Shetland Islands Council

Shetland Second Local Development Plan (LDP2) – MIR

Appendix IV: Environmental Assessment of Main Issues

Strategic Environmental Assessment

Environmental Report

Spatial Strategy

Main Issue 1: Spatial Strategy, Land Supply and Distribution - LDP2 will have a central role to play in providing certainty about where development will and will not take place. This will help us safeguard strategic land for future development and prevent sterilisation of key sites / areas.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="15">Preferred Option: Adopt the proposed Spatial Strategy which is an evolution of the Spatial Strategy set out in the existing LDP with the inclusion of the allocated sites, preferred areas for growth and reinforcement of the hierarchy of development</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="15">SEA Objectives</td></tr>
<tr><td>Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna</td><td>Population and Human Health</td><td colspan="3">Soil</td><td colspan="3">Water</td><td>Air</td><td colspan="2">Material Assets</td><td colspan="2">Climatic Factors</td><td colspan="2">Cultural Heritage</td><td colspan="2">Landscape</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3a</td><td>3b</td><td>3c</td><td>4a</td><td>4b</td><td>4c</td><td>5</td><td>6a</td><td>6b</td><td>7a</td><td>7b</td><td>8a</td><td>8b</td><td>9a</td><td>9b</td></tr>
<tr><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>+/-</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>+</td></tr>
<tr><td>It is likely that this will have a positive effects on biodiversity as the clearly set out intention to guide development to the right location will ensure that sensitive areas are protected from development.

This option is likely to be the most sustainable as it focuses development on sites that have been through an assessment process (either as allocated sites or in areas of preferred growth).</td><td>This policy should result in the development of a network of high quality sustainable places to live with associated benefits for those who live there. The spatial strategy encourages proportional growth throughout the whole of Shetland.

The preferred option should continue to ensure that new development facilitates access to public transport, pedestrian and cycle networks, where possible, which will</td><td colspan="3">There will be positive benefits form the assessment of proposed sites through the Call for Sites process which allows issues to be identified early and mitigated for. This approach will allow for greater consideration of peatland and other carbon rich soils.

Although There is very limited previously developed land in Shetland suitable for remediation, therefore, while this will be promoted</td><td colspan="3">This approach should ensure that new development protects and ideally enhances the water environment.

The sites identified have been assessed to be deliverable and not give rise to any significant flood risk or drainage issues or significant impacts on the water environment. Where relevant there will be an opportunity to protect and enhance the water environment and promote sustainable</td><td>The concentration of populations generally results in some air quality issues, however, given the small population size in Shetland and benefits offered through this approach, which should lead to increased active travel or public transport use by creating connected sustainable places it is expected that this will have a positive impact on air quality.

The end use of any development will</td><td colspan="2">The encouragement of proportional growth throughout the whole of Shetland is likely to be more sustainable with more local facilities – encouraging a ‘just transition’ to a more sustainable lifestyle.

The preferred option will provide a range and choice of development across Shetland delivering enhanced access to housing and employment. New development will require the use of building materials</td><td colspan="2">The Spatial Strategy encourages new development in locations with existing infrastructure. This is likely to have a positive climatic impacts through reduced requirements to travel by private vehicle and opportunities to facilitate active travel and the use of public transport with support for the transmission away from fossil fuel powered vehicles.</td><td colspan="2">The Spatial Strategy seeks to encourage development in areas where it will not negatively impact on designated cultural heritage features.</td><td colspan="2">There are likely to be significant landscape benefits, as development is encouraged in areas of preferred growth which should protect the landscape and seascape of rural and remote areas.

The Spatial Strategy seeks to encourage development away from areas subject to landscape designations.</td></tr>
</table>

Although the majority of these sites are still greenfield sites there is early opportunity to identify possible biodiversity impacts and ensure full mitigation is in place. These localities in the main also represent extensions to existing settlements, rather than isolated development in the open countryside.	offer access to local services and facilities and can help promote better health and wellbeing. This option will support the delivery of a range and choice of housing across Shetland to meet the housing needs of existing and future residents.	there will be impacts on previously undeveloped soil.	flood risk management.	determine if it will have an impact on air quality, however, these sites have been assessed to be in the most sustainable locations. Many sites are located within existing settlements which should reduce the need to travel and reduce the impact of car travel on air quality.	and resources but there will be an opportunity to incorporate low carbon technologies in the design of new homes. The preferred call for sites options coincide with a range of existing assets such as core paths and green and blue networks. This approach is also likely to increase the concentration of the population at key settlements which will ensure the most efficient use of material assets and is more likely to encourage a transition to a circular economy.	The consideration of sites means that development will be well located to minimise car journeys and maximise active travel and public transport opportunities. The focus on assessed sites means that Shetland Islands Council can take a strategic approach to supporting the delivery of these benefits. Although the delivery of these positive benefits will be reliant on ensuring that there is sustainable use of peat and other carbon rich soil as part of the development.		

Effects	
Comments (including scale, timescale, permanence, magnitude and potential indirect, cumulative or in-combination effects)	The likely effects as set out above are likely to be broadly similar in the short, medium and long term. The only potential negative impact identified from the preferred option is on the soil resource. However, this will be partially mitigated through the hierarchy of development, although there is potential for impacts especially from windfall development, this risk is increased due to the lack of brownfield sites and the significant areas of peat and carbon rich soils in Shetland. The impacts of this policy would be felt at a regional level with permanent irreversible effects. There is potential for positive cumulative effects as the delivery of the Spatial Strategy will create more desirable, sustainable places to live and work which will encourage more economic investment in these areas encouraging further delivery of the Spatial Strategy, there are also likely to be positive in-combination effects with a number of the other Main Issues includes climate change, outdoor access, green and blue networks and protecting town centres although while no indirect impacts have been identified. The effect of having clearly mapped and assessed land supply and distribution for the next plan period and beyond should be largely beneficial in the medium to long term. There would be construction impacts and a lag between application and completion that means short term impacts (although much of the development is planned within the next 5 years) are more difficult to predict and could have negative temporary impacts, especially in a local context, however, this is considerably better than dealing with large scale windfall development that has not been strategically considered. The proposed development and the associated impacts will be permanent, although there will be some local issues caused by construction that will be temporary and reversible. The preferred option is proposed as the most sustainable approach and one that is unlikely to lead to any negative indirect, cumulative or in-combination effects but there is potential for positive cumulative effects through the inclusion of a new Placemaking policy and up-to-date environmental policies in LDP2. Development of both housing and industrial sites will drive economic investment which should encourage more people to 'live, work, study and invest in Shetland' in line with the Council's Corporate Plan. This approach is not expected to lead to any negative environmental impacts but deliver permanent positive benefits over the short term with these increasing over the medium and long term. The effects would be experienced across Shetland. No indirect effects have been identified with this policy but that there would be positive cumulative and in-combination effects with successful sustainable communities attracting further sustainable investment of high quality design. The currently adopted spatial strategy has not led development to certain areas or prevented development in others. This means that the majority of development has been windfall, with each site being considered on a case by case basis without a strategic overview. This means that there is a much greater likelihood of negative impacts, especially in-combination and cumulative effects, rather than with the strategic approach set out in this evolution of the Spatial Strategy where these issues can be addressed to ensure they have a positive impact. Adoption of this evolved Spatial Strategy and new policies in LDP2 will ensure all windfall development or unplanned development, will be site checked against all environmental safeguarding features, and will be consulted on accordingly. This will give stakeholders the chance to assess the impacts of windfall development and apply mitigating conditions if required, therefore reducing the possible negative impacts of windfall development. This approach to development means that potential planning gain by developing preferred areas of growth and applying master planning and Placemaking principles is maximised to be delivered. As identified windfall development is important in a Shetland context but it should not be the predominant form of development and must be supported by sound justification. In order to help address this, we ran the call for sites. This was a proactive attempt to stem or reduce the number of windfall developments and steer development to pre-assessed areas in the first instance.

Mitigation:	The effectiveness of the spatial strategy will depend upon the wording and implementation of the policies in LDP2 and any associated Supplementary Guidance. The clear aim of the spatial strategy is to guide development towards the most sustainable, least environmentally damaging sites, however, it is recognised that windfall development will always be an important element of housing delivery in Shetland. Therefore policies must be included in LDP2 that require full justification for windfall development to be provided but also be guided by the 'right housing in the right location principle' to provide a robust framework to justify either granting or refusing planning permission while balancing the importance of this type of development to overall housing numbers in Shetland. Through the site assessment process site specific mitigation measures (or potential measures to deliver enhancement) have been identified. These will be secured at the planning application stage and should ensure that negative impacts are either avoided, mitigated or compensated for. There are numerous opportunities for enhancement including provision of blue and green networks, outdoor access and active travel, enhancement of public transport networks. There are opportunities to protect carbon rich soil, promote sustainable flood management and use low carbon technology. In order to avoid negative environmental effects and in line with the 'right development in the right place principle' there must be policy protection to ensure that there is a mechanism to refuse proposed developments, particularly housing in inappropriate and unsustainable locations, especially in the open countryside. This links back to the hierarchy of development introduced with the Spatial Strategy while allowing windfall development, which is important in Shetland in the right place. No specific mitigation is proposed in relation to this main issue, however, to ensure that the preferred option delivers the full range of benefits as envisioned will depend upon the final policy wording and the consistent application of the policy when assessing development applications. However, additional policy protection may be required to ensure that the soil resource, especially peat and carbon rich soil is protected which it is proposed to include in the climate change policy group along with a requirement to lower the carbon footprint of 'all' new development regardless of its location.

Alternative Option: Focus all new development in Lerwick and its surrounding settlements																	
SEA Objectives																	
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna	Population and Human Health	Soil			Water			Air	Material Assets		Climatic Factors		Cultural Heritage		Landscape	
1	2	3a	3b	3c	4a	4b	4c	5	6a	6b	7a	7b	8a	8b	9a	9b
? / -	? / -	? / -	? / -	? / -	?	?	?	? / -	? / +	? / +	? / -	? / -	?	?	? / -	? / -
Uncertain due to lack of developer and landowner engagement and subsequent lack of development of these areas. This means that there has been no strategic overview and that impacts of development have been managed by other plan policies. Although the lack of an agreed strategy for land supply and distribution means it is more likely proposed development outside of existing settlements in less sustainable locations is likely to come forward. The cumulative impacts of this dispersed development is likely	Uncertain due to lack of developer and landowner engagement. This means that there has been no strategic overview and that impacts of development have been managed by other plan policies. While pursuit of this policy option is likely to detract from the spatial plan and make its successful implementation less likely. This will reduce the value of place making efforts and not create sustainable communities indeed it is likely negatively impact on the ability of communities away from Lerwick being sustainable.	Uncertain due to lack of developer and landowner engagement. This means that there has been no strategic overview and that impacts of development have been managed by other plan policies. Although there is potential for greater impacts on soils, especially peat and carbon rich soils. There may also be additional impacts from new infrastructure required to service these potentially more dispersed sites. This option is also likely to steer development towards green field land around Lerwick and its surrounding			Uncertain due to lack of developer and landowner engagement. This means that there has been no strategic overview and that impacts of development have been managed by other plan policies. Although it is unlikely that sites with a high flood risk would be proposed for development and in any case any issues would be assessed against the relevant policies in the adopted Local Development Plan and any relevant Supplementary Guidance. Opportunities for enhancement of the water environment would be ad-hoc			Uncertain due to lack of developer and landowner engagement. This means that there has been no strategic overview and that impacts of development have been managed by other plan policies. This is likely to have a negative impact on air quality with all development focused on Lerwick. There is an increased risk that industry and housing will be situated in close proximity to each other which means that there is an increased risk of negative interactions. There is potential for increased car journeys and	Uncertain due to lack of developer and landowner engagement. This means that there has been no strategic overview and that impacts of development have been managed by other plan policies. As this option would lead to most development being centralised it is likely that there would be benefits from more efficient use of materials and efficiency of scale. Proposed development sites are more likely to be easy to develop green field sites although it could encourage regeneration or re-sue of sites in		Uncertain due to lack of developer and landowner engagement. This means that there has been no strategic overview and that impacts of development have been managed by other plan policies. This option would likely focus development on sites at and around Lerwick meaning that development would be concentrated. Therefore it may be possible that that there would be reduced car use from these developments. There is likely to be less opportunity to deliver climate change mitigation		Uncertain due to lack of developer and landowner engagement. This means that there has been no strategic overview and that impacts of development have been managed by other plan policies. Proposed development would be considered in line with the policies of the new Local Development Plan and any adopted Supplementary Guidance. While this should provide significant protection for cultural heritage features there is likely to be differing impacts on those sites in and around Lerwick and those outside this area.		Uncertain due to lack of developer and landowner engagement. This means that there has been no strategic overview and that impacts of development have been managed by other plan policies. The consideration of sites would be based on the policies of the new Local Development plan and any adopted Supplementary Guidance. While good design and consideration of place making should minimise landscape impacts it is likely that this alternative option will result in sites being proposed for development that will have a negative	

to have a greater cumulative impact, especially for Lerwick and its surrounding settlements, Although this is likely to lead to reduced development pressure in the rest of Shetland.		settlements rather than more suitable and sustainable sites around Shetland.	and considered on an individual basis. There is a risk that flood risk may not be fully understood or identified until application stage, leading to delays and design revision to address the issues.	subsequent air pollution as a greater focus of services and employment around Lerwick will increase the requirement for those living in rural or remote locations to have travel to Lerwick. Although there may be more opportunities to deliver active travel options into developments within and around Lerwick.	Lerwick and its surrounding settlements.	and adaptation solutions and a greater chance of cumulative effects. There is potential for greater impacts on carbon rich soils around Lerwick leading to increased emissions.		impact on landscape character or the settlement cohesion and place in and around Lerwick due to increased development pressure in this area.

Effects	
Comments (including scale, timescale, permanence, magnitude and potential indirect, cumulative or in-combination effects)	The impacts of this option would be at a local scale in terms of the individual developments, however, with more development there would be a cumulative impact at a Shetland level. These will be permanent developments and therefore the majority of impacts will be permanent, although there will be some temporary and reversible impacts form the construction activity. The effects of any development would be across the plan period and beyond, although as there will be a lag between site submission and completion of development these effects are likely to be more profound in the medium to long term rather than in the short term. Indirect and cumulative effects are potentially more likely as development around Lerwick may impact on the character of the settlements while having a negative impact on the sustainability of communities away from Lerwick. There is potential that greater levels of mitigation would be required and that there would be cumulative effects on biodiversity, especially in termsof disturbance. There is also a high likelihood that this approach would to development would lead to additional traffic movements and use of material meaning that there would be negative impacts in terms of air quality, climatic factors and material assets, although there would be some benefits of centralising development, services and employment. A potential in-direct effect is that this approach to development could make remote and rural communities less sustainable with more leisure, service, retail and employment only available in Lerwick, this could lead to more air and climate issues from increased car use and increased population in balance and disparity as those living in remote and rural communities could have additional costs to access leisure, service, retail and employment facilities. Although technically reversible the majority of consented applications once developed are likely to be relatively permanent and irreversible. Should this policy option lead to a loss of remote and rural communities it would be very difficult to reverse this process. The currently adopted spatial strategy has had limited success in directing development to certain areas or preventing development in others. This means that development has to a certain extent been unplanned and with each site being considered on a case by case basis without a strategic overview, nor have the current areas of best fit and sites with development potential been successful in terms of directing development. Consequently without a strategic overview there are likely to be additional negative impacts, especially when considering indirect, cumulative and in-combination effects. This approach to development means that potential planning gain by developing preferred areas of growth and applying master planning and Placemaking principles is less likely to be realised. Nor is it clear if enough suitable land around Lerwick is available to deliver the housing and industrial development required.
Mitigation:	Each site and proposed development is considered on an individual basis and relies on the consideration of other plan policies. Development is not directed towards previously assessed sites and there is no mechanism to refuse inappropriately sited development. The current LDP is weak in this regard but there are limited mechanisms to refuse inappropriately sited development; GP3 would be used to stop development that does not maintain the identity and character of a particular settlement; while H3 directs development to Sites with Development Potential and Areas of Best Fit and doesn't support isolated residential development. However, in order to minimise negative environmental impacts further policy protection is required. Mitigation measures would be set out as necessary on a case-by-case basis, however, there may be limited opportunity for early engagement with the developer meaning some opportunities may be lost due to design progress once the council is aware of the plans. It is unclear how an approach to focus development on Lerwick would be supported through the hierarchy of development.

Climate Change

Main Issue 2: Climate Change and Sustainable Development

Preferred Option: To replace existing overarching policies GP1 and GP2, with a new overarching policy "Climate Change and Sustainable Development", with new sub-policies contained within it. To support the LDP2's Vision and Objectives and to reflect current national and local policies and objectives – namely NPF3, SPP, Our Ambition (2021-2026), and Shetland Partnership Plan (2018-2028) and to better align with the forthcoming SIC Climate Change Route Map.																	
SEA Objectives																	
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna	Population and Human Health	Soil			Water			Air	Material Assets		Climatic Factors		Cultural Heritage		Landscape	
1	2	3a	3b	3c	4a	4b	4c	5	6a	6b	7a	7b	8a	8b	9a	9b
-/ = /+	+	+	+	*	+	+	+	+	+	+	++	++	=	=	+	+
There are likely to be positive effects on biodiversity through the consideration of nature-based solutions and other offsetting and adaptation measures. Although the encouragement of any new business and industry, even for decarbonisation and renewable energy has the potential to negatively impact on biodiversity. However, LDP2 should direct development to appropriate	It is likely that there will be positive impacts in terms of both population and human health. This should encourage more sustainable travel, better access to green spaces with more sustainable places to live, work and socialise. There will be benefits from supporting the economy and ensuring a just transition to a green economy. It will be important to ensure that any support for business does not lead to the creation of nuisance	There are likely to be significant positive effects in terms of protecting and potentially restoring peat and other carbon rich soils. Although this must be balanced against the risk that additional support for industrial development could result in additional impacts on soils.			This should ensure positive effects on the water environment through encouragement for more sustainable development, provide better protection of the water environment, with development encouraged in areas where it is possible to connect to the sewerage network, avoiding flood risk areas and providing sustainable management of water and efficient use of resources as well as providing protection and adaptation for future changes in rain fall			There will be positive air quality impacts of ensuring that development considers and reduces whole life GHG emissions especially in design and siting to encourage active travel and ensure that all development can be served by a public transport network. Development providing the infrastructure for electric vehicles will also contribute towards this. Potentially support for more dispersed employment	This approach should ensure that development makes the most efficient use of existing infrastructure and supports a circular economy. This should mean this type of development has a smaller cost as well as being lower carbon and therefore ensure that market forces also favour this type of development. Some impacts will be dependent upon the industry and the proposed location. The focus on sustainable development should		This approach to provide a suite of over-arching policy measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through all stages of development from design and construction through to use and include measures to adapt to climate change should be extremely beneficial. The policy would also promote resource efficient building design to standards set by Building Regulations for energy efficiency, renewable energy, sustainable		The focus on climate change is likely to generally have a neutral impact on the historic environment.		A sustainable approach to development focusing on climate change and supporting Shetland's route to net zero is likely to focus development towards the larger settlements with greater infrastructure and where active travel or use of public transport is more likely to be achievable. This means it is more likely that rural and remote land and seascapes will be protected. There is potential for greater support to industry to have positive and negative effects on the	

locations where significant negative impacts on biodiversity, flora and fauna are less likely to occur.	neighbours in residential areas.		patterns and flood risk. SEPA requirements for new development already include consideration of increased CC flood risks to 2100 at a precautionary level. However, Blue / Green corridors enhance this with a greater general futureproofing Although any additional support for industrial development, even for decarbonisation and renewable energy could result in additional impacts on the water environment. To mitigate against negative impacts each application must be considered on a case by case basis, it will also be location specific.	opportunities could to lead to a reduction in vehicle travel and journey length though there is potential for the siting of housing, employment and industry in close proximity leading to nuisance issues. There should be positive effects for air quality as this should ensure that housing is designed to facilitate transition to electric vehicles for necessary journeys but also reduce the requirements for journeys by private vehicles as much as possible.	reduce impacts as far as possible.	materials, and water conservation. Support for a green economic recovery is likely to have direct climatic impacts through the creation and support of low carbon jobs and has the potential to create more dispersed employment opportunities and a subsequent reduction in vehicle travel and journey length. All development will require the use of resources but there will be opportunities to ensure that any development has a low carbon footprint and is sustainable in the longer term.		landscape depending on the proposal and the location. However, existing landscape policy protection will ensure that these impacts are mitigated.

Effects	
Comments (including scale, timescale, permanence, magnitude and potential indirect, cumulative or in-combination effects)	There would be short, medium and long term benefits that would have permanent irreversible impacts at a local, regional and national scale. By building on increased community support, less travel and less consumption while establishing new models of social interaction there would be benefits for many of the SEA Objectives. Although there will be a requirement to maintain these policies to ensure that there is not a subsequent rise in the rate of GHG emissions. There are considered to be positive cumulative impacts of pursuing this Main Issue with other Main Issues, especially outdoor access and blue / green networks. There are not considered to be any potential indirect or cumulative effects from the implementation of these policy. There may be additional secondary, indirect, cumulative or in-combination effects and further detailed assessments will be required once full details of the proposed green industrial sites is available.
Mitigation:	The ability to ensure that pursuit of policy options which address the challenge of climate change and support our route to net zero will be reliant upon the adoption of clear new policies which clearly set out the requirements in this regard and ensuring that there is a common and consistent approach to adherence to these policies. SEPA Guidance requires some industrial discharges to be via the sewerage network. While some types of discharge can be accommodated with SUDs, but require multiple different SUDs devices in series to give the required treatment. This is not difficult in itself, but brings space / layout requirements to the development which are not always considered at an early stage.

No other suitable reasonable alternative has been identified to the preferred option for this Main Issue.

Place and Environment

Main Issue 3: Outdoor Access – this includes how we move within and around our settlements and open spaces, and how we access walking, cycling or public transport routes to access goods and services as well as the countryside. Supporting developments that encourage and promote outdoor access and active travel choices will provide physical and mental health benefits for our communities.

Preferred Option: – To introduce a new Outdoor Access policy that supports the aims and objectives of the National Planning Framework 3, Scottish Planning Policy and other relevant national and local strategies and policies and deliver positive outdoor access improvements.																	
SEA Objectives																	
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna	Population and Human Health	Soil			Water			Air	Material Assets		Climatic Factors		Cultural Heritage		Landscape		
1	2	3a	3b	3c	4a	4b	4c	5	6a	6b	7a	7b	8a	8b	9a	9b	
? / +	++	+	=	=	=	=	=	++	= / +	=	++	=	=	= / +	+	+	
The effects are uncertain since the provision of increased outdoor access could have negative impacts on biodiversity (through additional disturbance), however, on balance it appears that the outcome is more likely to be positive due to the opportunity to create green corridors and habitat linkages, potentially enhancing habitats or creating new ones and increase enjoyment and knowledge of the	There are likely to be very positive effects on human health both physical and mental of providing outdoor access. There should also be positive population effects through increasing accessibility for all.	Although broadly neutral there are likely to be some positive effects as the provision of an access network will allow for soil retention and protection in situ.			This policy option is unlikely to cause significant impact on the water environment.			By supporting and providing an outdoor access network this should reduce the number of vehicle journeys which will have air quality benefits. There is a significant issue with limited pedestrian accessibility and a reliance on private car use –this should assist in reducing the need to travel by car.	Although likely to be broadly neutral there may be a positive impact in terms of increased local access and use of facilities. Which may encourage other development (residential, services or industry) into an area while protecting the outdoor access network and thereby increasing sustainability of a locality. This policy will lead to increased outdoor access opportunities from existing settlements.		By supporting outdoor access near residential and industrial sites this is likely to have a positive effect, reducing car use and contributing towards Scottish Government greenhouse gas reduction targets. It will contribute towards Placemaking and the establishment of 20 minute neighbourhoods.		The provision of outdoor access is likely to generally have a neutral impact on the historic environment. Although in limited situations it may provide better access and promote awareness and interpretation.		It is likely that there will be a positive impact as the provision of outdoor access will be required to be considered at the design stage and it could lead to additional greenspace provision and higher quality design.	

natural environment. There will also be the opportunity to ensure that designated routes are identified to help deter desire lines so unmanaged access/erosion/species disruption can be managed.								
Effects								
Comments (including scale, timescale, permanence, magnitude and potential indirect, cumulative or in-combination effects)	There would be short, medium and long term positive environmental effects of adopting this preferred option. While the majority of effects would be at the local and regional scale, however, efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions contribute to national targets and the impacts of climate change will be felt globally therefore any reduction in greenhouse gas emissions is of national significance. The environmental benefits from the pursuit of this option should provide permanent benefits. Once established outdoor access networks will be permanent features, however, they are very difficult if not impossible to retrofit. It is believed that there will be positive cumulative effects from the adoption of this policy across Shetland, delivery of outdoor access across multiple developments offers an opportunity to create an outdoor access network further increasing opportunities for active travel. This can be linked to the development of green and blue networks which provide biodiversity benefit as well as climate change benefits both through reduced greenhouse gas emissions and nature-based solutions to address the existing and increasing impacts of climate change.							
Mitigation:	The LDP should provide provision for the protection of the existing outdoor access network and link with the Shetland Outdoor Access Strategy (2019) and the Open Space Strategy (in preparation) to ensure that development does not impact recreational or amenity open spaces or the access to these and delivers additional or improved access to these sites. Outdoor access should be linked to the provision of green infrastructure provision to deliver the most benefit. The delivery of outdoor access should link with the existing public transport network to deliver the maximum benefit. All future development should contribute towards the development of this network that delivers a high quality green outdoor access network and connecting natural spaces with development and services.							

Alternative Option: To not introduction of a specific Outdoor Access Policy.															
SEA Objectives															
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna	Population and Human Health	Soil			Water			Air	Material Assets		Climatic Factors		Cultural Heritage		Landscape	
1	2	3a	3b	3c	4a	4b	4c	5	6a	6b	7a	7b	8a	8b	9a	9b
= / ?/-	= / ? / -	= / -	= / -	=	=	=	=	-	=	=	-	=	=	=	=	=
Effects are uncertain but without the specific requirement for outdoor access it is likely opportunities to develop green infrastructure with the associated biodiversity benefits will be missed. It is also likely that opportunities to increase knowledge and enjoyment of the natural environment may be missed. There is also an increased risk of negative impacts on features of biodiversity value near development sites due to random development of desire lines / erosion / disturbance without managed outdoor access.	This is likely to lead to less opportunity for outdoor access and connections with nature while the impacts are difficult to predict it is likely that they could range from slightly adverse to neutral at best. There are proven mental and physical health benefits of outdoor access which would not be delivered.	It is likely that the pursuit of outdoor access on an ad-hoc basis is unlikely to have a significant impact on the soil resource. There is potential for negative impacts on soils near development sites due to random development of desire lines leading to erosion with no management of the paths.			It is likely that the pursuit of outdoor access on an ad-hoc basis is unlikely to have a significant impact on the water resource.			This is likely to have a negative impact on air quality as there will be no guaranteed delivery of outdoor access opportunities or the delivery of a wider network and increased active travel and pedestrian options and a continued or increased reliance on private cars.	This will be largely neutral in terms of material assets in that it will not promote sustainable use of natural resources or waste management but it is unlikely to lead to negative effects.		This is likely to have a negative impact as it will not lead to greater active travel or recreational opportunities and could lead to an increase in traffic movements meaning there could be an increase in greenhouse gas emissions.		It is likely that the pursuit of outdoor access on an ad-hoc basis is unlikely to have a significant impact on the cultural heritage of Shetland.		It is likely that the pursuit of outdoor access on an ad-hoc basis is unlikely to have a significant impact on the Shetland landscape.	

Effects	
Comments (including scale, timescale, permanence, magnitude and potential indirect, cumulative or in-combination effects)	While for the majority of SEA topics the short, medium and long term effects of adopting this alternative option are neutral it is likely to have negative impacts across all timescales for air, climatic factors and human health and population. While the effects on population and human health are at a local scale, the efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions contribute to national targets and the impacts of climate change will be felt globally than any failure to reduce or even increase greenhouse gas emissions is considered to be of at least national significance. This alternative option is not in-line with current NPF3 and SPP, and will undoubtedly result in lost opportunities to ensure active travel measures are considered and included within new developments. The chance to reduce car usage and increase active travel measures within larger developments, would be potentially lost. The current policies in LDP1 do not support outdoor access. The impacts of this would be permanent, although there may be limited opportunities to retro-fit outdoor access routes in practice this is likely to be extremely limited. This alternative option does not set out a strategic and pro-active approach to the delivery and protection of outdoor access. It is therefore not possible to identify indirect, cumulative or in-combination effects but it is likely to be neutral to slightly adverse as the lack of strategic direction means that individual developments may impact existing access routes and there is potential for missed opportunities to develop an outdoor access and active travel network.
Mitigation:	Each site would need to be considered on an individual basis with the requirement to deliver outdoor access needing to be established for each development. Without a specific outdoor access policy, it would leave any mitigation or negotiations difficult.

Main Issue 4: Green and Blue Networks - Green and Blue Networks are defined as 'features of the natural and built environment (including water) that provide a range of ecosystems and social benefits'. Well designed, multi-functional green and blue networks are a fundamental component of successful places, and provide a range of benefits: improving quality of place, providing opportunities for biodiversity, to get outdoors and lead healthier lives including safe and pleasant walking and cycling, strengthening landscape character and improving vacant and derelict land.

Preferred Option: To introduce a new policy specifically relating to blue and green networks in new developments is required in LDP2.															
SEA Objectives															
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna	Population and Human Health	Soil			Water			Air	Material Assets		Climatic Factors		Cultural Heritage		Landscape	
1	2	3a	3b	3c	4a	4b	4c	5	6a	6b	7a	7b	8a	8b	9a	9b
+	++	+/=	+/=	+/=	+	*	+	+	+	*	+	+	*	*	+	+
There will be positive benefits for biodiversity, flora and fauna from the provision of a blue and green network, increasing habitat availability and ensuring that development does not lead to fragmentation of habitat. The development of blue and green networks encourages the consideration of nature-based solutions and could offer potential off-setting in terms of	There is the potential to provide significant connections between people and wildlife which will have positive effects. This should also increase the quality of places where people live and work with subsequent positive effects for population and human health.	Although not directly proposed to address the SEA Objective of soil there may be positive effects on soil form this through the protection of green corridors and potential for some wider open spaces and retention of soil in situ. It may also be possible to provide increased access to and awareness and of sites of geodiversity interest.			The provision of blue and green infrastructure will provide significant positive benefits to the water environment through the management of water to avoid flood risk and ability to deploy nature based solutions to improve water quality and manage flood risk. Proposed development will be considered against sustainable design principles including the management and reduction of flood risk on the site.			There will be a positive impact on air quality through the safeguarding of green and open space and the provision of alternatives to local access to leisure and the potential to establish active travel networks. The use of nature-based solution often requires less GHC emissions to construct and offer more sustainable solutions.	Support and encouragement for green and blue infrastructure is likely to have a positive impact on the material assets in Shetland. Blue / Green corridors add a significant level of resilience to future drainage and flood risk issues in development, by giving easy access to drainage that is not limited by flood capacity. The development of blue and green		There are likely to be positive climatic effects as green and blue networks will promote nature based solutions and adaptation to climate change as well as facilitating active travel. The whole life GHG emissions from green and blue networks will be less than for more traditional engineering solutions and are therefore more sustainable.		There are unlikely to be any direct impacts on cultural heritage from this option.		The adoption of these polices including a requirement to Design to C753 The SUDs manual should have positive impact on local landscape character and improving the landscape, especially around settlement and developed areas.	

larger development. .			SUDs devices will handle water as required to protect the water environment downstream both in terms of flood risk and water quality but there is an opportunity to deliver wider amenity / biodiversity benefits by focusing on the use of nature-based solutions		networks will offer less resource intensive solutions. The same benefits from having access to open corridors could also apply to future upgrading of underground services such as fibre broadband or electrical supplies.			
Effects								
Comments (including scale, timescale, permanence, magnitude and potential indirect, cumulative or in-combination effects)	The delivery of green and blue infrastructure would have a range of positive environmental impacts over the short, long and medium term and that there will not be any negative effects from this. The effects would be of local significance making settlements better and improving the quality of life for those who live there. The effects would in most cases be permanent but changes in planning policy could potentially lead to these benefits being reversed through infill development. There will be significant positive in-combination effects with other main issues such as open access and no indirect effects have been identified. There is likely to be a significantly positive cumulative effect as more development implements these measures then the green and blue network will grow and provide wider benefits especially in terms of creating active travel networks. It will be important to ensure that the council develops an open space							
Mitigation:	There will need to be a proportionate approach to the enforcement of this policy to ensure that the costs of implementation are not disproportionate for small developments, however, it will also be vital to ensure that opportunities are not sterilised by small developments. Proportionality and consideration off off-setting for medium to large developments. A detailed description of blue and green networks should be included with the new policy.							

Alternative Option: To not introduce a specific green and blue network policy, and instead rely on existing LDP policies and the policies of relevant Key Agencies or organisations to promote the use of green and blue networks.															
SEA Objectives															
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna	Population and Human Health	Soil			Water			Air	Material Assets		Climatic Factors		Cultural Heritage		Landscape	
1	2	3a	3b	3c	4a	4b	4c	5	6a	6b	7a	7b	8a	8b	9a	9b
+ / = / -	+ / =	=	=	=	+	+	+	=	+	=	+	+	=	=	=	=
The existing policies encourage the protection and enhancement of biodiversity however, these benefits are likely to be diluted by not having a clear standalone overarching policy. Meaning that there will be disjointed approach to delivery and subsequently it is unlikely that there would significant biodiversity, flora or fauna gains. This alternative would require the delivery of SUDs, not necessarily a form of SUDs that provides specific biodiversity benefit therefore the impact	There will be some benefits however due to a lack of guiding principle it is likely that the benefits will not be as positive as they could have been. This alternative would require the delivery of SUDs, not necessarily a form of SUDs that provides specific amenity benefit meaning that the impacts may be neutral. Any development of green corridors would be negotiated on an individual basis with each development reducing the likelihood that a fully	This alternative option is unlikely to have any significant effects upon the soil resource.			Any delivery of blue infrastructure will have positive effects upon the water environment, however, the level of positive benefit delivered remains unclear at this time. Different types of SUDs deliver different benefits, therefore and without the specific requirement to deliver blue / green networks other type of SUDs may be selected, which could reduce the additional benefits that could be achieved.			This policy approach would be unlikely to have a significant impact on air quality.	While there will be some positive benefits this will not be as significant as having a specific policy requirement to deliver this. Impacts of the lack of this type of consideration are demonstrated when considering existing problem areas that lack suitable corridors and the range of problems that come with needing access through multiple established surrounding gardens to upgrade underground services.		There would be beneficial effects on climatic factors as SUDs would be required to ensure that measures were in place to manage flood risk. For large schemes there is the potential that some active travel networks could be delivered which may reduce use of vehicles. The policy would also ensure that there was a minimum level of environmental awareness within all designs. It will ensure that proper measures are in place e.g. drainage, but completed in a way the benefits biodiversity, flaura and fauna. The policy should ensure		There is unlikely to be any effect on cultural heritage from this option.		The adoption of these polices should have positive impact on local landscape character and improving the landscape, especially around settlement and developed areas.	

on biodiversity may be limited. Any development of green corridors would be negotiated on an individual basis with each development reducing the likelihood that a fully formed network would be developed.	formed network would be developed.					that in larger developments provide green infrastructure as an off-set, such as open space or playing fields (alongside the open space policy). Making sure that green and blue infrastructure is done in a way that benefits biodiversity and flora and fauna, in itself is a climate factor positive.		

Effects	
Comments (including scale, timescale, permanence, magnitude and potential indirect, cumulative or in-combination effects)	For all of the SEA topics the short, medium and long term effects of adopting this alternative option are neutral it is likely to neutral or slightly positive. However, this approach would result is significantly reduced positive environmental effects when compared to the preferred approach which would introduce a clear requirement to deliver blue / green networks. There is the requirement to deliver SuDS, however this would not necessarily deliver the additional benefits and inclusion of nature-based solutions that would be delivered by the preferred option. This is especially true for the development of green corridors which would be on a much more ad-hoc basis with options to deliver a fully integrated network much harder to achieve. The impacts of this would be permanent, although there may be limited opportunities to retro-fit blue and green networks in practice this is likely to be extremely limited. This alternative option does not set out a strategic and pro-active approach to the delivery and protection of blue and green networks. It is therefore not possible to identify indirect, cumulative or in-combination effects but it is likely to be neutral to slightly adverse as the lack of strategic direction means that individual developments may impact existing access routes and there is potential for missed opportunities to develop an outdoor access and active travel network. There is high potential that small developments would be allowed which do not deliver this which could have significant impacts on the ability to deliver wider blue and green networks and this is seen as a significant negative effect.
Mitigation:	Each site would need to be considered on an individual basis with the requirement to deliver blue and green networks needing to be established for each development.

People and our Communities

Main Issue 5: Enhancing our Town Centre and Village Retail Areas– Our town centres and village retail areas are the heart of our communities - they can provide access to products and services, but can also support sustainable economic and social activity.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="15">Preferred Option: To update existing policy ED3 to identify not only Lerwick but also Brae and Scalloway and acknowledge our village retail areas and locality hubs across Shetland, are also in need of support to ensure their continued economic viability and social vitality.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="15">SEA Objectives</td></tr>
<tr><td>Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna</td><td>Population and Human Health</td><td colspan="3">Soil</td><td colspan="3">Water</td><td>Air</td><td colspan="2">Material Assets</td><td colspan="2">Climatic Factors</td><td colspan="2">Cultural Heritage</td><td colspan="2">Landscape</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3a</td><td>3b</td><td>3c</td><td>4a</td><td>4b</td><td>4c</td><td>5</td><td>6a</td><td>6b</td><td>7a</td><td>7b</td><td>8a</td><td>8b</td><td>9a</td><td>9b</td></tr>
<tr><td>=</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>= / ?</td><td>= / ?</td><td>= / ?</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>=</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>=</td><td>=</td></tr>
<tr><td>Town centre polices do not make any specific provision for the protection or enhancement of biodiversity. It is likely that it would have a neutral impact on biodiversity.</td><td>The purpose of the policy is to ensure that development is focussed on the main community centres. This is likely to have benefits in terms of Placemaking, despite the rural and dispersed nature of settlement in Shetland as communities and individuals will be able to complete multiple tasks during a single visit. It will also encourage use by those already in the settlement therefore delivering local and regional benefits.</td><td colspan="3">The function of this policy is to direct development towards previously used land and buildings and therefore reduce impacts on greenfield sites</td><td colspan="3">Outwith the specific locations where longer term flood risk may be an issue this Main Issue would not have any direct impact on the water environment.

Consideration of longer term flood risk from sea level rises may have significant effects on (re)development of historic areas of Lerwick and Scalloway. A new development at street level on Main Street or The Esplanade would not meet current coastal flood risk</td><td>This policy seeks to create vibrant and viable town centres that provide a hub for economic and social activities. It is expected that this will reduce GHG emissions through reduced private vehicle journeys and increased use of active travel and public transport. The shared services available at these locations will further reduce the number of journeys.</td><td colspan="2">There is potential for significant positive benefits as this policy will encourage reuse of existing buildings, potentially increasing the energy efficient of these during redevelopment and in Lerwick offering an opportunity to connect to the district heating network.</td><td colspan="2">The policy is expected to provide positive benefits in terms of reduced GHG emissions, from reduced private vehicle movements, and more efficient use of buildings and materials as well as providing opportunities to retrofit existing buildings to ensure that they will be more resilient to the effects of climate change.</td><td colspan="2">There is potential for there to be a positive impact on these SEA Objectives. Both Lerwick and Scalloway town centres lie in conservation areas and well sited sympathetic design in these areas could have a positive impact. This option is likely to have positive impact on the conservation areas and other heritage assets by ensuring that Lerwick and Scalloway remain vibrant flourishing communities.</td><td colspan="2">As this Main Issue is concerned with the directing development to towns it is unlikely that there would be any direct landscape impacts.</td></tr>
</table>

			requirements. There may be a change in the current approach to flood risk assessment as climate change consideration of existing areas of development is refined, but there is potential that some developments may not be permitted without coastal flood defences in place or committed to.					
Effects								
Comments (including scale, timescale, permanence, magnitude and potential indirect, cumulative or in-combination effects)	This main issue would lead to short and medium term positive impacts at a local and regional level, however, the longer term impacts are more difficult to predict as it is dependant upon ongoing support for the this policy. However, due to the focus on the existing town centre and existing established settlement hubs this Main Issue has a neutral impact on many of the SEA Objectives. While the town themselves are likely to be permanent their vibrancy, success and economic and social focal point is not guaranteed and therefore the effects of this policy are reversible in that without continued support the benefits from this could easily be reversed. There are potential for indirect positive effects on a number of the SEA Objectives (biodiversity, landscape and water) by potentially reducing the pressure to develop more sensitive green field sites. There is also the potential for positive in-combination effects with the outdoor access and green and blue infrastructure Main Issues to create better access networks that connect to the town centres which could further reduce the requirement for private car journeys. It is not considered that there would be any cumulative impacts from the adoption of this policy.							
Mitigation:	No requirement for any specific mitigation in relation to this main issue has been identified.							

Alternative Option: To continue with LDP policy ED3 Lerwick Town Centre that references Lerwick as our town and main economic hub, and does not acknowledge the role our rural hubs play in retail and service provision.															
SEA Objectives															
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna	Population and Human Health	Soil			Water			Air	Material Assets		Climatic Factors		Cultural Heritage		Landscape	
1	2	3a	3b	3c	4a	4b	4c	5	6a	6b	7a	7b	8a	8b	9a	9b
=	-	+/-	+/-	+/-	=	=	=	-	+	=	-	+	+	+	=	=
Town centre polices do not make any specific provision for the protection or enhancement of biodiversity. It is likely that it would have a neutral impact on biodiversity.	At present there are benefits of the policy locally to those living in and around Lerwick, however, it creates the impression of decision making solely focused on Lerwick and its immediate surroundings and encourages the focus of virtually all development on Lerwick. This will have negative effects for the population as a whole and is likely to increase inequality in society.	The current policy provides support for Lerwick but of no other site although as it encourages regeneration and development in Lerwick this has positive effects of promoting development to previously used sites, however, this is solely focused on Lerwick			Impacts would be as set out above with the longer term flood risk issue only relating to Lerwick.			By focusing solely on Lerwick this policy risk further centralisation and creating a single town centres as the hub for economic, service and social activities. This would potentially increase GHG emissions through increased private vehicle journeys and rates of ownership, especially for the population living outwith Lerwick.	There is potential for positive benefits as this policy will encourage reuse of existing buildings, potentially increasing the energy efficient of these during redevelopment and in Lerwick offering an opportunity to connect to the district heating network.		The policy is likely to lead to an increase in GHG emissions, from increased private vehicle movements into Lerwick. However, it will provide opportunities to increase the resilience of Lerwick to the impacts of climate change through more efficient use of buildings and materials as well as providing opportunities to retrofit existing buildings to ensure that they will be more resilient to the effects of climate change.	There is potential for there to be a positive impact on these SEA Objectives. Lerwick town centres lie in a conservation areas and well sited sympathetic design in this areas could have a positive impact. The conservation area in general is likely to have positive impact as long as Lerwick remains a vibrant flourishing communities. It will not however support cultural heritage features outside of Lerwick.		As this Main Issue is concerned with the directing development to towns it is unlikely that there would be any direct landscape impacts.	

Effects	
Comments (including scale, timescale, permanence, magnitude and potential indirect, cumulative or in-combination effects).	This main issue would lead to short and medium term positive impacts at a local and regional level, however, the longer term impacts are more difficult to predict as it is dependant upon ongoing support for the this policy. However, due to focusing solely on Lerwick it is likely to have a negative impact on the SEA objectives to maintain air quality and climate change in the short and medium term while in the longer term this impact is likely to be negated as petrol and diesel are phased out and electrical vehicles become more common. The adoption of this alternative option would mean that other 'hubs' or settlements would not be supported to grow and thrive. They will continue to either grow or decline without intervention but by not acknowledging their role we restrict the opportunity to focus appropriate development into these locations to provide housing, business or employment etc as required. Selection of this alternative option could have long term effects as if it leads to decline of rural service centres then is could have negative impacts on population and human health and be very difficult to reverse. There is the potential for indirect positive effects on a number of the SEA Objectives (biodiversity, landscape and water) by potentially reducing the pressure to develop more sensitive green field sites. It is not considered that there would be any cumulative impacts from the adoption of this policy.
Mitigation:	No requirement for any specific mitigation in relation to this alternative option to this main issue have been identified.

Main Issue 6: Supporting our Remote and Rural Communities – our more remote and rural communities can experience additional challenges, such as economic and social decline and de-population.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="15">Preferred Option: To create a new Placemaking Policy which will promote place-based sustainable development of our remote and rural communities, supported by additional supplementary guidance. We also propose to update exiting Economic Development polices ED1 – ED3 to reflect these same Placemaking qualities.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="15">SEA Objectives</td></tr>
<tr><td>Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna</td><td>Population and Human Health</td><td colspan="3">Soil</td><td colspan="3">Water</td><td>Air</td><td colspan="2">Material Assets</td><td colspan="2">Climatic Factors</td><td colspan="2">Cultural Heritage</td><td colspan="2">Landscape</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3a</td><td>3b</td><td>3c</td><td>4a</td><td>4b</td><td>4c</td><td>5</td><td>6a</td><td>6b</td><td>7a</td><td>7b</td><td>8a</td><td>8b</td><td>9a</td><td>9b</td></tr>
<tr><td>-/+</td><td>+</td><td>-/+</td><td>-/+</td><td>-/+</td><td>-/+</td><td>-/+</td><td>-/+</td><td>-/+</td><td>? / - / +</td><td>? / - / +</td><td>-/+</td><td>-/+</td><td>=</td><td>=</td><td>-/+</td><td>-/+</td></tr>
<tr><td>Development in rural and remote locations has potential to impact wildlife, especially in Shetland there is potential for long term disturbance to breeding birds. Although the aim is to support successful development in remote and rural communities to ensure they remain sustainable and will be guided by the ‘right development in the right place’ principle.</td><td>It is likely that there would be population and human health benefits for those living in these communities by ensuring that there is housing and employment opportunities and this would ensure everyone across Shetland had similar opportunities.</td><td colspan="3">There is potential for increased impacts on soils, especially peat and other carbon rich soils. Although the aim is to support successful development in remote and rural communities to ensure they remain sustainable and will be guided by the ‘right development in the right place’ principle.</td><td colspan="3">There is potential for increased impacts on the water environment. Although the aim is to support successful development in remote and rural communities to ensure they remain sustainable and will be guided by the ‘right development in the right place’ principle. There may also be more space to consider nature based solution to address drainage management and water quality issues.

In general rural development with greater site flexibility means drainage and</td><td>There is potential for increased impacts on air quality. Although the aim is to support successful development in remote and rural communities to ensure they remain sustainable and will be guided by the ‘right development in the right place’ principle. There is the potential to lead to more journeys by private vehicle either for employment or leisure depending on the development.</td><td colspan="2">The impacts on material assets is unknown but are likely to be both positive and negative. There are likely to be negative impacts due to the location of the development and the increased potential to use virgin resources. However, provided development is proportional to capacity this approach will ensure remote and rural communities remain sustainable and therefore the assets in these areas will continue to be used.</td><td colspan="2">The impacts on climatic factors and GHG emissions are likely to be both positive and negative and it is uncertain which will be the most significant. Provision of employment opportunities may reduce journeys by private vehicle and reduce the need for multiple car ownership, however, the industry may be polluting in its own right or encourage others outside the local area to work there and subsequently increase car use. Although this would be out weighted by a</td><td colspan="2">There are unlikely to be significant impacts on cultural heritage from the preferred option.</td><td colspan="2">There is potential for negative impacts on the landscape. Although the aim is to support successful development in remote and rural communities to ensure they remain sustainable and will be guided by the ‘right development in the right place’ principle. Consideration of the type of development, designated sites and impacts on landscape character will be required.</td></tr>
</table>

			flood risk issues are easier to solve. However, problems can occur from piecemeal development over time, where the drainage solutions utilised by the initial development were appropriate for the development but did not allow for future development. By either not including capacity for further development in the drainage installed, or by not providing corridors for drainage/flood overflows, or by restricting site sizes/topography in a way that makes drainage more difficult than necessary for future development.			focus on sustainable development.		

Effects	
Comments (including scale, timescale, permanence, magnitude and potential indirect, cumulative or in-combination effects).	There would be local impacts from this option, although whether they will be positive or negative at this time remains uncertain. Whilst the impacts are likely to be permanent and irreversible as if rural and remote communities become unsustainable and subject to decline it will be extremely difficult, if not impossible to reverse this. Therefore it is really important that the measures set out in LDP2 support the stated aims of SIC to support these rural and remote communities. This preferred option could have a greater significance in the medium to longer term as it will ensure communities and rural service hubs remain viable and become increasingly sustainable. No indirect, cumulative or in-combination effects from this preferred option have been identified.

Mitigation:	In order to avoid negative environmental effects and in line with the 'right development in the right place principle' there must be policy protection to ensure that there is a mechanism to refuse development in inappropriate locations, especially in the open countryside. Therefore policy wording must reflect that while the aim of the council to support sustainable rural communities it must not be at the expense of the environment. The policy will introduce the 20 min neighbourhood principle, which should guide the siting of all new development, leading to a more sustainable approach to rural development. The new placemaking policy will introduce clearer and more concise approaches to siting and design in a rural context. LDP2 will also recognise that there will be particular situations where development cannot be located within existing settlements, and will need to be located in the wider countryside. Our refreshed policies will support developments where it can be demonstrated that they do not cause an adverse impact on the environment or the sustainability of the community, we still seek to avoid developments which could: • Lead to suburbanisation of the countryside • Place undue pressure on existing services, • Contribute to social isolation, The policy would need to be worded to ensure appropriate weight was given to the avoidance of negative impacts on the environment. There may need to be consideration to the type of development supported to ensure it does not create demand for labour that outstrips the local supply. Support for tourism supporting industry requires careful consideration – especially with regards to decarbonisation of travel. This links back to the hierarchy of development set out under the spatial strategy main issue.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="14">Alternative Option: To not update our existing General Policies, Economic Development and Housing policies. This would not introduce the 20-minute neighbourhood principle or establish the importance of the Locality Hubs.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="14">SEA Objectives</td></tr>
<tr><td>Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna</td><td>Population and Human Health</td><td colspan="3">Soil</td><td colspan="3">Water</td><td>Air</td><td colspan="2">Material Assets</td><td colspan="2">Climatic Factors</td><td colspan="2">Cultural Heritage</td><td colspan="2">Landscape</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3a</td><td>3b</td><td>3c</td><td>4a</td><td>4b</td><td>4c</td><td>5</td><td>6a</td><td>6b</td><td>7a</td><td>7b</td><td>8a</td><td>8b</td><td>9a</td><td>9b</td></tr>
<tr><td>-</td><td>+</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-/+</td><td>-/+</td><td>-/+</td><td>-</td><td>? / +/ -</td><td>? / + /-</td><td>-/+</td><td>-/+</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr>
<tr><td>The current policies provide broad support for development in rural and remote locations to sustain communities. There is limited guidance in terms of siting and design which could lead to negative impacts on the biodiversity.</td><td>There is existing policy support for rural and remote communities.</td><td colspan="3">The current policies provide broad support for development in rural and remote locations to sustain communities. There is limited guidance in terms of siting and design which could lead to negative impacts on the soils, especially with regards to impact on peat or other carbon rich soils nor does it provide any incentive to reuse derelict land.</td><td colspan="3">Impacts on the water environment are likely to be similar as set out for the preferred option.</td><td>There is potential for increased impacts on air quality. Although the aim is to support successful development in remote and rural communities, there is the potential to lead to more journeys by private vehicle either for employment or leisure depending on the development. A lack of suitable employment locally may also mean that people in remote and rural communities are commuting long distances by car with public transport not a suitable alternative.</td><td colspan="2">Impacts are uncertain and likely to be similar as set out above for the main issue.</td><td colspan="2">The impacts on climatic factors and GHG emissions are likely to be both positive and negative and it is uncertain which will be the most significant. Provision of employment opportunities may reduce journeys by private vehicle, however, the industry may be polluting in its own right or encourage others outside the local area to work there and subsequently increase car use. Without a focus on sustainable development there are likely to be negative impacts.</td><td colspan="2">There are unlikely to be significant impacts on features of cultural heritage interest from this alternative option.</td><td colspan="2">The current policies provide broad support for development in rural and remote locations to sustain communities. There is limited guidance in terms of siting and design which could lead to negative impacts on the landscape</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="14">Effects</td></tr>
</table>

Comments (including scale, timescale, permanence, magnitude and potential indirect, cumulative or in-combination effects).	With the current support for remote and rural communities it is unclear how much difference it has made but it is likely to have had some positive effects. Without the focus on sustainable development then it is likely that while this option would also support remote and rural communities there is potential for greater environmental impacts. There is no specific policy guidance in the current LDP relating to development in rural areas despite existing Council and national policy requirements to support sustainable rural communities. There is a requirement to provide guidance for housing and employment related development. The Placemaking policy directs development towards towns and villages this must be considered in a Shetland context with service hubs and provide policy guidance for developments in rural areas. The existing policy structure does not provide clear support for new employment opportunities close to rural communities and could result in some rural communities becoming unsustainable in the long term. There is also less control over the siting and design of employment related development in rural areas.
Mitigation:	Clear guidance on how support for rural and remote communities would not lead to negative environmental impacts will be required

Main Issue 7: Digital Connectivity – digital capacity is an issue in many of Shetland's rural communities

Preferred Option: To update the Economic Development policies, specifically to reference digital infrastructure provision and to better reflect the Council's aims on digital capacity building across all of Shetland's communities.																	
SEA Objectives																	
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna	Population and Human Health	Soil			Water			Air	Material Assets		Climatic Factors		Cultural Heritage		Landscape		
1	2	3a	3b	3c	4a	4b	4c	5	6a	6b	7a	7b	8a	8b	9a	9b	
=	+	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	= / +	=	=	=	=	=	
The promotion of digital connectivity is unlikely to affect biodiversity, flora or fauna.	The promotion of this Main Issue is likely to have positives effects upon population and health as ensuring that all communities have good digital connectivity will ensure equality and digital connectivity is linked to increased quality of life scores.	The promotion of digital connectivity is unlikely to impact soils.			The promotion of digital connectivity is unlikely to affect the water environment.			The promotion of digital connectivity is unlikely to affect air quality.	The promotion of digital connectivity is unlikely to impact upon material assets.		The promotion of digital connectivity is most likely to have a neutral impact on climatic factors. However, there may be positive effects if better digital connectivity allows more home working, then this could lead to a reduction in employment related car journeys.		The promotion of digital connectivity is unlikely to have an effect on cultural heritage.		The promotion of digital connectivity is unlikely to have a landscape effect.	
Effects																	
Comments (including scale, timescale, permanence, magnitude and potential indirect, cumulative or in-combination effects).	The effects of supporting digital connectivity are likely to be permanent across the medium term. Digital connectivity varies across Shetland, therefore the impacts of improved digital will be experienced locally where there are current issues or for any new development this will provide benefits. Although the impacts are permanent they are potentially reversible as broadband speeds continue to increase there will need to be continued support for this policy, as acceptable connectivity today may not be sufficient in the future and therefore the long term impacts are difficult to predict. There may be indirect positive effects for air quality and climatic factors as increased digital connectivity may allow more work and educational activities to be undertaken from home, reducing journeys by private vehicles and reducing the emission of GHG and other pollutants. The support of this main issue is also likely to have a positive in-combination effect with other main issues such as supporting remote and rural communities and a green recovery from covid-19. Although there may be an indirect negative impact of reducing income from public transport and making it less sustainable.																
Mitigation:	Encouraging telecoms mast sharing as per existing SG policy, thus reducing multiple masts being built to serve multiple companies. The policy will also work alongside environmental policies that guide infrastructure provision in the open countryside.																

No other suitable reasonable alternative has been identified to the preferred option for this Main Issue.

Work and Economy

Main Issue 8: Future Mineral Extraction

Preferred Option: To update our existing minerals policy in-line with current national and local policies and to add protection of future mineral extraction sites to the existing policy and interim policy document.															
SEA Objectives															
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna	Population and Human Health	Soil			Water			Air	Material Assets		Climatic Factors		Cultural Heritage		Landscape	
1	2	3a	3b	3c	4a	4b	4c	5	6a	6b	7a	7b	8a	8b	9a	9b
-/+	-/+	-	-	=	-/+	-/+	-/+	=	++	=	+	+	-/+	-/+	-/+	-/+
It is likely that any mineral extraction, even with careful site selection will lead to negative impacts on biodiversity. However, once extraction is complete and the site transitions to a restoration phase there is an opportunity to ensure positive effects for biodiversity.	There can be both positive (generally in the longer term) and negative (generally in the shorter term) effects on population and human health from mineral extraction. Negative effects such as noise and dust can be controlled and mitigated to an acceptable extent. High quality restoration schemes offer the potential for increased outdoor access to newly created open green space and even new opportunities for recreation facilities (including those where increased appreciation and enjoyment of flora	There is likely to be an unavoidable negative impact on soils from any mineral extraction. While some protection measures can be put in place these will be limited as minerals can only be extracted from where they occur. Best practice soil management will be required to minimise impacts, especially on peat or other carbon rich soils.			There are likely to be various positive and negative impacts on the water environment. There is the potential need to mitigate the possibility of a decrease in water quality downstream through onsite management and water treatment. There may also be increased requirement to manage site runoff form bare ground, however, in the longer term there may be opportunities to address flood management issues such as providing flood storage. Although there are			There are unlikely to be any significant air quality issues given the size and type of mineral extraction sites in Shetand.	There are likely to be positive benefits from the use of locally sourced materials provided that there is full consideration of the environmental impacts and that this is balanced against the effects of importing materials.		Mineral extraction, by its nature is located in the countryside remote from existing services. This is due to requirement for undeveloped sites for extraction and reduction of impact on existing land uses. Some larger development sites for other land use types may present limited pre-extraction opportunity, leading to greater efficiency. Given the remote location of Shetland the use of local sourced materials is likely to have significant benefits in terms of saved GHG emissions from transport. This must	There are unlikely to be any significant impacts on known cultural heritage features, although negative impacts on these or their settings can occur. Mineral extraction has the potential to reveal features of archaeological interest and there is already policy protection within the existing LDP which will be brought forward into LDP2.		In the short term there are likely to be negative landscape impacts from any mineral extraction. Although there is a policy framework in place to mitigate these and minimise impacts. It is also possible to secure restoration bonds to ensure restoration is undertaken. This means that longer term positive effects can be delivered through sensitive site restoration.	

	and fauna is possible)		requirements in other legislation to achieve specific pollution levels in discharges, and long term monitoring of some sites (e.g. RBMP).			always be balanced against the environmental impacts of local production. The restoration of the site allows consideration of uses that enable climate change adaptation such as flood storage.		

Effects	
Comments (including scale, timescale, permanence, magnitude and potential indirect, cumulative or in-combination effects).	This approach of better engagement with site operators to identify potential areas of reserves in order to avoid sterilisation of undeveloped mineral reserves is considered to have positive impacts for material assets, climatic factors and air quality. While there is potential for negative impacts on a number of SEA Objectives it is likely that early identification of sites allows for earlier engagement meaning mitigation is considered at an early stage especially with regards to improved restoration schemes. There will be short, medium and long term impacts of adopting this option and these will be permanent and irreversible. There are likely to be some negative impacts in the short term (usually during extraction phases), especially with regards biodiversity, population and human health, water and landscape but with sensitive restoration and ongoing maintenance. No indirect, cumulative or in-combination effects have been identified. Minerals are necessary for development and by their nature can only be worked where they are located. Once worked there will be a permanent impact on the environment, however, poorly sited and designed development can also lead to the permanent sterilisation of important mineral reserves.
Mitigation:	Specific reference to peat and potential for restoration during restoration schemes is required. Requirement for engagement with the minerals industry and mapping of future sites to ensure that these can be protected. The policy should explicitly refer to site restoration and ongoing management. The new and updated policy will bring much needed up-to-date guidance and safeguarding when assessing new minerals applications. The current LDP and SG are out of date and offer no current guidance on sustainable mineral extraction. The new policy will also include future extraction sites, which will go through an environmental assessment prior to being allocated as potential future extraction sites.

Alternative Option: To continue to use our policy M1 Minerals Policy in LDP2 and carry forward the adopted Council Interim Planning Policy: Minerals 2009																	
SEA Objectives																	
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna	Population and Human Health	Soil			Water			Air	Material Assets		Climatic Factors		Cultural Heritage		Landscape	
1	2	3a	3b	3c	4a	4b	4c	5	6a	6b	7a	7b	8a	8b	9a	9b
-	+/-	-	-	-	-	-	-	=	?	=	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	-	-
There is potential for minerals development to have negative impacts on biodiversity in a variety of ways. Although there is limited potential for some benefits through restoration this is dependent upon the quality of work undertaken by the operator.	Without an up to date strategic overview of proposed mineral development there is greater potential for development to negatively impact population and human health, especially from noise and dust	It is likely that minerals development would have a negative impact on soil quality, especially for peat and carbon rich soils.			There is the potential for mineral extraction to have negative impacts on water quality. Although there are requirements in other legislation to achieve specific pollution levels in discharges, and long term monitoring of some sites (e.g. RBMP).			There is unlikely to be a significant impact on air quality form this alternative approach to the preferred approach to this Main Issue.	There is unlikely to be any impact regarding opportunities for sustainable waste management. Support for the provision of locally sourced minerals will have some benefits it is unclear if this will promote sustainable use of materials or mean that competition will lead to sites being not worked and subsequent impacts from the lack of restoration.		The ability to provide material locally is likely to reduce the requirement to transport aggregate with associated environmental (reduction in GHG emissions) and cost benefits. Given the remote location of Shetland this is an important consideration, however, any increase in extraction of minerals for export is likely to increase GHG emissions.		There is potential for positive impacts, especially on unknown historical interest features as detailed archaeological assessment is generally required during the development of minerals sites and this allows for the identification of new information and preservation through record. Although there is limited protection under the existing policy to prevent impacts on the settings of known historic assets.		Mineral extraction has the potential for significant negative landscape impacts. Without updated identification of reserves this risk is increased as sites with less landscape could be sterilised by inappropriate development. The requirement for longer restoration of sites is important to minimise long term impacts.	

Effects	
Comments (including scale, timescale, permanence, magnitude and potential indirect, cumulative or in-combination effects).	This is likely to lead to permanent irreversible effects in the short, medium and long term across the whole of Shetland. The risk of potential extraction sites being extraction sites being sterilised by inappropriately sited development is very high. As with the preferred option there is potential for positive in-combination effects with the proposal to support rural and remote communities as minerals can only be worked where they occur, although the greater the distance between the extraction and use locations then the potential for negative impacts in regards to air quality and climatic factors. The LDP and Interim Planning Policy is out of date, and offers no new or up-to-date safeguarding on sustainable mineral extraction. The LDP and Interim Planning Policy offers little in terms of detail and relies on other policies when safeguarding against negative effects of quarrying and future extraction expansion. The Interim Planning Policy lacks up to date alignment with local need, active reserves and national policy requirements.
Commentary:	Bringing forward the existing policy as the continued approach to minerals development is likely to result in a wider range of negative impacts on the environment

Main Issue 9: Developer's Obligations

Preferred Option: We propose to introduce a new overarching place-based siting and design policy called Placemaking. The new policy will in part, help secure contributions in kind and will help deliver high quality public realm where applicable. The new Placemaking policy will become a keystone policy in terms of the Council's promotion and support of 'people first' high quality development, and will lend the strongest support for collaborative working between developers, designers and stakeholders.																	
SEA Objectives																	
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna	Population and Human Health	Soil			Water			Air	Material Assets		Climatic Factors		Cultural Heritage		Landscape		
1	2	3a	3b	3c	4a	4b	4c	5	6a	6b	7a	7b	8a	8b	9a	9b	
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
While not the principle focus of this main issue there are likely to be positive effects for biodiversity. The requirement to consider development against clear design and sustainability criteria means it is more likely that development will be well sited and of a high design standard and avoid many impacts through this process. It also provides more opportunity to ensure measures to deliver positive effects for biodiversity or include nature	The requirement for housing to be high quality well designed and sustainable while ensuring that communities are created that deliver on all the place making requirements should create vibrant desirable places to live and work. This will encourage the use of active travel and public transport options should have multiple significant positive effects on population and human health.	Whilst not specifically focused on soil carbon, geodiversity or contaminated land it should deliver positive benefits. It would reinforce other Plan policies by ensuring development complied with siting and design criteria including encouragement to reuse derelict land, takes advantage of existing topography and minimises negative impact on soils, especially carbon rich soils including peat.			Whilst not specifically focussed on the water environment it should deliver positive impacts. Proposed development will be considered against sustainable design principles including the management and reduction of flood risk on the site. SUDs devices will handle water as required to protect the water environment downstream both in terms of flood risk and water quality but there is an opportunity to deliver wider amenity / biodiversity benefits by focusing on the			There should be positive benefits for air quality. The implementation of this Placemaking policy should ensure that sustainable design principles are adhered to, including design to minimise car use and dependency and ensuring that new development contains green spaces. There should be positive effects for air quality as this should ensure that housing is designed to facilitate transition to electric vehicles for necessary journeys but also reduce the requirements for	While not the principle focus of the Main Issue there are expected to be positive impacts. The policy will ensure that development fully complies with siting and design criteria as well as ensuring that the use of non-renewable resources are minimised and that the waste hierarchy is fully applied in construction and operation / occupation of the development. This will facilitate the transition to a circular economy.		There will be positive impacts on climate factors through design to reduce car dependency and use. Whilst not specifically focussed on adaptation to climate change, the promotion of Placemaking, which includes greenspace and tree planting should help to reduce the impacts of climate change induced temperature rises. Appropriate siting and design can also assist in reducing GHG emissions from the construction and use of the development. Building design should be encouraged to		Whilst not specifically focussed on cultural heritage issues the requirement to consider development against clear design, sustainability, siting and Placemaking criteria will ensure that any development contributes to local distinctiveness through the retention, reuse or enhancement of existing buildings, structures or features of cultural interest, as well as, sensitive siting and design, appropriate to the cultural heritage of the locality.		Whilst not specifically focussed on landscape issues there should be positive impacts on this SEA topic. Through ensuring that development fully complies with siting and design criteria this will mean that it will minimise negative impacts on visual amenity, ensuring that suitable siting and location sensitive design delivers development which is appropriate in location, scale and design and positively contributes to the landscape character of the area. With high quality sympathetic design this should improve	

based solutions are delivered.			use of nature-based solutions	journeys by private vehicles as much as possible and facilitate and encourage Active Travel. Good design should also maximise the amount of green space within the development which will help mitigate any local pollution issues. The design and layout of new development should allow for access to pedestrian, cycle and public transport networks.		exceed current standards for energy efficiency, renewable energy, sustainable materials, and water conservation with siting to make the best use of topography to maxim these benefits.		the quality of existing locations in Shetland and create more sustainable communities through delivering development that supports Placemaking While not the principle focus of this issue it will deliver positive landscape effects. The requirement to consider development against clear design and sustainability criteria means development should be located to avoid negative impacts on the sites designated for their landscape value.

Effects	
Scale:	The implementation of this policy is expected deliver significant permanent positive environmental impacts over the short, medium and long term. No negative environmental impacts have been identified. The positive effects should increase over time as more development allows active travel networks to become better connected and that green space delivered as part of the design process matures. There is synergy with and will be positive in-combination effects with other Main Issues such as climate change, outdoor access and green / blue networks. Although consideration of how it applies with support for rural and remote communities will need to be considered. The Placemaking policy will bridge any policy gaps to catch developments not falling within a masterplan or design and access briefs etc (the two standard tools for securing planning gain / obligations in kind). The Placemaking policy will also enforce the use of master planning, design and access briefs for all relevant development.
Mitigation:	No specific mitigation has been identified in respect of this main issue. Although the implementation of this policy in the next plan is expected to deliver much higher standards of site specific mitigation for development going forward.

Alternative Option: An alternative would be to introduce the Placemaking siting and design policy as a key principle policy, and mechanism for negotiated developer contribution and also introduce a new developer obligation policy and supplementary guidance, and start charging set fees for certain types and sizes of development.
This alternative approach includes very similar policy provision to the preferred option and would therefore have identical impacts. While there may be potential for some additional gains should developments that would warrant large development contributions be proposed.