

Local Development Plan 2030

Sustainability Appraisal Interim Report

Incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment
and Habitats Regulations Assessment for Preferred
Options Paper
January 2017

Have your say

You are invited to give your comments on our Preferred Options Paper Consultation including our Sustainability Appraisal Interim Report Incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment for Preferred Options Paper.

This Sustainability Appraisal Interim Report has been prepared by Shared Environmental Service in conjunction with Antrim and Newtownabbey Borough Council.

Responses can be made online at

www.antrimandnewtownabbey.gov.uk/Council/Planning/Local-Development-Plan

The period of consultation is 12 weeks beginning on 18th January 2017 and closing on 4.30 pm 12th April 2017.

Alternatively, if you wish to make a response in writing please contact the Forward Plan Team at the address below and we will issue you with hard copy questionnaire for your response.

By e-mail to: planning@antrimandnewtownabbey.gov.uk

By post to: Planning Section,

Antrim and Newtownabbey Borough Council,

Mossley Mill,

Newtownabbey,

BT36 5QA

By phone: Forward Planning Team **by telephone** on: 0300 23 6677 or **by text phone** on: 18001 0289034 0000.

Details of all our planning events and where to view all our POP documents is available on our website.

Non-technical Summary

Antrim and Newtownabbey Local Development Plan

This document forms part of the work on a new Local Development Plan for the Borough which will look forward to 2030. The purpose of the new Plan will be to inform the public, statutory authorities, developers and other interested parties of how the Borough should develop in the years ahead. Local Development Plans contain policies and proposals that are used when determining planning applications. A good plan will lead to decisions that are consistent and people will know what to expect in terms of change, and the locations where development will be encouraged.

Our new Local Development Plan will be prepared within the context of the Council's Corporate Plan and will co-ordinate with our Community Planning process to enable us to plan positively and proactively for the future of our Borough. The policies and proposals defined in our Local Development Plan will be a vital tool in facilitating the implementation of any land use related objectives contained in our Community Plan.

Our Development Plan must also take account of the regional policy context set by the Northern Ireland Executive and Government Departments. This includes the Regional Development Strategy (RDS) 2035, the Sustainable Development Strategy for Northern Ireland, the Strategic Planning Policy Statement (SPPS), and any other policies, advice or guidance such as that relating to relevant landscape character assessments and conservation areas.

We are keen to engage with communities and stakeholders about their aspirations for future development. The earlier we know people's views, the easier it is to take them on board. Therefore it is very important that if you want to get involved you should do so at the earliest opportunity.

Preferred Options Paper

The Plan will comprise two documents that are prepared in sequence. The first is the Plan Strategy which will be followed by the Local Policies Plan. However, before we can prepare these documents we are publishing our Preferred Options Paper which will set out key planning issues for the Borough, identify a range of options to address them and define our preferred options.

In order to do this, it is a requirement that we carry out Sustainability Appraisal on our options. Preparation of this Interim Report is part of this process. It is accompanied by a Scoping Report which sets out baseline information and key sustainability issues as well as the sustainability appraisal methodology.

What is Sustainability Appraisal?

A Sustainability Appraisal is a statutory process being carried out alongside preparation of the Antrim and Newtownabbey Borough Council Local Development Plan. Local Planning Authorities such as Antrim and Newtownabbey Borough Council use Sustainability Appraisal to assess plans against a set of sustainability objectives developed in consultation with stakeholders. This assessment helps the Borough to identify the relative environmental, social and economic performance of possible strategic, policy and site options, and to evaluate which of these may be more sustainable.

What is the purpose of this document?

The purpose of this Sustainability Appraisal Interim Report is to:

- Document the appraisal of options and alternatives against a sustainability framework consisting of fourteen objectives, which has helped the Council to determine their preferred options
- Identify where there are significant effects of a preferred option and, where these are negative effects, identify how these could be addressed.
- Present any cumulative effects identified in the appraisal.
- Present any assumptions used in the appraisal, including assessing the significance of effects.

CONTENTS

Non-technical Summary	2
1 Introduction	6
1.1 Purpose of this Sustainability Interim Report	6
1.2 The Antrim and Newtownabbey Local Development Plan	6
1.3 Strategic Environmental Assessment	7
1.4 Integrated Sustainability Appraisal	7
1.5 Habitats Regulations Assessment	8
1.6 Rural Proofing	8
1.7 Interim Report Structure	8
2 Sustainability Appraisal: The Approach	10
2.1 Introduction	10
2.2 Context	10
2.3 Developing and Refining Policies and 'Reasonable Alternatives'	11
2.4 The Sustainability Appraisal Framework	11
2.5 The Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	11
2.6 Assessment Method	12
2.7 The Appraisal Meeting and Write-Up	13
2.8 Assessing the Significance of Effects	13
2.9 Consideration of Potential Mitigation Measures	13
2.10 Appraisal limitations and assumptions	13
2.11 Cumulative Effects	14
2.12 Compatibility of Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	14
2.13 Compatibility of Sustainability Appraisal Objectives with ANBC Local Development Plan Vision and Objectives.	14
3 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings	15
3.1 Issue 1: Hierarchy of Settlements	15
3.2 Issue 2: Potential for New Villages – Mallusk	16
3.3 Issue 3: Potential for New Hamlet Designation	17
3.4 Issue 4: Classification of Centres	18
3.5 Issue 5: New Centres – Mossley West	20
3.6 Issue 6A: New Local Centres - Mallusk	21
3.7 Issue 6B: New Village Centres	22
3.8 Issue 7: New Neighbourhood Centres	23
3.9 Issue 8: Strategic Employment Locations	24
3.10 Issue 9: Belfast International Airport	26
3.11 Issue 10: Rural Strategic Employment Location	28
3.12 Issue 11: Determining the Amount of Housing Growth	29

3.13	Issue 12: Housing Growth Allocation	30
3.14	Issue 13: Existing Housing Commitments	32
3.15	Issue 14: Retention of Existing Housing Commitments.....	33
3.16	Overall sustainability of the Preferred Options Paper	34
4	The Next Steps	35
4.1	How has the Sustainability Appraisal influenced the process so far?	35
4.2	Overall Assessment	35
4.3	Recommendation.....	35
4.4	How to comment	35
5	Appendix i: Compliance Checklist	36
6	Appendix ii: Habitats Regulations Assessment- Baseline Information.....	38
7	Appendix iii: Sustainability Appraisal Framework	44
8	Appendix iv: Compatibility of Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	50
9	Appendix v: Compatibility of Sustainability Appraisal and LDP Objectives	51
10	Appendix vi: Sustainability Appraisal Matrices	53

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this Sustainability Interim Report

This interim report is part of the Sustainability Appraisal process for the Antrim and Newtownabbey Local Development Plan. It documents the appraisal of options and alternatives against a sustainability framework consisting of fourteen objectives, which has helped the Council to determine their preferred options. This process identifies where there are significant effects of a preferred option and, where these are negative effects, identifies how these could be addressed. Finally, the report indicates how you can comment, and outlines the next steps in the process.

1.2 The Antrim and Newtownabbey Local Development Plan

Plan Area

The new LDP will apply to the entire Antrim and Newtownabbey Borough Council area which covers 728 square kilometres stretching from the shores of Lough Neagh in the west to the shores of Belfast Lough in the east. This is an area with an attractive and varied landscape centred on the South Antrim hills and the Six Mile Water valley which is also endowed with a rich historic and archaeological heritage.

Over 140,000 people live in the Borough with the majority of the population concentrated in the two main urban areas of Metropolitan Newtownabbey and Antrim and the towns of Ballyclare, Crumlin and Randalstown.

The Borough occupies an important strategic position within Northern Ireland with three major transport corridors traversing the area (the M2/A6, the A8 and the A26) as well as the rail lines to Derry/Londonderry and Larne.

We are home to Belfast International Airport, one of Northern Ireland's busiest gateways with over four million people arriving and departing every year.

Given its strategic advantages the Borough has been successful in attracting high profile businesses, such as Radox and Canyon Europe. The continued creation of jobs and prosperity for our residents is a key priority for the Council.

What is the Local Development Plan?

The Local Development Plan (LDP) is a spatial land use plan which primarily is about place. It will guide future development and use of land in our towns, villages and rural areas by addressing the spatial implications of social, economic and environmental change. The LDP will balance competing demands and aim to ensure that good development occurs in the right place and at the right time. It is therefore a powerful tool for place-shaping.

Under the new planning system introduced in 2015 the LDP will comprise of two documents, a Plan Strategy and a Local Policies Plan that will be prepared in sequence.

The Plan Strategy will set out our vision and objectives for the development of the Borough. It will include a range of strategic and Borough wide policies to facilitate and manage development and a Spatial Growth Strategy that will indicate in broad terms, the locations where different types of development will be facilitated. It will be subject to public consultation and an Independent Examination before it is adopted.

The Local Policies Plan will be prepared once the Plan Strategy is adopted. It will include site specific proposals and local policy designations required to deliver the vision, objectives and Spatial Growth Strategy set out in our Plan Strategy. It will also be subject to public consultation and an Independent Examination before it is adopted.

Importantly, once the Plan Strategy is adopted, it will replace the corresponding parts of the existing development plans for the Borough (the Antrim Area Plan and the Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan) and those regional operational planning policies that are currently retained by the Strategic Planning Policy Statement. The remaining relevant parts of the existing plans, such as land use zonings, designations and local policy, will then be replaced upon adoption of the Local Policies Plan.

The new planning system has introduced what is commonly referred to as the 'plan led' system. As a consequence our new LDP will be the primary consideration for decision making on all new development schemes and proposals will be required to accord with its provisions unless, exceptionally other material considerations indicate otherwise.

What is the Preferred Options Paper?

The Preferred Options Paper (POP) is a consultation document that considers key strategic planning issues arising in the plan area. For a number of the issues it sets out a range of possible options as well as the Council's preferred option or approach and the reasoning for this.

Options for the overall pattern of new development throughout the Borough up to 2030 are provided as well as options for the planned allocation and distribution of housing growth across our main settlements. Following the consultation these matters will then be taken forward in the preparation of our Plan Strategy and the Local Policies Plan.

The new planning system introduced the POP in order to front load community and stakeholder involvement in the plan process. As a Council, we decided to involve the public pre-publication, through a series of local engagement events, to establish the key matters which needed to be addressed.

Publication of the POP allows us to engage with you further now in this process. Public and stakeholder participation at the start of the plan making process is essential to identifying relevant issues and capturing your views from the outset. It allows for more meaningful participation and better informed plan preparation. We have already published our Statement of Community Involvement to set out how we intend to engage with everyone in the new planning process and we will continue this commitment to engage with you as we undertake ongoing preparation of our new LDP. The Preferred Options Paper was published on 18 January 2017.

1.3 Strategic Environmental Assessment

Strategic Environmental Assessment is a systematic process for assessing potential effects of proposed plans or programmes to ensure that significant environmental impacts are considered from the earliest opportunity and addressed in decision making. It was introduced by the European Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment. In Northern Ireland the Directive's requirements are taken forward through The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2004. The EAPP (NI) Regulations set out more detailed requirements for the process and content of the environmental assessment of plans and development. Appendix i records how these regulations are being complied with.

1.4 Integrated Sustainability Appraisal

The approach in this report is informed by Development Plan Practice Note 04: Sustainability Appraisal incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment¹. Sustainability Appraisal

¹ [Department of the Environment \(2015\) Development Plan Practice Note 04: Sustainability Appraisal incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment](#)

therefore refers to an integrated approach which fully incorporates Strategic Environmental Assessment (DOE, 2015) and fulfils the requirements for both Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment.

Section 25 of the Northern Ireland (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 2006 requires that all NI Departments and a council, in exercising their functions, act in the way they consider best calculated to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.

Section 5 of the Planning Act (Northern Ireland) 2011 (the 2011 Act) requires those who exercise any function in relation to local development plans to do so with the objective of furthering sustainable development.

In addition, Sections 8(6) and 9(7) of the 2011 Act requires an appraisal of sustainability to be carried out for the Plan Strategy and Local Policies Plan, respectively.

1.5 Habitats Regulations Assessment

Habitats Regulations Assessment is a provision of The Conservation (Natural Habitats, etc.) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 1995 (as amended). The regulations require assessment of possible adverse effects on the integrity of European sites (Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas) as a result of plans and policies in the Local Development Plan, this is also carried out for Ramsar sites. Baseline data for the Habitats Regulations Assessment which will be carried out for the plan is presented in Appendix ii. A draft Habitats Regulations Assessment will be published for consultation with the Draft Plan Strategy and Draft Local Policies Plan. A final Habitats Regulations Assessment will be published when each of these are adopted.

1.6 Rural Proofing

The Rural Needs Act (Northern Ireland) 2016, for which the proposed commencement date, as it applies to Government Departments and District Councils is 1 June 2017, states that 'A public authority must have due regard to rural needs when developing, adopting, implementing or revising policies, strategies and plans.' Public authorities must report annually on how they have implemented this requirement.

The approach to considering rural needs is called rural proofing and DAERA provides advice on carrying it out in Thinking Rural: The Essential Guide to Rural Proofing. Rural proofing is the process by which all major policies and strategies are assessed to determine whether they have a differential impact on rural areas and, where appropriate, adjustments are made to take account of particular rural circumstances.

The Scoping Report directly considers policy for rural populations and how the LDP could affect them in the Community topic. Where available, data on rural populations is also included under other topics, for example health, education and infrastructure. Key issues for the Borough include some specific to rural communities and the appraisal prompts include questions about how a proposal will meet the needs of rural populations or potentially have a disproportionate impact. Where measures that could either enhance positive or reduce negative effects have been identified these have been recorded.

As plan preparation progresses and more detail emerges about proposals, how they will be implemented and where they will be located, rural issues can be considered in more depth. A rural proofing checklist, reflecting the advice in Thinking Rural, will be included in the Sustainability Appraisal for Plan Strategy.

1.7 Interim Report Structure

The report continues with Chapter 3 which presents our approach to carrying out and documenting the sustainability appraisal of the Preferred Options Paper, including how we

assessed the significance of effects, and the limitations and difficulties that we encountered. Chapter 4 summarises the appraisal findings, and Chapter 5 outlines the next steps in the process. A number of appendices are referred to in the report and provide further detail.

2 Sustainability Appraisal: The Approach

2.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the overall approach taken to carry out sustainability appraisal for the Preferred Options Paper. The tools for this appraisal were developed in accordance with Development Plan Practice Note 04. Shared Environmental Service supported Antrim and Newtownabbey Borough Council in preparation of the sustainability appraisal.

2.2 Context

The following regional strategies are overarching and form a backdrop to the Local Development Plan. These were considered in preparation of the Sustainability Appraisal Framework.

Regional Development Strategy

The Regional Development Strategy (RDS) provides a strategic and long term perspective on the future development of Northern Ireland up to 2035 to deliver the spatial aspects of the Programme for Government.

Strategic Planning Policy Statement

The Strategic Planning Policy Statement (SPPS) - Planning for Sustainable Development provides an overarching statement of the general regional planning principles underlying the reformed plan led system. It provides a planning policy framework which must be taken into account in the preparation of Local Development Plans and the provisions are also material to all decisions on individual planning applications and appeals.

Sustainable Development Strategy

The Sustainable Development Strategy identifies 32 strategic objectives in the following Priority Areas.

- Building a dynamic, innovative economy that delivers the prosperity required to tackle disadvantage and lift communities out of poverty.
- Strengthening society so that it is more tolerant, inclusive and stable and permits positive progress in quality of life for everyone.
- Driving sustainable, long-term investment in key infrastructure to support economic and social development.
- Striking an appropriate balance between the responsible use and protection of natural resources in support of a better quality of life and a better quality environment.
- Ensuring reliable, affordable and sustainable energy provision and reducing our carbon footprint.
- Ensuring the existence of a policy environment which supports the overall advancement of sustainable development in and beyond Government.

Draft Programme for Government (PfG)

The draft PfG 2016-21 contains 14 Strategic Outcomes supported by 42 Indicators. The outcomes touch on every aspect of government, including the attainment of good health and education, economic success and confident and peaceful communities and are intended to meet statutory obligations and to make real improvements to the quality of life of citizens.

Community Planning

The new duty of Community Planning came into operation on 1st April 2015 and requires councils to act as the lead for community planning in their areas, in partnership with the community and service providers. This will result in a long term vision for the social, environmental and economic well-being of our area and its citizens. The Community Plan

also aims to promote community cohesion and improve the quality of life for all of our citizens. It will integrate service and function delivery and set out the future direction for development within the council area. The Local Development Plan will support delivery of the spatial aspects of our Community Plan.

2.3 Developing and Refining Policies and ‘Reasonable Alternatives’

The SEA Directive requires assessment of the likely significant effects of implementing the plan, and ‘reasonable alternatives’. Developing options and alternatives is an important part of both the plan-making and sustainability appraisal process. For the Preferred Options Paper the reasonable alternatives are the different options put forward during the preparation of the plan.

The sustainability appraisal objectives are developed from the themes identified in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, presented as Key Sustainability Issues. These themes have been considered from an early stage in the development of options to help ensure that any adverse effects of proposals were identified as early as possible.

For certain issues, such as bringing forward policies from Planning Policy Statements, firm proposals have not been brought forward at this stage. Instead opinion is invited on issues and factors that should be taken into account in new policies. The emerging policies will be subject to appropriate appraisal at a later stage.

2.4 The Sustainability Appraisal Framework

The Sustainability Appraisal Framework was developed with input from a number of stakeholders, and was presented in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report for comment. It consists of fourteen sustainability objectives with supporting criteria which have been used to assess the Preferred Options Paper.

The Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report allowed the Key Sustainability Issues for the Borough to be identified, and these helped to inform the appraisal prompts and to guide the appraisal. The Sustainability Appraisal Objectives are presented below, and the full Sustainability Appraisal Framework is presented in Appendix iii.

2.5 The Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

The objectives for sustainable development for are to...

- 1...improve health and well-being.
- 2...provide good quality, sustainable housing.
- 3...enable access to high quality education.
- 4...strengthen society.
- 5...enable sustainable economic growth.
- 6...encourage active and sustainable travel.
- 7...manage material assets sustainably.
- 8...protect physical resources and use sustainably.
- 9...protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.
- 10...protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.
- 11...improve air quality
- 12...reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.
- 13...conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.
- 14...maintain and enhance landscape character.

The rationale for and scope of each of these objectives is detailed in the Scoping Report and can also be found in Appendix iii.

2.6 Assessment Method

The options with their reasonable alternatives were assessed using the appraisal matrix shown in Table 2.1 and scoring in Table 2.2. The matrix includes:

- The plan topic and delivery options to be assessed.
- A score indicating the nature of the effect for each option in the short, medium and long term with an explanation of why the score was given.
- In the assessment matrices, measures to reduce negative effects and promote positive effects were recorded where they arose in discussion to capture ways in which each option could be made more sustainable. This includes measures for minor negative and positive effects.
- A summary and comparison of the options against the sustainability objectives, giving any mitigation recommended to address negative effects and measures where appropriate to enhance positive effects.

Table 2.1: Outline Sustainability Appraisal Matrix

Issue	Overview											
	Option 1:				Option 2:				Option 3:			
Sustainability Objective	ST	MT	LT	Explanation	ST	MT	LT	Explanation	ST	MT	LT	Explanation
1. Sustainability Objective												
2. Sustainability Objective												
3. Sustainability Objective												
4. Sustainability Objective												
Summary Summary and comparison of approaches against the sustainability objectives: The preferred approach: Measures to reduce negative effects and promote positive effects:												

Table 2.2: Scoring and definitions for Sustainability Appraisal Matrix

Score		Description
++	Significant Positive	Proposal would greatly help to achieve the objective
+	Minor Positive	Proposal would slightly help to achieve the objective
0	Neutral / no effect / effect that is not significant	Proposal would not significantly affect the objective
-	Minor Negative	Proposal would slightly conflict with the objective
--	Significant Negative	Proposal would greatly conflict with the objective
?	Uncertain	The effect cannot be predicted because <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the approach has an uncertain relationship to the objective; or • the relationship is dependent on the way in which the approach is implemented; • or insufficient information may be available to enable an appraisal to be made.
ST	Short Term	Up to five years
MT	Medium Term	Five to 15 years
LT	Long term	Over 15 years

2.7 The Appraisal Meeting and Write-Up

Appraisal of the options presented in the Preferred Options Paper was carried out on 24 November 2016. The appraisal panel comprised elected representatives, planning officers and staff from Shared Environmental Service. Appraisals were carried out using the agreed Sustainability Appraisal Framework, and scorings with explanations recorded in the appraisal matrices. For each issue all options were appraised in terms of how the option would either support or conflict with the sustainability objectives. Following this the matrices were written up, reviewed with planning officers and finalised to incorporate any amendments. A summary of the findings of the appraisal is presented in Chapter 3.

2.8 Assessing the Significance of Effects

The Sustainability Appraisal assessed the significant effects of options both positive and negative. There is no single definition of a significant effect therefore assessment was a matter of judgement taking account of the extent of the effect spatially and in time.

Sustainable development is an underlying principle of plan preparation therefore for the majority of issues the positive effects of all options already outweigh the negative effects and no options were put forward which were considered to have a significant negative effect for any sustainability objective. In appraising the options, some ways in which negative effects could be reduced or offset and positive effects could be enhanced were identified and these are presented where applicable.

2.9 Consideration of Potential Mitigation Measures

The SEA Directive requires consideration of 'measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme'. These are referred to as mitigation measures, and can include recommendations for improving beneficial effects. The findings in relation to significant negative effects are covered in Chapter 3 of this report.

2.10 Appraisal limitations and assumptions

The assessment reflects baseline information from the Local Development Plan evidence papers, information provided by consultees, and the experience and judgement of the panel carrying out the appraisal meeting. A 'precautionary approach' has been taken, especially with qualitative judgements.

There is uncertainty in some cases about how a given approach would be implemented due to insufficient detail about the proposal which is a consequence of this early and strategic stage. Where necessary 'uncertain' was recorded and a note made of further information that could inform future appraisal.

For some options the approach has an uncertain relationship with the sustainability objective or it could have both positive and negative effects. In these situations 'uncertain' was recorded and potential impacts noted in the explanation paragraph. Within scoring, sometimes the same score has been given for the effects of different options however more subtle differences may be described in the explanation.

During the appraisal of each option, where possible, significant effects were predicted. However it was found that, in some cases, the likely effect will depend upon the type of development and the exact location. Many of the proposals affect multiple locations and locations for which boundaries have not been defined which makes it hard to determine at this stage whether net effects are likely to be negative or positive.

Consideration has been given to the timescale in which an effect may be seen. In many cases it is hard to predict at this stage of plan development when an effect is likely to be apparent therefore the score is often the same for short, medium and long term. The sustainability appraisal at Plan Strategy and Local Policies Plan will take account of all additional and updated information available at that time.

2.11 Cumulative Effects

Consideration must be given to any cumulative effects of proposals during plan preparation. These include potential cumulative effects within the plan and in combination with other relevant plans and strategies. As more detail emerges of plan proposals cumulative effects will be considered.

2.12 Compatibility of Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

A comparison has been drawn between all of the sustainability objectives to identify any conflict between sustainability objectives and is presented in Appendix iv. No sustainability appraisal objectives were considered to be incompatible with the rest of the Sustainability Appraisal Framework.

2.13 Compatibility of Sustainability Appraisal Objectives with ANBC Local Development Plan Vision and Objectives.

A comparison has been drawn between the Sustainability Appraisal objectives and the Vision and Objectives for the Local Development Plan, to assess how they are aligned and is presented in Appendix v.

It identified that the Plan Vision is entirely compatible and the majority of the plan objectives are compatible with the sustainability appraisal objectives. Some plan objectives are considered to have a neutral or an uncertain relationship with the Sustainability Appraisal Objectives.

Three development plan objectives were identified to be incompatible with the following sustainability appraisal objective: Protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity. They were:

- To provide an adequate range and quality of land and premises for business and industry.
- To protect strategically important business and employment opportunities.
- To provide a sufficient supply of land for mainstream and affordable housing and ensure a diverse choice of housing.

The sustainability appraisal at the next stage will seek to ensure that delivery of these objectives is carried out in a sustainable manner and that potential conflict between objectives is addressed.

3 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

3.1 Issue 1: Hierarchy of Settlements

Overview

Our new Plan will need to define a settlement hierarchy for the Borough as the position of a particular settlement in this hierarchy will be an important factor that will inform our decisions about where new growth and development should take place.

What options have been considered?

The following policy options have been developed:

Option 1: Retain the existing hierarchy of settlements set out in the existing development plans (BMAP and the Antrim Area Plan)

Option 2: Reclassify our existing settlements within 5 tiers.

Option 3: Reclassify our existing settlements within 6 tiers

These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 14 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table.

ISSUE 1: Hierarchy of Settlements	1...improve health and well-being.	2...provide good quality, sustainable housing.	3...enable access to high quality education.	4...strengthen society.	5...enable sustainable economic growth.	6...encourage active and sustainable travel.	7...manage material assets sustainably.	8...protect physical resources and use sustainably.	9...protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	10...protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	11...improve air quality.	12...reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	13...conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	14...maintain and enhance landscape character.
OPTION 1: Retain the existing hierarchy of settlements set out in the existing development plans (BMAP and the Antrim Area Plan)	?	++	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	?	?	+	+
OPTION 2: Reclassify our existing settlements within 5 tiers.	?	++	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	?	?	+	+
OPTION 3: Reclassify our existing settlements within 6 tiers	?	++	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	?	?	+	+

Summary and comparison of options against the sustainability objectives

The pattern of scoring for all three options was similar across the sustainability objectives. At this stage of plan making, and given the strategic aspect of the topic, it is difficult to anticipate the overall effect of the alternative approaches without considering the specifics of sites. However, the appraisal found that identifying a local settlement hierarchy could have positive impacts for many areas within social, economic and environmental topics. It is also recognized that designating a hierarchy would have a strong benefit towards facilitating new housing growth, and possibly other areas such as strengthening society, helping with access to local education facilities and enabling economic growth.

Option 1 is based on the BMAP and Antrim area plan designations, which were not completed using the same criteria, and therefore are based on inconsistent approaches.

Therefore, for every objective, under option 1, the two legacy council areas that make up the Borough would not be treated in a consistent manner.

Option 2 provides an opportunity to approach classification of the Borough's settlements consistently.

Option 3 was considered the preferred option because it provides an opportunity to approach the Borough's hierarchy of settlements consistently.

What significant effects are envisaged?

No significant negative effects were identified.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

None identified as no significant negative effects were identified.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

All options scored the same for the sustainability appraisal objectives and it is not possible to determine a most favourable option.

3.2 Issue 2: Potential for New Villages – Mallusk

Overview

This proposal relates to that part of Mallusk that is located on land west of Hydepark Road and incorporating Tudor Park and Hydepark Manor, Newtownabbey. This neighbourhood, which is distinct from the larger Mallusk industrial area, lies at the edge of Metropolitan Newtownabbey and currently forms part of this area in BMAP. The residents of this area have expressed views that this area should be defined in the Plan as a village.

What options have been considered?

The following policy options have been developed:

Option 1: Retain Mallusk as part of Metropolitan Newtownabbey

Option 2: Reclassify Mallusk as a village

These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 14 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table.

ISSUE 2: Potential for New Villages - Mallusk	1...improve health and well-being.	2...provide good quality, sustainable housing.	3...enable access to high quality education.	4...strengthen society.	5...enable sustainable economic growth.	6...encourage active and sustainable travel.	7...manage material assets sustainably.	8...protect physical resources and use sustainably.	9...protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	10...protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	11...improve air quality.	12...reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	13...conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	14...maintain and enhance landscape character.
OPTION 1: Retain Mallusk as part of Metropolitan Newtownabbey	0	+	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
OPTION 2: Reclassify Mallusk as a village	0	+	+	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0

Summary and comparison of options against the sustainability objectives

This proposal relates to that part of Mallusk that is located on land west of Hydepark Road and incorporating Tudor Park and Hydepark Manor, Newtownabbey. This neighbourhood,

which is distinct from the larger Mallusk industrial area, lies at the edge of Metropolitan Newtownabbey and currently forms part of this area in BMAP. The residents of this area have expressed views that this area should be defined in the Plan as a village.

What significant effects are envisaged?

No significant negative effects were identified.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

None identified as no significant negative effects were identified.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

It was difficult to determine a link between the policy approach and a number of the sustainability appraisal objectives. Option 2 identified a significant benefit for strengthening society, and a number of other positive impacts and is considered the most favourable option in terms of sustainability.

3.3 Issue 3: Potential for New Hamlet Designation

Overview

Our review of our local settlement hierarchy has provided an opportunity to consider the potential for identification of a number of new hamlets within our Borough. The Antrim Area Plan (AAP) did set out criteria for the identification of hamlets and advised that these were small communities comprising several households and some service facilities e.g. sewerage capacity, shop, pub church etc. The more recent BMAP did not set out any such criteria therefore there is a mismatch in terms of the existing plans and clarity is needed. The Planning Appeals Commission (PAC) in its Report on the BMAP Strategic Plan Framework indicated that 'it would appear that in order to constitute a settlement there should be a concentration of buildings displaying an obvious sense of cohesion and place and offering one or more community facilities.

What options have been considered?

The following policy options have been developed:

Option 1: Use criteria for new hamlets based on guidance by the Antrim Area Plan.

Option 2: Use criteria for new hamlets based on the rationale used by the PAC

These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 14 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table.

ISSUE 3: Potential for New Hamlet Designation	1...improve health and well-being.	2...provide good quality, sustainable housing.	3...enable access to high quality education.	4...strengthen society.	5...enable sustainable economic growth.	6...encourage active and sustainable travel.	7...manage material assets sustainably.	8...protect physical resources and use sustainably.	9...protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	10...protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	11...improve air quality.	12...reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	13...conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	14...maintain and enhance landscape character.
OPTION 1: Use criteria for new hamlets based on guidance by the Antrim Area Plan.	-	-	?	-	?	?	?	?	?	+	?	?	?	?
OPTION 2: Use criteria for new hamlets based on the rationale used by the PAC	+	+	?	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?

Summary and comparison of options against the sustainability objectives

This appraisal gave mixed results across the Sustainability objectives. Option 1, which could result in a decrease in the number of hamlets, scored negatively for improving health and wellbeing, strengthening society and providing good quality and sustainable housing. However, it did score positively for protecting, managing and using water resources sustainably. The latter reflects the fact that this option would mean that sewerage capacity would be a factor in determining the status of a settlement.

Option 2 scored positively for improving health and wellbeing, strengthening society and providing good quality and sustainable housing. The appraisal identified that there could be greater risks to water quality. It also identified that there could be potential impacts from car use associated with rural dwelling, however, it was not possible to determine these effects at this stage of plan making without considering location, and mitigating policy.

What significant effects are envisaged?

No significant negative effects were identified.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

None identified as no significant negative effects were identified.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

Option 2 would have positive effects for the sustainability objectives for health and wellbeing, providing sustainable housing and strengthening society and is considered the most favourable in terms of sustainability.

3.4 Issue 4: Classification of Centres

Overview

This set of options allows us to look at how our centres sit within the proposed new-tiered classification and consider options for the new LDP. Our options are based upon our local settlement hierarchy and define four tiers of centres.

What options have been considered?

The following policy options have been developed:

Option 1: Retain and reclassify our current centres based upon our new classifications with Glengormley and Northcott identified as one District Centre

Option 2: Retain and reclassify our current centres based upon our new classifications with Glengormley and Northcott as separate centres

These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 14 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table.

ISSUE 4: Classification of Centres	1...improve health and well-being.	2...provide good quality, sustainable housing.	3...enable access to high quality education.	4...strengthen society.	5...enable sustainable economic growth.	6...encourage active and sustainable travel.	7...manage material assets sustainably.	8...protect physical resources and use sustainably.	9...protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	10...protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	11...improve air quality.	12...reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	13...conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	14...maintain and enhance landscape character.
OPTION 1: Retain and reclassify our current centres based upon our new classifications with Glengormley and Northcott identified as one District Centre	+	0	0	?	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+
OPTION 2: Retain and reclassify our current centres based upon our new classifications with Glengormley and Northcott as separate centres	+	0	0	+	+	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+

Summary and comparison of options against the sustainability objectives

The two options scored similarly across many of the sustainability appraisal objectives although for many options there is too little information about how the proposal would be implemented to score the options at this stage. Both options scored positively for improving health and well-being, enabling economic growth and conserving and enhancing both built heritage and landscape. Maintaining separate centres is slightly stronger for health and well-being and notably stronger for strengthening society. It was considered that a combined District Centre for Northcott and Glengormley would dilute the focus of economic growth and could reduce the vitality of Glengormley.

What significant effects are envisaged?

No significant negative effects were identified.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

None identified as no significant negative effects were identified.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

Both options recorded positive effects for improving health and well-being, enabling sustainable economic growth, conserving and enhancing built heritage, and maintaining landscape character. However option 2 also received a positive scoring for strengthening society as it would protect the vitality of each individual centre, which has an impact on local people who benefit from accessible meeting places. Option 2 is therefore considered the most favourable option in terms of sustainability.

3.5 Issue 5: New Centres – Mossley West

Overview

Following our classification of centres, our new LDP will provide the opportunity for new centres to be identified. We believe that the area around Mossley West rail station on the outskirts of Metropolitan Newtownabbey presents significant development potential. Option 1 is a status quo approach.

What options have been considered?

The following policy options have been developed:

Option 1: Do not consider the designation of Mossley West as a District Centre.

Option 2: Consider the designation of Mossley West as a District Centre.

These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 14 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table.

ISSUE 5: New Centres – Mossley West	1...improve health and well-being.	2...provide good quality, sustainable housing.	3...enable access to high quality education.	4...strengthen society.	5...enable sustainable economic growth.	6...encourage active and sustainable travel.	7...manage material assets sustainably.	8...protect physical resources and use sustainably.	9...protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	10...protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	11...improve air quality.	12...reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	13...conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	14...maintain and enhance landscape character.
OPTION 1: Do not consider the designation of Mossley West as a District Centre.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0
OPTION 2: Consider the designation of Mossley West as a District Centre.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	+	+

Summary and comparison of options against the sustainability objectives

Option 1 would maintain the status quo of the area and would not take the opportunity to make use of the transport links, and potential for economic growth and increased employment. There could be a slight negative effect for natural resources and biodiversity due to the less strategic approach but overall it is neutral in relation to the sustainability objectives.

Option 2 overall many more positive outcomes and would give a positive scoring for many of the sustainability objectives due to the opportunity to provide more active travel, improved accessibility, incorporation of green space and enhancement of built heritage. 'Active Travel' means using walking and cycling as an alternative to motorised transport for the purpose of making every day journeys.

There some uncertainty with option 2 against some of the sustainability objectives such as improving air quality and reducing greenhouse gas emissions however, if public transport infrastructure were to improve, there could be an increase in public transport use, which would benefit air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

What significant effects are envisaged?

No significant negative effects were identified.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

None identified as no significant negative effects were identified.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

Option 2 was considered the most favourable option in terms of sustainability, as it gained a positive scoring for 12 of the 14 sustainability appraisal objectives.

3.6 Issue 6A: New Local Centres - Mallusk

Overview

There are a range of shops and facilities clustered in the centre of the wider Mallusk Industrial and commercial area that service the needs of surrounding workers. This area is zoned as part of Metropolitan Newtownabbey in the current BMAP Plan. There exists an opportunity to consolidate a mix of uses at the heart of this existing employment area.

What options have been considered?

The following policy options have been developed:

Option 1: Do not consider the designation of a local centre at Mallusk.

Option 2: Consider the designation of a local centre at Mallusk.

These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 14 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table.

ISSUE 6A: New Local Centres - Mallusk	1...improve health and well-being.	2...provide good quality, sustainable housing.	3...enable access to high quality education.	4...strengthen society.	5...enable sustainable economic growth.	6...encourage active and sustainable travel.	7...manage material assets sustainably.	8...protect physical resources and use sustainably.	9...protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	10...protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	11...improve air quality.	12...reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	13...conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	14...maintain and enhance landscape character.
OPTION 1: Do not consider the designation of a local centre at Mallusk.	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OPTION 2: Consider the designation of a local centre at Mallusk.	?	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	?	?	0	0

Summary and comparison of options against the sustainability objectives

It is difficult to identify clear benefits of both options under many of the sustainability objectives. However, the appraisal did recognise some benefits of designating Mallusk as a Local Centre, under Option 2. These are encouraging sustainable economic growth, through encouraging a place for relevant businesses to cluster, and helping make Mallusk a more attractive place to work. Option 2 could also lead to less extra car journeys for those working in Mallusk through the convenience of having relevant services available near their place of work.

What significant effects are envisaged?

No significant negative effects were identified.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

None identified as no significant negative effects were identified.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

Both options received similar scorings across many of the sustainability appraisal objectives, however option 2 gained a positive scoring for the sustainability objectives for enabling sustainable economic growth, encouraging active and sustainable travel and managing material assets sustainably. It is considered the most favourable option in terms of sustainability.

3.7 Issue 6B: New Village Centres

Overview

Our initial evidence suggests that there are several places in our Borough not currently designated as centres in the existing development plans that may benefit from designation. This would entail consideration of the villages identified in our local settlement hierarchy to assess if a readily identifiable centre exists that would benefit from local planning policy to protect their commercial function and the current mix of uses as well as considering the need for potential expansion. There are currently no defined centres identified within our villages which are listed below:

Ballynure, Ballyrobert, Burnside (Cogry, Kilbride), Doagh, Dunadry, Parkgate, Straid, Templepatrick, Toome, (option for Mallusk)

What options have been considered?

The following policy options have been developed:

Option 1: Not to designate new village centres

Option 2: To designate new village centres

These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 14 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table.

ISSUE 6B: New Village Centres	1...improve health and well-being.	2...provide good quality, sustainable housing.	3...enable access to high quality education.	4...strengthen society.	5...enable sustainable economic growth.	6...encourage active and sustainable travel.	7...manage material assets sustainably.	8...protect physical resources and use sustainably.	9...protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	10...protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	11...improve air quality.	12...reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	13...conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	14...maintain and enhance landscape character.
OPTION 1: Not to designate new village centres	-	?	0	-	?	?	0	0	?	?	?	?	0	0
OPTION 2: To designate new village centres	++	+	0	++	+	++	+	0	?	?	+	+	+	+

Summary and comparison of options against the sustainability objectives

Option 1 is a status quo approach, and will allow a continuation of the baseline conditions which, long term, could mean a loss of services and a lack of community cohesion in those settlements. For many objectives there is not enough information about the disparate locations and potential effects on the object and the score is therefore uncertain.

Option 2 has the potential to bring benefits for health and well-being and providing good quality sustainable housing through consolidating and sustaining the population in those villages with particular benefits for rural dwellers. Option 2 could also contribute to

strengthening society through helping support the services and places meeting places for all social contact, including intergenerational aspects that encourage family cohesion. Option 2 also could enable sustainable economic growth, and encourage the use of active and sustainable travel, which could bring benefits for local air quality, and help reduce climate change emissions. Option 2 could also potentially limit growth of villages, and this could have positive impacts by reducing loss of agricultural land, habitat, biodiversity and landscape.

What significant effects are envisaged?

No significant negative effects were identified.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

None identified as no significant negative effects were identified.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

Option 2 is the most favourable option in terms of sustainability, it received significant positive scorings for the sustainability objectives for health and well-being, strengthening society and encouraging active and sustainable travel. In addition it recorded a positive scoring for 7 other sustainability appraisal objectives.

3.8 Issue 7: New Neighbourhood Centres

Overview

New Centres could also include neighbourhood centres. No neighbourhood centres were identified in BMAP for Metropolitan Newtownabbey and again initial evidence suggests that there are several places in the Metropolitan area that may benefit from such designation. Three such centres were identified in the Antrim Area Plan at the Greystone, Parkhall and Ballycraigy Estates.

What options have been considered?

The following policy options have been developed:

Option 1: Remove neighbourhood centres from the local hierarchy of centres.

Option 2: Retain the existing neighbourhood centres and identify new ones drawn from the Top 2 tiers of our settlement hierarchy.

These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 14 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table.

ISSUE 7: New Neighbourhood Centres	1...improve health and well-being.	2...provide good quality, sustainable housing.	3...enable access to high quality education.	4...strengthen society.	5...enable sustainable economic growth.	6...encourage active and sustainable travel.	7...manage material assets sustainably.	8...protect physical resources and use sustainably.	9...protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	10...protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	11...improve air quality.	12...reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	13...conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	14...maintain and enhance landscape character.
OPTION 1: Remove neighbourhood centres from the local hierarchy of centres.	?	0	0	?	?	?	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	?
OPTION 2: Retain the existing neighbourhood centres and identify new ones drawn from the Top 2 tiers of our settlement hierarchy.	+	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	?	?

Summary and comparison of options against the sustainability objectives

Option 1 long term, could mean a loss of services and a lack of community cohesion in those settlements however this would depend on any policies relating to this type of development therefore the effect of removing and not designating neighbourhood centres is hard to ascertain.

Option 2 has the potential to bring benefits for health and well-being and could also contribute to strengthening society through helping support the services and places meeting places for all social contact, including intergenerational aspects that encourage family cohesion. Option 2 also could enable sustainable economic growth, and encourage the use of active and sustainable travel, which could bring benefits for local air quality, and help reduce climate change emissions. The appraisal identifies more potential positive effects for option 2.

What significant effects are envisaged?

No significant negative effects were identified.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

None identified as no significant negative effects were identified.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

Option 2 is the most favourable option in terms of sustainability, it received positive scorings for the sustainability objectives for health and well-being, strengthening society, encouraging active and sustainable travel, improving air quality and reducing the causes of and adapting to climate change.

3.9 Issue 8: Strategic Employment Locations

Overview

To facilitate future employment growth, it is considered that the new LDP should ensure that there is a ready supply of economic land for strategic business use and industry.

What options have been considered?

The following policy options have been developed:

Option 1: Maintain status quo and do not identify Strategic Employment Locations (SEL).

Sub-Option 2a: Identify existing employment sites of over 10 hectares in the Borough's largest settlements (Metropolitan Newtownabbey, Antrim and Ballyclare) as SELs.

Sub-Option 2b: Identify existing sites as in Option 2a and consider designation of new SELs in Antrim, Ballyclare, Crumlin and Randalstown with the specific sites to be brought forward in Local Policies Plan.

These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 14 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table.

ISSUE 8: Strategic Employment Locations	1...improve health and well-being.	2...provide good quality, sustainable housing.	3...enable access to high quality education.	4...strengthen society.	5...enable sustainable economic growth.	6...encourage active and sustainable travel.	7...manage material assets sustainably.	8...protect physical resources and use sustainably.	9...protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	10...protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	11...improve air quality.	12...reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	13...conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	14...maintain and enhance landscape character.
OPTION 1: Maintain status quo and do not identify Strategic Employment Locations (SEL).	0	0	0	0	+	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SUB-OPTION 2a: Identify existing employment sites of over 10 hectares in the Borough's largest settlements (Metropolitan Newtownabbey, Antrim and Ballyclare) as SELs.	?	0	0	0	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	?
SUB-OPTION 2b: Identify existing sites as in Option 2a and consider designation of new SELs in Antrim, Ballyclare, Crumlin and Randalstown with the specific sites to be brought forward in Local Policies Plan.	+	0	?	?	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?

Summary and comparison of options against the sustainability objectives

Option 1 is a status quo option, which does not use the principles of 'strategic' locations, but rather continues with all employment land being brought forward on an equal footing, as described in the Regional Development Strategy and in line with a set of qualitative site criteria. However, this could open up greater uncertainty at Local Policies Plan stage, because the idea of using Strategic Employment Locations, and the possible locations had not been established in the Plan Strategy, as a result of the POP. It may also not ensure that there is an adequate supply of employment land available within appropriate locations in our Borough.

Option 2 establishes that employment land should be identified at sites over 10 hectares at our largest settlements. It is then broken down into 2 a (identifying existing sites only) or 2 b (identify existing sites but consider new ones at key strategic locations)

Option 2a and 2b are similar, in that both establish the principle of Strategic Employment Locations. Option 2a retains those which are currently 'major sites' in Antrim and

Metropolitan Newtownabbey, although in practice this will really only mean potential new locations in the latter, as those in Antrim are nearly fully developed. Option 2b retains all the same sites as 2a, but also indicates the need for new SELs in Antrim, Ballyclare, Crumlin and Randalstown. Option 2a and 2b scores positively for enabling economic growth and many potential positives were identified in terms of encouraging active travel, the use of material and physical assets. This is because consolidating new growth in strategic locations provides opportunities to use resources efficiently, and to provide infrastructure and connectivity in a sustainable way. By enabling the designation of new SELs through option 2b, economic benefits would be extended more widely through the Borough and there may be associated benefits through more local and accessible employment and sustaining communities. At this stage of plan preparation it is not possible to record a positive scoring under many of the sustainability objectives, however these may emerge at a later stage.

What significant effects are envisaged?

No significant negative effects were identified.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

None identified as no significant negative effects were identified.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

It was difficult to determine impacts on many of the sustainability appraisal objectives however sub-option 2b identified two positive scorings for improving health and well-being and enabling sustainable economic growth.

3.10 Issue 9: Belfast International Airport

Overview

Belfast International Airport is defined by the Regional Development Strategy (RDS) as a regional gateway. As such, it is a strategic element in our new LDP. The RDS advises that gateways are strategically important transport interchanges. Our new LDP will have a key role to play in facilitating the development of Belfast International Airport. The SPPS states that LDPs should zone land for known requirements for future expansion of airports where appropriate and that development proposals adjacent to such facilities which would seriously jeopardize their future expansion should not be permitted. This will include land required for any improvements or infrastructure required in relation to any transport improvements. Belfast International Airport is a major employer within our Borough, our Plan will seek to facilitate the further growth and development of the Airport.

What options have been considered?

The following policy options have been developed:

Option 1: Facilitating growth by zoning – this option will involve the identification of land to meet the future needs of the airport and would occur at the second stage of our plan, the Local Policies Plan.

Option 2: Facilitate growth through planning policy – this option would allow proposals to be assessed in relation to policy set out in our new plan and would apply at the first stage of our plan, the Plan Strategy Stage.

Option 3: Consider a Strategic Employment Location at Belfast International airport – this option would allow for the development of a range of suitable uses that would complement the operations of the airport.

Option 4: A combination of Options 2 and 3.

These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 14 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table.

ISSUE 9: Belfast International Airport	1...improve health and well-being.	2...provide good quality, sustainable housing.	3...enable access to high quality education.	4...strengthen society.	5...enable sustainable economic growth.	6...encourage active and sustainable travel.	7...manage material assets sustainably.	8...protect physical resources and use sustainably.	9...protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	10...protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	11...improve air quality.	12...reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	13...conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	14...maintain and enhance landscape character.
OPTION 1: Facilitating growth by zoning – this option will involve the identification of land to meet the future needs of the airport and would occur at the second stage of our plan, the Local Policies Plan.	0	0	0	0	+	?	?	-	-	?	-	-	0	-
OPTION 2: Facilitate growth through planning policy – this option would allow proposals to be assessed in relation to policy set out in our new plan and would apply at the first stage of our plan, the Plan Strategy Stage.	0	0	0	0	+	-	?	-	-	?	-	-	0	-
OPTION 3: Consider a Strategic Employment Location at Belfast International airport – this option would allow for the development of a range of suitable uses that would complement the operations of the airport.	0	0	0	0	+	?	?	-	-	?	-	-	0	-
OPTION 4: A combination of Options 2 and 3.	0	0	0	0	+	?	?	-	-	?	-	-	0	-

Summary and comparison of options against the sustainability objectives

All four options scored in a similar way across the sustainability objectives, where encouraging growth for this area will have a positive impact on enhancing the local economy, with the same potential downsides in terms of loss of agricultural land, and biodiversity. All options have potential negative effects on local air quality and could increase greenhouse gas emissions. Development at this location potentially create opportunities for improved public transport, such as a rail service however it is not certain that this will occur. It was acknowledged that any form of increased development (including developments in air passenger numbers) could also increase passenger numbers and freight traffic, which could have negative effects on the air quality and climate change objectives.

Option 1 will involve the identification of land to meet the future needs of the airport however it could potentially hinder the development needs of the airport as land will not be brought forward for zoning until the Local Policies Plan stage of the LDP. Option 2 would allow the airport to continue to be supported until such times as land is zoned at the Local Policies stage. Option 3 could widen the potential scope of uses permitted at the airport beyond the airport

related uses indicated in the current Antrim Area Plan. However, the exact boundary of the new SEL will not be determined until the Local Policies Stage including the policy that would apply to the zoning. Using a Strategic Employment Location was seen as a more targeted form of zoning and in Option 4 flexibility improves as it will create policy alongside the SEL designation.

What significant effects are envisaged?

No significant negative effects were identified.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

None identified as no significant negative effects were identified.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

Options 1, 3 and 4 scored the same for the sustainability appraisal objectives and it is not possible to determine a most favourable option.

3.11 Issue 10: Rural Strategic Employment Location

Overview

Rural SEL - Nutts Corner – Consider as SEL or not

What options have been considered?

The following policy options have been developed:

Option 1: Retain Nutts Corner within the countryside.

Option 2: Consider a Rural Strategic Employment Location at Nutts Corner.

These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 14 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table.

ISSUE 10: Rural Strategic Employment Location	1...improve health and well-being.	2...provide good quality, sustainable housing.	3...enable access to high quality education.	4...strengthen society.	5...enable sustainable economic growth.	6...encourage active and sustainable travel.	7...manage material assets sustainably.	8...protect physical resources and use sustainably.	9...protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	10...protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	11...improve air quality.	12...reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	13...conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	14...maintain and enhance landscape character.
OPTION 1: Retain Nutts Corner within the countryside.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OPTION 2: Consider a Rural Strategic Employment Location at Nutts Corner.	0	0	0	?	+	?	?	0	0	0	?	?	?	?

Summary and comparison of options against the sustainability objectives

Option 1 would not promote economic development at this location and is neutral or has a negligible effect for all the sustainability appraisals. Option 2 scored positively for enabling economic growth as further investment could be attracted if the area is zoned as a rural SEL, this may have a particular benefit for rural communities in this area. While the position of Nutts Corner on key transport links means that good road access is in place it is uncertain whether a SEL could generate a critical mass to bring about investment in public transport infrastructure which would make it sustainable in terms of public transport. It was also

recognised that the proposal for an SEL nearby at Belfast International Airport site needs to be assessed to determine whether a rural SEL would complement or conflict with it.

This proposal will be subject to completion of the RDS Employment Land Evaluation Framework and a transport assessment to take account of any Local Transport Study and this will help address some of the uncertainties in the current appraisal.

What significant effects are envisaged?

No significant negative effects were identified.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

None identified as no significant negative effects were identified.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

It was difficult to determine impacts on many of the sustainability appraisal objectives for this set of options, however option 2 gained a positive scoring for enabling economic growth and is considered the most favourable option in terms of sustainability.

3.12 Issue 11: Determining the Amount of Housing Growth

Overview

Planning for future housing growth across the Borough is one of the core functions of the Local Development Plan. There are two key stages in the process of planning for this growth. The first is to decide the total number of new dwellings that have to be accommodated through the Plan.

Based on the factors outlined in the Preferred Options Paper, four options are proposed in relation to the amount of housing growth that the new Plan should seek to accommodate in our Borough.

What options have been considered?

The following policy options have been developed:

Option 1: 11,080 dwellings (average 554 per annum)

Option 2: 8,020 dwellings (average 401 per annum)

Option 3: 14,960 dwellings (average 748 per annum)

Option 4: 13,000 dwellings (average 650 per annum)

These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 14 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table.

ISSUE 11: Determining the Amount of Housing Growth	1...improve health and well-being.	2...provide good quality, sustainable housing.	3...enable access to high quality education.	4...strengthen society.	5...enable sustainable economic growth.	6...encourage active and sustainable travel.	7...manage material assets sustainably.	8...protect physical resources and use sustainably.	9...protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	10...protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	11...improve air quality.	12...reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	13...conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	14...maintain and enhance landscape character.
OPTION 1: 11,080 dwellings (average 554 per annum)	?	+	?	+	+	?	?	?	-	-	-	-	?	?
OPTION 2: 8,020 dwellings (average 401 per annum)	?	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	-	-	?	?
OPTION 3: 14,960 dwellings (average 748 per annum)	?	+	?	+	+	?	?	?	-	-	-	-	?	?
OPTION 4: 13,000 dwellings (average 650 per annum)	?	+	?	+	+	?	?	?	-	-	-	-	?	?

Summary and comparison of options against the sustainability objectives

Each of the options presented a number of new dwellings determined from evidence and forecasting as set out in the Preferred Options Paper. It is hard to score the effect on many objectives as there is a lot of uncertainty about where sites would be taken up in each scenario and therefore effects cannot be predicted. A higher number of dwellings was in general favoured so that the demand would be more confidently met but there was some debate on this as all growth allocations are estimates. Over provision could lead to inefficiencies in providing infrastructure, less predictability about where growth will occur and services required and partially completed developments create a less attractive living environment.

Options 1 and 2 did not score positively for meeting the range of housing needs required by the Plan.

Option 3 scored positively for ensuring that a range of housing needs can be met, although the score awarded is the same it is a poorer option for other aspects including potential risk to landscape and biodiversity.

Option 4 was considered to be the most reasonable option in terms of numbers. It allows a range of housing needs to be met, but reduces the risks associated with over provision of housing capacity.

What significant effects are envisaged?

No significant negative effects were identified.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

None identified as no significant negative effects were identified.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

Options 1, 3 and 4 scored the same for the sustainability appraisal objectives and it is not possible to determine a most favourable option.

3.13 Issue 12: Housing Growth Allocation

Overview

Preliminary Housing Growth Allocation Options. The key principles used to shape the formulation of the options for housing growth allocation. Each of the options is based upon

the preferred option for growth across the Borough of 13,000 dwellings. This equates to approximately 23% growth in the total number of homes in the Borough (above the number of dwellings recorded in the 2011 Census. The options primarily consider the level of growth appropriate to each of the Local Towns and Villages.

What options have been considered?

The following policy options have been developed:

Option 1: Grow local towns and selected villages.

Option 2: Growth focused on local towns.

Option 3: Grow local towns and all villages.

Option 4: Growth based on existing land supply.

These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 14 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table.

ISSUE 12: Housing Growth Allocation	1...improve health and well-being.	2...provide good quality, sustainable housing.	3...enable access to high quality education.	4...strengthen society.	5...enable sustainable economic growth.	6...encourage active and sustainable travel.	7...manage material assets sustainably.	8...protect physical resources and use sustainably.	9...protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	10...protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	11...improve air quality.	12...reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	13...conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	14...maintain and enhance landscape character.
OPTION 1: Grow local towns and selected villages.	?	+	?	+	?	+	?	?	?	-	+	+	?	?
OPTION 2: Growth focused on local towns.	?	+	?	+	?	?	?	?	?	-	?	?	?	?
OPTION 3: Grow local towns and all villages.	?	+	?	+	?	?	?	?	?	-	?	?	?	?
OPTION 4: Growth based on existing land supply.	?	-	?	-	?	?	?	?	?	-	?	?	?	?

Summary and comparison of options against the sustainability objectives

It is hard to score the effect on many objectives as there is a lot of uncertainty about where sites would be taken up in each scenario and therefore effects cannot be predicted.

Options 1-3 which deliver a growth in housing give a positive scoring for providing good quality, sustainable housing, and strengthening society with 3 favouring rural communities particularly. These benefits were not determined for option 4, as growth would not be able to reflect local needs.

Option 1 was however more positive for encouraging sustainable travel, improving air quality and reducing the causes of climate change. All options had a minor negative scoring for protecting, managing and using water resources sustainably should be dealt with in mitigation.

What significant effects are envisaged?

No significant negative effects were identified.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

None identified as no significant negative effects were identified.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

Option 1 identified positive effects providing sustainable housing, strengthening society, encouraging active and sustainable travel, improving air quality and reducing the causes of and adapting to climate change and is considered the most favourable in terms of sustainability.

3.14 Issue 13: Existing Housing Commitments

Overview

BMAP includes two housing zonings on the lower slopes of Carnmoney Hill, but their development is conditional on a previously agreed transfer of a significant area of remaining agricultural/open land comprising the upper slopes of Carnmoney Hill to the legacy Newtownabbey Borough Council thereby creating the potential for the development of a Country Park in conjunction with land already in the ownership of the Council.

What options have been considered?

The following policy options have been developed:

Option 1: De-zone the current BMAP housing zonings MNY 04/27 and MNY 04/29 and protect all remaining open land at Carnmoney Hill from alternative development, but with the land remaining in private ownership.

Option 2: Retain the current BMAP housing zonings MNY 04/27 and MNY 04/29 conditional on the previously agreed transfer of a significant area of remaining open land at Carnmoney Hill to Council ownership.

These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 14 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table.

ISSUE 13: Existing Housing Commitments	1...improve health and well-being.	2...provide good quality, sustainable housing.	3...enable access to high quality education.	4...strengthen society.	5...enable sustainable economic growth.	6...encourage active and sustainable travel.	7...manage material assets sustainably.	8...protect physical resources and use sustainably.	9...protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	10...protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	11...improve air quality.	12...reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	13...conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	14...maintain and enhance landscape character.
OPTION 1: De-zone the current BMAP housing zonings MNY 04/27 and MNY 04/29 and protect all remaining open land at Carnmoney Hill from alternative development, but with the land remaining in private ownership.	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+
OPTION 2: Retain the current BMAP housing zonings MNY 04/27 and MNY 04/29 conditional on the previously agreed transfer of a significant area of remaining open land at Carnmoney Hill to Council ownership.	+	+	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	?	?	?	+	++

Summary and comparison of options against the sustainability objectives

Option 1 will reduce housing in the area however the impacts will be negligible for most objectives with slight positive effects for landscape. Option 2 for both housing and potential use as a Country Park was recognized as having potentially positive effects for many of the sustainability objectives. The appraisal identified that it would bring some uncertainties but many benefits for health and well-being, sustainable housing, sustainable travel, landscape character and several other objectives. It may score higher against some of the objectives (natural resources and biodiversity) but this could not be confirmed without proposals that are more detailed.

What significant effects are envisaged?

No significant negative effects were identified.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

None identified as no significant negative effects were identified.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

Option 2 gave a positive scoring for the majority of the sustainability appraisal objectives and recorded a significant positive scoring for maintaining and enhancing landscape character.

3.15 Issue 14: Retention of Existing Housing Commitments

Overview

It is proposed that there should be no de-zoning of housing land unless it can be demonstrated that there is no reasonable prospect of a specific site being delivered.

What options have been considered?

The following policy options have been developed:

Option 1: De-zone unimplemented housing land.

Option 2: Unimplemented housing zonings in BMAP and the Antrim Area Plan carried forward into the new Plan.

These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 14 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table.

ISSUE 14: Retention of Existing Housing Commitments	1...improve health and well-being.	2...provide good quality, sustainable housing.	3...enable access to high quality education.	4...strengthen society.	5...enable sustainable economic growth.	6...encourage active and sustainable travel.	7...manage material assets sustainably.	8...protect physical resources and use sustainably.	9...protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	10...protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	11...improve air quality.	12...reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	13...conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	14...maintain and enhance landscape character.
OPTION 1: De-zone unimplemented housing land.	0	-	?	-	?	?	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
OPTION 2: Unimplemented housing zonings in BMAP and the Antrim Area Plan carried forward into the new Plan.	0	+	?	?	?	?	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	?

Summary and comparison of options against the sustainability objectives

In the Sustainability Appraisal, both options are very similar in their appraisal outcomes. It is hard to score for many objectives as the effects positive and negative are likely to vary from location to location. Option 1 is likely to have a minor negative effect for housing and strengthening society whereas Option 2 would be better for providing good quality, sustainable housing.

What significant effects are envisaged?

No significant negative effects were identified.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

None identified as no significant negative effects were identified.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

Many of the sustainability appraisal objectives recorded an uncertain scoring, however, option 2 gave a positive scoring for providing good quality sustainable housing and is considered the most favourable option in terms of sustainability.

3.16 Overall sustainability of the Preferred Options Paper

This Sustainability Appraisal Interim Report has investigated the likely significant effects of policy options and alternatives presented in the Preferred Options Paper. It has found that significant positive effects are likely in some areas, but that no option is likely to create a significant negative impact. Many options were determined to bring about and both positive and negative effects in relation to the sustainability appraisal objectives.

4 The Next Steps

4.1 How has the Sustainability Appraisal influenced the process so far?

This is an Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report and the appraisal process will take account of the representations made during this public consultation. Sustainability appraisal will continue throughout plan preparation with a draft sustainability report being published with the draft Plan Strategy.

4.2 Overall Assessment

The assessment indicates that the preferred options could deliver positive effects, as well as some negative effects in relation to the sustainability appraisal objectives and criteria. There are also many uncertainties about the effects at this stage. In developing the Plan Strategy more detailed proposals will enable better informed sustainability appraisal.

4.3 Recommendation

In developing the Plan Strategy ensure that no significant effects for the sustainability objectives are likely or that where they are unavoidable they can be mitigated. Seek to ensure that where appropriate positive effects are enhanced.

4.4 How to comment

Details of how to comment on this appraisal can be found in the Preferred Options Paper.

5 Appendix i: Compliance Checklist

Schedule 2 of the The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2004 lists the following information required for environmental reports, according to Regulation 11 (3), (4). The location in this report or the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report is identified.

Requirement	Location in this report
1. An outline of the contents and main objectives of the plan or programme, and of its relationship with other relevant plans and programmes.	A summary of the contents of the draft Preferred Option Paper, including the plan vision and objectives is presented in the SA Scoping Report Chapter 4. Appendix 1 of the SA Scoping Report outlines the relationship with other plans, programmes and policies.
2. The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme.	SA Scoping Report Chapter 6
3. The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected.	SA Scoping Report Chapter 6 and summarised in section 6.16 of that chapter.
4. Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Council Directive 79/409/EEC on the conservation of wild birds(9) and the Habitats Directive.	A Habitats Regulations Assessment screening has been carried out and is presented in Chapter 1 of this report and Appendix ii.
5. The environmental protection objectives, established at international, Community or Member State level, which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation.	SA Scoping Report Chapter 6 and Appendix 1
6. The likely significant effects on the environment, including short, medium and long-term effects, permanent and temporary effects, positive and negative effects, and secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects, on issues such as – (i) biodiversity; (ii) population; (iii) human health; (iv) fauna;	These issues are all covered in the 14 sustainability objectives against which all of the policy approaches have been assessed in this report. Interrelationships have been covered in section 2.12 of this report.

Requirement	Location in this report
(v) flora; (vi) soil; (vii) water; (viii) air; (ix) climatic factors; (x) material assets; (xi) cultural heritage, including architectural and archaeological heritage; (xii) landscape, and (xiii) the inter-relationship between the issues referred to in sub paragraphs (i) to (xii).	
7. The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme.	Mitigation measures are referred to in both Chapter 3 and in the matrices presented in Appendix vi of this report.
8. An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with, and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information.	Chapter 2 (section 2.3) of this report considered how the options were developed. Chapter 2 (section 2.10) details the assumptions and limitations which were encountered in compiling the required information.
9. A description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring in accordance with regulation 16.	Not required at this stage
10. A non-technical summary of the information provided under paragraphs 1 to 9.	A non-technical summary is provided at the opening of this report.

6 Appendix ii: Habitats Regulations Assessment- Baseline Information

Introduction

The requirement for Habitats Regulations Assessment is introduced in section 2.5. Habitats Regulations Assessment will be an iterative process carried out in parallel with Local Development Plan (LDP) preparation which will be updated in line with knowledge of plan effects and any changes relating to European sites. This report provides a long list of sites that will be considered in the context of potential effects of the LDP on its own and in combination with other plans and projects.

Of necessity this screening takes a precautionary approach. It must be emphasised that only some potential impacts may arise. Measures to avoid, reduce or mitigate for impacts will be incorporated in the plan where necessary and feasible or proposals amended to avoid adverse effects on site integrity.

The policies and spatial zonings proposed within the plan will be assessed to determine whether any of the potential impacts could materialise as a result of the plan. This will consider the source of potential impacts, any pathways to sites and whether the impact could have a significant effect on site selection features, their conservation objectives and site integrity. Where there is a potential pathway between a source and European sites the likely significant effect on site selection features will be assessed in the context of any avoidance and mitigation measures identified in the course of assessment and plan preparation.

Scope

The sites listed are those for which there is a pathway allowing a connection with the plan area. Therefore it includes birds that utilise Belfast Lough and marine mammals which may range as far as Belfast Lough from the site for which they are a site selection feature. Sites within 15km of the LDP area have been considered and any distances listed are to the nearest 0.5km.

Overview

This is a summary of the long list of sites to be considered and how they are connected to the plan area and potential issues. Definitions of each type of connection is presented follow.

Within or Adjacent: All or part of the European or Ramsar Site is within or directly adjacent to the plan area.

Ecological: The European or Ramsar Site is ecologically connected to the plan area. Ecological connections include linkages by ecological corridors such as river systems; hydrological links between land in the plan area and peatland or wetland sites; known areas of land in the plan area which are regularly used by birds which also use a SPA; and sites that form part of the same coastal ecosystem or may be utilized by marine species that are mobile in the vicinity of the plan area.

Within 15km: The European or Ramsar Site is within 15km of the plan area (potential for aerial pollution).

By Infra-structure: The European or Ramsar Site is connected by infrastructure with the plan area. Infrastructural connectivity is related to the potential linkage of sites to the plan area by infrastructural services such as water abstraction or waste water discharges.

Glossary

Abbreviations

LDP	Local Development Plan
SAC	Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) are sites that have been adopted by the European Commission and formally designated by the government of each country in whose territory the site lies.
SCI	Sites of Community Importance (SCIs) are sites that have been adopted by the European Commission but not yet formally designated by the government of each country.
cSAC	Candidate SACs (cSACs) are sites that have been submitted to the European Commission, but not yet formally adopted.
pSAC	Possible Special Area of Conservation
SPA	Special Protection Area
pSPA	Proposed SPA
Ramsar	Sites listed under the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance adopted at Ramsar, Iran in 1971. As a matter of policy these sites are treated in the same way as European sites.

Table A1: Evidence to inform baseline data for Habitats Regulations Assessment

<u>JNCC Standard Data Form</u>	JNCC Standard data form generated from the Natura 2000 Database submitted to the European Commission on 22/12/2015.
<u>NIEA Conservation Objectives</u>	The most recent NIEA Conservation Objectives for each site.
<u>BMAP 2015 HRA</u>	Habitats Regulations Assessment Report, Belfast Metropolitan Plan 2015
Spatial Data Local Government	Spatial NI Data Layers for Local Government boundaries 13/1/2016
Spatial Data European and Ramsar sites	NIEA Data Layers for designated and proposed European and Ramsar sites 13/1/2016

Table A2: Potential pathways between plan area and European Sites

European Site Name	Connection with plan area				Potential Issues
	Within or Adjacent	Ecological	Within 15km	By Infra-structure	
Belfast Lough Open Water SPA	•	•	•	•	Activities during construction or use of development causing disturbance to birds. Impacts causing a significant deterioration of water quality.
Belfast Lough Ramsar	•	•	•	•	Activities during construction or use of development causing disturbance to birds. Impacts causing a significant deterioration of water quality.
Belfast Lough SPA	•	•	•	•	Activities during construction or use of development causing disturbance to birds. Impacts causing a significant deterioration of water quality.
Lough Neagh and Lough Beg Ramsar	•	•	•	•	Any major development in or adjacent to Lough Neagh. Significant increase in recreational disturbance. Major increase in demand for water.
Lough Neagh and Lough Beg SPA	•	•	•	•	Any major development in or adjacent to Lough Neagh. Significant increase in recreational disturbance. Major increase in demand for water.
Rea's Wood and Farr's Bay SAC	•	•	•	•	Major increase in demand for water.
Antrim Hills SPA		•	•	•	Major increase in demand for water. Activities causing disturbance to birds flying from SPA.
Larne Lough SPA		•	•		No impacts as 8km from plan area.
North Channel pSAC		•			Activities during construction causing disturbance to harbour porpoise. Impacts causing a significant deterioration of water quality.
Outer Ards Ramsar		•	•	•	Activities during construction or use of development causing disturbance to birds from the Ramsar. Impacts causing a significant deterioration of water quality.
Outer Ards SPA		•	•	•	Activities during construction or use of development causing disturbance to birds from the SPA. Impacts causing a significant deterioration of water quality.
Strangford Lough Ramsar		•			Activities during construction or use of development causing disturbance to birds from the Ramsar. Impacts causing a significant deterioration of water quality.
Strangford Lough SPA		•			Activities during construction or use of development causing disturbance to birds from SPA.

European Site Name	Connection with plan area				Potential Issues
	Within or Adjacent	Ecological	Within 15km	By Infra-structure	
					Impacts causing a significant deterioration of water quality.
Copeland Islands SPA		•			Activities during construction or use of development causing disturbance to birds from SPA. Impacts causing a significant deterioration of water quality.
East Coast (Northern Ireland) Marine pSPA		•		•	Activities during construction or use of development causing disturbance to birds. Impacts causing a significant deterioration of water quality.
Murlough SAC		•			Activities during construction or use of development causing disturbance to seals.
Skerries and Causeway SCI (SAC)		•			Activities during construction or use of development causing disturbance to harbour porpoise.
The Maidens SCI (SAC)		•	•		Activities during construction or use of development causing disturbance to seals.
Larne Lough SPA		•	•		No impacts as 8km from plan area.
Ballynahone Bog SAC			•		No impacts as 11.5km from plan area.
Ballynahone Bog Ramsar			•		No impacts as 11.5km from plan area.
Garron Plateau SAC			•		No impacts as 14.5km from plan area.
Garron Plateau Ramsar			•		No impacts as 14.5km from plan area.
Curran Bog SAC			•		No impacts as 9.5km from plan area.
Dead Island Bog SAC			•		No impacts as 12km from plan area.
Wolf Island Bog SAC			•		No impacts as 14km from plan area.
Montiaghs Moss SAC			•		No impacts as 7km from plan area.
Peatlands Park SAC			•		No impacts as 14km from plan area.

Overall Potential Impacts

More detailed description follows of potential development impacts that could arise as a result of the LDP and will need to be assessed in relation to European sites.

Table A3: Potential development impacts to be assessed in relation to European sites

Potential Impacts	Activities arising from the implementation of LDP
Loss, fragmentation, damage of habitats and / or species:	Construction activities associated with LDP could lead to the loss, fragmentation (or obstruction of movement) or damage of habitats and / or species through:
	Direct land take and / or land clearance and the use of machinery/materials.
	Direct and indirect impacts resulting from the construction and operation of built development and required infrastructure.
	Impacts caused during repair and maintenance activities for built development and required infrastructure.
	Direct impacts associated with mineral development in the plan area.
	Removal, fragmentation or physical changes to important connectivity features could create barrier effects to species, alter habitat availability or ecological functioning or result in changes in breeding, roosting, commuting and foraging behaviour.
Disturbance: physical, noise, lighting	Noise or activity during construction and operational activities could have adverse impacts on sensitive species (marine mammals and birds in particular).
	Increased lighting from construction or additional built development could: create barrier effects to species; result in changes in species breeding, roosting, commuting and foraging behaviour; or increase predation.
Biological Disturbance: invasive species, human disturbance	Sensitive habitats and species may experience adverse impacts from the introduction of invasive species, non-native, competitive or predatory species through construction activities and associated machinery, movement of soils and waste or from garden escapes.
	Increased human activity (including recreation; increase in pet ownership; increased incidence in fires) close to sensitive habitats and species may cause disturbance that could impact negatively on these features and lead to displacement of sensitive species from certain locations.
Contamination of land	Waste arising from the operation of developments associated with LDP could cause contamination of land which could have a direct detrimental impact on sensitive habitats or species or indirect impacts if subsequent emissions to water occur.
Emissions by air	The construction and operation of developments associated with LDP (in particular industrial developments) have the potential to generate chemical and dust emissions and could make a contribution to acid rain or nutrient deposition resulting in significant adverse impacts to animals and sensitive habitats for example they could cause localised smothering of vegetation or potential health issues in animals e.g. birds.

Potential Impacts	Activities arising from the implementation of LDP
	Increased traffic generation could lead to increased air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions which could have localized impacts on sensitive habitats or species.
Emissions by water and changes to hydrology	There is potential for an increased transport of chemical contaminants reaching the aquatic environment during the construction and operation of development associated with the LDP. This could range from transportation of fuels to cleaning or waste water treatment materials and associated drainage and discharges into watercourses. Changes to water quality can have harmful effects on fish, invertebrates, and vegetation, e.g. as a result of lowered oxygen levels.
	Surface run off and sediment release from construction works and operational activities associated with LDP can increase sediment deposition and turbidity within aquatic systems. This can adversely impact on associated wildlife by causing shading effects that can inhibit plant and algal growth and smother organisms thereby limiting productivity and survival.
	Water abstraction from streams or lakes required for construction and operation of developments associated with LDP could have physical impacts on water levels, fish species at intakes, affect populations of fish or alter the configuration or availability of breeding gravels.
	Construction and operation of development associated with BDLDP could alter the hydrology of sensitive habitats and species by either increasing or decreasing runoff or water percolation into aquifers.
	Increased demands on waste water treatment works or for septic tanks could lead to increased nutrient enrichment of waterbodies which could change water quality and increase eutrophication. This in turn could have a harmful effect on the ecological functioning of these systems.

7 Appendix iii: Sustainability Appraisal Framework

1. The objective for sustainability appraisal is to improve health and well-being.
Rationale
Public policy seeks to increase healthy life expectancy, reduce preventable deaths, improve mental health and reduce health inequalities. Evidence shows that there is a need to address obesity, increase physical activity and reduce inequalities in health. It is also necessary to provide for the needs of an aging population and minimize the detrimental impacts of noise. This can be achieved by creating an environment that is clean and attractive; encourages healthy lifestyles; protects tranquil and quiet areas and enables access to health care facilities for all.
Appraisal Prompts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Will it improve access to health care services? b) Will it reduce response times for the emergency services? c) Will it encourage healthy lifestyles? d) Will it enable people to grow their own food? e) Will it create open space that people can use? f) Will it provide opportunities for and encourage physical activity for all? g) Will it avoid or reduce noise impacts that may affect health? h) Will it promote good mental health? i) Will it provide meeting places? j) Will it increase social contact and intergenerational contact? k) Will it protect the tranquillity of Carnmoney Hill as a Quiet Area? l) Will it increase the sense of safety? m) Will the proposal support family cohesion? n) Will it reduce the risk of traffic accidents?

2. The objective for sustainability appraisal is to provide good quality, sustainable housing.
Rationale
The population is growing and therefore there is ongoing need for new housing in locations that meet regional policy, are accessible and balance the needs of society and the environment. The make-up of households is changing therefore design needs to meet long term requirements with good quality build to be sustainable. This objective should reduce homelessness and ensure decent, affordable homes with a mix of types.
Appraisal Prompts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Will it encourage low carbon, life-time homes? b) Will it encourage affordable housing? c) Will it reduce homelessness d) Will it meet the needs of specific groups e.g. single people, families, retired people, ethnic minorities, disabled? e) Will it reduce the number of unfit homes? f) Will it provide housing which meets locally identified needs (in terms of type, tenure and size)? g) Will it encourage the building of life-time homes with potential for adaptability, such as wheelchair access? h) Will it provide a mix of housing types?

3. The objective for sustainability appraisal is to enable access to high quality education.
Rationale
Good education improves opportunities for employment and also contributes to avoidance of poverty and healthier lifestyles. The provision of suitable accommodation for educational establishments in appropriate, accessible locations should play a part in making schools more sustainable and reducing inequalities in education.
Appraisal Prompts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Will it improve education level and employability of the population? b) Will it promote access to education and skills training? c) Will it help rural communities access education and skills training? d) Will it improve opportunities for cooperation between statutory agencies and other institutions? e) Will it help educational establishments to provide modern sustainable accommodation?
4. The objective for sustainability appraisal is to strengthen society
Rationale
Regional policy is directed towards improving community relations and creating a safe society which is more united. Success will be represented by places which are inclusive, respect culture and identity, promote social integration and create a sense of pride. They will also be designed to feel safe and to reduce opportunity for crime or anti-social behaviour.
Appraisal Prompts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Will it promote inclusion of all groups? b) Will it retain, create, or enhance shared space? c) Will it increase accessibility to shared space? d) Will it promote positive social interaction? e) Will it give rural communities appropriate access to facilities and services? f) Will it reduce the factors causing inequalities? g) Will it meet identified needs that will reduce inequalities experienced by the most deprived communities?
5. The objective for sustainability appraisal is to enable sustainable economic growth.
Rationale
Regional policy seeks to develop a strong, competitive and regionally balanced economy. It is necessary to provide suitable locations for employment, with flexibility where necessary, to reflect current and future distribution of jobs across sectors, encourage new business startups, facilitate innovation, regenerate areas, attract investment and make employment as accessible as possible for all. This will reduce unemployment and poverty by helping more people to earn a living and increase their income.
Appraisal Prompts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Will it support innovation and competitiveness within the local economy? b) Will it support creation of a range of job types that are accessible especially to areas of greatest deprivation? c) Will it support enhancement of the skills base. d) Will it support the change towards a low carbon economy for the Borough? e) Will it help make the Borough a place where people want to live and work, to visit and invest? f) Will it make the best use of the excellent transport links, including Belfast International Airport as a Regional Gateway? g) Will it ensure the vitality and vibrancy of town centres can be improved? h) Will it increase the number of people coming to the Borough to work?

6. The objective for sustainability appraisal is to encourage active and sustainable travel.**Rationale**

There is a common goal to reduce traffic emissions and congestion which means reducing car use and increasing other forms of transport. Better access to public transport and opportunities for active travel make travel more affordable with added health benefits and also reduces greenhouse gas emissions. Measures that help reduce car use and improve accessibility to encourage a shift to travel by public transport, walking and cycling will contribute to this goal.

Appraisal Prompts

- a) Will it encourage modal shift to active travel?
- b) Will it benefit those without access to cars?
- c) Will it retain, create, or enhance walking and cycle routes?

7. The objective for sustainability appraisal is to manage material assets sustainably.**Rationale**

Material assets such as infrastructure and sources of energy production are essential for society and the economy but need careful planning to ensure that they are designed for efficiency and to minimize adverse impacts. The concept of circular economy treats waste as resource which should be managed sustainably to reduce production and increase recovery, recycling and composting rates; new or adapted facilities may be required.

Appraisal Prompts

- a) Will the proportion of waste to landfill decrease?
- b) Will the proposal make recycling easier?
- c) Will recycling rates increase?
- d) Will composting rates continue to increase?
- e) Will it increase reuse of resources?
- f) Will waste production figures per household reduce?
- g) Will it ensure that there is sufficient transmission/distribution lines and infrastructure which is fit for purpose?
- h) Will it enable renewable energy production?
- i) Will it reduce the amount of contaminated or derelict land?

8. The objective for sustainability appraisal is to protect physical resources and use sustainably.**Rationale**

Land, minerals, geothermal energy and soil are resources which require protection from degradation and safeguarding for future use. Sustainable agriculture, tourism and sustainable use of minerals and geothermal energy can help to support the economy.

Appraisal Prompts

- a) Will earth science features remain protected?
- b) Will it enable the minerals industry to operate sustainably?
- c) Will it retain potential future use/benefit of physical resources (education/tourism/recreation/biodiversity)?
- d) Will it enable materials to be locally sourced?
- e) Will it reduce greenhouse gas emissions?
- f) Will it allow for the future use of geothermal energy?
- g) Will it avoid increase of curtilage cover in the area?
- h) Will it retain semi natural land cover/biodiversity?
- i) Will it avoid soil erosion/pollution?

9. The objective for sustainability appraisal is to protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.
Rationale
International obligations which are adopted in Northern Ireland legislation and policies require the protection of biodiversity including flora, fauna and habitats. This is for their intrinsic value and for the wider services that they provide to people, the economy and the environment for example as carbon stores which lessen the effects of climate change. This objective includes protecting and enhancing biodiversity as well as protection of green and blue infrastructure to enhance the services that natural resources provide.
Appraisal Prompts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Will it protect or enhance local biodiversity? b) Will protect or enhance existing or potential wildlife corridors? c) Will protect or enhance designated site and their buffers? d) Will locally important sites and buffers be protected? e) Will the proposal protect or enhance of blue/green infrastructure? f) Will the proposal increase blue/green infrastructure in the Borough? g) Will the proposal support/provide ecosystem services? h) Will the proposal incorporate blue/green infrastructure?
10. The objective for sustainability appraisal is to improve air quality.
Rationale
Air pollution has serious impacts on human health as well as degrading the natural environment. This objective can be achieved through reducing sources of air pollution. Where air pollution cannot be totally excluded careful siting of development should avoid impacts on sensitive receptors.
Appraisal Prompts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Will it improve air quality? b) Will it reduce emissions of key pollutants? c) Will it reduce transport emissions? d) Will other modes of transport than the car be encouraged/feasible? e) Will it avoid increase of ammonia emissions (near to sensitive receptors)? f) Will it help achieve the objectives of any Air Quality Management Plan?
11. The objective for sustainability appraisal is to reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.
Rationale
International commitments require greenhouse gas emissions to be reduced to lessen their effects on climate. Measures that help reduce energy consumption and enable renewable energy helps lessen greenhouse gas emissions however adaption is also required to plan for the impacts of climate change.
Appraisal Prompts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Will it reduce greenhouse gas emissions? b) Will it reduce energy consumption? c) Will it increase the proportion of renewable energy? d) Will it protect or enhance habitats that capture carbon? e) Will it protect or enhance floodplains? f) Will it increase/encourage other forms of transport than the car – cycling/walking? g) Will it reduce polluting forms of transport? h) Will it reduce emissions from livestock production? i) Will it incorporate measures to adapt to climate change?

12. The objective for sustainability appraisal is to protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.

Rationale

This objective encompasses reducing levels of water pollution, sustainable use of water resources, improving the physical state of the water environment and reducing the risk of flooding now and in the future. It meets the requirements of Northern Ireland legislation, strategies and plans in support of the Water Framework Directive and other Directives that relate to water and it takes account of the future impacts of climate change.

Appraisal Prompts

- a) Will it improve the quality of surface and ground water?
- b) Will it lead to more efficient use of water?
- c) Will it minimise risks from flooding?
- d) Will it avoid the need for flood defence?
- e) Will it protect or enhance floodplains?
- f) Will it maintain water flows for good ecological quality?
- g) Will it result in discharges that change the temperature of the receiving water?
- h) Will it protect aquatic food resources?

13. The objective for sustainability appraisal is to conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.

Rationale

Built and cultural heritage are resources that inform our history and bring character and sense of place. They also attract visitors and contribute to the economy and bring vibrancy to the places where we live, work and relax. This can be achieved by protecting and enhancing Conservation Areas, townscapes and other sites of historic and cultural value including their setting.

Appraisal Prompts

- a) Will it conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage?
- b) Will it allow 'sense of place' to be conserved in townscape and rural settings?
- c) Will it allow archaeological features to be assessed, recorded and preserved?
- d) Will it preserve and enhance the setting of cultural heritage assets?
- e) Will it support access to, interpretation of and understanding of the historic environment?
- f) Will it protect and enhance local distinctiveness and sense of place?
- g) Will it provide for clearer assessment of impacts of development on complex and extensive archaeological sites immediate to settlements?
- h) Will it provide opportunities for cultural activities?

14. The objective for sustainability appraisal is to maintain and enhance landscape character.
Rationale
International and national policies seek to conserve the natural character and landscape of the coast and countryside and protect them from excessive, inappropriate or obtrusive development. This objective seeks to maintain the character and distinctiveness of the area's landscapes and seascapes and to protect and enhance open spaces and the setting of prominent features, settlements and transport corridors.
Appraisal Prompts
a) Will it minimise visual intrusion? b) Will it protect the setting of prominent features, settlements and transport corridors? c) Will it protect areas designated for landscape? d) Will it protect views to the coast? e) Will it integrate new development to protect and enhance local distinctiveness?

8 Appendix iv: Compatibility of Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

Sustainability Appraisal Framework	1 Improve health and well-being.	2 Provide good quality, sustainable housing.	3 Enable access to high quality education.	4 Strengthen society.	5 Enable sustainable economic growth.	6 Encourage active and sustainable travel.	7 Manage material assets sustainably.	8 Protect physical resources and use sustainably.	9 Protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	10 Protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	11 Improve air quality.	12 Reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	13 Conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	14 Maintain and enhance landscape character.
1 Improve health and well-being														
2 Provide good quality, sustainable housing	✓													
3 Enable access to high quality education	✓	✓												
4 Strengthen society	✓	✓	✓											
5 Enable sustainable economic growth	✓	✓	✓	✓										
6 encourage active and sustainable travel.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓									
7 Manage material assets sustainably.	✓	✓	0	0	✓	0								
8 Protect physical resources and use sustainably.	✓	✓	0	0	✓	0	✓							
9 Protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	✓	0	✓	✓	?	✓	✓	✓						
10 Protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	✓	✓	0	0	?	0	✓	✓	✓					
11 Improve air quality	✓	✓	0	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				
12 Reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	✓	✓	0	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			
13 Conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	0	0	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
14 Maintain and enhance landscape character.	✓	0	0	✓	✓	0	?	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	



Compatible



Neutral



Incompatible



Uncertain

9 Appendix v: Compatibility of Sustainability Appraisal and LDP Objectives

Sustainability Appraisal Framework	1 Improve health and well-being.	2 Provide good quality, sustainable housing.	3 Enable access to high quality education.	4 Strengthen society.	5 Enable sustainable economic growth.	6 Encourage active and sustainable travel.	7 Manage material assets sustainably.	8 Protect physical resources and use sustainably.	9 Protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	10 Protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	11 Improve air quality.	12 Reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	13 Conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	14 Maintain and enhance landscape character.
Plan Vision ²	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
To provide an adequate range and quality of land and premises for business and industry.	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	?	X	?	?	?	?	?
To protect strategically important business and employment opportunities.	✓	0	0	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	?	?	?	?	✓
To promote the development and regeneration of our town and commercial centres.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	?	✓
To promote high quality environmentally sustainable design.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
To provide a sufficient supply of land for mainstream and affordable housing and ensure a diverse choice of housing.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	X	0	?	?	?	?
To ensure that necessary new infrastructure accompanies new development.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	?	✓	?	?	0	?
To accommodate necessary community facilities.	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	?	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0
To encourage better connectivity by transport and digital networks.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	?
To protect and enhance the natural and built environment.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Sustainability Appraisal Framework Cont.	1 Improve health and well-being.	2 Provide good quality, sustainable housing.	3 Enable access to high quality education.	4 Strengthen society.	5 Enable sustainable economic growth.	6 Encourage active and sustainable travel.	7 Manage material assets sustainably.	8 Protect physical resources and use sustainably.	9 Protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	10 Protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	11 Improve air quality.	12 Reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	13 Conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	14 Maintain and enhance landscape character.
To protect open spaces of public value and promote green network linkages around our larger settlements.	✓	✓	0	✓	?	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
To promote sustainable tourism and economic diversification.	✓	0	0	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	?	✓	✓
To integrate climate change adaptation requirements such as flood prevention and sustainable renewable energy production.	✓	✓	0	0	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
To make adequate provision for waste management.	✓	✓	0	0	✓	0	✓	✓	0	✓	0	?	✓	✓

² Plan Vision

In 2030 Antrim and Newtownabbey Borough will have a reputation as an excellent, attractive and diverse place in which to live and work. It will be a place that all citizens can take pride in and that is appealing to new residents, investors and visitors alike, with improved job opportunities, housing availability and connectivity that meets the needs of our community. Development will be sustainable and of high quality and will address the ongoing challenges of climate change. Our built and natural environment will continue to be high quality and well looked after and will support prosperity and economic development and provide for a wide range of recreational and leisure activities.

10 Appendix vi: Sustainability Appraisal Matrices

Issue 1: Hierarchy of Settlements	Our new Plan will need to define a settlement hierarchy for the Borough as the position of a particular settlement in this hierarchy will be an important factor that will inform our decisions about where new growth and development should take place.											
	Option 1: Retain the existing hierarchy of settlements set out in the existing development plans (BMAP and the Antrim Area Plan)				Option 2: Reclassify our existing settlements within 5 tiers.				Option 3: Reclassify our existing settlements within 6 tiers			
Sustainability Objective	ST	MT	LT	Explanation	ST	MT	LT	Explanation	ST	MT	LT	Explanation
1...improve health and well-being.	?	?	?	This option has an uncertain relationship to this sustainability objective. Option 1 is based on BMAP and Antrim area plan designations, which are not done consistently. Therefore, under option 1, the Borough would not be treated consistently.	?	?	?	This option has an uncertain relationship to this sustainability objective.	?	?	?	This option has an uncertain relationship to this sustainability objective.
2...provide good quality, sustainable housing.	+	+	+	Using a settlement hierarchy provides scope to allocate housing growth in line with local needs. Option 1 is based on the BMAP and Antrim area plan designations, which are not done consistently. Therefore, under option 1, the Borough would not be treated consistently.	+	+	+	Using a settlement hierarchy provides scope to allocate housing growth in line with local needs. This option of a reclassified hierarchy allows the development of the Borough to be based on agreed and consistent settlement characteristics, across both legacy council areas.	+	+	+	Using a settlement hierarchy provides scope to allocate housing growth in line with local needs. This option of a reclassified hierarchy allows the development of the Borough to be based on agreed and consistent settlement characteristics, across both legacy council areas.
3...enable access to high quality education.	+	+	+	Using a settlement hierarchy provides scope to allocate housing growth in line with local needs. It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage. However, a settlement hierarchy allows growth and future needs of population to be considered, and this can help	+	+	+	Using a settlement hierarchy provides scope to allocate housing growth in line with local needs. It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage. However, a settlement hierarchy allows growth and future needs of population to be considered, and this can help	+	+	+	Using a settlement hierarchy provides scope to allocate housing growth in line with local needs. It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage. However, a settlement hierarchy allows growth and future needs of population to be considered, and this can help

				facilitate access to educational facilities. Option 1 is based on the BMAP and Antrim area plan designations, which are not done consistently. Therefore, under option 1, the Borough would not be treated consistently.				facilitate access to educational facilities. Option 2 allows this to be done based on agreed and consistent settlement characteristics, across both legacy council areas.				facilitate access to educational facilities. Option 3 allows this to be done based on agreed and consistent settlement characteristics, across both legacy council areas.
4...strengthen society.	+	+	+	It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage. However using a settlement hierarchy could have benefits such as consolidating support for facilities and services in rural areas, which are in some cases currently experiencing deprivation in terms of access. This can also have positive impacts for social interaction, and sense of pride in community. Option 1 is based on the BMAP and Antrim Area Plan designations, which are not done consistently. Therefore, under option 1, the Borough would not be treated consistently.	+	+	+	It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage. However using a settlement hierarchy could have benefits such as consolidating support for facilities and services in rural areas, which are in some cases currently experiencing deprivation in terms of access. This can also have positive impacts for social interaction, and sense of pride in community. Option 2 allows this to be done based on agreed and consistent settlement characteristics, across both legacy council areas	+	+	+	It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage. However using a settlement hierarchy could have benefits such as consolidating support for facilities and services in rural areas, which are in some cases currently experiencing deprivation in terms of access. This can also have positive impacts for social interaction, and sense of pride in community. Option 3 allows this to be done based on agreed and consistent settlement characteristics, across both legacy council areas.
5...enable sustainable economic growth.	+	+	+	It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage. However using a settlement hierarchy could have benefits such as shaping distribution of population, and therefore future service centres, which can impact positively on local economic viability. Option 1 is based on the BMAP and Antrim area plan designations, which are not done consistently. Therefore, under option 1, the Borough would	+	+	+	It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage. However using a settlement hierarchy could have benefits such as shaping distribution of population, and therefore future service centres. This can impact positively on local economic viability. Option 2 allows this to be done based on agreed and consistent settlement characteristics, across both legacy council areas	+	+	+	It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage. However using a settlement hierarchy could have benefits such as shaping distribution of population, and therefore future service centres. This can impact positively on local economic viability. Option 3 allows this to be done based on agreed and consistent settlement characteristics, across both legacy council areas.

				not be treated consistently.								
6...encourage active and sustainable travel.	0	0	0	The effect of Option 1 on the use of active and sustainable travel is difficult to assess at this stage of plan-preparation. Option 1 is based on the BMAP and Antrim area plan designations, which are not done consistently. Therefore, under option 1, the Borough would not be treated consistently.	0	0	0	The effect of Option 2 on the use of active and sustainable travel is difficult to assess at this stage of plan-preparation.	0	0	0	The effect of Option 2 on the use of active and sustainable travel is difficult to assess at this stage of plan-preparation.
7...manage material assets sustainably.	+	+	+	Designating a hierarchy allows delivery of infrastructure to be achieved in line with housing growth. Option 1 is based on the BMAP and Antrim area plan designations, which are not done consistently. Therefore, under option 1, the Borough would not be treated consistently.	+	+	+	Designating a hierarchy allows delivery of infrastructure to be achieved in line with housing growth.	+	+	+	Designating a hierarchy allows delivery of infrastructure to be achieved in line with housing growth.
8...protect physical resources and use sustainably.	+	+	+	Designating a hierarchy encourages housing in settlements. This potentially will be better for retention of mineral reserves. Option 1 is based on the BMAP and Antrim area plan designations, which are not done consistently. Therefore under option 1, the Borough would not be treated consistently.	+	+	+	Designating a hierarchy encourages housing in settlements. This potentially will be better for retention of mineral reserves	+	+	+	Designating a hierarchy encourages housing in settlements. This potentially will be better for retention of mineral reserves
9...protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	0	0	0	The effect of Option 1 on protecting natural reserves and enhancing biodiversity is difficult to assess at this stage of plan-preparation. Option 1 is based on the BMAP and Antrim area plan designations, which are not done consistently.	0	0	0	The effect of Option 2 on protecting natural reserves and enhancing biodiversity is difficult to assess at this stage of plan-preparation.	0	0	0	The effect of Option 3 on protecting natural reserves and enhancing biodiversity is difficult to assess at this stage of plan-preparation.

				Therefore under option 1, the Borough would not be treated consistently.								
10...protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	0	0	0	The effect of Option 1 on protecting, managing and using water resources sustainably is difficult to assess at this stage of plan-preparation. Option 1 is based on the BMAP and Antrim area plan designations, which are not done consistently. Therefore, under option 1, the Borough would not be treated consistently.	0	0	0	The effect of Option 3 on protecting, managing and using water resources sustainably is difficult to assess at this stage of plan-preparation.	0	0	0	The effect of Option 3 on protecting, managing and using water resources sustainably is difficult to assess at this stage of plan-preparation.
11...improve air quality.	?	?	?	Designating a hierarchy is part of the process of allocating growth to settlements, and may influence the likely transport for services, employment, and education. However, it is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage. Option 1 is based on the BMAP and Antrim area plan designations, which are not done consistently. Therefore, under option 1, the Borough would not be treated consistently.	?	?	?	Designating a hierarchy is part of the process of allocating growth to settlements, and may influence the likely transport for services, employment, and education. However, it is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage.	?	?	?	Designating a hierarchy is part of the process of allocating growth to settlements, and may influence the likely transport for services, employment, and education. However, it is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage.
12...reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	?	?	?	Designating a hierarchy is part of the process of allocating growth to settlements, and may influence the likely transport for services, employment, and education. This relates to a large contributor to greenhouse gas emissions. In addition using a hierarchy can also increase the potential for using community renewable heating projects.	?	?	?	Designating a hierarchy is part of the process of allocating growth to settlements, and may influence the likely transport for services, employment, and education. This relates to a large contributor to greenhouse gas emissions. However, it is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage. In addition using a hierarchy	?	?	?	Designating a hierarchy is part of the process of allocating growth to settlements, and may influence the likely transport for services, employment, and education. This relates to a large contributor to greenhouse gas emissions. However, it is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage. In addition using a hierarchy

				However, it is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage.				can also increase the potential for using community renewable heating projects.				can also increase the potential for using community renewable heating projects.
13...conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	+	+	+	Designating a settlement hierarchy may have positive effects for aspects of identity for that community, which might give more emphasis to the built and cultural heritage in that settlement. Option 1 is based on the BMAP and Antrim area plan designations, which are not done consistently. Therefore, under option 1, the Borough would not be treated consistently.	+	+	+	Designating a settlement hierarchy may have positive effects for aspects of identity for that community, which might give more emphasis to the built and cultural heritage in that settlement.	+	+	+	Designating a settlement hierarchy may have positive effects for aspects of identity for that community, which might give more emphasis to the built and cultural heritage in that settlement.
14...maintain and enhance landscape character.	+	+	+	Designating a settlement hierarchy along with use of settlement limits, could contribute positively to protect the setting of the settlement, in its landscape. Option 1 is based on the BMAP and Antrim area plan designations, which are not done consistently. Therefore, under option 1, the Borough would not be treated consistently.	+	+	+	Designating a settlement hierarchy along with use of settlement limits, could contribute positively to protect the setting of the settlement, in its landscape.	+	+	+	Designating a settlement hierarchy along with use of settlement limits, could contribute positively to protect the setting of the settlement, in its landscape.
Summary and comparison of options against the sustainability objectives					<p>The pattern of scoring for all three options was similar across the sustainability objectives. At this stage of plan making, and given the strategic aspect of the topic, it is difficult to anticipate the overall effect of the alternative approaches without considering the specifics of sites. However, the appraisal found that identifying a local settlement hierarchy could have positive impacts for many areas within social, economic and environmental topics. It is also recognized that designating a hierarchy would have a strong benefit towards facilitating new housing growth, and possibly other areas such as strengthening society, helping with access to local education facilities and enabling economic growth.</p> <p>Option 1 is based on the BMAP and Antrim area plan designations, which were not completed using the same criteria, and therefore are based on inconsistent</p>							

	<p>approaches. Therefore, for every objective, under option 1, the two legacy council areas that make up the Borough would not be treated in a consistent manner. Option 2 provides an opportunity to approach classification of the Borough's settlements consistently.</p> <p>Option 3 was considered the preferred option because it provides an opportunity to approach the Borough's hierarchy of settlements consistently.</p>
The preferred option	Option 3
Measures to reduce negative effects and promote positive effects	None identified.

Issue 2: Potential for New Villages - Mallusk	This proposal relates to that part of Mallusk that is located on land west of Hydepark Road and incorporating Tudor Park and Hydepark Manor, Newtownabbey. This neighbourhood, which is distinct from the larger Mallusk industrial area, lies at the edge of Metropolitan Newtownabbey and currently forms part of this area in BMAP. The residents of this area have expressed views that this area should be defined in the Plan as a village.							
	Option 1: Retain Mallusk as part of Metropolitan Newtownabbey				Option 2: Reclassify Mallusk as a village			
Sustainability Objective	ST	MT	LT	Explanation	ST	MT	LT	Explanation
1...improve health and well-being.	0	0	0	There does not appear to be any link between this policy area, and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) objective.	0	0	0	There does not appear to be any link between this policy area, and the SA objective.
2...provide good quality, sustainable housing.	+	+	+	There is already housing in the area, both private and social.	+	+	+	Being reclassified as a village may allow the area to benefit from housing growth, but within a future village limit. It might also have a positive for the perception of the area, which could provide a ‘pull’ factor to encourage people to settle there.
3...enable access to high quality education.	0	0	0	The local school has recently transformed to integrated status, which has increased the enrollment number.	+	+	+	Being reclassified as a village may encourage housing growth, which could mean more local children to sustain the local school.
4...strengthen society.	0	-	-	The community of Mallusk has brought forward this suggestion, and has highlighted the potential benefits. There is a feeling that the residential parts of the area are very different to the commercial industrial estate, and this could continue to be a negative in terms of community identity.	+	+	+	Being reclassified as a village would have significant benefits for the sense of community, and could potentially strengthen the local ‘voice’. It could also long term encourage access to community facilities.
5...enable sustainable economic growth.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective. The trading role of Mallusk Industrial Estate should not be affected by the term village.
6...encourage active and sustainable travel.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.
7...manage material assets sustainably.	0	0	0	Mallusk Industrial Estate already has a number of waste management companies present. The status of the residential area of Mallusk does not appear to have any effect on this objective.	0	0	0	Mallusk Industrial Estate already has a number of waste management companies present. The status of the residential area of Mallusk does not appear to have any effect on this objective.
8...protect physical resources and use sustainably.	0	0	0	The status of the residential area of Mallusk does not appear to have any effect on this objective.	0	0	0	The status of the residential area of Mallusk does not appear to have any effect on this objective.
9...protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	0	0	0	The status of the residential area of Mallusk does not appear to have any effect on this objective.	0	0	0	The status of the residential area of Mallusk does not appear to have any effect on this objective.

10...protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	0	0	0	The status of the residential area of Mallusk does not appear to have any effect on this objective.	0	0	0	The status of the residential area of Mallusk does not appear to have any effect on this objective.
11...improve air quality.	0	0	0	The status of the residential area of Mallusk does not appear to have any effect on this objective.	0	0	0	The status of the residential area of Mallusk does not appear to have any effect on this objective.
12...reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	0	0	0	The status of the residential area of Mallusk does not appear to have any effect on this objective.	0	0	0	The status of the residential area of Mallusk does not appear to have any effect on this objective.
13...conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	0	-	-	The community of Mallusk has brought forward this suggestion, and has highlighted the potential benefits. Not being reclassified as a village could negatively affect local community identity, which is in part linked to 'sense of place' and local cultural identity.	+	+	+	Being reclassified as a village would have significant benefits for the sense of local community identity, which is in part linked to 'sense of place' and local cultural identity.
14...maintain and enhance landscape character.	0	0	0	The status of the residential area of Mallusk does not appear to have any effect on this objective.	0	0	0	The status of the residential area of Mallusk does not appear to have any effect on this objective.
Summary and comparison of options against the sustainability objectives				Although many of the sustainability objectives recorded a neutral scoring for both options, there were positives identified for reclassifying Mallusk as a village in terms of housing, education and conserving built and cultural heritage. There was a significant positive recorded in terms of strengthening society for the reclassification of Mallusk as a village.				
The preferred option				Option 2				
Measures to reduce negative effects and promote positive effects				None identified				

Issue 3: Potential for New Hamlet Designation	Our review of our local settlement hierarchy has provided an opportunity to consider the potential for identification of a number of new hamlets within our Borough. The Antrim Area Plan (AAP) did set out criteria for the identification of hamlets and advised that these were small communities comprising several households and some service facilities e.g. sewerage capacity, shop, pub church etc. The more recent BMAP did not set out any such criteria therefore there is a mismatch in terms of the existing plans and clarity is needed. The Planning Appeals Commission (PAC) in its Report on the BMAP Strategic Plan Framework indicated that ‘it would appear that in order to constitute a settlement there should be a concentration of buildings displaying an obvious sense of cohesion and place and offering one or more community facilities.							
	Option 1: Use criteria for new hamlets based on guidance by the Antrim Area Plan.				Option 2: Use criteria for new hamlets based on the rationale used by the PAC			
Sustainability Objective	ST	MT	LT	Explanation	ST	MT	LT	Explanation
1...improve health and well-being.	-	-	-	Using this definition would lose hamlets, as many designated under BMAP would no longer be deemed a hamlet, as they do not meet public sewerage criteria. Under this option, some settlements designated under BMAP would no longer be deemed a hamlet, and could therefore decline.	+	+	+	Using these criteria would strengthen the status of existing hamlets. This could contribute positively to supporting new housing in hamlets which may support social cohesion and increasing opportunities for social and intergenerational contact.
2...provide good quality, sustainable housing.	-	-	-	Using this definition would lose hamlets, as many designated under BMAP would no longer be deemed a hamlet, as they do not meet public sewerage criteria. Under this option, some settlements designated under BMAP would no longer be deemed a hamlet, and could therefore decline. This could impact negatively on the ability to provide good quality sustainable housing for those rural communities. There could be positives for villages as growth would be directed from hamlets to villages.	+	+	+	Using these criteria could strengthen the status of existing hamlets. This could contribute positively to supporting new housing in hamlets. This could help with the social housing need in rural areas, and provide a mix of housing types which address other housing identified needs.
3...enable access to high quality education.	?	?	?	Under this option, some settlements designated under BMAP would no longer be deemed a hamlet, and could therefore decline. This could impact negatively on the size of the population in those settlements which would have to be reflected by the Education Authority in provision of education services. However this growth would likely be allocated to other settlements which could provide positives in other areas. Overall, it is difficult to anticipate the effect if this policy approach at this stage of plan making, and without reference to individual settlements. Therefore, the impact is considered uncertain at this time.	?	?	?	Using these criteria could strengthen the status of existing hamlets. This could contribute positively to supporting new housing in hamlets. This could positively increase populations in these settlements which could provide support in consolidating local schools. This issue would be subject to the Education Authorities decision making processes. Overall, it is difficult to anticipate the effect if this policy approach at this stage of plan making, and without reference to individual settlements. Therefore, the impact is considered uncertain at this time.

4...strengthen society.	-	-	-	Under this option, some settlements designated under BMAP would no longer be deemed a hamlet, and could therefore decline. This could impact negatively on the social cohesion for those living in these rural communities. There could be positives for villages as growth would be directed from hamlets to villages.	+	+	+	Using these criteria could strengthen the status of existing hamlets. This could contribute positively to supporting social cohesion, access to shared space, and service.
5...enable sustainable economic growth.	?	?	?	Under this option, some settlements designated under BMAP would no longer be deemed a hamlet, and could therefore decline. However, this may lead new growth to be allocated to more consolidated hamlets, and villages, which could mean that populations are better located to contribute to the local economy in terms of local service centres. There would be likely positive and negative impacts on sustainable economic growth in these areas, but it is not possible to anticipate the overall effect of this policy approach at this stage of plan-making.	?	?	?	Using these criteria could strengthen the status of existing hamlets. This could contribute positively to supporting sustainable economic growth in these areas, but it is not possible to anticipate the overall effect of this policy approach at this stage of plan-making.
6...encourage active and sustainable travel.	?	?	?	Under this option, some settlements designated under BMAP would no longer be deemed a hamlet, and could therefore decline. The effect of this approach on this objective is uncertain.	?	?	?	Using these criteria could strengthen the status of existing hamlets. The effect of this approach on this objective is uncertain.
7...manage material assets sustainably.	?	?	?	Under this option, some settlements designated under BMAP would no longer be deemed a hamlet, and could therefore decline. However this may lead new growth to be allocated to more consolidated hamlets, and villages, which could mean that populations are better located to make use of recycling sites- although it is acknowledged that bring sites follow demand. Consolidated villages and hamlets could also allow transmission and distribution resources to be used efficiently. The effect of this approach on this objective is uncertain.	?	?	?	Using these criteria could strengthen the status of existing hamlets, which may be more resource intensive in terms of transmission and distribution networks, and efficient recyclables collection. The effect of this approach on this objective is uncertain.
8...protect physical resources and use sustainably.	?	?	?	Under this option, some settlements designated under BMAP would no longer be deemed a hamlet, and could therefore decline. However, this may lead new growth to be allocated to more consolidated hamlets, and villages, which could increase curtilage of agricultural land, in new housing growth in those areas. As a tourist resource, consolidated hamlets and larger villages can provide attractive locations to visit, but more so where there are services and protected features.	?	?	?	Using these criteria could strengthen the status of existing hamlets, which could increase curtilage of agricultural land, in new housing growth in those areas. As a tourist resource, all sizes of settlement can provide attractive locations to visit, but more so where there are services and protected features. It is not possible to anticipate the overall effect of this policy approach at this stage of plan-making.

				It is not possible to anticipate the overall effect of this policy approach at this stage of plan-making.				
9...protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	?	?	?	Under this option, some settlements designated under BMAP would no longer be deemed a hamlet, and could therefore decline. However, this may lead new growth to be allocated to more consolidated hamlets, and villages, which could impact on local biodiversity in those areas. It is not possible to anticipate the overall effect of this policy approach at this stage of plan-making.	?	?	?	Using these criteria could strengthen the status of existing hamlets, which could impact on local biodiversity in those areas. It is not possible to anticipate the overall effect of this policy approach at this stage of plan-making.
10...protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	+	+	+	Using this definition would lose hamlets as many designated under BMAP would no longer be deemed a hamlet as they do not meet public sewerage criteria. In addition, wastewater treatment works are working near or at capacity in some hamlets in the Borough. This option could support growth away from areas where water quality could be compromised. It is not possible to anticipate the full effect of this policy approach at this stage of plan-making. Since these issues are addressed later in the development planning process, detailed assessment of potential effects will continue throughout plan preparation.	?	?	?	There could be possible risks to water quality, with continuing hamlet status of settlements, which perhaps do not meet public sewerage criteria. It is not possible to anticipate the overall effect of this policy approach at this stage of plan-making. Since these issues are addressed later in the development planning process, detailed assessment of potential effects will continue throughout plan preparation.
11...improve air quality.	?	?	?	Under this option, some settlements designated under BMAP would no longer be deemed a hamlet, and could therefore decline, and this could mean less car use locally. However, this may lead new growth to be allocated to more consolidated hamlets, and villages, which could also affect local air quality in those areas. The effect of this approach on this objective is uncertain.	?	?	?	Using these criteria could strengthen the status of existing hamlets, which could impact on local traffic use, and potentially on local air quality. It is not possible to anticipate the overall effect of this policy approach at this stage of plan-making.
12...reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	?	?	?	Under this option, some settlements designated under BMAP would no longer be deemed a hamlet, and could therefore decline, and this could mean less car use locally and therefore greenhouse gas emissions. However, this may lead new growth to be allocated to more consolidated hamlets, and villages, which could also affect greenhouse gas emissions. The effect of this approach on this objective is uncertain.	?	?	?	Using these criteria could strengthen the status of existing hamlets, which could impact on local traffic use, and potentially on greenhouse gas emissions. It is not possible to anticipate the overall effect of this policy approach at this stage of plan-making.
13...conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	?	?	?	There could be losses to the ongoing replacement of building stock if a settlement is no longer deemed a hamlet. However, this may	?	?	?	Using these criteria could strengthen the status of existing hamlets, which could positively impact on the desire to enhance and conserve the sense of place in the settlement.

				lead to growth in other areas. The effect of this approach on this objective is uncertain.				
14...maintain and enhance landscape character.	?	?	?	Under this option, some settlements designated under BMAP would no longer be deemed a hamlet, and could therefore decline, but the impact on landscape character is difficult to determine at this stage, as this may lead to growth in other areas. The effect of this approach on this objective is uncertain.	?	?	?	This would depend on how the development of these hamlets was managed at Local Policies Plan stage.
Summary and comparison of options against the sustainability objectives				<p>This appraisal gave mixed results across the Sustainability objectives. Option 1, which could result in a decrease in the number of hamlets, scored negatively for improving health and wellbeing, strengthening society and providing good quality and sustainable housing. However, it did score positively for protecting, managing and using water resources sustainably. The latter reflects the fact that this option would mean that sewerage capacity would be a factor in determining the status of a settlement.</p> <p>Option 2 scored positively for improving health and wellbeing, strengthening society and providing good quality and sustainable housing. It also identified that there could be potential impacts from car use associated with rural dwelling, however, it was not possible to determine these effects at this stage of plan making without considering location, and mitigating policy.</p>				
The preferred option				Option 2				
Measures to reduce negative effects and promote positive effects				<p>Mitigation is possible at Local Policies Plan stage through site and building design. Possible risk to water quality can be managed by relevant planning policy.</p>				

Issue 4: Classification of Centres	This set of options allows us to look at how our centres sit within the proposed new-tiered classification and consider options for the new LDP. Our options are based upon our local settlement hierarchy and define four tiers of centres.									
	Option 1: Retain and reclassify our current centres based upon our new classifications with Glengormley and Northcott identified as one District Centre					Option 2: Retain and reclassify our current centres based upon our new classifications with Glengormley and Northcott as separate centres				
Sustainability Objective	ST	MT	LT	Explanation		ST	MT	LT	Explanation	
1...improve health and well-being.	+	+	+	The reclassification of four tiers of conurbation was acceptable with no specific comments about the classification. Designation of Centres in principle has benefits by focusing services, transport and open space which should benefit health and wellbeing.		+	+	+	The reclassification of four tiers of conurbation was acceptable with no specific comments about the classification. It was felt that the continued separation of Northcott and Glengormley would ensure that ongoing provision of local health and well-being services i.e. pharmacies and Doctors' surgeries closer to residents which would be more beneficial to the provision of service. Keeping separate boundaries would protect the vitality of Glengormley and ensure that services were not drawn away from Glengormley to Northcott. Therefore while not meriting a different score this is preferable for this objective.	
2...provide good quality, sustainable housing.	0	0	0	In its own right, the merging of Northcott and Glengormley into a single district centre is unlikely to create additional housing. Northcott is entirely retail and commercially focused and Glengormley is a residential community with shops and services along its main streets. The combining of the two would not necessarily create opportunities to build houses in comparison to simply zoning additional housing land in Glengormley.		0	0	0	As separate centres, it is not likely that additional lands could be made available to facilitate the provision of sustainable housing.	
3...enable access to high quality education.	0	0	0	All of the schools serving Glengormley and the wider area are broadly located within the town of Glengormley e.g. Glengormley High School and Ballyhenry Primary School and therefore in order to access the schools, students must travel either by public transport, by car or on foot. The zoning of a single district centre would not therefore facilitate access to high quality education.		0	0	0	Separate zonings would not clearly indicate any improvement in access to high quality education facilities.	
4...strengthen society.	?	?	?	By designating a single district centre there could be more opportunities created to develop shared spaces, which is an important element of strengthening society. On the other		+	+	+	On balance, it was considered that Northcott did not offer and potential to improve health and well-being. Keeping separate boundaries would protect the vitality of Glengormley and	

				hand spreading services over a wider area may reduce access and community focal points.				ensure that services were not drawn away from Glengormley to Northcott.
5...enable sustainable economic growth.	+	+	+	At present, the two areas of Glengormley and Northcott are separate economic centres and they are not inter-dependent to a high degree i.e. they are not necessarily complimentary retail locations. By keeping the centres separate the economic strength of Glengormley as an economic entity and not dilute the economic vitality of the town. Northcott's position as a retail centre is not likely to suffer because of the centres remaining separate.	+	+	+	By merging the designations, the economic vitality of Glengormley could be damaged as Northcott draws away services and businesses which would result in an outflow of business and services which are local economic drivers in the town currently and which service the local community. This would likely strengthen Northcott but only as a result of the demise of economic activity in Glengormley.
6...encourage active and sustainable travel.	?	?	?	By combining the two areas into one new District centre, it is unlikely that sustainable travel participation by the public would be increased. However, by combining both areas into a single district it may encourage public transport to interlink the two locations improving the local network and thus improve the uptake of sustainable transport.	0	0	0	The implication of leaving the two centres as separate districts would not improve the current situation in which local people travel to the different locations largely by car. Car usage in the Antrim and Newtownabbey Council district is already very high.
7...manage material assets sustainably.	?	?	?	It is difficult at this stage of plan preparation to determine any direct link between this policy area, and the SA objective.	?	?	?	It is difficult at this stage of plan preparation to determine any direct link between this policy area, and the SA objective.
8...protect physical resources and use sustainably.	?	?	?	It is difficult at this stage of plan preparation to determine any direct link between this policy area, and the SA objective.	?	?	?	It is difficult at this stage of plan preparation to determine any direct link between this policy area, and the SA objective.
9...protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	?	?	?	Creating a new combined District Centre, may possibly lead to a 'call for sites' process follow, it could allow brownfield sites to be revised and developed. However, at this stage of plan preparation it is not possible to fully determine the effect of this possible process.	?	?	?	It is difficult at this stage of plan preparation to determine any direct link between this policy area, and the SA objective.
10...protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	?	?	?	It is difficult at this stage of plan preparation to determine any direct link between this policy area, and the SA objective.	?	?	?	It is difficult at this stage of plan preparation to determine any direct link between this policy area, and the SA objective.
11...improve air quality.	?	?	?	By combining the two areas into one single district, it may encourage public transport to interlink the two locations improving the local network and thus improve the uptake of sustainable transport. This may positively affect local air quality.	?	?	?	It is difficult at this stage of plan preparation to determine any direct link between this policy area, and the SA objective.

12...reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	?	?	?	By combining the two areas into one single district, it may encourage public transport to interlink the two locations improving the local network and thus improve the uptake of sustainable transport. This may positively reduce climate change emissions.	?	?	?	It is difficult at this stage of plan preparation to determine any direct link between this policy area, and the SA objective.
13...conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	+	+	+	Defining a new combined District Centre could improve the urban infrastructure, which could positively affect the built environment and sense of place.	+	+	+	Defining two District Centres could improve the urban infrastructure, which could positively affect the built environment and sense of place.
14...maintain and enhance landscape character.	+	+	+	Defining development limits for this new combined District Centre, should allow impact on landscape to be controlled strategically.	+	+	+	Defining development limits for two District Centres, should allow impact on landscape to be controlled strategically.
Summary and comparison of options against the sustainability objectives				The two options scored similarly across many of the sustainability appraisal objectives although for many options there is too little information about how the proposal would be implemented to score the options at this stage. Both options scored positively for improving health and well-being, enabling economic growth and conserving and enhancing both built heritage and landscape. Maintaining separate centres is slightly stronger for health and well-being and notably stronger for strengthening society. It was considered that a combined District Centre for Northcott and Glengormley would dilute the focus of economic growth and could reduce the vitality of Glengormley.				
The preferred option				Option 2				
Measures to reduce negative effects and promote positive effects				Bring forward appropriate operational policy to complement the overarching designation. Regeneration is a key aspect. Potential restriction of uses to maintain the quality of the retail experience. Policies to protect important buildings. A transport analysis may be carried out for the plan and car parking should be reviewed as part of the new plan.				

Issue 5: New Centres – Mossley West	Following our classification of centres, our new LDP will provide the opportunity for new centres to be identified. We believe that the area around Mossley West rail station on the outskirts of Metropolitan Newtownabbey presents significant development potential. Option 1 is a status quo approach.									
	Option 1: Do not consider the designation of Mossley West as a District Centre.					Option 2: Consider the designation of Mossley West as a District Centre.				
Sustainability Objective	ST	MT	LT	Explanation		ST	MT	LT	Explanation	
1...improve health and well-being.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.		+	+	+	New centre would bring new active travel. Potential for new health centres, leisure positives; More investment possible –e.g. Global Point; Increased population could access Ballyearl and other facilities; Hockey club; Rail link and promote as centre; Empty buildings could be used; Walkway and access to it improved	
2...provide good quality, sustainable housing.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.		+	+	+	Good quality sustainable housing; New build; The old mill etc.; Improves access for people who don't drive.	
3...enable access to high quality education.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.		0	+	+	Short term: over-subscribed primary school/over demand for school places; Train access for Queens & better transport links in general. (Whitehead train example); In long term primary and secondary schools – could then lead to housing development and support investment in schools.	
4...strengthen society.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.		+	+	+	Would incorporate shared spaces.	
5...enable sustainable economic growth.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.		+	+	+	Significant growth potential e.g. Global Point.	
6...encourage active and sustainable travel.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.		+	+	+	Positive impact as close to M2 and rail network.	
7...manage material assets sustainably.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.		+	+	+	Could make a bit of an impact. As new houses so recycling better integrated.	
8...protect physical resources and use sustainably.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.		+	+	+	Could reverse dereliction – reusing brownfield land and protecting soils elsewhere from pollution and/or erosion	
9...protect natural resources and	-	-	-	Greenfields could be lost as more pressure would be placed on undeveloped lands without the zoning. Newtownabbey Way is important and could be impacted on.		+	+	+	Area could be designed to preserve green/open space and provide access to it and development to incorporate/link to open space. Could also maintain and enhance local biodiversity.	

enhance biodiversity.								Note that a further study is due on green space provision.
10...protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	0	0	+	Flooding can be difficult within the area and the flood maps would need to be reviewed. It could address flooding issues via new infrastructure. Sufficient treatment for residual waste. Positive long term in management of water etc.
11...improve air quality.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	0	?	?	There would positives and negatives for air quality in the medium to long term time scales. More businesses attract more cars so may lower air quality but rail link is available and other modes of transport so air quality may be improved or stay same. Difficult to call at this stage of plan making so uncertain.
12...reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	0	?	?	Positives and negatives in medium to long term. Potential problems of building near to rivers etc. Uncertain at this stage of plan making.
13...conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	+	+	+	The old mill houses could be conserved around Mossley Mill and reused for business etc. Mill Race – cultural legacy. Museum and Milltown Way would bring people to the area for cultural aspects.
14...maintain and enhance landscape character.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	0	+	+	Mossley Mill – promote as a landscape feature/asset Mill houses to retain (and use) Could enhance transport corridors as land backs on to the Ballyclare/henry Roads. Journey may be more enjoyable by train, car because of landscaping – visually attractive. Reducing dereliction, trees etc. Greening effect.
Summary and comparison of options against the sustainability objectives				<p>Option 1 would maintain the status quo of the area and would not take the opportunity to make use of the transport links, and potential for economic growth and increased employment. There could be a slight negative effect for natural resources and biodiversity due to the less strategic approach but overall it is neutral in relation to the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>Option 2 overall many more positive outcomes and would give a positive scoring for many of the sustainability objectives due to the opportunity to provide more active travel, improved accessibility, incorporation of green space and enhancement of built</p>				

	<p>heritage. 'Active Travel' means using walking and cycling as an alternative to motorised transport for the purpose of making every day journeys.</p> <p>There some uncertainty with option 2 against some of the sustainability objectives such as improving air quality and reducing greenhouse gas emissions however, if public transport infrastructure were to improve, there could be an increase in public transport use, which would benefit air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p>
The preferred option	Option 2
Measures to reduce negative effects and promote positive effects	Masterplan, planning conditions, key site requirements, planning policy, current design, landscaping and building guides.

Issue 6A: New Local Centres - Mallusk	There are a range of shops and facilities clustered in the centre of the wider Mallusk Industrial and commercial area that service the needs of surrounding workers. This area is zoned as part of Metropolitan Newtownabbey in the current BMAP Plan. There exists an opportunity to consolidate a mix of uses at the heart of this existing employment area.									
	Option 1: Do not consider the designation of a local centre at Mallusk.					Option 2: Consider the designation of a local centre at Mallusk.				
Sustainability Objective	ST	MT	LT	Explanation		ST	MT	LT	Explanation	
1...improve health and well-being.	?	?	?	At this stage of plan preparation difficult to determine link between option and objective.		?	?	?	The designation is aimed at supporting the cluster of shops and facilities in the area, which support the working population each day. This might help with the local services in relation to health care such as chemist. However, at this stage of plan preparation it difficult to fully determine a link between option and the objective.	
2...provide good quality, sustainable housing.	0	0	0	This option has no effect on this objective.		0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	
3...enable access to high quality education.	0	0	0	This option has no effect on this objective.		0	0	0	This option has no effect on this objective.	
4...strengthen society.	0	0	0	The working population in this area tends to have commuted to work, and is not a resident population. The opportunities for strengthening society are not likely to be relevant here.		0	0	0	The working population in this area tends to have commuted to work, and is not a resident population. The opportunities for strengthening society are not likely to be relevant here. Although some potential benefits could be increased opportunities for meeting places such as café's.	
5...enable sustainable economic growth.	0	0	0	This option would continue the current situation. This option has negligible effect on this objective.		+	+	+	Opportunity to protect services that workers need, at this location. Where there is a clustered range of shops and services available to a large working population, this could encourage growth, and innovation as the businesses compete to meet the customer's needs. It also could make Mallusk a more attractive location to work, and this could potentially increase investment into the area.	
6...encourage active and sustainable travel.	0	0	0	This option would continue the current situation. This option has negligible effect on this objective.		+	+	+	By strengthening protection on this cluster of shops, it would potentially reduce the need for workers to make additional journeys to fulfill service requirements. These local journeys would have a higher chance of being on foot, as the location is small and well connected.	
7...manage material assets sustainably.	0	0	0	This option would continue the current situation. This option has negligible effect on this objective.		+	+	+	Consolidating and strengthening local services at this location may increase resource efficiencies and may provide opportunities for shared infrastructure and connectivity linkages.	

8...protect physical resources and use sustainably.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.
9...protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.
10...protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.
11...improve air quality.	0	0	0	This option would continue the current situation.	?	?	?	At this stage of plan preparation difficult to determine link between option and objective. However, there may be a positive impact from reduced local travel if there is a range of clustered shops and services available to workers.
12...reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	0	0	0	This option would continue the current situation.	?	?	?	At this stage of plan preparation difficult to determine link between option and objective. However, there may be a positive impact from reduced local travel if there is a range of clustered shops and services available to workers.
13...conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	0	0	0	This option would continue the current situation.	0	0	0	At this stage of plan preparation difficult to determine link between option and objective.
14...maintain and enhance landscape character.	0	0	0	This option would continue the current situation.	0	0	0	At this stage of plan preparation difficult to determine link between option and objective.
Summary and comparison of options against the sustainability objectives				It is difficult to identify clear benefits of both options under many of the sustainability objectives. However, the appraisal did recognise some benefits of designating Mallusk as a Local Centre, under Option 2. These are encouraging sustainable economic growth, through encouraging a place for relevant businesses to cluster, and helping make Mallusk a more attractive place to work. Option 2 could also lead to less extra car journeys for those working in Mallusk through the convenience of having relevant services available near their place of work.				
The preferred option				Option 2				
Measures to reduce negative effects and promote positive effects				None identified.				

Issue 6B: New Village Centres	Our initial evidence suggests that there are several places in our Borough not currently designated as centres in the existing development plans that may benefit from designation. This would entail consideration of the villages identified in our local settlement hierarchy to assess if a readily identifiable centre exists that would benefit from local planning policy to protect their commercial function and the current mix of uses as well as considering the need for potential expansion. There are currently no defined centres identified within our villages which are listed below: Ballynure, Ballyrobert, Burnside (Cogry, Kilbride), Doagh, Dunadry, Parkgate, Straid, Templepatrick, Toome, (option for Mallusk)							
	Option 1: Not to designate new village centres				Option 2: To designate new village centres			
	Sustainability Objective	ST	MT	LT	Explanation	ST	MT	LT
1...improve health and well-being.	0	0	-	Under this option, not designating village centres could mean less opportunity to sustain the population in the future.	0	+	+	Under this option, designating village centres could mean a greater opportunity to sustain the population in the future. This could have potential positives for access to health care services and encouraging healthy life-styles. It also could encourage the evolution of meeting places for all social contact, including intergenerational aspects that encourage family cohesion.
2...provide good quality, sustainable housing.	?	?	?	Under this option, not designating village centres could mean less opportunity to sustain the population in the future however insufficient information is available to enable a score.	+	+	+	Under this option, designating village centres could mean a greater opportunity to sustain the population in the future. This could have potential positives for access to health care services and encouraging healthy life-styles. It could also help support the principle of a mix of housing types to meet local needs, including ‘over the shop’ accommodation, which also has benefits for vibrancy in villages. There is a small risk that some homes could be lost to retail and service development but this does not affect the overall score.
3...enable access to high quality education.	0	0	0	It is difficult at this stage of plan preparation to determine any direct link between this policy area, and the SA objective.	0	0	0	Under this option, designating village centres could mean a greater opportunity to sustain the population in the future. This could have potential positives for consolidating enrolment levels for local schools. However, it is difficult at this stage of plan preparation to determine any direct link between this policy area, and the SA objective.
4...strengthen society.	0	0	-	Not designating these village centres, could have a negative impact on social cohesion, long term.	+	+	+	Under this option, designating village centres could mean a greater opportunity to sustain the population in the future. This could help the evolution of meeting places for all social contact, including intergenerational aspects that encourage family cohesion. This option also will strengthen the role that villages play as service centres and social hubs for the outlying rural communities. The

								level of this advantage will depend upon the location, and the level of future investment.
5...enable sustainable economic growth.	?	?	?	May have negative effect but insufficient information is available to enable a score.	+	+	+	Under this option, there would be a village centre defined, which would mean that footfall would be consolidated, and future investors would have more certainty about the trading centre of the village. This could bring greater employment, and would allow public transportation and parking to be planned to reflect the use of the centre. It should positively influence vitality of the village, which in some cases allow the village to be further perceived as a shopping destination.
6...encourage active and sustainable travel.	?	?	?	Currently there is high car-usage, and in some locations particularly rural areas a perceived lack of public transport routes. May have negative effect but insufficient information is available to enable a score.	+	+	++	Under this option, designating village centres could mean a greater opportunity to sustain the population in the future. This could have potential effect of increasing the number of public transport users including commuters, which could help to bring about the provision of improved public transport routes.
7...manage material assets sustainably.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	+	+	+	Under this option, designating village centres could mean a greater opportunity to sustain the population in the future. This could mean a greater critical mass in some areas for sufficient transmission and distribution lines. Designated village centres, may be more attractive locations for recycling bring sites.
8...protect physical resources and use sustainably.	0	0	0	This will maintain the status quo and will not significantly affect this objective.	0	0	0	Designating a village centre could have the effect of containing development, which could possibly reduce curtilage of agricultural land. On balance it is thought that this option has negligible effect on this objective.
9...protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	?	?	?	May have negative effect but insufficient information is available to enable a score.	?	?	?	Designating a village centre could have the effect of containing development, which reduce loss of habitats and other threats to biodiversity. Without considering the specific locations, it is difficult to determine the impact of this option at this stage.
10...protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	?	?	?	May have negative effect but insufficient information is available to enable a score.	?	?	?	Without considering the specific locations, it is difficult to determine the impact of this option at this stage.
11...improve air quality.	?	?	?	Currently there is high car-usage, and in some locations particularly rural areas a perceived lack of public transport routes. May have	+	+	+	Under this option, designating village centres could mean a greater opportunity to sustain the population in the future. This could have potential effect of increasing the number public transport users

				negative effect but insufficient information is available to enable a score.				including commuters, which could help to bring about the provision of improved public transport routes. This would bring benefits for local air quality.
12...reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	?	?	?	Currently there is high car-usage, and in some locations particularly rural areas a perceived lack of public transport routes. May have negative effect but insufficient information is available to enable a score.	+	+	+	Under this option, designating village centres could mean a greater opportunity to sustain the population in the future. This could have potential effect of increasing the number public transport users including commuters, which could help to bring about the provision of improved public transport routes. This would bring benefits for reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
13...conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	0	0	0	This will maintain the status quo and will not significantly affect this objective.	+	+	+	Under this option, designating village centres could mean a greater opportunity to sustain the village, and with that, a great opportunity to recognize the built heritage and the cultural benefits it can bring. It can increase residents pride in 'their' village and the perceived value of local distinctiveness.
14...maintain and enhance landscape character.	0	0	0	This will maintain the status quo and will not significantly affect this objective.	+	+	+	Under this option, designating village centres could mean a greater opportunity to contain development of the village, and with that a great opportunity to protect landscape.
Summary and comparison of options against the sustainability objectives				<p>Option 1 is a status quo approach, and will allow a continuation of the baseline conditions which, long term, could mean a loss of services and a lack of community cohesion in those settlements. For many objectives there is not enough information about the disparate locations and potential effects on the object and the score is therefore uncertain.</p> <p>Option 2 has the potential to bring benefits for health and well-being and providing good quality sustainable housing through consolidating and sustaining the population in those villages with particular benefits for rural dwellers. Option 2 could also contribute to strengthening society through helping support the services and places meeting places for all social contact, including intergenerational aspects that encourage family cohesion. Option 2 also could enable sustainable economic growth, and encourage the use of active and sustainable travel, which could bring benefits for local air quality, and help reduce climate change emissions. Option 2 could also potentially limit growth of villages, and this could have positive impacts by reducing loss of agricultural land, habitat, biodiversity and landscape.</p>				
The preferred option				None stated as this is presented as a question however, the appraisal identifies more potential positive effects for option 2.				
Measures to reduce negative effects and promote positive effects				Development of criteria for defining village centres and assessment of locations against these could help to ensure positive benefits and address those areas where effects are uncertain.				

Issue 7: New Neighbourhood Centres	New Centres could also include neighbourhood centres. No neighbourhood centres were identified in BMAP for Metropolitan Newtownabbey and again initial evidence suggests that there are several places in the Metropolitan area that may benefit from such designation. Three such centres were identified in the Antrim Area Plan at the Greystone, Parkhall and Ballycraigy Estates.									
	Option 1: Remove neighbourhood centres from the local hierarchy of centres.					Option 2: Retain the existing neighbourhood centres and identify new ones drawn from the Top 2 tiers of our settlement hierarchy.				
Sustainability Objective	ST	MT	LT	Explanation		ST	MT	LT	Explanation	
1...improve health and well-being.	?	?	?	Where a neighbourhood centre has not been designated there is an increased risk that local services could be lost. However, this option would use planning policy to achieve the same aims.		+	+	+	Designated neighbourhood centres provide an opportunity to potentially sustain small clusters of shops, accessible to housing areas, and this could have positives for community, social and inter-generational contact. They may also encourage local shopping on foot, which has associated health and well-being benefits. It would also be a meeting point for the community therefore increasing interaction and contribute to mental well-being.	
2...provide good quality, sustainable housing.	0	0	0	Neighbourhood centres in their own right are unlikely to provide a direct link to the provision of good quality housing.		0	0	0	Neighbourhood Centres in their own right are unlikely to provide a direct link to the provision of good quality housing	
3...enable access to high quality education.	0	0	0	Neighbourhood centres in their own right are unlikely to enable access to education.		0	0	0	Neighbourhood centres in their own right are unlikely to enable access to education.	
4...strengthen society.	?	?	?	Where a neighbourhood centre has not been designated there is an increased risk that local services could be lost, which could negatively affect opportunities for shared space, and positive social interaction. However, this option would use planning policy to achieve the same aims. Without reviewing the policy and considering the specific locations, it is difficult to determine the impact of this option at this stage.		+	+	+	Designated neighbourhood centres provide an opportunity to potentially sustain small clusters of shops, accessible to housing areas, and this could have positives for community, social and inter-generational contact. All of these are important for strengthening society and creating a sense of pride in the local area.	
5...enable sustainable economic growth.	?	?	?	Designating neighbourhood centres potentially helps to sustain local clusters of shops will have positives for enabling sustainable economic growth in that location. Retail planning policy could alternatively work to achieve the same aims. However reviewing the policy and considering the specific locations, it is difficult to determine the impact of this option at this stage. The SA process would need review the future policy to see if it would be strong enough to protect these areas without a proper designation.		+	+	+	Designated neighbourhood centres provide an opportunity to potentially sustain small clusters of shops, accessible to housing areas, and this could have positives for community, social and inter-generational contact. All of these are important for strengthening society and creating a sense of pride in the local area. They could also provide small scale employment for local people	

6...encourage active and sustainable travel.	?	?	?	Policy that helps to maintain neighbourhood centres and potentially sustain local clusters of shops will have positives for encouraging active and sustainable travel. Without reviewing the policy and considering the specific locations, it is difficult to determine the impact of this option at this stage	+	+	+	Designated neighbourhood centres provide an opportunity to potentially sustain small clusters of shops, accessible to housing areas, which would encourage walking and cycling. This will reduce the use of the car in travelling to larger retail outlets for those goods that are required on a frequent basis. I.e. car travel could be reduced.
7...manage material assets sustainably.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.
8...protect physical resources and use sustainably.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.
9...protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.
10...protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.
11...improve air quality.	?	?	?	Policy that helps to maintain neighbourhood centres and potentially sustain local clusters of shops will have positives for encouraging active and sustainable travel, which will have benefits for improving local air quality. However, these benefits would be offset by other factors, which affect the background levels of poor air quality, such as vehicles moving through neighbourhoods. Without reviewing the policy and considering the specific locations, it is difficult to determine the overall impact of this option at this stage.	+	+	+	Designated neighbourhood centres provide an opportunity to potentially sustain small clusters of shops, accessible to housing areas, which would encourage walking and cycling, which would help reduce local car use, and help improve local air quality. These benefits could be offset by other factors, which affect the background levels of poor air quality, such as vehicles moving through neighbourhoods however considered to be net positive effect
12...reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	?	?	?	Policy that helps to maintain neighbourhood centres and potentially sustain local clusters of shops will have positives for encouraging active and sustainable travel, which will help in a small part to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to global warming. Without reviewing the policy and considering the specific locations, it is difficult to determine the overall impact of this option at this stage.	+	+	+	Designated neighbourhood centres provide an opportunity to potentially sustain small clusters of shops, accessible to housing areas, which would encourage walking and cycling, which will help in a small part to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to global warming.

13...conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	?	?	?	It is difficult at this stage of plan preparation to determine any direct link between this policy area, and the SA objective	?	?	?	It is difficult at this stage of plan preparation to determine any direct link between this policy area, and the SA objective
14...maintain and enhance landscape character.	?	?	?	It is difficult at this stage of plan preparation to determine any direct link between this policy area, and the SA objective	?	?	?	It is difficult at this stage of plan preparation to determine any direct link between this policy area, and the SA objective
Summary and comparison of options against the sustainability objectives					<p>Option 1 long term, could mean a loss of services and a lack of community cohesion in those settlements however this would depend on any policies relating to this type of development therefore the effect of removing and not designating neighbourhood centres is hard to ascertain.</p> <p>Option 2 has the potential to bring benefits for health and well-being and could also contribute to strengthening society through helping support the services and places meeting places for all social contact, including intergenerational aspects that encourage family cohesion. Option 2 also could enable sustainable economic growth, and encourage the use of active and sustainable travel, which could bring benefits for local air quality, and help reduce climate change emissions. The appraisal identifies more potential positive effects for option 2.</p>			
The preferred option					Option 2			
Measures to reduce negative effects and promote positive effects					Development of criteria for defining village centres and assessment of locations against these could help to ensure positive benefits and address those areas where effects are uncertain.			

Issue 8: Strategic Employment Locations	To facilitate future employment growth, it is considered that the new LDP should ensure that there is a ready supply of economic land for strategic business use and industry.											
	Option 1: Maintain status quo and do not identify Strategic Employment Locations (SEL).				Sub-Option 2a: Identify existing employment sites of over 10 hectares in the Borough's largest settlements (Metropolitan Newtownabbey, Antrim and Ballyclare) as SELs.				Sub-Option 2b: Identify existing sites as in Option 2a and consider designation of new SELs in Antrim, Ballyclare, Crumlin and Randalstown with the specific sites to be brought forward in Local Policies Plan.			
Sustainability Objective	ST	MT	LT	Explanation	ST	MT	LT	Explanation	ST	MT	LT	Explanation
1...improve health and well-being.	0	0	0	There could be small negative effect if there is a lack of employment across the Borough however it is thought this has overall negligible effect on this objective.	?	?	?	At this stage of plan preparation, it is difficult to determine the net effect of the option on this objective SA objective however effects likely to be negligible.	+	+	+	At this stage of plan preparation, it is difficult to determine the effect of the option on this objective SA objective however any effects likely to be positive.
2...provide good quality, sustainable housing.	0	0	0	At this stage of plan preparation, it is difficult to determine the effect of the option on this objective SA objective.	0	0	0	At this stage of plan preparation, it is difficult to determine the effect of the option on this objective SA objective.	0	0	0	At this stage of plan preparation, it is difficult to determine the effect of the option on this objective SA objective.
3...enable access to high quality education.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	?	?	?	Where new strategic employment lands are identified, this could provide opportunities for apprentices and skills training in those locations. Without considering the exact locations, and the types of employment that may result, it is difficult to determine the level of this possible opportunity.
4...strengthen society.	0	0	0	Having a range of different types of employment available does help to tackle deprivation and decrease inequality, which have benefits for strengthening society. At this stage of plan preparation, it is difficult to fully determine the links between the option and the SA objective.	0	0	0	Having a range of different types of employment available does help to tackle deprivation and decrease inequality, which have benefits for strengthening society however effects likely to be negligible.	?	?	?	Having a range of different types of employment available does help to tackle deprivation and decrease inequality, which have benefits for strengthening society however hard to determine scale of the benefits.

5...enable sustainable economic growth.	+	+	+	Where the current approach to employment lands is taken, it will continue to have the same role in enabling economic growth.	+	+	+	Having strategic employment locations can play a part in enabling sustainable economic growth. This option would retain the major sites in Antrim and Metropolitan Newtownabbey. However as the sites in Antrim are already almost fully developed, this benefit would apply more in Metropolitan Newtownabbey and Ballyclare.	+	+	+	Having strategic employment locations can play a part in enabling sustainable economic growth. This option retains the sites as in 2a but also allows provision to indicate the need for new SELs in Antrim, Ballyclare, Crumlin and Randalstown. This could bring the possible benefits in terms of economic growth to a wider area of the Borough.
6...encourage active and sustainable travel.	?	?	?	Where the current approach to employment lands is taken, it will continue to have the same role in encouraging active and sustainable travel. Rather than identifying strategic locations, the plan would use qualitative site appraisal criteria, which could possibly include the potential for sustainable travel. However, it is not possible to determine this detail at this stage of plan making.	?	?	?	Having employment lands available at strategic locations may increase the opportunities for use of sustainable and active travel for workers. This applies to workers coming into the area, but also may increase the likelihood of Borough residents having greater employment opportunities closer to home. In addition, new strategic employment locations may have an impact on the critical mass of commuters which might bring about improvements in sustainable travel options available, such as 'Goldline' bus services and park and ride facilities- which could lead to better services and higher public transport use. However the net effect is hard to score.	?	?	?	Having employment lands available at strategic locations may increase the opportunities for use of sustainable and active travel for workers. This applies to workers coming into the area, but also may increase the likelihood of Borough residents having greater employment opportunities closer to home. As this option retains the sites as in 2a but also allows provision to indicate the need for new SELs in Antrim, Ballyclare, Crumlin and Randalstown, it may bring these benefits throughout more of the Borough. In addition, new strategic employment locations may have an impact on the critical mass of commuters which might bring about improvements in sustainable travel options available, such as 'Goldline' bus services and park and ride facilities- which could lead to better services and higher public transport use. However the net effect is hard to score.

7...manage material assets sustainably.	0	0	0	Where the current approach to employment lands is taken, it will continue to have the same role in managing material assets.	?	?	?	Having employment at strategic locations may increase opportunities to centralise provision of infrastructure, and waste management facilities/routes.	?	?	?	Having employment at strategic locations may increase opportunities to centralise provision of infrastructure, and waste management facilities/routes.
8...protect physical resources and use sustainably.	0	0	0	Where the current approach to employment lands is taken, it will continue to have the same role in the protection and sustainable use of physical resources.	?	?	?	Having employment at strategic locations may increase opportunities to sustainably use land and avoid mineral/earth science sites.	?	?	?	Having employment at strategic locations may increase opportunities to sustainably use land and avoid mineral/earth science sites.
9...protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	0	0	0	Where the current approach to employment lands is taken, it will continue to have the same role in protecting natural resources and enhancing biodiversity.	?	?	?	Where new land is considered as Strategic Employment Locations, there is a potential risk for a loss of biodiversity. However good site design could avoid impacts and create opportunities for biodiversity.	?	?	?	Where new land is considered as Strategic Employment Locations, there is a potential risk for a loss of biodiversity. However good site design could avoid impacts and create opportunities for biodiversity.
10...protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	0	0	0	Where the current approach to employment lands is taken, it will continue to have the same role in protecting, managing and using water resources sustainably.	?	?	?	Where new land is considered as Strategic Employment Locations, there are potential risks to water quality and increased consumption. This can be mitigated through key site requirements, and pollution prevention policy.	?	?	?	Where new land is considered as Strategic Employment Locations, there are potential risks to water quality and increased consumption. This can be mitigated through key site requirements, and pollution prevention policy.
11...improve air quality.	0	0	0	Where the current approach to employment lands is taken, it will continue to have the same impact on air quality.	?	?	?	Having employment at strategic locations, and considering some additionally is unlikely to improve air quality in those local areas. New employment lands may increase the frequency of freight in and out of sites, increase the car journeys in that location and there may be additional air-borne outputs from activities on site. The impact of these emissions will depend upon the location and adjacent land uses.	?	?	?	Having employment at strategic locations, and considering some additionally is unlikely to improve air quality in those local areas. New employment lands may increase the frequency of freight in and out of sites, increase the car journeys in that location and there may be additional air-borne outputs from activities on site. The impact of these emissions will depend upon the location and adjacent land uses.

								In addition, new strategic employment locations may have an impact on the critical mass of commuters, which might bring about improvements in sustainable travel options available, which may reduce local air pollution from car use.				In addition, new strategic employment locations may have an impact on the critical mass of commuters, which might bring about improvements in sustainable travel options available, which may reduce local air pollution from car use.
12...reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	0	0	0	Where the current approach to employment lands is taken, it will continue to have the same impact on reducing the causes of and adapting to climate change.	?	?	?	Unlikely to reduce climate change emissions with transport movements of people and goods; operational outputs from businesses/industry. This will also depend on the types of business in the SEL. Development within a SEL may be designed with climate change adaptation in mind; building design including energy efficiency measures. In addition, strategically decided development can be located away from waterways and floodplains.	?	?	?	Unlikely to reduce climate chance emissions with increased transport movements of people and goods; operational outputs from businesses/industry. This will also depend on the types of business in the SEL. Development within a SEL may be designed with climate change adaptation in mind; building design including energy efficiency measures. In addition, strategically decided development can be located away from waterways and floodplains.
13...conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	0	0	0	At this stage of plan preparation, it is difficult to determine the effect of the option on this objective SA objective however effects likely to be negligible.	?	?	?	At this stage of plan preparation, it is difficult to determine the effect of the option on this objective SA objective but there could be potential for reuse of built heritage.
14...maintain and enhance landscape character.	0	0	0	At this stage of plan preparation, it is difficult to determine the effect of the option on this objective SA objective. Although where the current approach to employment lands is taken, it will continue to have the same impact on maintaining and enhancing landscape character.	?	?	?	At this stage of plan preparation, it is difficult to determine the impact of the link between the option and the SA objective. This can best be determined at a later stage of plan preparation, when the locations of the new sites are identified.	?	?	?	At this stage of plan preparation, it is difficult to determine the impact of the link between the option and the SA objective. This can best be determined at a later stage of plan preparation, when the locations of the new sites are identified.

<p>Summary and comparison of options against the sustainability objectives</p>	<p>Option 1 is a status quo option, which does not use the principles of 'strategic' locations, but rather continues with all employment land being brought forward on an equal footing, as described in the Regional Development Strategy and in line with a set of qualitative site criteria. However, this could open up greater uncertainty at Local Policies Plan stage, because the idea of using Strategic Employment Locations, and the possible locations had not been established in the Plan Strategy, as a result of the POP. It may also not ensure that there is an adequate supply of employment land available within appropriate locations in our Borough.</p> <p>Option 2 establishes that employment land should be identified at sites over 10 hectares at our largest settlements. It is then broken down into 2 a (identifying existing sites only) or 2 b (identify existing sites but consider new ones at key strategic locations)</p> <p>Option 2a and 2b are similar, in that both establish the principle of Strategic Employment Locations. Option 2a retains those which are currently 'major sites' in Antrim and Metropolitan Newtownabbey, although in practice this will really only mean potential new locations in the latter, as those in Antrim are nearly fully developed. Option 2b retains all the same sites as 2a, but also indicates the need for new SELs in Antrim, Ballyclare, Crumlin and Randalstown. Option 2a and 2b scores positively for enabling economic growth and many potential positives were identified in terms of encouraging active travel, the use of material and physical assets. This is because consolidating new growth in strategic locations provides opportunities to use resources efficiently, and to provide infrastructure and connectivity in a sustainable way. By enabling the designation of new SELs through option 2b, economic benefits would be extended more widely through the Borough and there may be associated benefits through more local and accessible employment and sustaining communities. At this stage of plan preparation it is not possible to record a positive scoring under many of the sustainability objectives, however these may emerge at a later stage.</p>
<p>The preferred option</p>	<p>Option 2 with Sub-Option 2b</p>
<p>Measures to reduce negative effects and promote positive effects</p>	<p>Key site requirements, planning conditions, SEL masterplans, site selection criteria, transport assessment. Current design, landscaping and building guides. Corporate/SEL car sharing schemes and/or public transport provision and partnership working. Incorporation of sustainability appraisal considerations in the Employment Land Evaluation Framework criteria.</p>

Issue 9: Belfast International Airport	Belfast International Airport is defined by the Regional Development Strategy (RDS) as a regional gateway. As such, it is a strategic element in our new LDP. The RDS advises that gateways are strategically important transport interchanges. Our new LDP will have a key role to play in facilitating the development of Belfast International Airport. The SPPS states that LDPs should zone land for known requirements for future expansion of airports where appropriate and that development proposals adjacent to such facilities which would seriously jeopardize their future expansion should not be permitted. This will include land required for any improvements or infrastructure required in relation to any transport improvements. Belfast International Airport is a major employer within our Borough, our Plan will seek to facilitate the further growth and development of the Airport.															
	Option 1: Facilitating growth by zoning – this option will involve the identification of land to meet the future needs of the airport and would occur at the second stage of our plan, the Local Policies Plan.				Option 2: Facilitate growth through planning policy – this option would allow proposals to be assessed in relation to policy set out in our new plan and would apply at the first stage of our plan, the Plan Strategy Stage.				Option 3: Consider a Strategic Employment Location at Belfast International airport – this option would allow for the development of a range of suitable uses that would complement the operations of the airport.				Option 4: A combination of Options 2 and 3.			
Sustainability Objective	S T	M T	L T	Explanation	S T	M T	L T	Explanation	S T	M T	L T	Explanation	S T	M T	L T	Explanation
1...improve health and well-being.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.
2...provide good quality, sustainable housing.	0	0	0	This option has no effect on this objective.	0	0	0	This option has no effect on this objective.	0	0	0	This option has no effect on this objective.	0	0	0	This option has no effect on this objective.
3...enable access to high quality education.	0	0	0	This option has no effect on this objective.	0	0	0	This option has no effect on this objective.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective. There may be some opportunities for skills learning and enhancement associated with a ‘strategic employment location’ status.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective. There may be some opportunities for skills learning and enhancement associated with a ‘strategic employment location’ status.
4...strengthen society.	0	0	0	This option has no effect on this objective.	0	0	0	This option has no effect on this objective.	0	0	0	This option has no effect on this objective.	0	0	0	This option has no effect on this objective.
5...enable sustainable economic growth.	-	+	+	Long term, zoning would promote and aid a developer to create jobs and investment, however it	+	+	+	This would be a quick approach as the policy would be available at the first stage of the plan.	+	+	+	Where a Strategic Employment Location is determined it allows a tailored policy to be	+	+	+	This approach brings the benefits of a Strategic Employment Location, but also allows a high level of

				would be 3-4 years before could do anything and this may deter investment. Although there would potentially be job creation, it would require the new plan to be complete. In addition it would not be flexible as the plan would have to be altered if there was a desire to alter the zoning.				However with a policy approach each application can be reviewed on its own merits.				produced for the area. This can allow for a better mix of businesses, and allows more opportunity for complementary uses. This approach allows a high level of flexibility in determining the uses best suited to the location.				flexibility in creating a tailored policy for the area.
6...encourage active and sustainable travel.	?	?	?	The area currently serves as a distribution hub and the Belfast International Airport is recognized as a Regional Gateway. Having a zoning to meet the needs of the airport, could potentially create opportunities for improved public transport, such as a rail service however it is not certain that this will occur.	-	-	-	Planning policy could not influence the provision of improved public transport infrastructure.	?	?	?	The area currently serves as a distribution hub and the Belfast International Airport is recognized as a Regional Gateway. Designating the area as a Strategic Employment Location could potentially create opportunities for improved public transport, such as a rail service however it is not certain that this will occur.	?	?	?	The area currently serves as a distribution hub and the Belfast International Airport is recognized as a Regional Gateway. Designating the area as a Strategic Employment Location could potentially create opportunities for improved public transport, such as a rail service however it is not certain that this will occur.
7...manage material assets sustainably.	?	?	?	It is difficult at this stage of plan preparation to determine any direct link between this policy area, and the SA objective.	?	?	?	It is difficult at this stage of plan preparation to determine any direct link between this policy area, and the SA objective.	?	?	?	It is difficult at this stage of plan preparation to determine any direct link between this policy area, and the SA objective.	?	?	?	It is difficult at this stage of plan preparation to determine any direct link between this policy area, and the SA objective.
8...protect physical resources and use sustainably.	-	-	-	Future growth at this location, could result in loss of agricultural land.	-	-	-	Future growth at this location, will likely result in loss of agricultural land.	-	-	-	Future growth at this location, will likely result in loss of agricultural land.	-	-	-	Future growth at this location, will likely result in loss of agricultural land.
9...protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	-	-	-	Future growth at this location, could result in loss of greenfield land, and potentially biodiversity.	-	-	-	Future growth at this location, could result in loss of greenfield land, and potentially biodiversity.	-	-	-	Future growth at this location, could result in loss of greenfield land, and potentially biodiversity.	-	-	-	Future growth at this location, could result in loss of greenfield land, and potentially biodiversity.

10...protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	?	?	?	Future growth could also increase risk of water pollution and increase water usage.	?	?	?	Future growth could also increase risk of water pollution and increase water usage.	?	?	?	Future growth could also increase risk of water pollution and increase water usage.
11...improve air quality.	-	-	-	The area currently serves as a distribution hub and the Belfast International Airport is recognized as a Regional Gateway. Having a zoning to meet the needs of the airport, could potentially create opportunities for improved public transport, such as a rail service. However it could also increase passenger numbers and freight traffic, all of which could contribute to decreases in air quality locally. It is noted that there is a sparse pattern of population settlement in this area.	-	-	-	Additional growth could increase transport needs in the area and freight traffic, all of which could contribute to decreases in air quality locally. It is noted that there is a sparse pattern of population settlement in this area.	-	-	-	The area currently serves as a distribution hub and the Belfast International Airport is recognized as a Regional Gateway. Designating the area as a Strategic Employment Location could potentially create opportunities for improved public transport, such as a rail service. However it could also increase transport needs in the area and freight traffic, all of which could contribute to decreases in air quality locally. It is noted that there is a sparse pattern of population settlement in this area.
12...reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	-	-	-	The area currently serves as a distribution hub and the Belfast International Airport is recognized as a Regional Gateway. Having a zoning to meet the needs of the airport, could potentially create opportunities for improved public transport, such as a rail service. However it could also increase passenger numbers and freight traffic,	-	-	-	Additional growth could increase transport needs in the area and freight traffic, all of which could contribute increased greenhouse gas emissions.	-	-	-	The area currently serves as a distribution hub and the Belfast International Airport is recognized as a Regional Gateway. Designating the area as a Strategic Employment Location could potentially create opportunities for improved public transport, such as a rail service. However it could also increase transport needs in

				all of which could contribute to increased greenhouse gas emissions.					the area and freight traffic, all of which could contribute to increased greenhouse gas emissions.				However it could also increase transport needs in the area and freight traffic, all of which could contribute to increased greenhouse gas emissions.			
13...conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.
14...maintain and enhance landscape character.	-	-	-	Future growth could extend urbanization and cause of loss of green space and agricultural lands, which will affect the overall landscape character.	-	-	-	Under this option, there is no opportunity to provide for a mix of business types and development, and less opportunity to integrate development into the landscape.	-	-	-	Future growth could extend urbanization and cause of loss of green space and agricultural lands, which will affect the overall landscape character.	-	-	-	Future growth could extend urbanization and cause of loss of green space and agricultural lands, which will affect the overall landscape character.
Summary and comparison of options against the sustainability objectives									<p>All four options scored in a similar way across the sustainability objectives, where encouraging growth for this area will have a positive impact on enhancing the local economy, with the same potential downsides in terms of loss of agricultural land, and biodiversity. All options have potential negative effects on local air quality and could increase greenhouse gas emissions. Development at this location potentially create opportunities for improved public transport, such as a rail service however it is not certain that this will occur. It was acknowledged that any form of increased development (including developments in air passenger numbers) could also increase passenger numbers and freight traffic, which could have negative effects on the air quality and climate change objectives.</p> <p>Option 1 will involve the identification of land to meet the future needs of the airport however it could potentially hinder the development needs of the airport as land will not be brought forward for zoning until the Local Policies Plan stage of the LDP. Option 2 would allow the airport to continue to be supported until such times as land is zoned at the Local Policies stage. Option 3 could widen the potential scope of uses permitted at the airport beyond the airport related uses indicated in the current Antrim Area Plan. However, the exact boundary of the new SEL will not be determined until the Local Policies Stage including the policy that would apply to the zoning. Using a Strategic Employment Location was seen as a more targeted form of zoning and in Option 4 flexibility improves as it will create policy alongside the SEL designation.</p>							
The preferred option									Option 4							

Measures to reduce negative effects and promote positive effects	Mitigation for risks to water quality could be water pollution prevention local policy guidelines. Current design, landscaping and building guides, corporate/SEL car sharing schemes and/or public transport provision, partnership working.
---	---

Issue 10: Rural Strategic Employment Location	Rural SEL - Nutts Corner – Consider as SEL or not									
	Option 1: Retain Nutts Corner within the countryside.					Option 2: Consider a Rural Strategic Employment Location at Nutts Corner.				
Sustainability Objective	ST	MT	LT	Explanation		ST	MT	LT	Explanation	
1...improve health and well-being.	0	0	0	This option has no effect on this objective.		0	0	0	No link	
2...provide good quality, sustainable housing.	0	0	0	This option has no effect on this objective.		0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	
3...enable access to high quality education.	0	0	0	This option has no effect on this objective.		0	0	0	This option has no effect on this objective.	
4...strengthen society.	0	0	0	This option has no effect on this objective.		?	?	?	Uncertain because insufficient information is available to enable an appraisal to be made. Could help sustain rural communities in this area.	
5...enable sustainable economic growth.	0	0	0	This option has no effect on this objective.		+	+	+	Considering Nutts Corner as a Strategic Employment Location could attract investment, and employment to this location although it is hard to determine whether this is a net benefit for the Borough. The proposal for an SEL nearby at Belfast International Airport site needs to be assessed to determine whether a rural SEL would complement or conflict with it. Infrastructure upgrade would be required.	
6...encourage active and sustainable travel.	0	0	0	This option has no effect on this objective.		?	?	?	If a SEL generated a critical mass it might justify investment in public transport infrastructure. Otherwise this would conflict with the objective of accessibility by modes of transport other than the private car and could cause road traffic delays if the area becomes a bottleneck. If there is evidence of lack of employment in/near the area then creating opportunities for employment could reduce commute distances.	
7...manage material assets sustainably.	0	0	0	This option has no effect on this objective.		?	?	?	The effects are uncertain as this may enable use of brownfield land which in turn reduces pressure on land elsewhere and, depending on the nature of the development allowed for, may provide opportunities for more efficient infrastructure but on the other hand it could lead to requirement for new infrastructure.	

8...protect physical resources and use sustainably.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective. Slight positive through retaining land in this location but may be offset by use of land elsewhere.	0	0	0	Potentially some loss of land, however much of this area is in intermittent commercial use.
9...protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective. Slight positive through retaining land in this location but may be offset by use of land elsewhere.	0	0	0	Potentially some loss of land, however much of this area is in intermittent commercial use. Impacts could occur on local biodiversity.
10...protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective. Slight positive through minimizing development in this location but may be offset by impacts elsewhere.	0	0	0	At this stage of plan preparation difficult to determine link between option and objective. If the location were to be a Strategic Employment Location, this could increase the level of water consumption, require more sewerage, and increase the risks associated with water pollution.
11...improve air quality.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective. Slight positive through minimizing development in this location but may be offset by impacts elsewhere.	?	?	?	Designating the location as a SEL is likely to lead to an increase in frequency of goods vehicles and may increase movement of commuters to and from the site however note comments for objective 6. On balance it is thought that there is likely to be a net reduction in local air quality however this may be offset by avoiding impacts elsewhere. Further information on the transport implications of this proposal would need to be considered.
12...reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective. Slight positive through minimizing development in this location but may be offset by impacts elsewhere.	?	?	?	Designating the location as a SEL could lead to an increase in frequency of goods vehicles and movement of commuters to and from the site. It could also attract new industries that emit greenhouse gas emissions.
13...conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective. Slight positive through minimizing development in this location but may be offset by impacts elsewhere.	?	?	?	Uncertain as insufficient information is available to enable an appraisal to be made. Built heritage including archaeology would need to be considered
14...maintain and enhance landscape character.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective. Positive through minimizing development in this location but may be offset by impacts elsewhere.	?	?	?	Uncertain as insufficient information is available to enable an appraisal to be made. The area is characterized as a level area with limited natural cover and some commercial development. It is visible from the Belfast Hills. The landscape impact would depend on the scale of the SEL and any landscaping requirements.
Summary and comparison of options against the sustainability objectives				Option 1 would not promote economic development at this location and is neutral or has a negligible effect for all the sustainability appraisals. Option 2 scored positively for enabling economic growth as further investment could be attracted if the area is zoned as a rural SEL, this may have a particular benefit for rural communities in this area. While the position of Nutts Corner on key transport links means that good road access is in place it is uncertain whether a SEL could generate a critical mass to bring				

	<p>about investment in public transport infrastructure which would make it sustainable in terms of public transport. It was also recognised that the proposal for an SEL nearby at Belfast International Airport site needs to be assessed to determine whether a rural SEL would complement or conflict with it.</p> <p>This proposal will be subject to completion of the RDS Employment Land Evaluation Framework and a transport assessment to take account of any Local Transport Study and this will help address some of the uncertainties in the current appraisal.</p>
The preferred option	Option 2 (Subject to no significant negative effects being identified as a result of further assessment to include transport assessment and completion of the RDS Employment Land Evaluation Framework)
Measures to reduce negative effects and promote positive effects	Incorporation of sustainability appraisal considerations in the Employment Land Evaluation Framework criteria. Transport and economic impact assessment. Partnership working with other organisations such as Invest NI and Transport NI. Promoting car sharing and other forms of corporate environmental sustainability. Consideration of water quality in planning policy, relating to employment land and the corresponding range of uses.

Issue 11: Determining the Amount of Housing Growth	Planning for future housing growth across the Borough is one of the core functions of the Local Development Plan. There are two key stages in the process of planning for this growth. The first is to decide the total number of new dwellings that have to be accommodated through the Plan. Based on the factors outlined in the Preferred Options Paper, four options are proposed in relation to the amount of housing growth that the new Plan should seek to accommodate in our Borough.															
	Option 1: 11,080 dwellings (average 554 per annum)				Option 2: 8,020 dwellings (average 401 per annum)				Option 3: 14,960 dwellings (average 748 per annum)				Option 4: 13,000 dwellings (average 650 per annum)			
Sustainability Objective	S T	M T	L T	Explanation	S T	M T	L T	Explanation	S T	M T	L T	Explanation	S T	M T	L T	Explanation
1...improve health and well-being.	?	?	?	Uncertain	?	?	?	Uncertain	?	?	?	Uncertain	?	?	?	Uncertain
2...provide good quality, sustainable housing.	+	+	+	More scope to accommodate social housing. May be enough to accommodate need. Reduce homelessness.	-	-	-	May not meet the need in the Borough. Reduce homelessness but possibly not as effectively as the other options.	+	+	+	More scope to accommodate social housing/affordable homes. May risk the landscape and create 'ghost' areas. Reduce homelessness.	+	+	+	May be enough to accommodate need. More scope to provide social/affordable housing. Reduce homelessness.
3...enable access to high quality education.	?	?	?	It is uncertain what effect this might have and whether any effect would be positive or negative.	-	-	-	Minor Negative Under supply of housing therefore reduced number of families supported in the area, knock-on effect for schools in the area.	?	?	?	Over capacity for housing may make it harder for schools to predict future demand and develop strategically but it is uncertain what the net effect might be.	?	?	?	It is uncertain what effect this might have and whether any effect would be positive or negative.
4...strengthen society.	+	+	+	Provides more housing/households. Social cohesion.	-	-	-	Risks of not providing enough housing. Still able to support social cohesion but possibly not as much as the other options.	+	+	+	Provides more housing/households. Social cohesion.	+	+	+	Provides more housing/households. Social cohesion.
5...enable sustainable economic growth.	+	+	+	Provides homes for employees and enables employment in the construction sector.	+	-	-	Insufficient provision of homes in the medium to long term. Number not enough to support the working population needed for sustainable economic growth.	+	+	+	Provides homes for employees and enables employment in the construction sector.	+	+	+	Provides homes for employees and enables employment in the construction sector.

6...encourage active and sustainable travel.	?	?	?	Uncertain as insufficient information is available to enable an appraisal to be made.	?	?	?	Uncertain as insufficient information is available to enable an appraisal to be made.	?	?	?	Uncertain as insufficient information is available to enable an appraisal to be made.
7...manage material assets sustainably.	?	?	?	Uncertain as insufficient information is available to enable an appraisal to be made.	?	?	?	Uncertain as insufficient information is available to enable an appraisal to be made.	?	?	?	Uncertain as insufficient information is available to enable an appraisal to be made.
8...protect physical resources and use sustainably.	?	?	?	Uncertain as insufficient information is available to enable an appraisal to be made.	?	?	?	Uncertain as insufficient information is available to enable an appraisal to be made.	?	?	?	Uncertain as insufficient information is available to enable an appraisal to be made.
9...protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	-	-	-	Location is key as areas of natural heritage interest can be avoided but there is always likely to be an impact on the natural environment and a loss of local biodiversity.	-	-	-	Location is key as areas of natural heritage interest can be avoided but there is always likely to be an impact on the natural environment and a loss of local biodiversity.	-	-	-	Location is key as areas of natural heritage interest can be avoided but there is always likely to be an impact on the natural environment and a loss of local biodiversity. The higher number of houses would be likely to cause a higher loss of biodiversity.
10...protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	-	-	-	Potential to increase flooding due to increase in curtilage. Increase in run-off during and after construction. Increased water consumption.	-	-	-	Potential to increase flooding due to increase in curtilage. Increase in run-off during and after construction. Increased water consumption.	-	-	-	Potential to increase flooding due to increase in curtilage. Increase in run-off during and after construction. Increased water consumption.
11...improve air quality.	-	-	-	Additional housing with heating and transport emissions.	-	-	-	Additional housing with heating and transport emissions.	-	-	-	Additional housing with heating and transport emissions.
12...reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	-	-	-	Construction phase will add greenhouse gas emissions from land change,	-	-	-	Construction phase will add greenhouse gas emissions from land change,	-	-	-	Construction phase will add greenhouse gas emissions from land change,

				transport and material sources. Housing will increase domestic emissions of greenhouse gas emissions – heating/transport. Note that actions/mitigation can to a certain extent balance out these scenarios if in place.				transport and material sources. Housing will increase domestic emissions of greenhouse gas emissions – heating/transport. Note that actions/mitigation can to a certain extent balance out these scenarios if in place.				transport and material sources. Housing will increase domestic emissions of greenhouse gas emissions – heating/transport. Note that actions/mitigation can to a certain extent balance out these scenarios if in place.				transport and material sources. Housing will increase domestic emissions of greenhouse gas emissions – heating/transport. Note that actions/mitigation can to a certain extent balance out these scenarios if in place.
13...conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	?	?	?	Uncertain as insufficient information is available to enable an appraisal to be made.	?	?	?	Uncertain as insufficient information is available to enable an appraisal to be made.	?	?	?	Uncertain as insufficient information is available to enable an appraisal to be made.	?	?	?	Uncertain as insufficient information is available to enable an appraisal to be made.
14...maintain and enhance landscape character.	?	?	?	Uncertain as insufficient information is available to enable an appraisal to be made.	?	?	?	Uncertain as insufficient information is available to enable an appraisal to be made.	?	?	?	Uncertain as insufficient information is available to enable an appraisal to be made.	?	?	?	Uncertain as insufficient information is available to enable an appraisal to be made.
Summary and comparison of options against the sustainability objectives								<p>Each of the options presented a number of new dwellings determined from evidence and forecasting as set out in the Preferred Options Paper. It is hard to score the effect on many objectives as there is a lot of uncertainty about where sites would be taken up in each scenario and therefore effects cannot be predicted. A higher number of dwellings was in general favoured so that the demand would be more confidently met but there was some debate on this as all growth allocations are estimates. Over provision could lead to inefficiencies in providing infrastructure, less predictability about where growth will occur and services required and partially completed developments create a less attractive living environment.</p> <p>Options 1 and 2 did not score positively for meeting the range of housing needs required by the Plan.</p> <p>Option 3 scored positively for ensuring that a range of housing needs can be met, although the score awarded is the same it is a poorer option for other aspects including potential risk to landscape and biodiversity.</p> <p>Option 4 was considered to be the most reasonable option in terms of numbers. It allows a range of housing needs to be met, but reduces the risks associated with over provision of housing capacity.</p>								

The preferred option	Option 4
Measures to reduce negative effects and promote positive effects	Planning policies on flood risk, nature conservation, open space, site-specific conditions, key site requirements, sustainable drainage systems and community led renewable energy projects.

Issue 12: Housing Growth Allocation	Preliminary Housing Growth Allocation Options. The key principles used to shape the formulation of the options for housing growth allocation. Each of the options is based upon the preferred option for growth across the Borough of 13,000 dwellings. This equates to approximately 23% growth in the total number of homes in the Borough (above the number of dwellings recorded in the 2011 Census). The options primarily consider the level of growth appropriate to each of the Local Towns and Villages.											
	Option 1: Grow local towns and selected villages.			Option 2: Growth focused on local towns.			Option 3: Grow local towns and all villages.			Option 4: Growth based on existing land supply.		
Sustainability Objective	S T	M T	L T	Explanation	S T	M T	L T	Explanation	S T	M T	L T	Explanation
1...improve health and well-being.	?	?	?	Focusing on selected villages may have a minor positive effect, in terms of health services, but uncertain at this time.	?	?	?	Focusing on local towns may have a minor positive effect, in terms of health services, but uncertain at this time.	?	?	?	Growing local towns and all villages may have a minor positive effect, in terms of health services, but uncertain at this time.
2...provide good quality, sustainable housing.	+	+	+	Providing housing, and aiming to meet local needs, balanced across settlements however will limit provision on some villages.	+	+	+	Providing housing, and aiming to meet local needs, balanced across settlements however will limit provision in all villages.	+	+	+	Providing housing, and aiming to meet local needs, balanced across settlements.
3...enable access to high quality education.	?	?	?	Unclear relationship between location of housing and location of high quality education.	?	?	?	Unclear relationship between location of housing and location of high quality education.	?	?	?	Unclear relationship between location of housing and location of high quality education.
4...strengthen society.	+	+	+	Growing local town and selected villages gives the ability to target housing in reaction to local needs and could enhance/sustain the vitality of those places and positively strengthen society.	+	+	+	Growing towns allows need to be met in those towns, and could positively strengthen society in those locations however the converse could be the case for villages and rural communities with less opportunity to e.g. settle close to family.	+	+	+	Growing towns and all villages allows need to be met in those settlements, and could positively strengthen society in those locations. This is better for supporting rural communities.
5...enable sustainable economic growth.	?	?	?	It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage.	?	?	?	It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage.	?	?	?	It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage.

6...encourage active and sustainable travel.	+	+	+	Using Towns and three selected growth villages because of their location and transport routes, has the potential to encourage active and sustainable travel. This may lead to greater use of public transport.	?	?	?	Using Towns has the potential to encourage active and sustainable travel in towns and may lead to greater use of public transport. On the other hand it may undermine provision of public transport in villages.	?	?	?	It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage.	?	?	?	It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage.
7...manage material assets sustainably.	?	?	?	It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage.	?	?	?	It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage.	?	?	?	It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage.	?	?	?	It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage.
8...protect physical resources and use sustainably.	?	?	?	It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage.	?	?	?	It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage.	?	?	?	It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage.	?	?	?	It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage.
9...protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	?	?	?	It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage.	?	?	?	It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage.	?	?	?	It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage.	?	?	?	It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage.
10...protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	-	-	-	All housing development has the potential to increase risks to water quality, and increase water usage. However, all towns and selected villages have mains sewerage and capacity. A detailed assessment of potential effects such as risks to water quality will continue through plan preparation.	-	-	-	All housing development has the potential to increase risks to water quality, and increase water usage. However, all local towns and have mains sewerage and capacity. A detailed assessment of potential effects such as risks to water quality will continue through plan preparation.	-	-	-	All housing development has the potential to increase risks to water quality, and increase water usage. However, all towns and all villages have mains sewerage and capacity. A detailed assessment of potential effects such as risks to water quality will continue through plan preparation.	-	-	-	All housing development has the potential to increase risks to water quality, and increase water usage. A detailed assessment of potential effects such as risks to water quality will continue through plan preparation.
11...improve air quality.	+	+	+	Allocating growth to towns and selected growth villages may encourage growth in settlements with	?	?	?	It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage.	?	?	?	It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage.	?	?	?	It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage.

[illegible]

13...conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	?	?	?	It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage.	?	?	?	It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage.	?	?	?	It is difficult to determine the overall effect of this option at this stage.
14...maintain and enhance landscape character.	?	?	?	Spatial distribution at a local scale will have impacts on landscape. It is difficult to determine the effects of option 1 without further information such as specific location and design details. More focused development may offer opportunities for better landscape integration.	?	?	?	Spatial distribution at a local scale will have impacts on landscape. It is difficult to determine the effects of option 2 without further information such as specific location and design details. More focused development may offer opportunities for better landscape integration.	?	?	?	Spatial distribution at a local scale will have impacts on landscape. It is difficult to determine the effects of option 3 without further information such as specific location and design details. More widely dispersed development may make landscape integration more difficult overall.
Summary and comparison of options against the sustainability objectives					It is hard to score the effect on many objectives as there is a lot of uncertainty about where sites would be taken up in each scenario and therefore effects cannot be predicted. Options 1-3 which deliver a growth in housing give a positive scoring for providing good quality, sustainable housing, and strengthening society with 3 favouring rural communities particularly. These benefits were not determined for option 4, as growth would not be able to reflect local needs. Option 1 was however more positive for encouraging sustainable travel, improving air quality and reducing the causes of climate change. All options had a minor negative scoring for protecting, managing and using water resources sustainably should be dealt with in mitigation.							
The preferred option					Option 1							
Measures to reduce negative effects and promote positive effects					Mitigation for risks to water quality could be water pollution prevention local policy guidelines. Take opportunities to work with providers of public transport in planning new housing allocation locally.							

Issue 13: Existing Housing Commitments	BMAP includes two housing zonings on the lower slopes of Carnmoney Hill, but their development is conditional on a previously agreed transfer of a significant area of remaining agricultural/open land comprising the upper slopes of Carnmoney Hill to the legacy Newtownabbey Borough Council thereby creating the potential for the development of a Country Park in conjunction with land already in the ownership of the Council.							
	Option 1: De-zone the current BMAP housing zonings MNY 04/27 and MNY 04/29 and protect all remaining open land at Carnmoney Hill from alternative development, but with the land remaining in private ownership.				Option 2: Retain the current BMAP housing zonings MNY 04/27 and MNY 04/29 conditional on the previously agreed transfer of a significant area of remaining open land at Carnmoney Hill to Council ownership.			
Sustainability Objective	ST	MT	LT	Explanation	ST	MT	LT	Explanation
1...improve health and well-being.	?	?	?		+	+	+	Very good asset for local residents to access/view/be aware of. Access to open space, recreation, amenity value area, landscape; green infrastructure. Many benefits from natural environment near to housing/built up areas. Perceptions can even improve mental health – the idea of having the Country Park could boost well-being.
2...provide good quality, sustainable housing.	0	0	0	Minor reduction of capacity of 100 dwellings however could be offset by provision elsewhere.	+	+	+	New housing near to open space. Urban area so improving quality of housing for local people in the area – raising standard of landscape setting.
3...enable access to high quality education.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	0	0	0	Neutral No link
4...strengthen society.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	+	+	+	Shared space across/between communities for all to use at same time. Sense of place – unity.
5...enable sustainable economic growth.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	+	+	+	Potential tourism Potential to link up with other organisations/schemes in the area for example Belfast Hills Partnership. Development brings workers in to build/manage the housing and the Country Park and both add to the local economy with employment during and after construction i.e. maintenance and other opportunities.
6...encourage active and sustainable travel.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective as it would represent a small loss of housing in a much bigger area.	+	+	+	Enabling access through walking and cycling. Could integrate these transport options to the housing.

7...manage material assets sustainably.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	0	0	0	Neutral No link
8...protect physical resources and use sustainably.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	+	+	+	Adjacent to geological site so the Country Park could act as a buffer The site could be used as a local educational resource.
9...protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	0	0	0	Neutral, reduces loss of land to housing in this location however may inhibit an opportunity to enhance biodiversity on adjacent land.	+	+	+	Although the housing would cause negatives with a loss of biodiversity, the Country Park would retain local biodiversity and if managed properly could enhance it. Likewise, the housing development could integrate measures to connect with the green space through wildlife corridors and maintain local biodiversity. Other risks are noted such as nuisance from dog mess and anti-social behavior, and erosion but if managed properly these could be avoided.
10...protect, manage and use water resources sustainably.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	?	?	?	Potential risk of increased run-off from housing but also from erosion of the site as a whole i.e. including Country Park. Measures could reduce run-off during and after construction i.e. silt traps, SuDS.
11...improve air quality.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	?	?	?	Housing will probably increase local air quality issues (heating/transport/waste) but it could be balanced out with energy efficiency measures, renewable energy projects, walking/cycling modes of transport and integrated waste management solutions. There could be potential to slightly improve air quality by planting trees.
12...reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	?	?	?	The housing would increase the carbon footprint and greenhouse gas emissions with the construction of houses, associated transport and the heating of the homes and the increase in associated travel with more people accommodated in the area. However, measures such as energy efficiency and sustainable travel options can be taken to balance these impacts out.
13...conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	+	+	+	The Country Park could add to the importance of a local geological site. There could be potential to interpret the local site (s) and add to local cultural /educational value.

14...maintain and enhance landscape character.	+	+	+	This area is visually prominent and de-zoning would retain the farmland.	+	+	+	Depends on integration of the site - the location/aspect, design and landscaping. Standard measures such as local planting schemes and site topography very likely to help integrate with and/or improve the local area. The tranquil area designation of Carnmoney Hill would be supported by the Country Park proposal/option.
Summary and comparison of options against the sustainability objectives					Option 1 will reduce housing in the area however the impacts will be negligible for most objectives with slight positive effects for landscape. Option 2 for both housing and potential use as a Country Park was recognized as having potentially positive effects for many of the sustainability objectives. The appraisal identified that it would bring some uncertainties but many benefits for health and well-being, sustainable housing, sustainable travel, landscape character and several other objectives. It may score higher against some of the objectives (natural resources and biodiversity) but this could not be confirmed without proposals that are more detailed.			
The preferred option					Option 2			
Measures to reduce negative effects and promote positive effects					Planning policy, key site requirements, planning conditions, local planting schemes (native species).			

Issue 14: Retention of Existing Housing Commitments	It is proposed that there should be no de-zoning of housing land unless it can be demonstrated that there is no reasonable prospect of a specific site being delivered.									
	Option 1: De-zone unimplemented housing land.					Option 2: Unimplemented housing zonings in BMAP and the Antrim Area Plan carried forward into the new Plan.				
Sustainability Objective	ST	MT	LT	Explanation		ST	MT	LT	Explanation	
1...improve health and well-being.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.		0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective.	
2...provide good quality, sustainable housing.	-	-	-	Would hinder objective as may be lack of potential housing locations particularly in the short term.		+	+	+	Potential to meet objective.	
3...enable access to high quality education.	?	?	?	Could jeopardize sustainability of some schools but that depends on location of housing land and circumstances of schools.		?	?	?	Retaining zoned land for housing could help sustain schools; however, this only can take place where that land becomes developed.	
4...strengthen society.	-	-	-	Could be a negative effect for the adjacent existing housing if the area is not developed as intended and potentially services/facilities and open space are not developed or sustained.		?	?	?	Probably positive to some extent for adjacent and future housing but may vary from location to location.	
5...enable sustainable economic growth.	?	?	?	Could free land for other economic uses. Positives and negatives Would need more information therefore outcome uncertain.		?	?	?	Better than zoning new greenfield sites and positives and negatives again evident so outcome is uncertain.	
6...encourage active and sustainable travel.	?	?	?	Could be a negative effect for the adjacent existing housing if the area is not developed as intended and potentially public transport is not developed or sustained. On the other hand may allow housing to be zoned in locations with (or with potential) for better public transport.		?	?	?	Depends on spatial location. Site design-walking/cycling modes of transport could be favoured. Would need more detailed project level information.	
7...manage material assets sustainably.	0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective as it does not change the net provision of housing.		0	0	0	This option has negligible effect on this objective as it does not change the net provision of housing.	
8...protect physical resources and use sustainably.	?	?	?	This option has negligible effect on this objective as it does not change the net provision of housing.		?	?	?	This option has negligible effect on this objective as it does not change the net provision of housing.	
9...protect natural resources and enhance biodiversity.	?	?	?	Uncertain as impact may vary from location to location, loss of biodiversity to land for housing might be reduced if alternative sites are brought forward in the future.		?	?	?	Uncertain as impact may vary from location to location.	
10...protect, manage and use	?	?	?	Uncertain as impact may vary from location to location.		?	?	?	Uncertain as impact may vary from location to location.	

water resources sustainably.								
11...improve air quality.	?	?	?	Uncertain due to the reasons set out for objective 6.	?	?	?	Uncertain due to the reasons set out for objective 6.
12...reduce causes of and adapt to climate change.	?	?	?	Uncertain due to the reasons set out for objective 6 and depends on impacts of alternative uses of de-zoned land.	?	?	?	Positives and negatives of housing linked to climate change
13...conserve and enhance built and cultural heritage.	?	?	?	Uncertain as impact may vary from location to location.	?	?	?	Uncertain as impact may vary from location to location.
14...maintain and enhance landscape character.	?	?	?	Uncertain as impact may vary from location to location.	?	?	?	Uncertain as impact may vary from location to location.
Summary and comparison of options against the sustainability objectives				In the Sustainability Appraisal, both options are very similar in their appraisal outcomes. It is hard to score for many objectives as the effects positive and negative are likely to vary from location to location. Option 1 is likely to have a minor negative effect for housing and strengthening society whereas Option 2 would be better for providing good quality, sustainable housing.				
The preferred option				Option 2				
Measures to reduce negative effects and promote positive effects				Review of key site requirements, planning conditions, planning policy. Design and landscaping guides.				



ANTRIM CIVIC CENTRE
50 STILES WAY, ANTRIM BT41 2UB
T 028 9446 3113



MOSSLEY MILL
NEWTOWNABBEY BT36 5QA
T 028 9034 0000



www.antrimandnewtownabbey.gov.uk