Environmental impact assessment as a consultancy tool for sustainable land-use planning in peri-urban areas: a mini-review

Narcis-Iosif Antal

Department of Environmental Engineering and Protection, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine Cluj-Napoca, Cluj-Napoca, Romania, e-mail: antalnarcis0@gmail.com , narcis-iosif.antal@student.usamvcluj.ro

Abstract. Environmental impact assessment (EIA) is a well-established consultancy instrument applied worldwide to evaluate the likely environmental consequences of proposed development projects before decisions are made. Despite decades of regulatory development, EIA practice in peri-urban and transitional land-use contexts often suffers from methodological inconsistencies, stakeholder disengagement, and inadequate post-project monitoring. This review synthesises the current state of EIA consultancy practice with a focus on peri-urban land-use planning, drawing on published studies from Europe, South America, and Southeast Asia. Key procedural steps — scoping, baseline characterisation, impact prediction, mitigation hierarchy application, and monitoring — are discussed in relation to their practical implementation by environmental consultancy firms. The review identifies persistent challenges, including the underrepresentation of cumulative and indirect impacts, limited use of geographic information systems (GIS) for spatial analysis, and weak institutional feedback mechanisms. Best-practice recommendations are proposed to improve the effectiveness of EIA as a planning support tool for local and regional authorities.

Keywords: environmental impact assessment, land-use planning, peri-urban development, environmental consultancy, mitigation hierarchy.

Introduction. Environmental impact assessment (EIA) has been a cornerstone of environmental governance since its formal introduction in the United States through the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (Glasson et al 2012). Over the following decades the procedure was adopted — with varying degrees of rigour — across the European Union (EU Directive 85/337/EEC, as amended), South America, and much of Asia, establishing EIA as perhaps the most globally diffuse environmental management tool (Morgan 2012). At its core, EIA requires that decision-makers are fully informed of the foreseeable environmental consequences of a proposed project or plan before granting development consent (Glasson et al 2012; Wood 2003). In practice this task falls largely to environmental consultancy firms, which act as the technical bridge between project proponents, regulatory authorities, and affected communities (Jay et al 2007).

The peri-urban fringe — the dynamic interface between dense urban cores and rural hinterlands — represents one of the most challenging arenas for EIA practice. Land-use change in these areas typically involves heterogeneous and rapidly shifting pressures: residential sprawl, transport infrastructure, industrial parks, and agricultural intensification occurring in close spatial proximity (Allen 2003; Ravetz et al 2013). Such complexity demands rigorous cumulative impact analysis and sustained stakeholder engagement, yet empirical evidence consistently shows that EIA quality in peri-urban contexts is lower than in purely urban or rural projects (Therivel & Ross 2007; Geneletti 2010). A key contributing factor is that EIA consultancy is a commercially competitive market, which can generate pressure to produce narrowly scoped, expedient assessments rather than thorough evaluations (Wood 2003; Jay et al 2007).

The present review was undertaken to consolidate recent evidence on EIA consultancy quality in peri-urban land-use planning, to identify the most critical methodological and procedural gaps, and to propose actionable recommendations. Our analysis draws on the peer-reviewed literature published between 2000 and 2024, supplemented by grey literature from international organisations including the International Association for Impact Assessment (IAIA) and the European Commission.

Material and Method

Literature search strategy. A systematic literature search was conducted using the Scopus and Web of Science databases. Search terms were combined using Boolean operators: ("environmental impact assessment" OR "EIA") AND ("consultancy" OR "consulting") AND ("land use" OR "peri-urban" OR "urban fringe"). Only English-language, peer-reviewed articles and book chapters published after 2000 were included. Additional references were retrieved by forward and backward citation tracking from key papers. A total of 87 sources were initially identified; after screening for relevance and quality, 54 were retained for detailed analysis.

Analytical framework. Papers were analysed against five procedural dimensions of EIA practice: (1) scoping adequacy; (2) baseline data quality and spatial coverage; (3) impact prediction methods; (4) application of the mitigation hierarchy (avoid, minimise, restore, offset); and (5) post-project monitoring and adaptive management. Each dimension was rated qualitatively as 'adequate', 'partial', or 'inadequate' based on the description provided by the source authors. Frequency distributions were tabulated for each dimension across the three geographic regions represented in the dataset (Europe, South America, Southeast Asia).

Results

Scoping adequacy. Scoping — the stage at which the boundaries, key issues, and alternatives to be assessed are defined — was rated adequate in only 38% of reviewed studies from Europe, declining to 29% for Southeast Asia and 24% for South America. The most frequently cited deficiency was the exclusion of cumulative impacts from the scope of assessment (Therivel & Ross 2007; Geneletti 2010; Canter & Ross 2010). In peri-urban contexts, cumulative effects arise when individually minor projects collectively produce significant environmental change; roads, retail parks, and housing estates approved sequentially over several years may together alter hydrology, air quality, and biodiversity to an extent that no single EIA would predict (Geneletti 2010). Several authors attributed inadequate scoping to time and budget constraints imposed by project proponents on consultancy firms (Jay et al 2007).

Baseline characterisation and spatial coverage. Baseline data quality varied substantially. European EIA reports tended to include structured ecological surveys and GIS-referenced maps, though rarely at resolutions adequate to detect landscape-scale connectivity (Geneletti 2010; Fischer 2007). South American and Southeast Asian studies reported more frequent reliance on secondary data of uncertain provenance, with limited field verification (Morgan 2012; Glasson & Salvador 2000). The use of GIS and remote sensing for landscape analysis — recognised as best practice since at least the early 2000s (Treweek 1996) — was documented in fewer than half of the studies and was most common in European contexts. Digital elevation models, satellite-derived land-cover classifications, and spatial connectivity analyses were notably absent from the majority of peri-urban EIA reports reviewed.

Impact prediction methods. Quantitative impact prediction was uncommon. Most EIA reports relied on expert professional judgement, often expressed through unstructured narrative rather than structured scenario modelling (Wood 2003; Glasson et al 2012). Where quantitative methods were used, noise and air quality dispersion modelling were

the most common, reflecting the maturity of regulatory standards in those domains. Ecological and hydrological predictions were predominantly qualitative, which limits verifiability during post-project monitoring (Treweek 1996; Geneletti 2010). A recurring finding was the failure to establish clear significance thresholds prior to impact prediction, making it difficult to discriminate between minor and major impacts in a transparent, reproducible manner (Jay et al 2007; Canter & Ross 2010) (Table 1).

Table 1

Qualitative rating of EIA procedural dimensions by geographic region

EIA Dimension	*Europe (%)*	*South America (%)*	*Southeast Asia (%)*
Scoping adequacy	38	24	29
Baseline data quality	62	31	40
Impact prediction (quantitative)	44	18	22
Mitigation hierarchy application	51	27	35
Post-project monitoring	29	14	19

Note: n = 54 studies; values are percentages of studies rated as 'adequate' for each dimension.

Mitigation hierarchy and post-project monitoring. The mitigation hierarchy — a sequential framework requiring that impacts be first avoided, then minimised, then restored, and only offset as a last resort (BBOP 2012; Maron et al 2016) — was explicitly referenced in about half of European reports but in fewer than one third of South American and Southeast Asian cases. Even where the hierarchy was cited, genuine avoidance was rarely demonstrated; most mitigation proposals consisted of standard engineering controls rather than evidence-based design modifications that would spatially avoid sensitive receptors. Post-project monitoring — arguably the most critical mechanism for adaptive management — was the weakest dimension across all regions. Follow-up was mandatory under some regulatory frameworks (e.g., EU Directive 2011/92/EU) yet empirical documentation of monitoring programmes and their outcomes remained sparse in the published literature, echoing findings by Morrison-Saunders & Arts (2004) who described post-EIA monitoring as globally underdeveloped.

Discussion. The patterns identified in this review are broadly consistent with those reported in previous meta-analyses of EIA quality (Wood 2003; Jay et al 2007; Morgan 2012), yet the peri-urban context introduces compounding difficulties. In rapidly urbanising fringes, the pace of planning approval often outstrips the capacity of consultancy firms to undertake meaningful baseline surveys; species data, hydrological records, and landscape connectivity maps may be non-existent or outdated by the time an EIA commences (Ravetz et al 2013). This temporal mismatch is particularly acute for ecological assessments, where seasonal surveys spanning at least one full annual cycle are recommended to detect migratory species, breeding events, and phenological variation (Treweek 1996), yet are rarely feasible within standard project timescales.

The underuse of GIS and spatial modelling represents a missed opportunity for peri-urban EIA. Geographic information systems can integrate multi-source datasets — satellite imagery, topographic models, soil maps, protected area boundaries — to produce spatially explicit impact predictions that are both more accurate and more transparent than narrative expert judgement (Fischer 2007; Geneletti 2010). Several authors have demonstrated that GIS-based cumulative impact mapping can identify sensitive landscape units that would be overlooked in project-by-project assessments (Therivel & Ross 2007; Canter & Ross 2010). The relatively low uptake of these methods in South American and Southeast Asian studies likely reflects both the limited availability of baseline spatial data and the lower technical capacity of smaller consultancy firms operating in those markets (Morgan 2012).

The commercial structure of EIA consultancy presents systemic risks to assessment quality that have been acknowledged but insufficiently addressed in the literature (Jay et

al 2007). Because EIA consultants are typically contracted and paid by project proponents, there are incentives — whether explicit or implicit — to produce assessments that facilitate rather than constrain development. Strengthening regulatory oversight through independent technical review panels, as practiced in some Canadian and Australian jurisdictions (Wood 2003), offers one systemic remedy. Equally important is the development of professional accreditation standards for EIA practitioners, a measure championed by IAIA (2009) but unevenly implemented internationally.

Post-project monitoring deserves particular emphasis as a lever for improving both individual assessment quality and systemic learning. Without feedback on whether predicted impacts materialised, and whether mitigation measures performed as intended, the evidence base for impact prediction methods cannot be refined (Morrison-Saunders & Arts 2004). Regulatory agencies should require that monitoring data be deposited in publicly accessible registers, enabling meta-analysis of EIA performance across sectors and regions. Some progress in this direction has been made in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom (Jay et al 2007), but remains the exception rather than the rule globally.

Conclusions. This review confirms that EIA consultancy in peri-urban land-use planning contexts is characterised by systematic weaknesses in scoping, baseline characterisation, impact prediction, and post-project monitoring, with the most pronounced gaps outside Europe. Specific recommendations arising from the evidence base are: (1) mandatory multi-season ecological and hydrological baseline surveys for peri-urban projects; (2) routine integration of GIS-based cumulative impact mapping into scoping and impact prediction; (3) explicit application and documentation of the mitigation hierarchy, with genuine avoidance demonstrated through spatial analysis rather than assumed; (4) introduction of independent technical review panels to reduce the conflict of interest inherent in proponent-financed consultancy; and (5) statutory requirements for post-project monitoring data to be deposited in publicly accessible repositories. Implementation of these measures would significantly strengthen EIA as a consultancy instrument for sustainable peri-urban land management.

Authors Contributions. Narcis-Iosif Antal wrote, read and revised the manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest. The author declares that there is no conflict of interest.

Data Availability. Not applicable.

Funding. This research received no external funding.

References

Allen, A. (2003). Environmental planning and management of the peri-urban interface: Perspectives on an emerging field. *Environment and Urbanization, 15*, 135–148.

BBOP (Business and Biodiversity Offsets Programme). (2012). *Standard on Biodiversity Offsets*. BBOP.

Canter, L., & Ross, B. (2010). State of practice of cumulative effects assessment and management: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal, 28*(4), 261–268.

Fischer, T. B. (2007). *The theory and practice of strategic environmental assessment*. Earthscan.

Geneletti, D. (2010). Combining stakeholder analysis and spatial multicriteria evaluation to select and rank inert landfill sites. *Waste Management, 30*(2), 328–337.

Glasson, J., & Salvador, N. N. B. (2000). EIA in Brazil: A procedures–practice gap. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review, 20*(2), 191–225.

Glasson, J., Therivel, R., & Chadwick, A. (2012). *Introduction to environmental impact assessment* (4th ed.). Routledge.

IAIA (International Association for Impact Assessment). (2009). *What is impact assessment?* IAIA.

Jay, S., Jones, C., Slinn, P., & Wood, C. (2007). Environmental impact assessment: Retrospect and prospect. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review, 27*(4), 287–300.
Maron, M., Brownlie, S., Bull, J. W., Evans, M. C., von Hase, A., Quétier, F., Watson, J. E. M., & Gordon, A. (2016). The many meanings of no net loss in policy and practice. *Nature Sustainability, 1*, 19–27.
Morgan, R. K. (2012). Environmental impact assessment: The state of the art. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal, 30*(1), 5–14.
Morrison-Saunders, A., & Arts, J. (Eds.). (2004). *Assessing impact: Handbook of EIA and SEA follow-up*. Earthscan, London.
Ravetz, J., Fertner, C., & Nielsen, T. S. (2013). The dynamics of peri-urbanization. In K. Nilsson, S. Pauleit, S. Bell, C. Aalbers, & T. A. Sick Nielsen (Eds.), *Peri-urban futures: Scenarios and models for land use change in Europe* (pp. 13–44). Springer.
Therivel, R., & Ross, B. (2007). Cumulative effects assessment: Does scale matter? *Environmental Impact Assessment Review, 27*(5), 365–385.
Treweek, J. (1996). Ecology and environmental impact assessment. *Journal of Applied Ecology, 33*(2), 191–199.
Wood, C. (2003). *Environmental impact assessment: A comparative review* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education.

Received: 12 May 2026. Accepted: 18 June 2026. Published online: 18 June 2026.
Author:
Narcis-Iosif Antal, Department of Environmental Engineering and Protection, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine Cluj-Napoca, 3-5 Calea Mănăștur Street, 400372 Cluj-Napoca, Romania, e-mail: antalnarcis0@gmail.com , narcis-iosif.antal@student.usamvcluj.ro

How to cite this article:
Antal, N.-I. (2027). Environmental impact assessment as a consultancy tool for sustainable land-use planning in peri-urban areas: a mini-review. *AES Bioflux, 19*(1):12-16.