	--	-
17	=	=	=	L	=	=

Commentary

The preferred option, in the long term may have a significant positive impact on the built and natural environment of Inverness City. The preference is based upon choosing an approach to development in and around Inverness that would ensure growth and investment is directed to the most important areas of the city. While the results of the SEA were considered they were only a contributing factor the choosing the preferred option as there were also many other social and economic reasons for this choice.

Spatial Strategy Elements - A96 Corridor

Preferred Option

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	+	++	H	+	=
2		=	=	+	M	+	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		=	=	=	L	=	=
5		=	+	+	M	+	=
6		=	=	+	M	+	=
7		=	-	-	M	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	+	+	H	+	=
10		=	=	=	M	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		=	=	+	M	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	+	+	M	=	=
17		=	+	+	M	=	=

Alternative 1

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	-	M	-	=
2		=	=	=	M	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		=	-	-	M	-	=
5		=	=	-	M	-	=
6		=	=	=	M	=	=
7		=	-	-	M	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	-	-	M	-	=
10		=	-	-	M	-	=
11		=	-	-	L	=	=
12		=	=	-	M	=	=
13		=	=	-	M	-	=
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Alternative 2

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		=	=	+	L	=	=
5		=	=	-	M	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		=	+	+	M	+	+
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	-	M	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	-	-	M	-	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		-	-	-	L	-	-
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Commentary

There are a number of benefits to the preferred option including those towards reducing the need to travel, benefits which will be delivered through the green framework and also those which can be brought forward through developer contributions. We believe there should be no discernable difference between

the preferred and alternative approaches in terms of environmental effects especially with alternative 2. The preference is based upon choosing an approach that would ensure sustainable development across the area but focussing on the area where there will be the most potential for economic growth.

Spatial Strategy Elements – A96 Developer Contributions

Preferred Option

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	+	+	M	+	=
2		=	+	+	M	+	=
3		=	=	+	M	+	=
4		=	+	++	M	+	=
5		=	+	++	M	+	=
6		=	=	+	M	=	=
7		=	=	=	L	=	=
8		=	=	=	M	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		+	+	+	M	+	=
11		=	+	++	H	+	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	+	++	M	++	=
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	+	++	M	+	=
17		=	+	++	M	+	=

Alternative

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	+	M	+	=
2		=	=	+	M	=	=
3		=	=	+	M	+	=
4		=	=	+	M	=	=
5		=	+	+	M	+	=
6		+	+	+	M	+	=
7		=	=	=	L	=	=
8		=	=	+	M	+	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	--	--	M	-	=
11		=	=	-	M	-	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Commentary

We believe there should be no discernable difference between the preferred and alternative approaches in terms of environmental effects. The preference is based upon choosing an approach that would ensure suitable levels of infrastructure are in place to facilitate the sustainable development of the area.

Spatial Strategy Elements – East Inverness

Preferred Option

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	+	+	M	+	=
2		=	=	+	M	+	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		=	+	+	M	+	=
5		=	+	++	M	+	=
6		=	=	+	M	+	=
7		-	-	=	L	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	+	+	M	+	=
11		=	=	=	M	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	+	++	H	++	=
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Alternative

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	-	-	M	-	=
2		=	-	-	M	-	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		=	-	-	M	-	=
5		=	=	=	M	=	=
6		=	=	=	M	=	=
7		=	=	=	M	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	=	-	M	=	=
11		=	=	-	M	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	=	+	M	+	=
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Commentary

We believe there should be no discernable difference between the preferred and alternative approaches in terms of environmental effects. The preference is based upon choosing an approach that would apply a more transparent, equitable and consistent method of seeking contributions and ensuring the

right level of infrastructure is in place to facilitate development in the area. Therefore the results of the SEA were considered but some other social and economic factors were deemed to be of high priority in the areas as well.

Spatial Strategy Elements – Nairn

Preferred Option

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	+	+	M	+	=
2		=	=	+	M	+	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		=	+	+	M	+	=
5		=	+	++	M	+	=
6		=	=	+	M	+	=
7		-	-	=	L	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	+	+	M	+	=
11		=	=	=	M	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	+	++	H	++	=
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Alternative

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		+	=	-	M	=	=
2		=	=	-	M	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		=	=	=	L	=	=
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		=	=	=	L	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	-	--	M	-	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	=	-	M	=	=
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Commentary

We believe there should be no discernable difference between the preferred and alternative approaches in terms of environmental effects. The preference is based upon choosing an approach that would apply a more transparent, equitable and consistent method of seeking contributions and ensuring the

right level of infrastructure is in place to facilitate development in the area. Therefore the results of the SEA were considered but some other social and economic factors were deemed to be of high priority in the areas as well.

Spatial Strategy Element – Tornagrain

Preferred Option

	SEA Objective	Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		-	-	+	L	+	=
2		-	-	+	L	+	+
3		-	-	+	L	+	++
4		=	+	++	H	++	+
5		=	+	++	H	++	+
6		-	=	+	M	+	=
7		-	-	-	L	=	=
8		-	-	-	L	=	=
9		=	=	+	H	+	=
10		=	-	=	M	-	=
11		-	=	=	L	=	=
12		-	=	+	H	+	=
13		-	=	+	L	=	=
14		=	+	++	H	+	+
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		-	-	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Commentary

Despite not identifying a reasonable alternative to this approach we believe that we have identified an approach which will ensure the social and economic development of this potential new settlement will balance with the environmental concerns which are raised in the area, ensuring any mitigation required is secured at an early stage in the process.

Spatial Strategy Elements - Smaller Settlements in the A96 Corridor

Preferred Option

	SEA Objective	Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		-	-	+	L	=	=
2		-	-	+	L	=	=
3		-	-	+	L	+	++
4		=	=	=	L	=	=
5		=	+	+	L	+	=
6		-	=	=	L	=	=
7		-	-	-	L	=	=
8		-	-	-	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		-	-	+	M	=	=
11		-	=	=	L	=	=
12		-	=	+	H	+	=
13		=	=	+	L	+	=
14		=	=	=	L	=	+
15		=	=	=	H	=	=
16		-	-	=	H	=	=
17		=	=	=	H	=	=

Commentary

Despite not identifying an alternative approach we believe that the preferred approach will set out a fair and equitable scale of development in these smaller settlements which will be in scale with the existing settlements and not adversely affect the natural areas and the wider countryside around these areas. The potential for the development of these settlements will need to be appropriately balanced with environmental need and mitigation will be secured where appropriate.

Spatial Strategy Elements – Caithness and North Sutherland

Preferred Option

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L		
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		=	+	+	M	+	=
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		+	+	++	M	++	+
8							
9		=	=	=	L	=	
10		=	=	=	L	=	
11		=	-	-	L	-	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		+	++	++	H	++	+
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	+	+	M	+	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Commentary

A reasonable alternative for the spatial strategy element for Caithness and North Sutherland has not been identified. Although the SEA impacts have been taken into consideration the main driver for this strategy are the economic outcomes.

Spatial Strategy Elements – Nigg and Easter Ross

Preferred Approach

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		=	+	+	M	+	=
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		+	+	++	M	++	+
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	-	-	L	-	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	+	+	M	+	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Commentary

A reasonable alternative for the spatial strategy element for Nigg and Easter Ross has not been identified. Although the SEA impacts have been taken into consideration the main driver for this strategy are the economic outcomes.

**Spatial Strategy Elements – Development of Local Centres
Preferred Option**

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	+	+
4		=	+	+	M	=	=
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		=	+	+	M	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	+	+	M	+	+
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	M	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Commentary

Despite an alternative approach not being identified, we believe that through this policy approach we will be able to balance the environmental constraints

of the area with the social and economic regeneration of the area. Therefore while the results of the SEA were taken into consideration the preferred option identified to ensure social and economic benefits could be delivered.

Spatial Strategy Elements – Wider Countryside and Fragile Areas

Preferred Option

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		+	+	+	M	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		+	+	+	L	+	+
4		=	+	+	M	=	=
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		=	+	+	M	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	+	+	M	+	+
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	H	=	=

Sustainable Highland Communities
Housing Land Requirement and Supply
Preferred Option

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		+	+	+	M	+	+
5		+	+	+	M	+	+
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		+	+	+	M	+	+
8		+	+	+	M	+	+
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		+	+	+	M	+	+
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		+	+	+	M	+	+
13		+	+	+	M	+	+
14		+	+	+	M	+	+
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Alternative

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		+	+	+	M	+	+
5		+	+	+	M	+	+
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		+	+	+	M	+	+
8		+	+	+	M	+	+
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		+	+	+	M	+	+
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		+	+	+	M	+	+
13		+	+	+	M	+	+
14		+	+	+	M	+	+
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		--	--	--	H	--	-
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Commentary

The topic is of direct relevance to several of the SEA objectives. We believe there should be no discernable difference between the preferred and alternative approaches in terms of environmental effects. The preference is based upon choosing a policy that would apply a more flexible approach to the provision of housing land. Therefore the results of the SEA were considered but deemed not to be significant in the choice of preferred policy option

Housing in the Countryside

Preferred Option

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		+	+	+	M	+	+
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		+	+	+	M	+	+
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		+	+	+	M	+	+
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		+	+	+	M	+	+
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		+	+	+	M	+	+
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		-	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Alternative 1

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		=	=	=	L	=	=
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		+	+	+	M	+	+
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		+	+	+	M	+	+
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		+	+	+	M	+	+
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		+	+	+	M	+	+
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		-	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Alternative 2

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		+	+	+	M	+	+
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		+	+	+	M	+	+
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		+	+	+	M	+	+
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		+	+	+	M	+	+
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		??	??	??	M	??	??
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		-	=	=	M	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Commentary

The topic is of low relevance to most of the SEA objectives. We believe there should be no discernable difference between the preferred and Alternative1 approaches in terms of environmental effects, Alternative2 is likely to have a greater impact on the wider landscape and increased need to travel. The preference is based upon choosing a policy that would apply a more transparent, equitable and consistent method of considering housing development proposals than current practice. Therefore the results of the SEA were considered but deemed not to be significant in the choice of preferred policy option

Affordable Housing

Preferred Option

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		+	+	+	M	+	+
5		+	+	+	M	+	+
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		+	+	+	M	+	+
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	=	=	M	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		+	+	+	M	+	+
13		+	+	+	M	+	+
14		+	+	+	M	+	+
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Alternative1

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		+	+	+	M	+	+
5		+	+	+	M	+	+
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		+	+	+	M	+	+
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	=	=	M	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		+	+	+	M	+	+
13		+	+	+	M	+	+
14		+	+	+	M	+	+
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Alternative2

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		+	+	+	M	+	+
5		+	+	+	M	+	+
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		+	+	+	M	+	+
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	=	=	M	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		+	+	+	M	+	+
13		+	+	+	M	+	+
14		+	+	+	M	+	+
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Commentary

The topic is of low relevance to most of the SEA objectives. We believe there should be no discernable difference between the preferred and alternative approaches in terms of environmental effects. The preference is based upon choosing a policy that would apply a more transparent, equitable and consistent method of seeking affordable housing contributions than current practice. Therefore the results of the SEA were considered but deemed not to be significant in the choice of preferred policy option

Planning For an Ageing Population

Preferred Option

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		+	+	+	M	+	+
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		=	=	=	L	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		+	+	+	M	+	+
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Alternative 1

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		-	-	-	M	-	-
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		=	=	=	L	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		+	+	+	M	+	+
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Alternativ2

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		-	-	-	M	-	-
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		=	=	=	L	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		+	+	+	M	+	+
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Commentary

The topic is of low relevance to most of the SEA objectives, however has direct relevance in relation to protect and enhance human health. We believe there should that the preferred option offers benefits in terms of human health over the alternative approaches. The preference is based upon choosing a policy that would apply a more transparent, equitable and consistent method of seeking the provision of housing for older people in appropriateness. Therefore the results of the SEA were considered and deemed to support the choice of preferred policy option.

Gypsy/Travellers

Preferred Option

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		+	+	+	M	+	+
5		=	=	=	M	=	=
6		=	=	=	M	=	=
7		=	=	=	M	=	=
8		=	=	=	M	=	=
9		=	=	=	M	=	=
10		=	=	=	M	=	=
11		=	=	=	M	=	=
12		=	=	=	M	=	=
13		=	=	=	M	=	=
14		=	=	=	M	=	=
15		=	=	=	M	=	=
16		=	=	=	M	=	=
17		=	=	=	M	=	=

Alternative

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		=	=	=	L	=	=
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		=	=	=	L	=	=
8		-	-	-	L	-	-
9		-	-	-	L	-	-
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Commentary

The topic is of low relevance to most of the SEA objectives. We believe there should be no discernable difference between the preferred and alternative approaches in terms of environmental effects. The preference is based upon choosing a policy that would apply a more transparent, equitable and consistent method of seeking contributions than current practice.

Therefore the results of the SEA were considered but deemed not to be significant in the choice of preferred policy option, although in this case the preferred option.

Retailing

Preferred Option

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		+	+	+	M	+	+
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		+	+	+	M	+	+
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		+	+	+	M	+	+
10		=	=	=	M	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		+	+	+	M	+	+
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Alternative 1

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		-	-	-	M	-	-
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		=	=	=	M	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	M	=	=
10		=	=	=	M	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		-	-	-	M	-	-
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Alternative 2

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		+	+	+	M	+	+
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		+	+	+	M	+	+
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		+	+	+	M	+	+
10		=	=	=	M	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		+	+	+	M	+	+
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Commentary

The topic is of relevance to some of the SEA objectives in particular in terms of minimising non-active travel and its implications for climate change. The preferred option and alternative 2 would have relatively better environmental effects than alternative 1. This is because

alternative 1 would allow retail developers to lead on the location of their proposals, which in many cases would not be in locations accessible to public transport or which would promote active travel.

The preferred option has been favoured over alternative 2 because the environmental effects would be similar but the former retains a degree of flexibility to the requirements of retail operators. Therefore the results of the SEA were used to not support one possible alternative.

Developer Contributions

Preferred Option

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		+	+	+	M	+	+
5		+	+	+	M	+	+
6		+	+	+	M	+	+
7		=	=	=	L	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	M	=	=
10		=	=	=	M	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		=	=	=	M	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	=	=	M	=	=
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Alternative

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		+	+	+	M	+	+
5		+	+	+	M	+	+
6		+	+	+	M	+	+
7		=	=	=	L	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	M	=	=
10		=	=	=	M	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		=	=	=	M	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	=	=	M	=	=
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Commentary

The topic is of low relevance to most of the SEA objectives. We believe there should be no discernable difference between the preferred and alternative approaches in terms of environmental effects. The preference is based upon choosing a policy that would apply a more transparent, equitable and

consistent method of seeking contributions than current practice. Therefore the results of the SEA were considered but deemed not to be significant in the choice of preferred policy option.

Safeguarding Our Natural Environment

Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage

Preferred Option

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		+	+	+	H	+	+
2		+	+	+	H	+	+
3		+	+	+	M	+	+
4		=	=	=	L	=	=
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		+	+	+	M	+	+
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		+	+	+	M	+	+
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		+	+	+	M	+	+
13		-	-	-	M	-	-
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		+	+	+	H	+	+
16		+	+	+	H	+	+
17		+	+	+	H	+	+

Alternative

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		+	+	+	H	+	+
2		+	+	+	H	+	+
3		+	+	+	M	+	+
4		=	=	=	L	=	=
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		+	+	+	M	+	+
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		+	+	+	M	+	+
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		+	+	+	M	+	+
13		-	-	-	M	-	-
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		+	+	+	H	+	+
16		+	+	+	H	+	+
17		+	+	+	H	+	+

Commentary

The topic is of significant relevance to most SEA objectives. We believe there is no discernible difference between the overall balance of the environmental effects of the preferred option and the alternative. The alternative, which takes a formal designations-led approach to protecting heritage, may be more successful in preventing harmful negative effects than the preferred option but will not encourage positive mitigation. We have chosen the preferred policy because it offers a more streamlined and proportionate approach to protection of heritage features and encourages developers to take a more holistic approach to enhancing biodiversity particularly outwith designations.

Previously Used Land

Preferred Option

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		+	+	+	M	+	+
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		=	=	=	L	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		+	+	+	M	+	+
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Alternative 1

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		-	-	-	M	-	-
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		=	=	=	L	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		+	+	+	M	+	+
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Alternatve2

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		-	-	-	M	-	-
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		=	=	=	L	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		+	+	+	M	+	+
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Commentary

The topic is of low relevance to most of the SEA objectives, however has direct relevance in relation to protect and enhance human health. We believe there should that the preferred option offers benefits in terms of human health over the alternative approaches. The preference is based upon choosing a policy that would apply a more transparent, equitable and consistent method of seeking the provision of housing for older people in appropriateness. Therefore the results of the SEA were considered and deemed to support the choice of preferred policy option.

Wild Land

Preferred Option

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		+	+	+	M	+	+
2		+	+	+	M	+	+
3		++	++	++	H	++	++
4		+	+	+	M	+	+
5		+	+	+	M	+	+
6		+	+	+	M	+	+
7		=	=	=	L	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		-	-	-	M	-	-
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		+	+	+	M	+	+
17		+	+	+	M	+	+

Alternative

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	M	=	=
2		=	=	=	M	=	=
3		=	=	=	H	=	=
4		=	=	=	M	=	=
5		=	=	=	M	=	=
6		=	=	=	M	=	=
7		=	=	=	L	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	M	=	=
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	M	=	=
17		=	=	=	M	=	=

Commentary

The topic is of significant relevance to the health, landscape and renewable energy SEA objectives. The preferred option and the alternative have very different environmental effects

since the preferred option proposes the identification of wild land as a development constraint and remote area recreation opportunity whereas the alternative does not.

The preferred option has been selected because the Council believes there will be a balance of positive environmental effects compared to the do nothing option. The only negative will be a potential constraint on renewable energy developments, particularly on-shore wind and hydro electric schemes with the attendant impact on tackling climate change.

Water Environment

Preferred Option

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		+	++	++	M	+	+
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		=	=	=	L	=	=
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		=	=	=	L	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		+	++	++	H	++	+
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Alternative

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		+	+	+	M	+	+
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		=	=	=	L	=	=
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		=	=	=	L	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		+	+	+	H	+	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Commentary

The SEA of the different approaches highlights the advantage of having a policy within the HwLDP. It should help to raise awareness for planners and the public and should better integrate and coordinate RBMP with the planning process so that they contribute towards common goals and reinforce and

support each other. Relying solely on consultation responses from SEPA could run the risk of only picking up on implications from larger applications rather than necessarily cumulative impacts. Also including within the development plan raises awareness of RBMP which should have a beneficial impact.

Sustainable Development and Climate Change

Renewable Energy Preferred Approach

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	M	=	=
2		=	=	=	M	=	=
3		=	=	=	M	=	=
4		=	=	=	L	=	=
5		=	=	=	M	=	=
6		=	=	=	M	=	=
7		=	=	=	M	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	M	=	=
10		=	=	=	M	=	=
11		=	++	++	M	+	+
12		=	=	=	M	=	=
13		++	++	++	H	++	++
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		=	=	=	M	=	=
16		.	.	.	M	.	.
17		.	.	.	M	.	.

Alternative

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	M	=	=
2		=	=	=	M	=	=
3		=	=	=	M	=	=
4		=	=	=	L	=	=
5		=	=	=	M	=	=
6		=	=	=	M	=	=
7		=	=	=	M	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	M	=	=
10		=	=	=	M	=	=
11		=	++	++	M	+	+
12		=	=	=	M	=	=
13		+	+	+	H	+	+
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		=	=	=	M	=	=
16		-	-	-	M	-	-
17		-	-	-	M	-	-

Commentary

The topic is fundamental to support one of the SEA objectives, namely renewable energy. It is of relevance to several others, having regard to potential negative impacts on environmental assets of certain types or potential positive contributions in respect

of raising awareness of natural forces, potentially providing responsible access opportunities and new reservoirs. A high level benefit is the improvement of air quality in the long term through reducing reliance on fossil fuel burning. We believe that there is some difference between the preferred and alternative approaches in terms of environmental effects, with the preferred option being assessed as slightly better based on its provision of a spatial planning framework. The alternative option, the grid-led option, would not give a strong spatial steer to renewable energy development and would rely on other topic policies (envisaged being in the Plan, dependent upon advancing them) to set out general criteria for consideration of proposals and the protection of designated sites. This lack of steer could frustrate the realisation of renewable energy targets. The assessment results across the SEA objectives other than the Renewable Energy objective do not indicate any consequential difference between the options. This is because there would be other general policies to protect the environmental assets. However it may be expected that given a steer, conflicts would be more likely to be avoided early on in the planning of schemes. For both options, assessment against the landscape objectives flags negative effects in recognition of inevitable change arising from development, although the preferred option might be expected to provide a more robust basis for considering landscape issues in respect of renewable energy developments specifically and may assist in reducing negative effects. Therefore the results of the SEA were considered and have influenced the choice and type of preferred policy, whilst acknowledging the base that renewable energy developments are to be promoted generally in the Highlands.

Flooding

Preferred Option

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		+	+	+	M	+	+
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		=	=	=	L	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		+	+	+	M	+	+
10		+	+	+	M	+	+
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		+	+	+	H	+	+
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Alternative

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		+	+	+	M	+	+
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		=	=	=	L	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	M	=	=
10		=	=	=	M	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		++	++	++	H	++	++
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Commentary

The topic is of relevance to some SEA objectives notably those concerned with the water environment and biodiversity. The preferred option is marginally less successful than the alternative in avoiding flood risk but by supporting

enhanced mitigation measures, such as wetland habitat creation could have wider benefits for the environment. Therefore we believe there would be no discernable difference between the preferred and alternative approaches in terms of the overall balance of environmental effects. The preference is based upon choosing a policy that would be flexible to development always providing adequate mitigation is secured.

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	M	=	=
2		=	=	+	L	+	=
3		=	=	+	L	+	=
4		=	=	=	M	=	=
5		=	=	+	L	+	=
6		=	=	+	L	+	=
7		=	=	=	M	=	=
8		+	++	++	H	++	++
9		=	=	=	M	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	=	M	=	=
12		=	=	+	L	+	=
13		+	+	+	H	+	+
14		=	=	+	L	+	=
15		=	=	=	M	=	=
16		-	-	-	M	-	=
17		=	=	=	M	=	=

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	-	M	-	=
2		=	=	+	L	+	=
3		=	=	+	L	+	=
4		=	=	=	M	=	=
5		=	=	+	L	+	=
6		=	=	+	L	+	=
7		=	=	-	M	-	=
8		+	++	++	H	++	++
9		=	=	=	M	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	=	M	=	=
12		=	=	+	L	+	=
13		+	+	+	H	+	+
14		=	=	+	L	+	=
15		=	=	-	M	-	=
16		-	-	-	M	-	=
17		=	=	-	M	-	=

Commentary

The topic is fundamental to support two of the SEA objectives, namely waste and renewable energy. It is of relevance to several others, having regard to potential negative impacts on environmental assets of certain types or

potential positive contributions to open space, wildlife habitats or reuse of brownfield land. We believe that there is slight difference between the preferred and alternative approaches in terms of environmental effects, with the preferred option being assessed as slightly better based on its provision of a wider range of potential site opportunities to accommodate waste management facilities and, by contrast, the uncertainties and potential lack of steer of the alternative approach in the event that it did not identify all of the sites as and when required. Therefore the results of the SEA were considered and have influenced the choice and type of preferred policy, whilst acknowledging the base that there will be a requirement for additional waste management facilities locally in Highland in order to minimise and deal with waste in accordance with the waste hierarchy and through that deliver regionally significant environmental benefits.

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		=	=	+	M	+	=
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		=	=	=	L	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		+	+	+	H	+	=
12		=	=	+	H	+	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	=	=	L	=	=

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Sustainable Design

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		+	+	+	M	+	+
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		+	+	+	M	+	+
8		+	+	+	M	+	+
9		+	+	+	M	+	+
10		+	+	+	M	+	+
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		+	+	+	M	+	+

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
13		+	+	+	M	+	+
14		+	+	+	M	+	+
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Commentary

The topic has a direct relevance to many of the SEA objectives. No alternative policy approach has been identified. The policy approach identifies areas of potential gains, the policy would also apply a more transparent, equitable and consistent method of promoting and encouraging sustainable design. Therefore the results of the SEA were considered in the creation of the preferred policy option.

A Competitive, Sustainable and Adaptable Highland Economy

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		.	.	.	M	.	.
2		.	.	.	M	.	.
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		=	=	=	M	=	=
5		=	=	=	L	=	=

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		+	+	+	M	+	+
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	M	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		.	.	.	M	.	.
12		.	.	.	M	.	.
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	=	=	M	=	=
15		.	.	.	M	.	.
16		.	.	.	M	.	.
17		.	.	.	M	.	.
SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		=	=	=	L	=	=

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		+	+	+	M	+	+
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	M	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		-	-	-	M	-	-
12		=	=	=	M	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	=	=	M	=	=
15		=	=	=	M	=	=
16		=	=	=	M	=	=
17		=	=	=	M	=	=
SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	+	+	L	+	+
3		=	+	+	L	+	+
4		=	++	++	L	++	++

SEA Objective	Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
	Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
5	=	+	+	L	+	+
6	=	+	+	L	+	+
7	=	=	=	L	=	=
8	=	=	=	L	=	=
9	=	=	=	L	=	=
10	=	=	=	L	=	=
11	=	++	++	L	++	++
12	=	=	=	L	=	=
13	=	+	+	L	+	+
14	=	++	++	L	++	++
15	=	+	+	L	+	+
16	=	=	=	L	=	=
17	=	+	+	L	+	+

The topic is of high relevance to most of the SEA objectives. We believe there should be a significant positive environmental effects. The option is based upon choosing a policy approach that will deal with transport at a strategic level acknowledging important local projects for the encouragement of sustainable travel. In choosing the approach the results of the SEA were considered but deemed not to be significant in the choice of a final policy option."

SEA Objective	Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
	Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		=	=	=	L	=	=
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		+	+	+	M	+	+
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		+	+	+	M	+	+
17		=	=	=	L	=	=
SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	

		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		=	=	=	L	=	=
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		++	++	++	M	++	+
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		+	+	+	M	+	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

The preferred option does not assess quite as positively as the alternative. However the topic is of low relevance to most of the SEA objectives.. "We believe there should be no big difference between the preferred and alternative approaches in terms of environmental effects. Therefore the results of the SEA were considered but deemed not to be significant in the choice of preferred policy option. The preferred option fits with the national planning policy and is not a negative SEA assessment so this is the preferred approach. The concern is that the alternative option may adversely affect development opportunities in particular areas.

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		+	+	+	L	+	=
2		+	+	+	L	+	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		+	+	+	L	+	=
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		+	+	+	M	+	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		+	+	+	M	+	=
16		+	+	+	M	+	=
17		-	-	-	M	-	=
SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	

		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		=	=	=	L	=	=
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		=	=	=	M	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		=	=	=	M	=	=
16		=	=	=	M	=	=
17		+	+	+	M	+	=

The preferred option assesses relatively evenly with the alternative in terms of SEA. We believe there should be no big difference between the preferred and alternative approach in terms of environmental effects. The preference is based upon choosing a policy that balances the need to allow development on croft land, ensuring the community is not unduly constrained (bearing in mind single house development is so important within these areas), against the need to protect the better croft land. Therefore the results of the SEA were considered but deemed not to be significant in the choice of preferred policy option. The alternative option of protecting inbye land through no more than one additional house on a croft would be a blanket approach without site

consideration. The preferred approach would give assessment of that site's agricultural value and give feedback on siting and access arrangements to limit impact on crofting activities.

Allocation of Inbye Land

Preferred Option

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		+	+	+	M	+	+
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		=	=	=	L	=	=
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		-	-	-	M	-	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		+	+	+	L	+	=
16		+	+	+	M	+	=
17		+	+	+	M	+	+

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		-	-	-	M	-	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		=	=	=	L	=	=
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		+	+	+	M	+	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		+	+	+	M	+	=
16		+	+	+	M	+	=
17		-	-	-	M	-	=

The preferred option does not score as well on loss of soil function as the alternative, however it is considered that overall the environmental impacts of being able to consider inbye land if necessary more than outweighs this slight negative. The alternative option of protecting inbye land at all costs would put less weight on other environmental factors particularly when you consider that the options in some areas will be quite badly constrained by a complete veto

on developing on inbye land. It seems a less preferable approach particularly when the inbye land concerned is not of particularly good quality. The SEA of these options is crucial to deciding on the correct approach however balancing the needs of the community alongside the need to protect crofting is also fundamental to the decision.

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		+	+	+	L	+	+
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		+	+	+	M	+	+
4		+	+	+	M	+	+
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		+	+	+	L	+	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		+	+	+	M	+	=
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		++	++	++	M	++	++
17		+	+	+	M	+	+

SEA Objective	Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
	Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1	=	=	=	L	=	=
2	=	=	=	L	=	=
3	.	.	.	M	.	.
4	.	.	.	M	.	.
5	=	=	=	L	=	=
6	=	=	=	L	=	=
7	=	=	=	M	=	=
8	=	=	=	L	=	=
9	=	=	=	L	=	=
10	=	=	=	L	=	=
11	=	=	=	L	=	=
12	=	=	=	L	=	=
13	=	=	=	M	=	=
14	=	=	=	L	=	=
15	=	=	=	L	=	=
16	=	=	=	M	=	=
17	=	=	=	L	=	=

The preferred policy has a more positive SEA but also offers more social, cultural and economic benefits than the alternative. It is important to open crofting up to new entrants and this is a key objective of Scottish Government crofting reform proposals. We recognise there is a contrary argument that encouraging new crofting townships would have a negative impact on the landscape however there are benefits in terms of local distinctiveness. Where

there is a measure of landscape impact concern (probably more likely with agricultural crofts) there would be a requirement for supporting work on this aspect to sensitively address. Also where landscape impact is unacceptable the site would not be supported through the Area Local Plan. It is considered that housing development with a good relationship to its croft adds to the visual distinctiveness of the Highland's and can add a sense of scale to the surrounding landscape.

Small Scale New Crofts

Preferred Option

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		+	+	+	M	+	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		+	+	+	M	+	=
4		+	+	+	M	+	=
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		+	+	+	M	+	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		+	+	+	M	+	=
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		++	++	++	M	++	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		-	-	-	M	-	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		-	-	-	M	-	=
4		-	-	-	M	-	=
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		=	=	=	L	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	M	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

The preferred policy has a more positive SEA but also offers more social, cultural and economic benefits than the alternative. It is important to open crofting up to new entrants and this is a key objective to the Scottish Government's crofting reform proposals. We recognise there is a contrary argument that encouraging new crofts would have a negative impact on the landscape however there are benefits in terms of local distinctiveness

particularly when introduced in tandem with siting and design guidance. It is considered that historical single house development with a good relationship to its croft land adds to the visual distinctiveness of the Highland's and can also add a sense of scale to the rest of the landscape.

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		+	+	+	M	+	+
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		=	=	=	L	=	=
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		+	+	+	L	+	+
7		=	=	=	L	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	H	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		=	=	=	M	=	=
16		+	+	+	M	+	=
17		+	+	+	M	+	=

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		+	+	+	M	+	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		=	=	=	L	=	=
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		=	=	=	L	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		-	-	-	H	-	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		-	-	-	M	-	=
16		=	=	=	M	=	=
17		=	=	=	M	=	=

The preferred option assesses better in terms of SEA because it has the benefit of an overview to catch any proposals that come forward outwith the AFP framework areas whilst the AFP's provide good detail and pick up the majority of proposals. The benefit of the preferred approach will be in providing detailed mitigation of effects that would not be achieved through an overview general policy framework.

Forestry and Woodland

Preferred Option

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		+	+	+	L	+	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		+	+	+	M	+	=
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		+	+	+	M	+	=
7		+	+	+	L	+	+
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		++	++	++	M	++	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		+	+	+	M	+	=
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		++	++	++	M	++	+
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	+	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		=	=	+	M	+	=
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	+	M	+	=
7		=	=	+	L	+	+
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	++	M	++	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	+	M	+	=
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	+	M	+	+
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

In assessment of these policy approaches there is a difference in the timing of the review and therefore the timing of the environmental impacts. Also the detail of how the review will impact on the environment is more speculative at this stage because exactly how the HFWS would change is not determined. Furthermore there is a judgement to be made as to whether a policy led approach on supplementary guidance for protection of trees/woodland and new woodland cover/landscaping for new developments, can be resourced and dealt with better on a case by case basis,

through the development management process, or if consistency is more important and this requires supplementary guidance to be produced. How you judge these questions impacts on the environmental impacts of the approaches considered. The Council's opinion is that an early selective review of the HFWS is the best approach, alongside preparing supplementary guidance to gain consistency on tree/woodland matters through the development management process.

Minerals

Preferred Option

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		+	+	+	M	+	+
2		+	+	+	M	+	+
3		+	+	+	M	+	+
4		+	+	+	M	+	+
5		+	+	+	M	+	+
6		+	+	+	M	+	+
7		-	-	-	H	-	-
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	M	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		+	+	+	M	+	+
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		=	=	=	M	=	=
16		=	=	=	M	=	=
17		=	=	=	M	=	=

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		-	-	-	M	-	-
2		-	-	-	M	-	-
3		-	-	-	M	-	-
4		+	+	+	M	+	+
5		+	+	+	M	+	+
6		+	+	+	M	+	+
7		-	-	-	H	-	-
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	M	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		+	+	+	M	+	+
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		-	-	-	M	-	-
16		-	-	-	M	-	-
17		-	-	-	M	-	-

The topic is of relevance to many SEA objectives notably biodiversity, soils, recreation, the water environment and landscape. There is a stark difference between the balance of environmental effects for the preferred option which favours safeguarding and extension of existing operations together with enhanced mitigation compared to the alternative which offers far more positive support for new quarries. New quarries, other things being equal, are likely to

result in greater adverse residual environmental effects than extending existing operations. The preferred policy also builds in a requirement for mitigation levels better than currently achieved with Highland which should maximise the positive effects that restoration schemes can have in terms of habitat creation and recreational opportunities. Therefore the results of the SEA were considered and have influenced the choice and type of preferred policy.

A Healthier Highlands

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	+	+	L	+	=
2		+	+	++	M	++	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		+	++	++	M	++	+
5		=	+	+	L	+	=
6		=	=	+	L	=	=
7		=	=	+	L	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	+	+	L	+	=
11		=	=	+	L	=	=
12		=	=	+	L	+	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	+	+	L	=	=
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	+	+	L	++	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=
SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	

		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	+	+	L	+	+
3		+	+	+	M	+	+
4		+	+	++	H	+	+
5		=	+	+	L	+	=
6		+	++	++	M	+	=
7		=	=	=	L	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11					L		
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		+	+	++	H	++	=
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Topics not covered by the Main Issues Report but to be included in the proposed plan

**Green Networks
Preferred Option**

SEA Objective	Time Scale	Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude
---------------	------------	---------------------	-----------

		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		+	+	++	H	++	+
2		+	++	++	H	++	+
3		=	+	+	M	+	=
4		=	+	+	M	+	=
5		+	+	+	M	++	=
6		+	+	+	M	+	=
7		=	=	=	L	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	+	M	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	+	+	M	+	=
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Water and Waste Water Infrastructure

Preferred Option

Preferred Option	Time Scale	Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude
SEA Objective			

		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		=	+	+	H	+	+
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		=	=	=	L	=	=
8		=	=	=	L	=	=
9		=	+	+	H	++	+
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	=	L	=	=
12		=	=	=	L	=	=
13		=	=	=	L	=	=
14		=	=	=	L	=	=
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	=	=	L	=	=
17		=	=	=	L	=	=

Commentary

While a preferred option has not been identified we believe this option will safeguard the water environment and ensure there is not a negative impact while making sure there is appropriate levels of water abstraction to serve an expanding network.

Design Quality

Preferred Option

SEA Objective		Time Scale			Sensitivity (H/M/L)	Magnitude	
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term		Local	Regional
1		=	=	=	L	=	=
2		=	=	=	L	=	=
3		=	=	=	L	=	=
4		=	+	+	H	+	+
5		=	=	=	L	=	=
6		=	=	=	L	=	=
7		=	=	=	L	=	=
8		=	+	++	H	+	+
9		=	=	=	L	=	=
10		=	=	=	L	=	=
11		=	=	+	M	+	+
12		=	+	+	M	+	=
13		=	+	++	H	+	+
14		=	+	++	H	+	+
15		=	=	=	L	=	=
16		=	+	+	H	+	+
17		=	=	=	L	=	=