

**STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
POST MODIFICATION ASSESSMENT**

Introduction

The Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005 requires development plans and programmes produced by public bodies to be subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). The Perth & Kinross Local Development Plan (LDP) is an important plan which will guide the use and development of land across the area up to at least 2024.

In October 2010, alongside the LDP Main Issues Report, the Council published and consulted on the SEA Environmental Report. This was followed in January 2012 by an Addendum which provided more detail in terms of the potential environmental impacts of the Plan's policies and also the mitigation and enhancement measures identified for individual site proposals.

Following receipt of the LDP Examination Report in October 2013 it was necessary to assess the Reporters' recommendations to identify what impact these had on the SEA, and to undertake any further assessment required. For each of the issues considered at the Examination this Post Examination SEA Update sets out the original assessment, the Reporters recommendation and what, if any, impact the recommendation has. A number of new policies have been introduced as a result of the Reporters recommendations and an assessment of these against the SEA objectives is given in Section 3.

This Update is split into four parts:

1. Vision, Strategy and Other Issues
2. Policies Assessment
3. Assessment of New Policies
4. Proposals Assessment

Section 1 – VISION, STRATEGY AND OTHER ISSUES

Some of the more general strategy-related issues were not specifically assessed through SEA and this part of the update considers whether further assessment needs to be carried out in light of the Reporters recommendations.

| Issue | Original SEA | Reporters Recommendations | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| 1. Vision and Objectives | The Plan's vision and objectives were assessed through the SEA process (ER section 5) | 1. Add the following sentence to section 2.2: <i>'We want to put a Plan in place that will enable us to live a Zero Waste lifestyle, maximising the value from waste resources'</i> . | The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, make the effects more positive. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| 2. Strategy | Section '2.4 Strategy' of the Plan was not specifically assessed through the SEA process. | 1. Add a new paragraph 2.4.15 under the subheading "Use of resources" to read as follows: <i>"Use of resources</i> <i>2.4.15 Agricultural land provides an important role in food and other resource production. The quality of such land is graded according to its value, and that which is recognised to be of the highest quality requires to be protected from redevelopment unless there is no alternative."</i> 2. Add a new paragraph 2.4.16 under the new "Use of resources" subheading to read as follows: <i>"2.4.16 In order to address potential energy scarcity issues in the future, development needs to be located and designed in a way that maximises energy efficiency. The benefit of development which delivers more secure and diverse energy supplies will also need to be recognised."</i> 3. Add to the end of paragraph 2.4.6 the following sentence: <i>"The projected increase in the average age of our population will require new homes and services to be appropriately located and will have implications for the design of new development."</i> 4. Replace paragraph 2.4.8 with paragraph 3.2.12 from the Main Issues Report, which reads as follows: <i>"The land use planning system has to be prepared to respond to any economic upturn and ensure that the lack of effective housing land does not become a constraint on general economic recovery. Should the planning system be unable to respond to economic recovery through a lack of identified effective housing land supply, there would be pressure to release housing land through ad-hoc decisions. This presents the possibility that the decision making process would respond primarily to the housing land shortage at the expense of longer term sustainability issues. This would also defeat one of the primary aims of the new planning system to be plan-led."</i> | Although this section of the Plan was not previously assessed through the SEA process the changes recommended by the Reporter are not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| 20a. TAYplan Spatial Strategy | The effects of the spatial strategy on TAYplan tiered settlements was assessed through the SEA process (ER section 6) | No modifications. | No modifications made to this section therefore no SEA implications |
| 20b. Employment Land Strategy | The employment land strategy was not specifically assessed through the SEA process. | 1. Delete the text of paragraph 5.1.8 and replace with the following: <i>"5.1. 8 The total 5 year employment land supply for which sites have been identified in the Perth area to 2024 is 70 hectares and this is considered to be more than adequate. The table at paragraph 5.1.7 identifies sites which will meet that requirement. It also includes land, such as that at Oudenarde, which will contribute towards the effective land supply towards the end of</i> | Although not an issue previously assessed through the SEA process the change recommended by the Reporter is not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |

| Issue | Original SEA | Reporters Recommendations | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|--|---|---|---|
| | | <i>that period and beyond. Some sites, including the James Hutton Institute at Invergowrie, are identified for specialist employment.”</i> | |
| 20c. Housing Land Strategy | The housing land strategy was not specifically assessed through the SEA process. | No modifications with respect to these specific representations other than those set out elsewhere in the report. | No modifications made to this section therefore no SEA implications. |
| 20d. Effectiveness of Strategic Sites | The effectiveness of the strategic sites was not specifically assessed through the SEA process. | No modifications. | No modifications made to this section therefore no SEA implications. |
| 20e. HMA Specific Housing Strategy Issues | The effects of the spatial strategy on each of the TAYplan tiered settlements was assessed through the SEA process (ER section 6) | 1. Delete the diagram incorporated within paragraph 5.1.1. As a consequential amendment, for continuity, insert bullet points in advance of each of the settlements listed as being part of the Perth Core Area. | Although not an issue previously assessed through the SEA process the change recommended by the Reporter is not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| 20f. Greenfield Land and Housing Density | The housing land strategy – including the section on greenfield land and housing density – was not specifically assessed through the SEA process. | 1. For each housing allocation in the plan there should be included an additional column which provides for the users of the plan a range which sets out the expected density of development. As a consequence of that recommendation delete paragraph 4.3.13 including the associated table. Make any consequential changes elsewhere in the Proposed Plan. However following a request for clarification on the latter point the Reporter has indicated that the Council may proceed with this modification without the inclusion of an additional density range column for each housing allocation. | Although not an issue previously assessed through the SEA process the changes recommended by the Reporter are not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| | | 2. Modify the first clause in the second paragraph of Policy PM1A to read: “ <i>The design, density and siting of development.</i> ” 3. Modify Policy PM1B at its item (c) to read: “ <i>The design and density should complement...</i> ” | Policy PM1 has already been assessed through the SEA process and the minor textual changes proposed would not significantly change the original assessment or require further SEA to be carried out. |
| 46. Whole Plan Issues | These issues were not specifically assessed | <p><u>Glossary</u></p> <p>1. Modify the definition of “Town centre” to refer to “local development plans” rather than “local plans”.</p> <p>2. Add a definition for the term “Commercial centre” to the glossary to read as follows: “<i>These are distinct from town centres as their range of uses and physical structure makes them different in character and sense of place. They generally have a more specific focus on retailing or on retailing and leisure uses. Examples of commercial centres include out-of-centre shopping centres, commercial leisure developments, mixed retail and leisure developments, retail parks and factory outlet centres.</i>”</p> <p>3. Modify the definition of “Retail park” to refer to “out of town centre” rather than “off centre”.</p> <p><u>Maps</u></p> <p>4. Add to the landward maps for each of the Plan’s sub-areas, the location and extent of locally designated areas that are protected by Policy NE1C.</p> <p><u>Clarity</u></p> <p>5. Modify paragraph 9.1.12 to highlight the settlements within the Lunan Valley Lochs catchment area by adding an additional sentence at the end to read as follows: “<i>The settlements that lie within the Lunan Valley Lochs catchment are Butterstone, Concraigie, Craigie, Kinloch and the west of Blairgowrie.</i>”</p> | The Reporter makes a number of minor modifications to add clarity but none that would require further SEA to be carried out. |

Section 2 – POLICIES ASSESSMENT

The Environmental Report Addendum No. 2 – Appendix B provides a detailed summary of the findings of the analysis of the Plan’s policies against the following SEA objectives:

| Ref. | Objective |
|--------|---|
| SEA 1 | Conserve and enhance the diversity of species and habitats |
| SEA 2 | Accommodate population and household growth and direct that growth to appropriate locations |
| SEA 3 | Improve the quality of life for communities in Perth and Kinross |
| SEA 4 | Maximise the health and wellbeing of the population through improved environmental quality |
| SEA 5 | Maintain, protect and where necessary enhance the fundamental qualities and productive capacities of soils |
| SEA 6 | Protect and where possible enhance waterbody status |
| SEA 7 | Safeguard the functional floodplain |
| SEA 8 | Protect and enhance air quality |
| SEA 9 | Direct development to sustainable locations which help to reduce journey lengths and the need to travel |
| SEA 10 | Reduce emissions of greenhouse gases |
| SEA 11 | Reduce the area’s vulnerability to the effects of climate change through identifying appropriate mitigation and adaptation measures |
| SEA 12 | Minimise waste per head of population |
| SEA 13 | Maximise the sustainable use/re-use of material assets (land and buildings) |
| SEA 14 | Promote and ensure high standards of sustainable design and construction |
| SEA 15 | Protect and enhance where appropriate the historic environment |
| SEA 16 | Protect and enhance the character, diversity and special qualities of the area’s landscapes to ensure new development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it |
| SEA 17 | Protect and enhance townscape character and respect the existing pattern, form and setting of settlements |

The following table gives the summary of the likely effects of each policy grouping from the original SEA together with the Reporters recommendations and the impact of these.

| Issue | Summary of Overall Likely Policy Group Effects | Reporters Recommendations | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|--|---|--|---|
| 3. Placemaking | Overall it is anticipated that the policy will have a positive effect, as it supports the creation of sustainable places and seeks to ensure that new development takes account of land uses within the vicinity of the proposed development and is designed accordingly, in order to limit potential impacts and create well designed places. In some cases those positive impacts will be dependent on how the policy is implemented at a planning application level for specific proposals, and also it’s implementation in combination with other policies in the Plan. | <u>Policy PM1B</u> 1. Modify criterion (b) to read as follows: <i>“Consider and respect site topography and any surrounding important landmarks, views or skylines, as well as the wider landscape character of the area.”</i> 2. Add an additional criterion (h) to read as follows: <i>“Incorporate green infrastructure into new developments and make connections where possible to green networks.”</i> | The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, make the effects of the policy even more positive. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| | It is expected that the policy will have positive environmental effects by protecting; smaller areas of open space, residential amenity, and encouraging brownfield development. The policy encourages suitable infill development within existing urban areas where there is better access to public transport and local services. There aren’t expected to be any effects on waterbody status, soils or climatic factors. | <u>RD1 Residential Areas</u> 3. Modify category (a) to read as follows: <i>“Infill residential development at a density which represents the most efficient use of the site while respecting its environs.”</i> | The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, make the effects of the policy even more positive. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| 4. Infrastructure Contributions | A pre-screening was previously carried out for this policy and it was determined that as the policy itself will not result in any physical development but rather provides a statement of the Council’s general intent in respect of when and how it will seek financial contributions from developers related their proposals. Therefore it was considered unlikely that it would have a significant effect on any the SEA topics listed under | <u>Policy PM3 Infrastructure Contributions</u> 1. Modify the policy by the insertion of an additional paragraph immediately before the Note, to read as follows: <i>“In all cases, the Council will consider the economic viability of proposals alongside options of phasing or staging payments.”</i> 2. Modify the policy by replacing the paragraph that follows points (a) and (b) with | Given that this policy did not previously undergo full assessment it was felt appropriate to consider whether the addition of this second part to the policy would change the original assessment in any way – see section below. |

| Issue | Summary of Overall Likely Policy Group Effects | Reporters Recommendations | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|--------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | Schedule 3 of the 2005 Act. | the following: "Wherever possible, the requirements of this policy will be secured by planning condition. Where a legal agreement is required, the possibility of using an agreement under other legislation such as the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973 will be considered. Only where successors in title need to be bound will a planning obligation be required." | |
| 5. Economic Development | New definition added to the glossary – not previously assessed | <u>Glossary</u> 1. Add a definition for "tourism-related development to the Proposed Plan's glossary to read as follows: "Development in hospitality, leisure and retail facilities and infrastructure where the primary purpose is to attract tourism visits (overnight and/or leisure day visits) thereby generating revenues and employment within the local economy." | This is a minor modification to add clarity and would not require further SEA to be carried out. |
| | It is considered that the policy will have positive effects on a number of the SEA topics as a result of locating employment and housing land uses together and requiring good active travel and public transport links, which should help to reduce the need to travel by private car. The policy's requirement for development not to detract from the amenity of adjacent, particularly residential, areas should result in positive impacts on the SEA objectives for quality of life, ensuring high standards of design and construction and also protecting and enhancing townscape character; however, such impacts will be dependent on the delivery of the policy in combination with other policies in the Plan. Unknown/unpredictable effects have been identified for SEA objectives in relation to biodiversity, population health and wellbeing, the water environment, Climate Change, waste, the historic environment and landscape, as any potential impacts will be dependent on the location of the specific development proposals and any environmental sensitivities present. | <u>Policy ED1A</u> 2. Add the following text as a Note: "Supplementary guidance prepared in relation to Policy TA1: Transport Standards and Accessibility Requirements will explain when a travel and transport assessment is required." 3. Add the following text to the policy as item (e): "Proposals for waste management facilities can be considered to be acceptable subject to detailed site specific considerations." 4. Add the following text to the policy as item (f): "Proposals should not result in adverse impacts, either individually or in combination, on the integrity of any European designated site." | The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, make the effects of the policy even more positive. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| | Overall the policy will have uncertain or unpredictable effects with potential for policy divergence with the environmental objectives depending on location, type and scale of individual proposals coming forward through planning applications and also how the policy is implemented for those proposals in conjunction with other policies in the Plan which could help to remove/reduce/mitigate any potential significant effects and/or provide for appropriate enhancement measures for specific development proposals. There are however potential negative impacts of concern, primarily in terms of water quality, flooding and air quality which need to be dealt with in more detail through the supplementary guidance linked to this LDP policy. In addition, further strengthening of issues relating to biodiversity, environmental quality, soils, sustainable locations and travel, climate change, waste, material assets, landscape and townscape also need to be incorporated into the associated supplementary guidance to enable a more positive outcome. | <u>Policy ED3</u> 5. Delete sentence 4 of the introduction to the policy and insert the following: "This is provided that they will contribute to the local economy through the provision of permanent employment, or visitor accommodation, or additional tourism or recreational facilities, or involves the re-use of existing buildings." 6. Amend the first clause of paragraph 2 of the introduction to the policy to read as follows: "New and existing tourism-related development will be supported...." | The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, make the effects of the policy more positive. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| 6. Tourism | Overall the policy will have uncertain or unpredictable effects with potential for policy divergence with the environmental objectives depending on the type, scale and location of individual proposals submitted through a planning application and also it's implementation in combination with other policies in the Plan, which could help to remove/reduce/mitigate any potential significant effects and/or provide for appropriate enhancement measures for specific development proposals. There are likely to be positive effects as a result of the policy on SEA Objectives 3, 13 and 14 when delivered in conjunction with other policies in the Plan, due to the provision of new and improved holiday and leisure facilities, ensuring the retention of existing caravan sites, chalets and timeshare developments and also seeking high standards of design and | <u>Policy ED4:Caravan Sites, Chalets and Timeshare Developments</u> 1. In the section of the policy headed "In all cases" add the following text: "Development proposals will only be approved where they will not result in adverse impacts, either individually or in combination, on the integrity of the River Tay Special Area of Conservation. Where proposals are located close to a watercourse, which is part of or connects to the Special Area of Conservation, a Construction Method Statement should be provided for all aspects of the development to protect the watercourse from the impact of pollution and sediment, so as to ensure no adverse effects on the qualifying interests of the Special Area of Conservation. Other studies including an otter survey, drainage impact assessment and species protection plan, where appropriate, may be required." | The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, make the effects of the policy more positive. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |

| Issue | Summary of Overall Likely Policy Group Effects | Reporters Recommendations | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|--|--|---|--|
| | <p>construction for such developments by requiring proposals to be compatible with policy PM1: Placemaking.</p> <p>There is potential for negative impacts on the area's landscapes due to the likely location of such developments in rural areas i.e. close to natural assets of interest for tourism purposes; but such impacts are largely unknown at this stage and should be assessed at an individual planning application stage against the Plan's policy framework.</p> <p>Overall the policy will have uncertain or unpredictable effects with potential for policy divergence with the environmental objectives depending on the type, scale and location of individual proposals arising out of this policy, and also its implementation in combination with other policies in the Plan for specific proposals at planning application stage, which could help to remove/reduce/mitigate any potential significant effects and/or provide for appropriate enhancement measures.</p> <p>Potential for negative impacts on elements of the historic and water environments at some of the listed major resorts; any proposals coming forward under this policy would require further detailed consideration at planning application stage to ensure no significant effects occur. However, the Plan's policies in relation to the historic environment, placemaking, designated sites and drainage should help to avoid/reduce/mitigate for any potential negative impacts at these or other locations.</p> <p>Positive impacts are likely in terms SEA Objectives 3, 13, 14 and 16 due to the encouragement given to improving and expanding these resort facilities under the policy; the retention and use of some of the area's significant tourism material assets, and also the policies presumption in favour of protecting the landscape setting of these resorts.</p> | <p><u>Policy ED5: Major Tourism Resorts</u></p> <p>1. Delete sentence 3 of Policy ED5 including the five listed tourism resorts (a) to (e).</p> | <p>The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment. No further SEA requires to be carried out.</p> |
| <p>7. Retail and Commercial Development</p> | <p>New policy not previously assessed</p> <p>Overall the policy will have positive effects as it promotes retail and commercial development to be located within town centres which are the most accessible and sustainable location for the general population. Any impact on landscape or soil is likely to be minimal as proposals will be within an urban location.</p> <p>There are however negative impacts of concern primarily in terms of water quality, air quality (particularly in Perth) and waste generation which need dealt with in more detail through LDP policy and possibly supplementary guidance. There is however potential to</p> | <p><u>New Retail Policy</u></p> <p>1. Add a new Policy RC5, worded as follows: <i>"Proposals to modify planning obligations and other planning controls that control floorspace and/or the range of goods that can be sold from retail units must be justified by a health check, a retail impact assessment and where appropriate a transport assessment. Proposals will only be acceptable where:</i> <i>(a) It can be demonstrated that there will be no significant impact (individual or cumulative) on any town centre.</i> <i>(b) It can be demonstrated that the proposal helps meet quantitative or qualitative deficiencies in existing provision.</i> <i>(c) It can be demonstrated that there will be no change to the role or function of the centre in the network of centres.</i> <i>(d) It is supported by a favourable sequential assessment, that demonstrates that no other suitable site in a sequentially preferable location is available or is likely to become available in a reasonable time.</i> <i>(e) It is of an appropriate scale.</i> <i>(f) Any detrimental impacts identified in the transport assessment are mitigated.</i> <i>Any significant changes in the evolving role and function of a centre should be addressed through the next review of the Local Development Plan rather than changes being driven by individual applications."</i></p> <p><u>Town and Neighbourhood Centres (Policies RC1- RC2)</u></p> <p>2. Include within the Plan a larger scale map showing the Perth town centre boundary.</p> <p>3. Modify the first sentence of Policy RC1 to read as follows: <i>"Within the areas identified as Town and Neighbourhood Centres, the Council will encourage uses within Class 1 (retail) of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Scotland) Order 1997. Within defined Town Centres the Council will support development where larger retail floorplates are created and/or which creates additional retail floorspace. Within the areas identified as Neighbourhood Centres, the Council will support development which creates additional retail floorspace of a</i></p> | <p>New policy which requires SEA – see full assessment below.</p> <p>The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, make the effects of the policy more positive. No further SEA requires to be carried out.</p> |

| Issue | Summary of Overall Likely Policy Group Effects | Reporters Recommendations | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|-------|---|--|---|
| | <p>avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment through applying the Plan's policies in relation to drainage (required connection to public sewer system and the use of SUDS in new developments).</p> <p>In addition, further strengthening of issues relating to biodiversity, flooding, climate change, and townscape also need to be incorporated into the associated supplementary guidance to enable a more positive outcome. There are unknown impacts in terms of the historic environment depending on the location, scale and design of individual development proposals, as they could impact on neighbouring historic environment elements. However, such potential impacts could be avoided/minimised by applying the Plan's historic environment policies where relevant.</p> <p>Potential negative impacts in terms of waste minimisation have been identified as further waste is likely to be generated in these areas as a result of increased retail activities.</p> | <p><i>scale which is commensurate with the role of the centre within the established retail hierarchy."</i></p> <p>4. Modify the second sentence of Policy RC1 to read as follows: <i>"The Council will also encourage ground floor uses within Classes 2 and 3 (building societies, estate agents, restaurants and cafes etc) of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Scotland) Order 1997 and leisure, entertainment, recreation, cultural and community facilities, provided that they contribute to the character, vitality and viability of the retail area and satisfy all of the following criteria:"</i></p> <p>5. Modify Policy RC1 by adding the following after criterion (d): <i>"(e) Ensure there are no adverse effects, either individually or in combination, on the integrity of the River Tay Special Area of Conservation and Loch Leven Special Protection Area.</i> <i>Where development proposals will affect a watercourse in Perth City Centre, Aberfeldy, Pitlochry and Alyth town centres (River Tay Special Area of Conservation), and Kinross and Milnathort town centres (Loch Leven Special Protection Area), a Construction Method Statement should be provided for all aspects of the development to protect the watercourse from the impact of pollution and sediment."</i></p> | |
| | <p>Overall the policy will have positive effects as it promotes retail and commercial development to be located within town centres which are the most accessible and sustainable location for the general population. Any impact on landscape or soil will be minimal as it is within an urban location.</p> <p>There are however negative impacts of concern primarily in terms of water quality and air quality which need dealt with in more detail through LDP policy and possibly supplementary guidance, and also in terms of the waste minimisation objective as further waste is likely to be generated in these areas as a result of increased retail activities.</p> <p>There are unknown impacts in terms of the historic environment depending on the location, scale and design of individual development proposals, as they could impact on neighbouring historic environment elements. However, such potential impacts could be avoided/minimised by applying the Plan's historic environment policies where relevant.</p> <p>In addition, further strengthening of issues relating to biodiversity, flooding, climate change, and townscape also need to be incorporated into the associated supplementary guidance to enable a more positive outcome.</p> | <p>6. Modify Policy RC2 by adding the following at the end: <i>"Development proposals should not result in adverse impacts, either individually or in combination, on the integrity of the River Tay Special Area of Conservation; where retail and commercial proposals will affect a watercourse within Perth City Centre, a Construction Method Statement should be provided for all aspects of the development in order to protect the watercourse from the impact of pollution and sediment."</i></p> | <p>The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, make the effects of the policy even more positive. No further SEA requires to be carried out.</p> |
| | <p>Overall the policy will have positive effects as it promotes retail and commercial development to be located within town centres which are the most accessible and sustainable location for the general population. Any impact on landscape or soil should be minimal if development is within an urban location.</p> <p>There are however negative impacts of concern primarily in terms of water quality and air quality which need dealt with in more detail through LDP policy and possibly supplementary guidance.</p> <p>In addition, further strengthening of issues relating to biodiversity, flooding, climate change, and townscape also need to be incorporated into the associated supplementary guidance to enable a more positive outcome.</p> | <p>7. Modify Policy RC4 by adding the following at the end: <i>"Development proposals should not result in adverse impacts, either individually or in combination, on the integrity of the River Tay Special Area of Conservation and Loch Leven Special Protection Area (SPA).</i> <i>Where development will affect a watercourse in Perth city centre, Aberfeldy, Pitlochry and Alyth town centres (River Tay Special Area of Conservation), and Kinross and Milnathort town centres (Loch Leven SPA), a Construction Method Statement should be provided for all aspects of the development to protect the watercourse from the impact of pollution and sediment.</i> <i>Where the development of the site is within 30 metres of a watercourse an Otter survey should be undertaken and a species protection plan provided, if required, so as to ensure no adverse effects on the River Tay Special Area of Conservation."</i></p> <p>8. Add a new paragraph 3.4.6 containing the commercial centres role and function text that is set out in Schedule 4 document 805. Re-number the existing paragraph 3.4.6 as 3.4.7.</p> <p>9. Add to the new paragraph 3.4.6, the Highland Gateway as an additional commercial centre with appropriate text to describe its role and function.</p> <p>10. Modify the first paragraph of Policy RC4 to read as follows: <i>"The location for retail and commercial leisure facilities should follow a sequential approach in which locations for such development are considered in the following order:"</i></p> | <p>The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, make the effects of the policy even more positive. No further SEA requires to be carried out.</p> |

| Issue | Summary of Overall Likely Policy Group Effects | Reporters Recommendations | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|-------|--|--|------------------------------------|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • town centre, • edge of town centre, • other commercial centres identified in the development plan, • out of centre locations that are or can be made easily accessible by a choice of transport modes. <p>11. Modify the fourth paragraph of Policy RC4 to read as follows: <i>“Proposals in edge of town centre, other commercial centre or out of centre locations will only be acceptable where:”</i></p> <p>12. Modify Policy RC4 by adding, after the requirements (a) to (g), the following: <i>“For all proposals outwith town centres the Council will consider the need for restrictions to be imposed on the installation of mezzanine floors and, in the case of convenience shopping developments, on the amount of comparison goods floorspace allowed.”</i></p> <p>13. For clarity, the full modified text of Policy RC4 is set out below: <i>“The location for retail and commercial leisure facilities should follow a sequential approach in which locations for such development are considered in the following order:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • town centre, • edge of town centre, • other commercial centres identified in the development plan, • out of centre locations that are or can be made easily accessible by a choice of transport modes. <p><i>Proposals for any retail or commercial leisure development of 1,500 square metres or more gross floorspace outwith a defined town centre boundary, and not in accordance with the development plan, will require a transport, retail or leisure impact assessment. Any detrimental effects identified in such an assessment will require mitigation.</i></p> <p><i>For smaller developments, the requirement for an impact assessment will be at the discretion of the Council.</i></p> <p><i>Proposals in edge of town centre, other commercial centre or out of centre locations will only be acceptable where:</i></p> <p>(a) <i>It can be demonstrated that a proposal helps meet quantitative and qualitative deficiencies in existing provision.</i></p> <p>(b) <i>It is supported by a favourable sequential assessment.</i></p> <p>(c) <i>It is of an appropriate scale.</i></p> <p>(d) <i>It provides improved distribution and accessibility of shopping provision.</i></p> <p>(e) <i>It provides for accessibility to public transport and non car modes of transport.</i></p> <p>(f) <i>Any detrimental effects identified in the transport assessment are mitigated.</i></p> <p>(g) <i>It has been demonstrated that there will be no significant impact (individual or cumulative) on any of the centres within the network of centres).</i></p> <p><i>For all proposals outwith town centres the Council will consider the need for restrictions to be imposed on the installation of mezzanine floors and, in the case of convenience shopping developments, on the amount of comparison goods floorspace allowed.</i></p> <p><i>Development proposals should not result in adverse impacts, either individually or in combination, on the integrity of the River Tay Special Area of Conservation and Loch Leven Special Protection Area.</i></p> <p><i>Where development will affect a watercourse in Perth city centre, Aberfeldy, Pitlochry and Alyth town centres (River Tay Special Area of Conservation), and Kinross and Milnathort town centres (Loch Leven SPA), a Construction Method Statement should be provided for all aspects of the development to protect the watercourse from the impact of pollution and sediment.</i></p> <p><i>Where the development of the site is within 30 metres of a watercourse an Otter survey should be undertaken and a species protection plan provided, if required, so as to ensure no adverse effects on the River Tay Special Area of Conservation.”</i></p> | |

| Issue | Summary of Overall Likely Policy Group Effects | Reporters Recommendations | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|---|---|--|--|
| 8a. Housing in the Countryside | A separate SEA was previously carried out for this policy. It concluded that overall the policy will have positive environmental effects specifically with reference to maximising re-use of land / buildings , conserving important elements of built cultural heritage, guiding development to minimise or avoid risks associated with the effects of climate change e.g. flood risk, and also meeting the desire for people to live in the countryside (p.9). | <u>Policy Amendments</u> 1. Modify the final sentence of the policy to read as follows: <i>“Note: For development to be acceptable under the terms of this policy it must comply with the requirements of all relevant supplementary guidance, in particular the Housing in the Countryside Guide.”</i> 2. Modify the policy by adding, immediately before the Note, the following: <i>“Development proposals should not result in adverse effects, either individually or in combination, on the integrity of the Firth of Tay and Eden Estuary, Loch Leven, South Tayside Goose Roosts and Forest of Clunie SPAs and Dunkeld-Blairgowrie Loch and the River Tay SACs”.</i> | The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, make the effects of the policy more positive. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| 8b. Settlement Boundaries | New policy therefore not included in the original SEA. | 1. Add a new Policy PM4 worded as follows: “Policy PM4 Settlement Boundaries For settlements which are defined by a settlement boundary in the plan, development will not be permitted, except within the defined settlement boundary.” | New policy which requires SEA – see full assessment below. |
| 9. Affordable and Particular Needs Housing | It is expected that the policy will overall have positive environmental effects by meeting the objectives of sustainable developments, directing particular needs housing to appropriate locations and meeting the housing needs of particular groups not met by the general housing market. This will improve opportunities for people who are older or more vulnerable in communities to have access to appropriate housing. It will also ensure development works towards reducing travel by car thereby reducing air pollution and congestion as close proximity to public transport and local facilities and services e.g. shops, community facilities, GP surgeries. There are not expected to be any direct effects on waterbody status or soils or functional floodplains as a result of this policy, any effects will have been guided by other policies in the Plan such as those on flooding, drainage and prime agricultural land (p.9). | <u>Change to Policy RD4 wording – Flexibility</u> 1. Modify Policy RD4 by adding a sentence to the end of the third paragraph to read as follows: <i>“The Council will consider innovative and flexible approaches to the delivery of affordable housing and will take into account considerations that might affect deliverability such as development viability and the availability of funding.”</i> | The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, make the effects of the policy even more positive. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| 10. Transport and Accessibility | Overall the policy will have some uncertain or unpredictable effects with the environmental objectives due to the fact that each development involving transport infrastructure will be dealt with on a case by case basis and the impacts in each case could either contribute positively or negatively depending on the type of transport infrastructure being provided, its location and environmental sensitivities present. Any potential adverse impact should however be mitigated through the identification of specific mitigation measures for the individual proposal, which may include the application of other policies in the Plan. Positive impacts have been identified in terms of population, human health and material assets with promotion of more sustainable modes of transport to be provided with developments. There are potentially negative impacts on soil and water quality, which should be considered in more detail through the supplementary guidance linked to this LDP policy and at individual planning application stage. In addition, further strengthening of issues relating to biodiversity, water, air quality, heritage and landscape are also required to be incorporated into the associated supplementary guidance to enable a more positive outcome. | <u>Preamble</u> 1. In the third sentence of paragraph 3.6.2 the word “ <i>comments</i> ” should be deleted and replaced with the word “ <i>requires</i> ”. 2. In paragraph 3.6.3 introduce as the third sentence the following text: “ <i>A large part of Perth and Kinross is rural and not well served by public transport and this has led to a reliance on the private car as a means of transport.</i> ” <u>Policy TA1: New Development Proposals</u> 3. Within the text headed “ <i>Development proposals should:</i> ” the wording should be modified read as follows: <i>“(b) incorporate appropriate mitigation on site and/or off site, provided through developer contributions where appropriate, which might include improvements and enhancements to the walking/cycling network and public transport services including railway and level crossings, road improvements and new roads;”</i> 4. Within the text commencing “ <i>Development for significant travel generating uses in locations which would encourage reliance on the private car will only be supported where:</i> ” the wording should be modified to reads as follows: <i>“(c) it would not have a detrimental effect on the capacity or safety of the strategic road and/or rail network including level crossings;”</i> | The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, make the effects of the policy more positive. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| | The Core Path Plan was subject to a separate SEA. The policy also covers other rights of way and paths. Other existing rights of way and paths have not been subject to the same consideration of environmental effects and potential mitigation as Core Paths. However development with a potential impact on a right of way or another path will be subject to the Plan’s landscape, biodiversity and transportation policies. Therefore potential negative environmental impacts of the path are likely to be mitigated at planning application stage. The findings of the Core Path Plan SEA are therefore relevant to other paths. The SEA considered that | <u>Policy CF2: Public Access</u> 5. The text of Policy CF2: Public Access should be modified to read as follows: <i>“Development proposals that would have an adverse impact upon the integrity of any (proposed) core path, disused railway line, asserted right of way or other well used route will be refused. Development proposals that would affect unreasonably public access rights to these features will be refused unless these adverse impacts are adequately addressed in the plans and suitable alternative provision is made.”</i> | The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, make the effects of the policy more positive. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |

| Issue | Summary of Overall Likely Policy Group Effects | Reporters Recommendations | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|--|---|---|--|
| | <p>core paths have significant positive benefits including the health, recreation and active travel opportunities for residents. This reduces demand for vehicular travel, improves air quality through reduction in emissions and provides mitigation in relation to the effects of climate change.</p> | | |
| <p>11. Community Facilities, Sport and Recreation</p> | <p>The protection of existing open space from unrelated development and provision of new open space as part of development is likely to have significant positive benefits for the environment. These include climate change mitigation in terms of carbon capture in trees, release of oxygen from plants, local community food growing and providing a good microclimate for energy efficient design. It is also important for climate change adaptation, as it is a use that is compatible with flood storage, and the protection and enhancement of biodiversity and water quality. Protection of existing and the provision of new open space in development has significant benefits for the health, recreation and active travel opportunities for residents, it therefore reduces demand for vehicular travel. Open space also has significant benefits for communities' landscape setting, townscape and local amenity (p.10).</p> | <p><u>Policy CF1: Open Space Retention and Provision</u> 1. Modify paragraph 3.7.2 by adding a third sentence as follows: <i>"Playing fields, including those within educational establishments, which are required to meet existing or future needs are identified within the plan."</i> <u>Policy CF1A</u> 2. Modify the first paragraph of the policy to read as follows: <i>"The Plan identifies Sports Pitches, Parks and Open Space. These are areas of land which have value to the community for either recreational or amenity purposes. Development proposals resulting in the loss of these areas will not be permitted, except in circumstances where one or more of the following apply:"</i> 3. Modify criterion (a) of the policy to read as follows: <i>"Where the site is principally used as a recreation resource, the proposed development is ancillary to the principal use of the site as a recreational resource."</i> 4. Modify the criterion (b) of the policy to read as follows: <i>"The proposed development involves a minor part of the site which would not affect its continued use as a recreational or amenity resource."</i> 5. Modify criterion (c) of the policy by adding the following at the start: <i>"In the case of proposals involving the loss of a recreational facility..."</i> 6. Modify criterion (d) by adding the following at the start: <i>"Where a proposal would involve the loss of a sports pitch..."</i> <u>Policy CF1B: Open Space within New Developments</u> 5. Delete the text associated with the first bullet point of the Note and replace it with the following: <i>"The quantity, quality and accessibility of open space required for proposed developments."</i> 6. A consequential amendment is required at the third paragraph of the policy as follows: delete, <i>"an adequate quantity of accessible open space;"</i> and insert, <i>"an adequate supply of accessible open space of an appropriate quality"</i>. 7. Add the following as paragraph 4 to the existing text: <i>"Opportunities should be pursued through the development process to create, improve and avoid fragmentation of green networks and core path networks."</i></p> | <p>The modification made by the Reporter to policy CF1A extends the protection of the policy to include amenity as well as recreational spaces. This change does not in itself necessitate further SEA to be carried out. In relation to the second part of the policy the Reporter inserts additional requirements however this would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, make the effects of the policy more positive. No further SEA requires to be carried out.</p> |
| | <p>The overall effect of the policy is likely to be positive, particularly in relation to human health, quality of life and the sustainable reuse of material assets. The policy will have little if any impact on the other SEA objectives due to its underlying restrictive nature (p.10).</p> | <p><u>Policy CF3: Community Facilities</u> 8. Rename the policy as follows: "Policy CF3: Social and Community Facilities".</p> | <p>This is a minor modification to add clarity and would not require further SEA to be carried out.</p> |
| <p>12. The Historic Environment</p> | <p>The policy is expected to have overall positive effects on the SEA topics, particularly in respect of biodiversity, human health, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage, and townscape. However, in some case this may be dependent on the delivery of the policy in combination with other policies and guidance in the Plan and/or actions on the part of property owners.</p> <p>Uncertain effects have been identified in terms of SEA Objective 2, as although population and household growth can be accommodated in listed buildings, whether or not a property is considered to be an 'appropriate location' in terms of achieving sustainable communities, will be very much dependent on the specific location of individual listed buildings.</p> <p>No effects have been predicted in terms of soil, water and air.</p> | <p><u>Policy HE2: Listed Buildings</u> 1. Adjust the final paragraph to read as follows: <i>"Enabling development may be acceptable where it can be shown to be the only means of retaining a listed building. The layout, design, materials, scale, siting and use of any development which will affect a listed building or its setting should be appropriate to the building's character, appearance and setting."</i></p> | <p>The Reporter recommends a number of minor modifications to this policy group however they would not significantly change the original assessments but would, if anything, make the effects of the policies more positive. No further SEA requires to be carried out.</p> |
| | <p>Overall the policy will have significant positive effects, although in the case of SEA Objectives in relation to biodiversity, population, climatic factors, sustainable design and construction, and protecting and enhancing landscapes, these beneficial effects will be dependent on</p> | <p><u>Policy HE3A Conservation Areas</u> 2. Delete the first sentence of Policy HE3A and replace with the following: <i>"Development within a Conservation Area must preserve or enhance its character or appearance."</i></p> | |

| Issue | Summary of Overall Likely Policy Group Effects | Reporters Recommendations | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|---|---|--|--|
| | <p>either how the policy is implemented on a case by case basis, the willingness of owners to carry out works to increase the energy efficiency of their properties, and build in climate change mitigation and adaptation measures, and also the delivery of the policy in combination with the Plan's other policies and supplementary guidance e.g. biodiversity, nature conservation, green networks, design statements, climate change, and sustainable construction.</p> <p>There are some uncertainties as to the possibility for effects on prime agricultural land, flooding, and air for reasons of either the potential for positive benefits would be secondary, unintentional outcomes of the policy in specific locations (soil and flooding), or positive effects on air by encouraging the use of older buildings which will typically be in the core of settlements may be reduced or even cancelled out by possible increases in tourism levels in Conservation Areas.</p> <p>Finally, no effects are expected on waterbody status as a result of the policy.</p> | | |
| | <p>The overall effect of the policy is likely to be significantly positive, particularly in relation to biodiversity, human health, the sustainable reuse of material assets, cultural heritage, landscape and townscape. Positive effects on SEA Objectives in relation to population, climatic factors, and standards of sustainable design and construction will very much be dependent on how the policy is implemented on a case by case basis, the willingness of owners to make changes to help tackle climate change challenges and also the delivery of the policy in combination with other policies and guidance in the Plan.</p> | <p><u>Policy HE4 Gardens and Designed Landscapes</u> 3. Delete the text of Policy HE4 and replace with the following: <i>"Gardens and designed landscapes make a significant contribution to the character and quality of the landscape in Perth and Kinross. The Council will seek to manage change in order to protect and enhance the integrity of those sites included on the current Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes. The Council may require the submission of a management plan with any application for development within areas included in the current Inventory.</i> <i>As resources permit, the Council will continue with the process of identification of non-Inventory sites in Perth and Kinross and the associated task of devising an approach to their future management."</i></p> | |
| | <p>Issue not specifically addressed</p> | <p><u>Cleish Conservation Area</u> 1. Include Cleish Conservation Area Appraisal under the heading <i>"Design Guidance"</i> within Appendix 1 at page 311.</p> | <p>This is a minor modification to add clarity and would not require further SEA to be carried out.</p> |
| <p>13. The Natural Environment</p> | <p>The policy is likely to have significant beneficial effects on conserving the diversity of species and habitats at designated sites from adverse impact from development and directing inappropriate development away from these areas. In doing so the plant life will also result in beneficial effects on water and air quality and absorbing greenhouse gases. In protecting designated habitats and protected species areas of derelict land may be recognised for their international nature conservation value and conserved as such or good quality sustainable design used to conserve them as part of development. Secondary benefits include conserving sites which can also perform as functional floodplain and protecting habitats which have local, regional or national importance in contributing to landscape character and distinctiveness (p.12).</p> | <p><u>Policy NE1A International Nature Conservation Sites</u> 1. Modify Policy NE1A to read as follows: <i>"Development which could have a significant effect on a site designated or proposed under the Habitats or Birds Directive (Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas) or Ramsar site, will only be permitted where:</i> <i>(a) an appropriate assessment has demonstrated that it will not adversely affect the integrity of the site, or</i> <i>(b) there are no alternative solutions, and</i> <i>(c) there are imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of social or economic nature."</i></p> <p><u>Policy NE1B National Designations</u> 2. Modify the first sentence of the policy to read as follows: <i>"Development which would affect a National Park, National Scenic Area, Site of Special Scientific Interest or National Nature Reserve, will only be permitted where the Council as Planning Authority is satisfied that:"</i></p> <p><u>NE1C Local designations</u> 3. Modify the first sentence of the policy to read as follows: <i>"Development which would affect an area designated by the Planning Authority as being of local conservation or geological interest will not normally be permitted, except where the Council as Planning Authority is satisfied that:"</i></p> <p><u>NE1D European Protected Species</u> 4. Delete the policy.</p> | <p>Modifications are proposed to each part of the policy and are largely to provide additional clarity or ensure compliance with SPP. Part D of the policy on European Protected Species is to be deleted. However none of the recommendations would significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, make the effects of the policy more positive. No further SEA requires to be carried out.</p> |
| | <p>The draft Woodland Strategy will be updated as Supplementary Guidance and is currently part of a separate SEA process, having reached scoping stage. There are potential environmental benefits and problems associated with forest and woodland planting and harvesting (identified in full in that scoping report). Many of these also apply to the</p> | <p><u>NE2 general</u> 5. Add an additional bullet point to the Note section in NE2B to read as follows: <i>"apply the guidance and advice in the Scottish Government's Control of Woodland Removal Policy when considering proposals for tree removal."</i></p> <p><u>NE2A</u></p> | <p>Several modifications are proposed to both parts of the policy and to the policy note. These are largely textual changes to provide greater detail and clarity. None of the recommendations would significantly change</p> |

| Issue | Summary of Overall Likely Policy Group Effects | Reporters Recommendations | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|-------|--|---|---|
| | <p>protection and enhancement of existing trees and woodlands on and adjacent to development sites and provision of new woodlands on and as part of these. The protection of trees and woodlands on development sites has one significant benefit on its own which is adaption to and mitigation of the effects of climate change as trees and woods absorb carbon and provide biofuel, which is a carbon neutral alternative to fossil fuels.</p> <p>The policy also has many significant benefits when applied along with other topic policies and river catchment management plans. These benefits include: the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (including historic trees and ancient woodlands), biodiversity, environmental conservation, water quality, reduction of flood risk, placemaking, local amenity, landscape, open space and health and wellbeing – through access and the enjoyment of habitats and fruit trees. The impact of commercial forestry on local communities is uncertain as their amenity is affected by noise and timber traffic, but local employment in the forestry sector is currently limited.</p> <p>The potential impact on the areas soil resource is uncertain as forestry practices can raise issues in relation to contamination, compaction and erosion of soils. Impacts on soil quality, and on the function of soils in storing carbon, can occur in areas of low pH/high carbon soils. Forestry and woodland can contribute positively to soil and slope stabilisation, particularly in relation to increased rainfall associated with Climate Change (p.12).</p> | <p>6. Modify the policy wording to read as follows: <i>“The Council will support proposals which:</i> <i>(a) deliver woodlands that meet local priorities as well as maximising benefits for the local economy, communities, sport and recreation and environment;</i> <i>(b) protect existing trees, woodland, especially those with high natural, historic and cultural heritage value;</i> <i>(c) seek to expand woodland cover in line with the guidance contained in the Perth and Kinross Forestry and Woodland Strategy;</i> <i>(d) encourage the good management of amenity trees or groups of trees important for amenity, sport and recreation or because of their cultural or heritage interest;</i> <i>(e) ensure the protection and good management of amenity trees, safeguard trees in Conservation Areas and trees on development sites in accordance with BS5837 “Trees in Relation to Construction”.</i> <i>(f) seek to secure establishment of new woodland in advance of major developments where practicable and secure new tree planting in line with the guidance contained in the Perth and Kinross Forestry and Woodland Strategy.”</i> <u>NE2B</u> 7. Modify the policy wording to read as follows: <i>“Tree surveys, undertaken by a competent person, should accompany all applications for planning permission where there are existing trees on a site. The scope and nature of such surveys will reflect the known or potential amenity, nature conservation and/or recreational value of the trees in question and should be agreed in advance with the council. The Council will follow the principles of the Scottish Government Policy on Woodland Removal. In accordance with that document, there will be a presumption in favour of protecting woodland resources except where the works proposed involve the temporary removal of tree cover in a plantation, which is associated with clear felling and restocking. In exceptional cases where the loss of individual trees or woodland cover is unavoidable, the Council will require mitigation measures to be provided.</i> <u>NE2 note</u> 8. Modify the first bullet point to read as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“promote multi-objective woodland management that delivers environmental, economic and social benefits;”</i> 9. Modify the sixth bullet point to read as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“conserve and expand riparian woodlands using appropriate species for the benefit of biodiversity and flood alleviation purposes.”</i> 10. Modify the seventh bullet point to read as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“promote community participation in woodland planning and management;”</i> 11. Modify the eighth bullet point to read as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“promote the value of trees and woodlands as a sustainable tourism asset.”</i> 12. Add an additional bullet point, worded as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“To identify trees and woodlands in the Perth and Kinross area where nature conservation is of primary importance.”</i> </p> | <p>the original assessment but would, if anything, make the effects of the policy even more positive. No further SEA requires to be carried out.</p> <p>The associated supplementary guidance is also currently undergoing a separate SEA.</p> |
| | <p>The policy is likely to have a significant beneficial effect of ensuring development conserves and enhances the diversity of species and habitats. In doing so the plant life will also have beneficial effects on water and air quality and absorbing greenhouse gases.</p> <p>Derelict land may be valuable in terms of its nature conservation interest, which could be conserved and improved through development by applying good quality sustainable design such as using natural environment to create good microclimates and SUDS.</p> <p>Secondary benefits include conserving and enhancing sites which also perform as functional floodplain and using development to creating natural areas in open spaces could improve quality of life. It could also help protect habitats which have local, regional or national importance in contributing to landscape character and distinctiveness.</p> <p>The conservation of peatland in particular and other habitats with carbon</p> | <p><u>NE3 Biodiversity</u> 13. Modify the first paragraph of the policy to read as follows: <i>“The Council will seek to protect and enhance all wildlife and wildlife habitats, whether formally designated/protected or not, taking into account the ecosystems and natural processes in the area.”</i> 14. Modify the second paragraph to read as follows: <i>“The Council will apply the principles of the Tayside Biodiversity Action Partnership Planning Manual and will take account of the Tayside Local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP) and relevant national and European legislation relating to protected species when making decisions about applications for development.”</i> 15. After requirement (d) insert the following text: <i>“European Protected Species Planning permission will not be granted for development that would, either individually or cumulatively, be likely to have an adverse effect upon European protected species (listed in Annex IV of the Habitats Directive (Directive 92/43/EEC))</i></p> | <p>Aside from a minor textual change, the modification to this policy is the incorporation of European and other protected species, previously considered under policy NE1D. Given that this issue has already been assessed under the Environment and Conservation policies, and the fact that the assessment of policy NE1 and NE3 are broadly similar, it is not considered that any further SEA is required as a result of these modifications.</p> |

| Issue | Summary of Overall Likely Policy Group Effects | Reporters Recommendations | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|---|---|--|--|
| | rich soils will help to mitigate against the effects of climate change. Another potential benefit could include ensuring development conserves the historic environment along with the habitat or species; however this would depend on the successful implementation of the historic environment policies (p.12). | <p><i>unless the Council as planning authority is satisfied that:</i></p> <p><i>(a) there is no satisfactory alternative, and</i></p> <p><i>(b) the development is required for preserving public health or public safety or for other imperative reasons of overriding public interest including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment.</i></p> <p><i>In no circumstances can a development be approved which would be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of a European protected species at a favourable conservation status in its natural range.</i></p> <p><i>Other protected species</i></p> <p><i>Planning permission will not be granted for development that would be likely to have an adverse effect on protected species unless it can be justified in accordance with the relevant protected species legislation (Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the Protection of Badgers Act (1992)."</i></p> | |
| | Green Infrastructure has significant beneficial effects in relation to 13 SEA objectives. This is because it encompasses a wide range of land uses including flood plains, agricultural land, woodlands, open spaces and natural habitats. The policy is a way of identifying the value of these different elements both individually and collectively as networks and therefore strengthens the justification for enhancing them. The policy has significant beneficial effects on the quality of water, air and soil. It provides mitigation against the effects of climate change through: protecting and encouraging land uses which contain plants and trees to absorb carbon; providing networks for active travel; form landscaping as part of energy efficient design and adapt to flooding as a water storage resource. It also enhances the townscape and setting of settlements and the historic environment. Its' open space and landscape function enhances quality of life and provides an opportunity for recreation (p.12). | <p><u>NE4 Green Infrastructure</u></p> <p>16. Modify the first paragraph to read as follows: <i>"The Council will require all new development to contribute to the creation, protection, enhancement and management of green infrastructure by the."</i></p> <p>17. Modify point (a) to read as follows: <i>"(a) incorporation of green infrastructure into new developments, particularly where it can be used to mitigate any negative environmental impact of the development and link green infrastructure to the wider green network; "</i></p> <p>18. Modify point (d) to read as follows: <i>"protection, enhancement and management of open spaces and linkages for active travel or recreation, including links between open spaces and the wider countryside and the provision of new connections where required;"</i></p> <p>19. Modify point (f) to read as follows: <i>"protection, enhancement and management of watercourses, waterbodies, floodplains and wetlands which are important contributors to the network of blue and green corridors for the alleviation of flood risk, wildlife, recreation and the amenity needs of the community."</i></p> <p>20. Modify the Note to read as follows: <i>"Supplementary Guidance will be prepared expanding on how development can comply with this policy. This will also define the network and provide a vision for how it will develop, provide a spatial representation of the network and identify opportunity areas where the network could be improved."</i></p> | Several modifications are made to provide clarity the policy's intentions and provide greater detail. None of the recommendations would significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, make the effects of the policy even more positive. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| 14. Green Belt | <p>The Green Belt has significant beneficial effects for 6 SEA objectives. These include directing population growth to appropriate locations within Perth and elsewhere. It also protects the setting of Perth and its surrounding villages and promotes its use for recreation, thereby enhancing local resident's quality of life and health opportunities, and settlement character.</p> <p>Other significant benefits include protecting prime agricultural land and promoting forestry. These land uses in turn contain trees which absorb carbon, filter out dust and provide oxygen and water vapour, which will contribute to improvements to air quality in the Perth Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>Other beneficial effects are created in combination with other policies due to the potential of agricultural land, recreation development and woodland to be offer other benefits such as protection and enhancement of the historic environment, landscape, flood storage and biodiversity.</p> | No modifications. | No modifications made to this section therefore no SEA implications. |
| 15a. Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation and Electricity transmission | Potential negative impacts have been identified in terms of the sustainable use/re-use of material assets (land), the area's landscapes and townscape character, as the location of the majority of proposals is likely to be on greenfield sites in rural areas or micro-renewables within settlements. There is also potential for negative impacts on the SEA objectives for biodiversity, quality of life, soils, water quality, air quality, | <p><u>Policy ER1 - General Policy Changes</u></p> <p>1. Add a short introduction to section 3.10 referencing, amongst other things, the national agenda, aims, objectives and policy in relation to renewable and low carbon energy generation. The specific wording to be decided by the planning authority.</p> <p><u>Policy ER1A – Comments on the First Paragraph</u></p> <p>2. Replace the opening paragraph of policy ER1A with the following words:</p> | The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, make the effects of the policy more positive. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |

| Issue | Summary of Overall Likely Policy Group Effects | Reporters Recommendations | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|--|---|---|--|
| Infrastructure | <p>reducing journey lengths and the need to travel, and the historic environment, depending on the type, scale and location of proposals. However, the type and extent of impacts are largely unknown at present and would be more appropriately assessed at individual planning application stage. The policy's requirement for proposals to consider the individual or cumulative effects on biodiversity, landscape character, visual integrity, the historic environment, cultural heritage, tranquil qualities, wildness qualities, water resources and residential amenity of the surrounding area should ensure that where any negative effects are identified that appropriate measures are developed to help avoid/reduce/mitigate against any potential effects and also allow for the identification of specific enhancement measures.</p> <p>Potential positive effects on greenhouse gas emissions, reducing the area's vulnerability to the effects of Climate Change and ensuring high standards of sustainable design and construction are anticipated as a result of implementing the policy in conjunction with other policies in the Plan e.g. Placemaking, Managing future landscape change, and Climate Change, Carbon Reduction and Sustainable Construction.</p> | <p>'Proposals for the utilisation, distribution and development of renewable and low carbon sources of energy will be supported subject to the following factors being taken into account.'</p> <p><u>Clarifying the content of related Supplementary Guidance</u></p> <p>3. Replace the note at the end of policy ER1 to read as follows: Note: Supplementary Guidance will provide a spatial framework for large-scale wind energy developments, and further explain the locational, technological, environmental, and design requirements for developers to consider in making their applications for a range of other renewable and low carbon energy generating developments, including: small-scale wind energy developments and single turbines, hydro-schemes, woody biomass, landfill gas, energy from waste, anaerobic digestion, energy storage, large photovoltaic arrays, and micro-generation.'</p> <p><u>Policy ER1A – Criterion (a)</u></p> <p>4. Insert the following words between 'water resources' and 'and': 'aviation and telecommunications'.</p> <p><u>Policy ER1A – Criterion (c)</u></p> <p>5. Insert between 'The' and 'connection', the following words: 'effects on the elements listed in criterion (a) of the'.</p> <p><u>Policy ER1A – Criterion (g)</u></p> <p>6. Insert after the word 'economy': 'including tourism and recreation interests,'.</p> <p><u>Policy ER1A – Criterion (h)</u></p> <p>7. Replace the words: 'The reasons why the favoured choice over other alternatives sites has been selected' with the words: 'In the case of large-scale onshore wind energy developments, their fit with the spatial framework for wind energy developments'.</p> <p><u>Policy ER1A – Last paragraph</u></p> <p>Replace with the following words: 'Proposals for the development of renewable and low carbon sources of energy by a community will be supported provided it has been demonstrated that the factors (a) –(h) itemised above have been fully considered.'</p> | |
| 15b. Minerals and Other Extractive Activities | <p>Potential negative effects in relation to objectives for reducing journey lengths and the need to travel and protecting and enhancing the character, diversity and special qualities of the area's landscapes are anticipated due to the likely increased levels of transportation into and out of these sites and changes to landscapes as a result of workings. However, the policy's criteria in respect of having regard to the visual effect of proposals and transport implications should help to ensure that these issues are addressed at the specific site level at planning application stage.</p> <p>The possible effects on biodiversity, soil, water quality, air quality, quality of life (traffic, noise, dust, pollution, vibration or disturbance) and minimising waste are largely unknown at present and will depend on the location, type and scale of proposals. The policy's criteria should help to ensure that such issues are addressed at the relevant planning application(s) stage and any potential effects avoided, reduced and/or mitigated for. The requirement for a restoration, after use and aftercare proposals should allow for appropriate future remediation and enhancement measures to be identified.</p> <p>Potential positive effects of implementing the policy on quality of life (employment opportunities), reducing the area's vulnerability to the effects of climate change in combination with other policies in the Plan. Possible positive effects on SEA Objective 13 (sustainable use/re-use of material assets) will depend on implementation of the policy to ensure that important workable mineral deposits are not sterilised.</p> | <p><u>Policy ER4A</u></p> <p>1. In the sentence beginning '<i>And in all cases, their impact on local communities....</i>' replace the words '<i>adverse effect having regard to all the following</i>' with the words '<i>adverse residual effect after appropriate mitigation having regard to</i>'.</p> <p>2. Add additional criterion: '<i>(vi) ensuring there are no adverse effects on the integrity of a European designated site(s).</i>'</p> <p>3. Add at end of policy ER4A the following words: '<i>Note: A Waste Management Plan must be submitted as part of any application for planning permission.</i>'</p> <p><u>Policy ER4B</u></p> <p>4. Insert between the first and second sentences, the following words: '<i>Operators are encouraged to consider after-uses that would add to the cultural, recreational and environmental assets of the area.</i>'</p> <p>5. Insert the following word at the beginning of the third sentence: '<i>Appropriate</i>'. Following clarification, a consequential amendment will be made to Policy EP9B to ensure consistency.</p> | <p>The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, make the effects of the policy more positive. No further SEA requires to be carried out.</p> |
| 15c. Prime Agricultural Land | <p>The protection of prime quality agricultural land is likely to significant positive benefits in respect of the majority of the objectives due to the function soils have in terms of biodiversity, food production, carbon</p> | <p>No modification to policy ER5.</p> | <p>No modifications made to this section therefore no SEA implications.</p> |

| Issue | Summary of Overall Likely Policy Group Effects | Reporters Recommendations | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|---|---|--|---|
| | <p>storage, and water. It is likely to have other positive impacts in combination with other policies in the Plan, including protecting land which can also be used for reduction of flood risk, biodiversity enhancements, and protecting the setting of historic environment elements and settlements.</p> <p>The policy directs development to land within settlement boundaries thus contributing to the SEA Objectives for accommodating population and household growth and development in appropriate and sustainable locations and helping to reduce the need to travel.</p> | | |
| <p>15d. Managing Future Landscape Change</p> | <p>The policy will have significant environmental effects of improving the quality of life for residents, visitors and tourists by protecting and enhancing visual amenity, key views and the setting of landmarks. It also encourages new development to protect and enhance the character, diversity and special qualities of the area's landscapes. In combination with other topic policies the policy can have the following significant positive environmental effects: produce an attractive environment that encourages active travel and recreation, improve air and water quality, improve the character and setting of the historic environment and settlements.</p> <p>By encouraging high quality landscape design the policy can also help mitigate the effects of climate change in association with the development of sites by improving microclimate and therefore reducing energy consumption, carbon sequestration by planting trees and woods, and reducing water run off.</p> | <p><u>Policy ER6</u></p> <p>1. Replace the second sentence of the introductory paragraph with the words: 'Accordingly, development proposals will be supported where they do not conflict with the aim of maintaining and enhancing the landscape qualities of Perth and Kinross.'</p> | <p>The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, make the effects of the policy even more positive. No further SEA requires to be carried out.</p> |
| <p>16. Climate Change</p> | <p>The policy will have a significant beneficial effect on conserving wider biodiversity, maintaining the productive capacity of soils, reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases, mitigating/ adapting to climate change, minimising waste, reusing recycled materials and promoting sustainable design and construction. Its' benefits will be further enhanced when applied in combination with other policies in the Plan on transportation, biodiversity, open space, drainage and placemaking policies. It does this by requiring reduction in energy/ resource use and waste, providing for adaptability, well being and security and encouraging micro renewables (p.13).</p> | <p><u>Policy EP1</u></p> <p>1. In first paragraph, delete the third sentence and replace with the following words: <i>'New buildings should also include low and zero-carbon generating technologies (LZCGT) to off-set a proportion of emissions arising from the use of the buildings, as specified in the table below. Some relevant buildings must be accompanied by a sustainability statement and all buildings must receive an appropriate sustainability label as per the Building Standards Technical Handbook Section 7 - Sustainability'</i>.</p> <p>2. The policy should specify a proportion of greenhouse gases to be avoided through the use of Low and Zero-Carbon Generating Technology and this specified proportion should rise over time. Specific amendments to the table are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2012 Domestic - rename 'Bronze Active' and insert following text at end: <i>'and includes a minimum 2% carbon dioxide emissions abatement through the use of Low and Zero-Carbon Generating Technology'</i>. • 2012 Non-domestic - rename 'Bronze Active' and insert following text at end: <i>'and includes a minimum 2% carbon dioxide emissions abatement through the use of Low and Zero-Carbon Generating Technology'</i>. • 2014 - delete • 2016 Domestic - rename 'Silver Active'. Replace first sentence with the following words: <i>Where the dwelling complies with the Silver Active level in each of the 8 aspects below</i> and insert following text at end of first sentence: <i>'and includes Low and Zero-Carbon Generating Technology'</i>; insert following text at end: <i>'New buildings should include a minimum 3% carbon dioxide emissions abatement through the use of Low and Zero-Carbon Generating Technology'</i>. • 2016 Non-domestic - rename 'Silver Active' and insert following text at end: <i>'A minimum 3% of this emissions improvement should come from the use of Low and Zero-Carbon Generating Technology'</i>. • 2018 - delete • 2020 Domestic – add after 'Gold' the following sentence: <i>Where the dwelling complies with the Gold level in each of the 8 aspects below. Insert the following text at end: 'New buildings should include a minimum 5% carbon dioxide emissions abatement through the use of Low and Zero-Carbon Generating Technology'</i>. | <p>The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, make the effects of the policy more positive. No further SEA requires to be carried out.</p> |

| Issue | Summary of Overall Likely Policy Group Effects | Reporters Recommendations | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|
| | New policy therefore not included in the original SEA. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2020 Non-domestic - insert following text at end: 'a minimum 5% of this emissions improvement should come from the use of Low and Zero-Carbon Generating Technology '. 2022 - amend to cover both domestic and non-domestic; insert following text at end: 'including a minimum 6% carbon dioxide abatement through the use of Low and Zero-Carbon Generating Technology '. In first point of the note delete the word 'development' and replace with 'building'. | New policy which requires SEA – see full assessment below. |
| 17a. New Development and Flooding | Overall the policy will have positive effects diverting development away from those areas at risk from flooding. It will impact positively on biodiversity and habitats, the population of Perth and Kinross and on human health and water bodies, whilst assisting in reducing the area's vulnerability to climate change (p.14). | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Modify the diagram on page 52 where it refers to Category ii to read as follows: "...development acceptable here subject to a satisfactory flood risk assessment if required by the Council." Related to that, in the text below the diagram which refers to Category ii Low to Medium Flood Risk amend the first sentence to read: "Suitable for most forms of development but may be subject to a flood risk assessment." | The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, make the effects of the policy even more positive. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| 17b. Water Environment and Drainage | <p>There are expected to be significant beneficial effects as a result of this policy as it encourages the improvement of waterbody status, use of public sewage systems, the development of sustainable urban drainage solutions for surface water, and the reinstatement of watercourses. This will ensure development protects and enhances water body status (quality and quantity) and in turn conserves and enhances the diversity of water environment species and habitats. It also encourages sustainable design to improve waterbody status, manage surface water and reinstate natural watercourses.</p> <p>In combination with the Development Strategy, infrastructure contributions, the Lunan Valley and Loch Leven catchment policies and other topic policies in the Plan, the policy should help to direct population to sustainable locations with public sewage systems and also contribute to health improvements through the improvement to water quality. The encouragement to improve waterbody status and natural watercourses under the policy could provide for some natural flood alleviation and sustainable urban drainage systems, both of which could allow for adaption to the effects of climate change and improvements to soil quality.</p> <p>There are also likely to be benefits for landscape, townscape and quality of life by protecting and enhancing watercourses to improve waterbody status. Uncertain effects have been noted for the air quality and historic environment objectives due to possible odours from treatment works and depending on the location of specific proposals to reinstate watercourses in relation to elements of the historic environment, as they could require the removal or alteration of structures such as weirs, culverts, walls or lades (p.14).</p> | <p><u>Policy EP3A: Water Quality</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Policy EP3A should be re-titled "Water Environment". The existing wording of the policy should be deleted and replaced with text as follows: "The Scottish River Basin Management Plan has protection and improvement objectives which aim to ensure that there is no deterioration of water body status and where possible secure long term enhancements to water body status. Proposals for development which do not accord with the Scotland River Basin Management Plan and any relevant associated Area Management Plans will be refused planning permission unless the development is judged by the Council to be of significant specified benefit to society and/or the wider environment." <p><u>Policy EP3B: Foul Drainage</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Delete paragraph 2 | The modification to part A: Water Quality is a revision to the original policy text to ensure that the Council's statutory obligations in relation to the Water Framework Directive, specifically River Basin Management Planning, are met. Part of B: Foul Drainage is to be deleted to reflect the outcome of the HRA. Neither of these recommendations would significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, make the effects of the policy more positive. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| 17c. Lunan Valley and Loch Leven Catchment Areas | It is considered that overall the policy is likely to have positive effects in the Lunan Valley area, particularly on improving the population's health and wellbeing through environmental quality, and protecting and enhancing waterbody status. Further identified potential positive effects are likely to occur as a result of implementing the policy in combination with other policies in the Plan, such as those in the Natural Environment | <p><u>Policy EP6: Lunan Valley Catchment Area</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Replace Policy EP6 with the following: "The Council will protect and seek to enhance the nature conservation and landscape interests of the Lunan Valley Catchment Area. Within the area: (a) there will be a presumption against built development except: within settlements; for renovations or alterations to existing buildings; and developments necessary | The wording of policy EP6 is to be replaced with revised text which reflects the changes recommended as a result of the HRA. There will be positive environmental implications as a result of the changes. |

| Issue | Summary of Overall Likely Policy Group Effects | Reporters Recommendations | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|--|---|---|--|
| | <p>and Placemaking groups.</p> <p>Potential negative impacts have been identified in terms of accommodating population and household growth (SEA Objective 2) as the policy restricts further development in the Lunan Valley area, which may also reduce the potential for securing enhancements to existing drainage and treatment infrastructure through new development.</p> | <p><i>for economic need which the developer can demonstrate will have no adverse impact on the environmental assets of the area nor are likely to result in an unacceptable increase in traffic volumes;</i></p> <p><i>(b) recreational pursuits like power water sports, likely to cause disturbance in and around sites of nature conservation interest, will be discouraged;</i></p> <p><i>(c) tree planting should be predominantly native species, including Scots Pine, except in cases where it can be proved that the landscape diversity will be improved by the use of a more varied range of species. All planting should be designed to complement the landscape.</i></p> <p><i>Total phosphorus from built development must not exceed the current level permitted by the existing discharge consents and the current contribution from built development within the rural area of the catchment. Where improvements reduce the phosphorus total from the built development, there will be a presumption in favour of retaining such gains to the benefit of the ecological recovery of the Lunan Lochs. All applicants will be required to submit details of the proposed method of drainage with their application for planning consent and adopt the principles of best available technology, not entailing excessive costs, to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority in conjunction with SEPA.</i></p> <p><i>Note 1: Policy RD3: Housing in the Countryside is limited to economic need, conversions or replacement buildings within the Lunan Valley Catchment Area.</i></p> <p><i>Note 2: Development within the catchment must comply with the general drainage policies as well as policies relating to the catchment area. Supplementary Guidance details the procedures to be adopted for drainage from development in the Lunan Valley area (produced by SEPA/SNH and the Council)."</i></p> | |
| | <p>Overall the policy will have uncertain or unpredictable effects. The policy supports development which can connect to a public WWTW or provides appropriate mitigation reducing the level of phosphorus entering Loch Leven. This will have a positive environmental effect on the water and habitat quality and could have a positive benefit on the quality of life of the population.</p> <p>The policy also may have a negative impact as it could restrict development within the catchment area on drainage grounds.</p> | <p>Policy EP7 Drainage within the Loch Leven Catchment Area</p> <p>2. Amend the 'Note' at the start of Policy EP7 on page 56 to read: <i>"Note: Development within the catchment must comply with the general drainage policies as well as policies relating to the catchment area. To ensure there are no adverse impacts, either individually or in combination, on water quality in Loch Leven SPA."</i></p> <p>3. Delete first section of EP7B (b) <i>"where, for a non-residential development, it is not economic to connect to the public system and.."</i></p> | <p>Modifications are proposed to part B to incorporate the mitigation measures as set out in the HRA and Appropriate Assessment. There will be positive environmental implications as a result of the changes.</p> |
| <p>18. Environmental Protection and Public Safety</p> | <p>This policy requires enhanced consultation for certain types of development proposals in the vicinity of notifiable installations and will not in itself have any significant environmental effects. It is considered therefore that an assessment is not required.</p> | <p>Policy EP4: Health and Safety Consultation Zones</p> <p>1. Delete the existing text and replace with the following: <i>"In determining planning applications for development within the Pipeline Consultation Zones identified on the proposals, inset maps and Appendix 3, the Council will seek and take full account of the advice from the Health and Safety Executive and the facility's operators and owners. The Council will also seek the advice of the Health and Safety Executive and the facility's operators and owners on the suitability of any proposals for a new notifiable installation within the Plan area or any proposal within the consultation zone of any other notifiable installation."</i></p> | <p>An assessment of this policy was deemed not to be required and the change recommended by the Reporter would not alter this. No action is therefore considered necessary.</p> |
| | <p>There is potential for overall positive effects as a result of implementing this policy, particularly in terms of: reducing greenhouse gases, mitigating for the effects of climate change, minimising waste, protecting existing facilities and encouraging further facilities in close proximity, and also encouraging technologically advanced green processes.</p> <p>The potential for some policy divergence has been identified in terms of the quality of life objective due to the negative perception of the environmental impact of some waste management facilities. However the presumption in favour of locating new infrastructure in general industrial and employment areas and also close to existing facilities should help to avoid significant negative effects on the amenity of communities.</p> <p>The policy reflects the objectives of the Zero Waste Plan: using waste as a resource, encouraging alternative facilities to landfill to reduce greenhouse gases, and Climate Change mitigation through encouraging reuse and recycling. The policy also encourages energy and heat from</p> | <p>Policy EP9A: Existing Waste Management Infrastructure</p> <p>2. Modify Policy EP9A to refer to refer to existing and consented waste management sites.</p> <p>Policy EP9B: New Waste Management Infrastructure</p> <p>3. At item (i), delete the existing text and replace with the following: <i>"(i) the proposal is located close to an existing waste management installation and/or within an area identified within the Plan for existing or new employment uses."</i></p> <p>4. At item (k) delete the existing text and replace with the following: <i>"(k) the proposal demonstrates satisfactory mitigation measures for any unacceptable impacts arising from the development with respect to emissions including: air, noise, odour, dust, litter, vermin, birds, insects, leachate and surface water. It will also be necessary to mitigate any visual impact, traffic impact, impact on the natural or built heritage, and the water resource. Cumulative impacts will also be considered;"</i></p> <p>5. At item (l) delete the existing text and replace with the following: <i>"(l) the potential for heat and/or electricity generation (which may include local or district heating schemes and co-location of industrial processes where the heat could be utilised) has been fully explored and demonstrated to be viable."</i></p> | <p>The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, make the effects of the policy even more positive. No further SEA requires to be carried out.</p> |

| Issue | Summary of Overall Likely Policy Group Effects | Reporters Recommendations | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|-------|---|---|---|
| | <p>waste - an alternative to fossil fuels.</p> <p>Uncertain/unpredictable effects have been identified in terms of maximising the health and wellbeing of the population, protecting and enhancing waterbody status, air quality and landscape, as potential effects will depend on the type, scale and location of individual proposals, but any potential negative effects should be avoided/minimised or mitigated for through applying other policies in the Plan and also other control regulations.</p> | <p>Following clarification, the last sentence of item (l) will be "...explored, and utilised where it is demonstrated to be viable."</p> <p>6. Delete the second sentence of the final paragraph and replace with the following: "In some cases it may be that restoration bonds will be required to be lodged."</p> | |
| | <p>The existing waste management site at Binn Farm was not specifically assessed.</p> | <p><u>Binn Farm</u></p> <p>7. Below paragraph 5.9.1 insert:</p> <p>"Note: A masterplan will be developed by way of Supplementary Guidance which at a minimum will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • justify the site boundaries • identify the uses to be accommodated on the site and the processes and technologies to be accommodated • identify the impacts on the environment and any appropriate mitigation necessary • hours of working • address the array of consequential traffic matters and explain how these will be dealt with." | <p>The Reporters recommendation would not require further SEA to be carried out at this stage, however further assessment will be required at the supplementary guidance and planning application stages.</p> |
| | <p>The policy has the significant beneficial effect of reducing waste and helping prevent the need for more mineral workings. In combination with waste management, noise and transportation policies it should help to minimise the potential impact on residential amenity by directing the processing to existing minerals, waste, employment and brownfield sites. It could also contribute to a reduction in carbon and transport emissions by processing material close to where it is produced.</p> <p>Potential impacts on biodiversity will be dependent on the location of individual proposals and should be considered at planning application stage against policies in the Plan's Natural Environment group. There is potential for negative impacts on human health and wellbeing and air quality as a result of pollution, and on water quality through leachate, but such effects are largely unknown at present as they are dependent on the type of proposal and its location. These issues should be considered carefully at individual planning application stage against the policies in the Plan and where possible controlled through applying other regulations outwith the remit of planning.</p> | <p><u>Policy EP10: Management of Inert and Construction Waste</u></p> <p>8. Add as item (e) the following: "(e) they will not result in adverse impacts, either individually or in combination, on the integrity of a European designated site(s)."</p> | <p>The addition reflects the change recommended as a result of the HRA. The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, make the effects of the policy more positive. No further SEA requires to be carried out.</p> |
| | <p>It is expected that overall this policy will have positive effects, particularly in respect of improving quality of life, and maximising the health and wellbeing of citizens, and in terms of improvements to soil and water quality at the locality. The restoration of contaminated sites should also enable them to be brought back into use, thereby contributing to the achievement of the sustainable use/re-use of material assets sought under Objective 13.</p> <p>Potential positive effects have been identified in terms of biodiversity, accommodating population and household growth, reducing the vulnerability of the effects of climate change, waste minimisation and ensuring high standards sustainable design and construction when the policy is implemented in combination with other policies in the Plan.</p> <p>There are uncertain/unpredictable effects noted in respect of the objectives for air quality, reducing journey lengths and the need to travel, reducing greenhouse emissions, and the historic environment, as potential impacts will be dependent on the location of existing contaminated sites, the extent and type of contamination present and the new proposed use. Such issues would be more appropriately addressed at individual planning application stage in line with the Plan's policy framework.</p> | <p><u>Policy EP12: Contaminated Land</u></p> <p>9. Delete the second sentence and replace with the following: "Consideration will be given to proposals for the development of contaminated land, as defined under Part IIA, Section 78A (2) of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, where it can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Council that appropriate remediation measures can be incorporated in order to ensure the site/land is suitable for the proposed use and in order to ensure that contamination does not adversely affect the integrity of a European designated site(s)."</p> | <p>The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, make the effects of the policy more positive. No further SEA requires to be carried out.</p> |

| Issue | Summary of Overall Likely Policy Group Effects | Reporters Recommendations | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|---|--|---|--|
| <p>19. Airfield Safeguarding</p> | <p>Assessment not required as this policy relates to the compatibility of new developments with the safe operation of existing airfields. It does not deal with physical development but sets out the criteria where additional assessments will be required from new development within the vicinity of identified airfields.</p> | <p><u>Policy EP13</u> 1. Delete the text of Policy EP13, and replace it with the following: <i>"Policy EP13: Airfield Safeguarding: Planning permission will be refused for developments likely to have an unacceptable impact on the safe operation of aircraft from the following airfields:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dundee Airport; • Perth Airport; and • Unlicensed airfields, as defined in Supplementary Guidance. <i>Applicants for planning consents within the safeguarding zones of these airfields may be required to provide an independent assessment of the impact on the safe operation of the existing facility, prepared by a suitably qualified person.</i> <i>Note: Licensed airfields are safeguarded in line with CAA document CAP 168 "Licensing of Aerodromes". Unlicensed airfields are safeguarded in line with CAA document CAP 793 "Safe Operating Practices at Unlicensed Aerodromes", and Supplementary Guidance will define the areas where consultations will take place and consider prejudicial developments including incompatible activities and navigational obstructions."</i></p> | <p>An assessment of this policy was deemed not to be required and the revised wording recommended by the Reporter would not alter this. No action is therefore considered necessary.</p> |

Section 3 – ASSESSMENT OF NEW POLICIES

Policy PM3 Infrastructure Contributions

The assessment of Policy PM3 can be found in the Environmental Report Addendum No.2 Appendix B (page 6). The Reporter has recommended the replacement of the third paragraph of this policy as follows:

“Wherever possible, the requirements of this policy will be secured by planning condition. Where a legal agreement is required, the possibility of using an agreement under other legislation such as the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973 will be considered . Only where successors in title need to be bound will a planning obligation be required.

In all cases, the Council will consider the economic viability of proposals alongside options of phasing or staging payments.”

In terms of SEA it was necessary to assess whether the addition of this second part to the policy would change the original overall policy assessment in any way. For ease of reference the original assessment is replicated below.

| Policy Name | SEA OBJECTIVE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Summary of Overall Likely Effects | |
|--------------------------------|---------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----------------------------------|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | | |
| Developer Contributions | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | A pre-screening was previously carried out for this policy and it was determined that as the policy itself will not result in any physical development but rather provides a statement of the Council’s general intent in respect of when and how it will seek financial contributions from developers related their proposals. Therefore it was considered unlikely that it would have a significant effect on any SEA topics listed under Schedule 3 of the 2005 Act. |

Overall it was considered that the inclusion of the second part of the policy would not change the original assessment.

Policy PM4 Settlement Boundaries

The assessment of the Placemaking policy group can be found in the Environmental Report Addendum No.2 Appendix B (page 6). The Reporter has recommended the inclusion of an additional policy to this group – PM4 Settlement boundaries – as follows:

“For settlements which are defined by a settlement boundary in the plan, development will not be permitted, except within the defined settlement boundary.”

This new policy requires to be assessed against the SEA objectives and this is set out in the table below.

| Policy Name | SEA OBJECTIVE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Summary of Overall Likely Effects |
|-----------------------|---------------|----|---|---|----|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | |
| Settlement Boundaries | | ++ | + | + | ++ | | | | ++ | | | | + | | ~ | + | + | Overall it is anticipated that the policy will have significant beneficial effects in directing growth to appropriate and more sustainable locations, helping to reduce journey lengths and the need to travel. It will also help maintain and protect soils surrounding settlements. It is expected to have several positive effects in improving quality of life and environmental quality, maximising use of assets, and protecting landscapes and the setting of settlements although these benefits will be dependent on the implementation of the policy in combination with other policies in the Plan. Impacts on the historic environment are uncertain as the policy could lead to increased pressure for infill development. There are not expected to be any direct effects on several of the SEA topics as a result of this policy as effects on these will have been guided by other policies in the Plan. |

Policy RC5

The assessment of the Retail and Commercial Development policy group can be found in the Environmental Report Addendum No.2 Appendix B (page 8). The Reporter has recommended the inclusion of an additional policy to this group as follows:

“Proposals to modify planning obligations and other planning controls that control floorspace and/or the range of goods that can be sold from retail units must be justified by a health check, a retail impact assessment and where appropriate a transport assessment. Proposals will only be acceptable where:

- (a) It can be demonstrated that there will be no significant impact (individual or cumulative) on any town centre.*
 - (b) It can be demonstrated that the proposal helps meet quantitative or qualitative deficiencies in existing provision.*
 - (c) It can be demonstrated that there will be no change to the role or function of the centre in the network of centres.*
 - (d) It is supported by a favourable sequential assessment, that demonstrates that no other suitable site in a sequentially preferable location is available or is likely to become available in a reasonable time.*
 - (e) It is of an appropriate scale.*
 - (f) Any detrimental impacts identified in the transport assessment are mitigated.*
- Any significant changes in the evolving role and function of a centre should be addressed through the next review of the Local Development Plan rather than changes being driven by individual applications.”*

This new policy requires to be assessed against the SEA objectives and this is set out in the table below.

| Policy Name | SEA OBJECTIVE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Summary of Overall Likely Effects |
|-------------|---------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | |
| RC5 | ~ | + | + | + | | ~ | | - | ++ | ~ | ~ | - | ++ | + | ~ | | ~ | Overall the policy will have limited effects as it does not result in new built development. Any impact on landscape or soil is likely to be minimal as proposals will be within an urban location or are already in existence. There may be limited additional negative impacts in terms of air quality which are dealt with in more detail through other LDP policies. Several of the impacts are unknown and will depend on the nature of the change in the types of goods that could be sold from any unit. |

Policy EP1A Climate Change, Carbon Reduction and Sustainable Construction

The assessment of policy EP1 can be found in the Environmental Report Addendum No.2 Appendix B (page 13). The Reporter has recommended the inclusion of a second part to this policy – EP1A – as follows:

“The Council is committed to ensuring that development minimises disturbance to, and the loss of, carbon rich soils, including peatland, which are of value as carbon stores. Development will only be permitted on areas of undisturbed carbon rich soils, including peatland, where it has been clearly demonstrated that there is no viable alternative, or where the economic and social benefits of the development outweigh any potential detrimental effect on the environment.”

In terms of SEA it was necessary to assess whether the addition of this second part to the policy would change the original overall policy assessment in any way. For ease of reference the original assessment is replicated below.

| Policy Name | SEA OBJECTIVE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Summary of Overall Likely Effects |
|--|---------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | |
| Climate Change, Carbon Reduction & Sustainable Construction | ++ | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | | | + | The policy will have a significant beneficial effect on conserving wider biodiversity, maintaining the productive capacity of soils, reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases, mitigating/ adapting to climate change, minimising waste, reusing recycled materials and promoting sustainable design and construction. Its' benefits will be further enhanced when applied in combination with other policies in the Plan on transportation, biodiversity, open space, drainage and placemaking policies. It does this by requiring reduction in energy/ resource use and waste, providing for adaptability, well-being and security and encouraging micro renewables. |

Overall it was considered that the inclusion of the second part of the policy would not change the original assessment. The main areas this second part of the policy would impact on, namely SEA objective 5 (maintain, protect and where necessary enhance the fundamental qualities and productive capacities of soils), SEA 10 (reduce emissions of greenhouse gases), and SEA 11 (reduce the area’s vulnerability to the effects of climate change through identifying appropriate mitigation and adaptation measures) were already assessed as being likely to have significant beneficial effects albeit these may be dependent on policy implementation and / or in combination with other policies / guidance in the Plan.

Policy EP15: Development within the River Tay Catchment Area

The Reporter has recommended the inclusion of a new policy EP15 within the Local Development Plan to address the mitigation required for development within the River Tay Catchment Area as identified within the Habitats Regulation Assessment. Policy EP15 would read as follows:

“The Council will seek to protect and enhance the nature conservation interests within the River Tay Catchment area. In order to ensure no adverse effects on the River Tay Special Area of Conservation, all the following criteria will apply to development proposals at Acharn, Balnaguard, Camserney, Croftinloan/Donavourd/East haugh/Ballyoukan, Fortingall, Grandtully/Strathtay/Little Ballinluig, Logierait, Tummel Bridge, Concraigie, Craigie and Kinloch, and criteria (b) and (c) to development proposals at Bankfoot and Kirkmichael.

- (a) Drainage from all development should ensure no reduction in water quality.
- (b) Construction Method Statement to be provided where the development site will affect the watercourse. Methodology should provide measures to protect the watercourse from the impact of pollution and sediment.
- (c) Where the development site is within 30metres of a watercourse an Otter survey should be undertaken and a species protection plan provided, if required

Note: Supplementary Guidance ‘River Tay Special Area of Conservation’ provides detailed advice to developers on the types of appropriate information and safeguards to be provided in support of planning applications for new projects which may affect the River Tay Special Area of Conservation.”

In terms of SEA it was necessary to assess the addition of the policy within the plan against the SEA objectives.

| Policy Name | SEA OBJECTIVE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Summary of Overall Likely Effects |
|--|---------------|---|---|----|---|----|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | |
| Development within the River Tay Catchment Area | ++ | + | + | ++ | + | ++ | + | + | | | + | | | + | | + | | The policy will have a significant beneficial effect on conserving wider biodiversity, improving environmental quality and protection of the water body status within the River Tay Catchment Area. The policy would also have a positive effect in conjunction with other policies in terms of development within the named settlements, improving quality of life for communities, protection of soil qualities, and reducing vulnerability to climate change through safeguarding the floodplain, air quality and promoting sustainable construction. |

Overall it was considered that the inclusion of this policy within the plan would have positive environmental implications. The main areas that the policy would likely to have significant beneficial effects would be, namely SEA objective 1 (conserve and enhance the diversity of species habitat), SEA 4 (improve the quality of life for communities), and SEA 6 (protect and where possible enhance water body status) albeit these may be dependent on policy implementation and / or in combination with other policies / guidance in the Plan.)

Section 4 – PROPOSALS ASSESSMENT

As part of the SEA assessment process positive and negative impacts / issues were identified for each proposed site together with the mitigation and enhancement measures which may help to offset adverse effects on the environment resulting from the implementation of the Plan. These are not replicated in full in the table below but instead where applicable a brief summary is given of the issues or impacts identified through the SEA together with the Reporters recommendations and the impact of these. Page references to the full assessment in Addendum No.2 Appendix C are included.

| Issue | Issue / Impact identified through the SEA (Addendum Appendix page ref in brackets) | Reporters Recommendation | Impact of Reporters Recommendation | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|------------------------------------|--------------------|------|--------|-----|-----------------------|--|--------------------|--|
| <p>21. Perth Strategic Development Area - West/North West Perth</p> | <p>H73 & E38 (originally referenced as one site – H5): Negative impacts – UK BAP priority species recorded, listed buildings within the site, partially covered by non-designated archaeology, East Pow River classified as being less than good, Almondbank WWTW may be at capacity, site directly intersects an intercatchment at risk area, flood risk, the Town Lade runs through the site, potential risk of overland flow from the East Pow, significant issues of scouring of river banks, partially covered by ancient woodland / semi-natural woodland, partially intersects with the River Tay SAC, and partially within 500m or less of SSSI (p.18)</p> | <p><u>Almond Valley Village</u> 1. Add a new site, identified as H73 Almond Valley Village, the boundaries of which should be defined by the plan which accompanied planning application 08/00678/IPM minus the part of that site which is to be allocated site E38. 2. Add site-specific developer requirements for that site as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1041 590 1967 709"> <thead> <tr> <th>Ref</th> <th>Location</th> <th>Size</th> <th>Number</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>H73</td> <td>Almond Valley Village</td> <td></td> <td>Approximately 1500</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Site Specific Developer Requirements ⇒ A masterplan will be required for the comprehensive development of this site setting out the phased release of both the housing and community land. ⇒ Flood Risk Assessment ⇒ Delivery of a suitable road access through the site from Site E38 into Site H7 across the River Almond (phasing details to be agreed). ⇒ Facilities to enable connection to Perth’s bus network. ⇒ Network of paths and cycle routes providing good active travel links to Perth and Almondbank. ⇒ Green corridors in particular networks to link the site with Perth and the wider countryside. ⇒ Enhancement of biodiversity. ⇒ Integration of existing landscape framework into the development. ⇒ New Primary School provision. ⇒ Investigation of the provision of a district heating system and combined heat and power infrastructure using renewable resources. ⇒ A Construction Method Statement shall be provided where a development site will affect a watercourse. The methodology should provide measures to protect the watercourse from the impact of pollution and sediment so as to ensure no adverse effects on the River Tay Special Area of Conservation. ⇒ Where a development site is within 30 metres of a watercourse an otter survey should be undertaken and a species protection plan provided, if required, so as to ensure no adverse effects on the River Tay Special Area of Conservation.</p> <p>3. Modify the table under paragraph 5.1.11 to include Site H73, specifying the delivery of 700 units by 2024 and 800 thereafter.</p> | Ref | Location | Size | Number | H73 | Almond Valley Village | | Approximately 1500 | <p>The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out.</p> |
| | Ref | Location | Size | Number | | | | | | | |
| | H73 | Almond Valley Village | | Approximately 1500 | | | | | | | |
| <p>H7: Negative impacts – UK BAP priority species recorded, partially covered by Scheduled Monument, partially covered by non-designated archaeology, River Almond classified as less than good, site directly intersects an</p> | <p><u>Site E38 Ruthvenfield Road</u> 4. Add two additional site-specific developer requirements to read as follows: <i>“Masterplan and phasing to incorporate a suitable road access through the site into Site H72 (Almond Valley Village) and thence into Site H7.”</i> <i>“The developable area of the site is likely to be constrained by flood risk. A flood risk assessment will be required.”</i> Following clarification from the Reporter, the reference to site H72 in connection with the access to site E38 Ruthvenfield Road is modified to H73.</p> <p><u>Site H7 Bertha Park</u> 5. Modify the fourth site-specific developer requirement to read as follows: <i>“Development shall be phased with the delivery of the Cross Tay Link Road. The first phase of development (for not more than 750 homes and a secondary school) shall not commence until the first phase of the Cross Tay Link Road, linking the site to the A9/A85 junction, has been</i></p> | <p>The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out.</p> | | | | | | | | | |

| Issue | Issue / Impact identified through the SEA (Addendum Appendix page ref in brackets) | Reporters Recommendation | Impact of Reporters Recommendation | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|----------|------|--------|-----|------------|--|--|---|
| | intercatchment at risk area, flood risk, watercourse catchment of less than 3km ² at site, Gelly Burn also within the development boundary, significant issues of scouring of river banks, partially covered by ancient woodland / semi-natural woodland, partially intersects SSSI, borders River Tay, SAC, and Perth WWTW may be at capacity and is currently causing a WFD downgrade to the River Tay (p.17) | <p><i>provided.</i></p> <p>6. Modify the eighth site-specific developer requirement to read as follows: <i>“Protection and enhancement of biodiversity.”</i></p> <p>7. Modify the 10th site-specific developer requirement to read as follows: <i>“New secondary school with potential to provide an all-through school/campus.”</i></p> <p>8. Add two additional site-specific developer requirements to read as follows: <i>“Construction Method Statement to be provided for all aspects of the development to protect the watercourse. Methodology should provide measures to protect the watercourse from the impact of pollution and sediment so as to ensure no adverse effects on the River Tay Special Area of Conservation.”</i></p> <p><i>‘Where the development of the site is within 30 metres of a watercourse an Otter survey should be undertaken and a species protection plan provided, if required so as to ensure no adverse effects on the River Tay Special Area of Conservation.’</i></p> | | | | | | | | | |
| | H70: Negative impacts – tributaries of the Pow Burn run through the site, flood risk, site directly intersects an intercatchment at risk area, East Pow River classified as being less than good, entire site is prime agricultural land, UK BAP priority species recorded at the site, and non-designated archaeology present (p.19) | <p><u>Site H70 Perth West</u></p> <p>9. Modify the boundaries of this site on the proposals map so that they match those set out representation 08651/3/002 (Huntingtower View).</p> <p>10. Modify the site specific developer requirements for the site as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1044 758 2089 877"> <thead> <tr> <th>Ref</th> <th>Location</th> <th>Size</th> <th>Number</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>H70</td> <td>Perth West</td> <td></td> <td>A maximum of 550 with employment space and/or primary school</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Site Specific Developer Requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ A masterplan will be required for the comprehensive development of this site setting out the phased release of housing, community and employment land. ⇒ Development not to commence before the A9/A85 junction improvements are complete. ⇒ Flood Risk Assessment ⇒ Facilities to enable connection to Perth’s bus network. ⇒ Network of paths and cycle routes providing good active travel links to Perth ⇒ Green corridors in particular networks to link the site with Perth and the wider countryside. ⇒ Enhancement of biodiversity. ⇒ Integration of existing landscape framework into the development. ⇒ New Primary School provision to be considered. ⇒ Investigation of the provision of a district heating system and combined heat and power infrastructure using renewable resources. <p>Additional modification following agreement from Reporter that it would provide clarity in relation to the development potential of the area of white land to the south of H70, inserted as a note within H70: “Note: The area of white land to the south of H70 is excluded from the Green Belt and included within the settlement boundary so as to preserve its development potential, which could come forward through a planning application during the plan period.”</p> | Ref | Location | Size | Number | H70 | Perth West | | A maximum of 550 with employment space and/or primary school | The Reporters recommends reducing the allocation from that in the Proposed Plan, but as the original site has already been assessed it is considered that no further SEA needs to be carried out. |
| Ref | Location | Size | Number | | | | | | | | |
| H70 | Perth West | | A maximum of 550 with employment space and/or primary school | | | | | | | | |
| 22. Perth Area (within Core) - Green Belt | The effects of the spatial strategy on Perth were assessed through the SEA process (ER p.40-42 and ER Addendum No.2 p.11-19) | 1. Modify the green belt boundary adjacent to site H3 to reflect that proposed in representation 10152/2. | Although not an issue specifically assessed through the SEA process the change recommended by the Reporter is not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. | | | | | | | | |
| 23a. Perth Area (within Core) - Perth City Proposals | H4: Positive impacts – reuse of brownfield land; negative impacts – relatively undisturbed brownfield site, protected species recorded at site, potential to impact on an industrial archaeological site, and potential to increase probability of flooding elsewhere as a result of development (p.20) | <p><u>H4: Marshalling Yards, Tulloch</u></p> <p>1. Relocate the reference to site H4 on page 78 to page 80 so that it follows the reference to site H3 under the heading “Residential Sites”.</p> | This is a minor modification to add clarity and would not require further SEA to be carried out. | | | | | | | | |
| | MU1: Negative impacts – UK BAP priority species recorded, partially covered by non- | <p><u>MU1 Broxden</u></p> <p>2. Modify the boundary of the MU1 allocation so that it includes that part of the land at</p> | Although not an issue specifically assessed through the SEA process the change recommended by the Reporter is | | | | | | | | |

| Issue | Issue / Impact identified through the SEA (Addendum Appendix page ref in brackets) | Reporters Recommendation | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|--|---|---|---|
| | designated archaeology, flood risk, watercourses and storage ponds which form part of Perth Flood Prevention Scheme within the site boundary, and potential to increase probability of flooding elsewhere as a result of development (p.20) | Pitheavlis which is included within the boundary of planning application 11/00933/FLM. | not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| | E1: Negative impacts – site directly intersects an intercatchment at risk area, flood risk, and Perth WWTW may be at capacity (p.21) | <u>E1: The Triangle, Dunkeld Road</u> 3. Add to the list of site specific developer requirements the following text: <i>“Flood Risk Assessment required which will define the developable area of the site.”</i> | The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| | Existing roadside services site – assessment not required (p.75) | <u>E2: Broxden</u> 4. Extend the site boundary to include the location of the former Broxden farmhouse. | As an existing site assessment was deemed not to be required and the modification recommended by the Reporter would not alter this. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| | E3: Negative impacts – UK BAP priority species, site directly intersects an intercatchment at risk area, flood risk, borders with the River Tay SAC, and Perth WWTW may be at capacity (p.21) | <u>E3: Arran Road</u> 5. Add to the list of site-specific developer requirements the following text: <i>“Flood Risk Assessment required which will define the developable area of the site.”</i> | The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| | H3: Negative impacts – UK BAP priority species recorded (p.22) | <u>H3: Gannochy Road</u> 6. Modify the site boundary in the proposals map to reflect the extended boundary set out in the plan at Schedule 4 document 478. 7. Modify the reference to the site on page 80 to indicate an output of 50 units and make consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 5.1.11. 8. Add the following site-specific developer requirements: <i>“All units to be affordable housing.”</i> <i>“Flood Risk Assessment required which will define the developable area of the site.”</i> <i>“Investigate the potential for providing on-site community facilities.”</i> | The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| | Op7: Negative impacts – UK BAP priority species recorded, partially covered by non-designated archaeology, watercourse may exist within a culvert beneath the site, and Perth WWTW may be at capacity (p.22) | <u>Op7: Newton Farm</u> 9. Reallocate the site for housing. Modify the reference to the site on page 80 to replace the Op7 designation with H71 and indicate an output of 100 units. Modify the first of the site specific developer requirements to read as follows: <i>“A masterplan will be required for the comprehensive development of the site setting out the phased release of the housing areas and incorporating the restoration of the culverted section of the Newton Burn to its natural state where this is practicable. The masterplan should be informed by a flood risk assessment, which will identify which areas of the site are suitable for development.”</i> 10. Make consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 5.1.11. | The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| | Op8: Negative impacts – flood risk, and Perth WWTW may be at capacity (p.22) | <u>Op8: Friarton Road</u> 11. Add to the list of site specific developer requirements the following text: <i>“Flood Risk Assessment required which will define the developable area of the site.”</i> | The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| | Op2: Positive impacts – reuse of brownfield land; negative impacts – potential for impact on setting of listed buildings (p.23) | <u>Op2: Thimblelow Car Park</u> 12. Add to the list of site specific developer requirements the following text: <i>“Flood Risk Assessment required which will define the developable area of the site and which ensures that no built development takes place on the functional flood plain or within an area of known flood risk.”</i> And <i>“Scheme to incorporate an element of public car parking.”</i> | The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| 23b. Perth Area (within Core) - Perth City New Sites | The effects of the spatial strategy on Perth were assessed through the SEA process (ER p.40-42 and ER Addendum No.2 p.11-19) | <u>Auction Mart</u> Remove the “ <i>Employment Land – existing</i> ” designation from the land to the west of the Crieff Road roundabout. | Although not an issue previously assessed through the SEA process the change recommended by the Reporter is not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| 24. Perth Area (within Core) - Transport Infrastructure | The effects of the spatial strategy on Perth were assessed through the SEA process (ER p.40-42 and ER Addendum No.2 p.11-19) | No modifications. | No modifications made to this section therefore no SEA implications. |
| 25a. Perth Area | H27: Negative impacts – UK BAP priority | <u>Luncarty South H27</u> | The Reporters recommendations would not significantly |

| Issue | Issue / Impact identified through the SEA (Addendum Appendix page ref in brackets) | Reporters Recommendation | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|---|--|--|---|
| (within Core) - North Settlements | species recorded, partially covered by non-designated archaeology, flood risk, adjacent to watercourses, partially covered by ancient/semi-natural woodland, part of the site intersects with the River Tay SAC, River Tay classified as being of moderate status, and may be capacity issues with WW pumping station at Luncarty (p.33) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Modify the table on page 135 to replace “200 houses and 5 ha of employment land” with “in excess of 300 houses and 5 ha of employment land.” 2. Modify the next sentence to read “The maximum permitted to 2024 will be 300 houses.” 3. Modify the following sentence to read “The site is capable of accommodating more than 300 houses but the total numbers and phasing require to be identified through a masterplan.” 4. Modify the site-specific developer requirement by adding three additional requirements as follows: “Construction Method Statement to be provided for all aspects of the development to protect the watercourse. Methodology should provide measures to protect the watercourse from the impact of pollution and sediment so as to ensure no adverse effects on the River Tay SAC.” “Where the development of the site is within 30 metres of a watercourse an otter survey should be undertaken and a species protection plan provided, if required so as to ensure no adverse effects on the River Tay SAC.” “A desk based archaeological assessment of the site with a subsequent more detailed investigation if justified.” 5. Modify the fourth site-specific developer requirement to read as follows: “Design of the new A9 junction and river crossing will require to have been approved prior to finalisation of the layout for more than the first 300 houses.” 6. Delete the fifth site-specific developer requirement (restricting development to 75 units in advance of the new A9 junction). 7. Make consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 5.1.11. | change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| | <p>H30: Negative impacts – partially covered by ancient and semi-natural woodland, near to SSSI, flood risk, River Tay classified as being of moderate status, and Stanley works at capacity (p.36)</p> <p>H31: Negative impacts – partially covered by non-designated archaeology, flood risk, River Tay classified as being of moderate status, and Stanley WWTW at capacity (p.75)</p> <p>H32: No strategic environmental sensitivities noted; negative impacts – potential flood risk, River Tay classified as being of moderate status, and Stanley WWTW at capacity (p.36)</p> <p>H33: Negative impacts – UK BAP priority species recorded, River Tay classified as being of moderate status, and Stanley WWTW at capacity (p.37)</p> <p>H34: No strategic environmental sensitivities noted; negative impacts – flood risk, River Tay classified as being of moderate status, and Stanley WWTW at capacity (p.37)</p> | <p><u>Stanley</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. Modify the site-specific developer requirements for sites H30-H34 by deleting “300 maximum (180 occupied by 2024)” and replacing with “280 built by 2024” 9. Modify the second site-specific developer requirement to read as follows: “Development phased to ensure that there is adequate infrastructure to accommodate it.” 10. Make consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 5.1.11. <p><u>Stanley H30</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11. Modify the site-specific developer requirements for sites H30-H34 by adding an additional requirement as follows: “Flood risk assessment required for site H30, as the developable area of the site may be constrained by flood risk from a field drain along the southern and western part of the site.” | The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| 25b. Perth Area (within Core) - East Settlements | <p>RT1: Negative impacts – within 500m or less of the River Tay SAC, part within 500m or less of the Kinnoull Hill SSSI (p.32)</p> <p>H29: Negative impacts – UK BAP priority species recorded, part within Designed Landscape, site directly intersects an intercatchment at risk area, Annaty Burn classified as less than good status, concerns regarding capacity at Scone WWTW in relation to size of proposed development, watercourse within and adjacent to site, spring and dry valley within the site, flood risk, partially covered by ancient woodland, and high landscape and visual sensitivities (p.34)</p> | <p><u>Kinfauns: Transport Infrastructure Site: RT1</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add the following to the site specific developer requirements: “a transport assessment with appropriate attention to the impact of vehicular emissions, noise and light pollution on nearby properties.” <p><u>H29:Scone North</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Delete the first site-specific developer requirement. Replace with the following: “Masterplanning required for entire site (allowing for only 100 houses in advance of the CTRLR becoming a committed project). The first stage of this masterplanning process will establish broad land use and placemaking principles for the site.” 3. Delete the second and third site-specific developer requirements. | <p>The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out.</p> <p>The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out.</p> |

| Issue | Issue / Impact identified through the SEA (Addendum Appendix page ref in brackets) | Reporters Recommendation | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|---|--|---|--|
| | The effects of the spatial strategy on Scone were assessed through the SEA process (ER Addendum No.2 p.29) | <u>Woolcombe Square</u> 4. Identify the small grass area at Woolcombe Square as <i>open space</i> . Following clarification, the Reporter has confirmed this pertains to land east of Stormont Road. | Although not an issue previously assessed through the SEA process the changes recommended by the Reporter are not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| 25c. Perth Area (within Core) - South Settlements | The effects of the spatial strategy on Bridge of Earn and Oudenarde were assessed through the SEA process (ER Addendum No.2 p.25) | <u>Bridge of Earn and Oudenarde settlement</u> 1. Add an additional sentence under 5.10.3 to read as follows: <i>"The development will be required to provide a new rail station, subject to this receiving funding and support from Transport Scotland."</i> | Although not an issue previously assessed through the SEA process the change recommended by the Reporter is not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| | H15: Positive impacts – increased density minimises the loss of greenfield land elsewhere; negative impacts – partially covered by non-designated archaeology, River Earn classified as less than good, flood risk, Perth WWTW may be at capacity, and may be capacity issues relating to the waste water pumping station at Bridge of Earn (p.27) | <u>H15: Oudenarde</u> 2. Add an additional site-specific developer requirement as follows: <i>"A Flood Risk Assessment will be required. No built development shall take place on the functional flood plain or within an area of known flood risk."</i> | The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| | The effects of the spatial strategy on Bridge of Earn and Oudenarde were assessed through the SEA process (ER Addendum No.2 p.25). In addition the adjacent site (H14) was assessed as follows: Positive impacts – low biodiversity values; negative impacts – UK BAP species noted, may be capacity issues relating to the waste water pumping station at Bridge of Earn, Perth WWTW may be at capacity, and loss of agricultural land (p.28) | <u>Bridge of Earn and Oudenarde new sites</u> 3. Modify the Bridge of Earn and Oudenarde inset map by adding a new housing site, H72 at Kintillo Road, the borders of which should follow those in representation 09313/4/001 on Schedule 4 document 006. An indicative landscaping area should be shown at the southern boundary. 4. Add a new residential site under site H14 on page 96 of the Proposed Plan, describing site H72, stipulating a development of 70 units and the following site-specific developer requirements: <i>"Financial contribution to education provision in line with the Supplementary Guidance." "Site will be phased to reflect the construction of the new school at Oudenarde." "Landscaping to be provided along the southern site boundary to create an appropriate village edge, enhance biodiversity and create new habitats." 5. Make consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 5.1.1.</i> | This site is considered to be an extension to site H14 which has already been assessed. The Reporters recommendation would not significantly change the original assessment for site H14 but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the extended site. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| 25d. Perth Area (within Core) - West Settlements | The effects of the spatial strategy on Almondbank and Pitcairngreen were assessed through the SEA process (ER Addendum No.2 p.15-20) Methven was not specifically assessed | No modifications. | No modifications made to this section therefore no SEA implications. |
| 26a. Perth Area (outwith Core) – North Settlements | Bankfoot settlement was not specifically assessed | <u>Bankfoot</u> 1. Modify the Spatial Strategy Considerations text by the addition of the following two paragraphs at the end of that section. <i>"A Construction Method Statement shall be provided where a development site will affect a watercourse. The methodology should provide measures to protect the watercourse from the impact of pollution and sediment so as to ensure no adverse effects on the River Tay Special Area of Conservation. Where a development site is within 30 metres of a watercourse an otter survey should be undertaken and a species protection plan provided, if required, so as to ensure no adverse effects on the River Tay Special Area of Conservation."</i> | Although not an issue previously assessed through the SEA process the changes recommended by the Reporter are not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| | The effects of the spatial strategy on Burrelton / Woodside were assessed through the SEA process (ER Addendum No.2 p.31-32) | <u>Burrelton/Woodside settlement boundaries</u> 2. Modify the settlement boundary at the north of Manse Road to reflect that set out in the Perth Area Local Plan (Schedule 4 document 782). 3. Modify the settlement boundary along the southern side of Whitelea Road to reflect that set out in the Perth Area Local Plan (Schedule 4 document 782). | Although not an issue previously assessed through the SEA process the changes recommended by the Reporter are not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| | Burrelton/Woodside E8: existing employment site – assessment not required (p.76) | <u>Burrelton/Woodside E8</u> 4. Modify the site-specific developer requirements by the addition of the following: <i>"A flood risk assessment will be required to inform the scale, layout and form of the development. No built development should take place on the functional flood plain or within an area of known flood risk."</i> | As an existing site assessment was deemed not to be required and the modification recommended by the Reporter would not alter this. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| | Burrelton / Woodside H16: Negative impacts – site directly intersects an intercatchment at risk area (p.28) | <u>Burrelton/Woodside H16</u> 5. Delete site H16 from the plan. Modify the settlement boundary at this point to reflect that set out in the Perth Area Local Plan (Schedule 4 document 782). | Only general enhancement measures to be delivered through the development were identified: to enhance biodiversity where appropriate. The Reporters |

| Issue | Issue / Impact identified through the SEA (Addendum Appendix page ref in brackets) | Reporters Recommendation | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|---|--|---|---|
| | | 6. Make consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 5.1.11. | recommendation to delete the site will not therefore impact on the delivery of any significant enhancement measures identified through the SEA. |
| | Damside / Saucher settlements were not specifically assessed | <u>Damside/Saucher</u> 7. Delete section 5.15 and the accompanying settlement plan from the plan. | Although not an issue previously assessed through the SEA process the changes recommended by the Reporter are not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| | Wolfhill H35: Negative impacts – site directly intersects an intercatchment at risk area (p.37) | <u>Wolfhill H35</u> 8. Delete site H35 and align the settlement boundary at the western edge of Wolfhill with the western edge of site H67 in the Perth Area Local Plan. 9. Make consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 5.1.11. | Only general enhancement measures to be delivered through the development were identified: to enhance biodiversity where appropriate. The Reporters recommendation to delete the site will not therefore impact on the delivery of any significant enhancement measures identified through the SEA. |
| 26b. Perth Area (outwith Core) - East Settlements and Landward Sites | Errol settlement was not specifically assessed | <u>Errol</u> 1. Delete the word “ <i>principal</i> ” in paragraph 5.17.1. | This is a minor modification to add clarity and would not require further SEA to be carried out. |
| | The effects of the spatial strategy on Errol Airfield / Grange were assessed through the SEA process (ER Addendum No.2 p.39-40) | <u>Errol Airfield/Grange H21</u> 2. Add to the site-specific developer requirements: “ <i>Flood risk assessment</i> ”. | Although not an issue previously assessed through the SEA process the changes recommended by the Reporter are not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| | Rait settlement was not specifically assessed | <u>Rait</u> 3. Modify the settlement boundary for Rait to follow, in the vicinity of Old Burnside Cottage and Weavers Cottage, that identified in the adopted Perth Area Local Plan. | Although not an issue previously assessed through the SEA process the change recommended by the Reporter is not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| 26c. Perth Area (outwith Core) South Settlements and Landward | Aberargie settlement was not specifically assessed | <u>Aberargie</u> 1. Modify the settlement boundary to follow that delineated in the adopted Perth Area Local Plan. | Although not an issue previously assessed through the SEA process the change recommended by the Reporter is not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| | Forgandenny H22: Negative impacts – site directly intersects an intercatchment at risk area and partially covered by non-designated archaeology (p.31) | <u>Forgandenny</u> 2. Delete site H22 from the Plan. | Only general enhancement measures to be delivered through the development were identified: to enhance biodiversity where appropriate. The Reporters recommendation to delete the site will not therefore impact on the delivery of any significant enhancement measures identified through the SEA. |
| | The effects of the spatial strategy on Abernethy were assessed through the SEA process (ER Addendum No.2 p.22-23) | <u>Abernethy</u> 3. At paragraph 5.4.1 delete, “ <i>a population of 900</i> ”; insert, “ <i>with an estimated population of around 1470</i> ”. | This is a minor modification to add clarity and would not require further SEA to be carried out. |
| | Abernethy H8: Negative impacts – partially covered by non-designated archaeology and part of site within a flood risk area (p.25) | 4. Delete site H8 from the Plan. | Only general enhancement measures to be delivered through the development were identified: to enhance biodiversity where appropriate. The Reporters recommendation to delete the site will not therefore impact on the delivery of any significant enhancement measures identified through the SEA. |
| | Abernethy H9: No strategic environmental sensitivities noted (p.25) | 5. Add to the site-specific requirements at H9 a fifth requirement as follows: “ <i>Flood Risk Assessment and no development should take place on a functional flood plain or within an area of known flood risk.</i> ” 6. Add to the site-specific requirements at H9 a sixth requirement as follows: “ <i>A feasibility study to assess the potential for channel restoration by removing the culvert.</i> ” | The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| | Abernethy H10: Negative impacts – partially covered by non-designated archaeology, small watercourse within the site, and historic record of flooding (p.25) | 7. Delete H10 from the Plan. | Only general enhancement measures to be delivered through the development were identified: to enhance biodiversity where appropriate. The Reporters recommendation to delete the site will not therefore impact on the delivery of any significant enhancement measures identified through the SEA. |
| | Abernethy H11: Positive effects – reuse of brownfield land; negative effects - partially covered by non-designated archaeology, small | 8. Delete H11 and replace as a Mixed Use opportunity. | The Reporters recommendation would not significantly change the original assessment. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |

| Issue | Issue / Impact identified through the SEA (Addendum Appendix page ref in brackets) | Reporters Recommendation | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|--|--|---|--|
| | watercourse within the site, and culverted watercourse beneath the site (p.26) Glenfarg H23: Negative impacts – UK BAP priority species identified, partially covered by non-designated archaeology, site directly intersects an intercatchment at risk area (p.31) | <u>Glenfarg H23</u> 9. Add to the site-specific requirements at H23 a fifth requirement as follows: “ <i>Re-consult the HSE on the development of the site at the planning application stage to ensure that there are no conflicting issues.</i> ” | The Reporters recommendation would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| 26d. Perth Area (outwith Core) West Settlements | Clathymore H19: Negative impacts – partially covered by non-designated archaeology, existing sewage treatment system would not support further development (p.29) | <u>Clathymore H19</u> 1. Delete from page 101, paragraph 5.12.2 and the reference to residential site H19 (including the site-specific developer requirements) at the bottom of the page. 2. Modify the inset map for Clathymore to delete site H19 and to redraw the settlement boundary along the north east boundary of the existing building group so as to exclude the land identified as site H19 from the settlement. 3. Make consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 5.5.11. | Only general enhancement measures to be delivered through the development were identified: to enhance biodiversity where appropriate. The Reporters recommendation to delete the site will not therefore impact on the delivery of any significant enhancement measures identified through the SEA. |
| | The effects of the spatial strategy on Dunning were assessed through the SEA process (ER Addendum No.2 p.33-34) | <u>Dunning settlement</u> 4. Designate as Open Space all of the field to the west of the road between Dunning and Newton of Pitcairns. | Although not an issue previously assessed through the SEA process the change recommended by the Reporter is not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| | Dunning H20: no strategic environmental sensitivities noted; negative impacts – small watercourse bounding the site, Dunning Burn classified as moderate status, may be capacity issues at Dunning WWTW to accommodate development (p.30) | <u>Dunning H20</u> 5. Modify the inset map for Dunning on page 109 to show an area of indicative landscaping along the western as well as the northern site boundaries. | The Reporters recommendation would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| | Tibbermore settlement was not specifically assessed | <u>Tibbermore settlement</u> 6. Modify the settlement boundary and green belt boundary on the inset map on page 148 to follow the northern edge of the A85, omitting from the settlement any land to the south of that road. | Although not an issue previously assessed through the SEA process the change recommended by the Reporter is not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| 27. Dundee Housing Market Area Settlements | H25: Negative impacts – partially covered by non-designated archaeology, Knapp Burn/Huntly Burn classified as moderate status, and Longforgan pumping station listed as a key pressure on the waterbody (p.32) | 1. Delete sites H25 and H26 from the Plan. | Only general enhancement measures to be delivered through the development were identified: to enhance biodiversity where appropriate. The Reporters recommendation to delete the site will not therefore impact on the delivery of any significant enhancement measures identified through the SEA. |
| | H26: Negative impacts – flood risk, Knapp Burn/Huntly Burn classified as moderate status, and Longforgan pumping station listed as a key pressure on the waterbody (p.33) | | Only general enhancement measures to be delivered through the development were identified: to enhance biodiversity where appropriate. The Reporters recommendation to delete the site will not therefore impact on the delivery of any significant enhancement measures identified through the SEA. |
| 28a. Highland Perthshire Area – Aberfeldy | E10 Borlick: Negative impacts – UK BAP priority species, flood risk, partially within ancient / semi-natural woodland, Urlur Burn classified as moderate status, River Tay classified as good status, and lack of capacity at Aberfeldy WWTW (p.38) | <u>Site E10 - Borlick</u> 1. Modify the site boundary on the Aberfeldy Settlement Map to exclude all the woodland area identified in the Ancient Woodland Inventory (see Schedule 4 document 439). | Reporter recommends a minor modification to the site boundary to protect Ancient Woodland adjacent to the site. The SEA notes the need to retain important trees and extend area of semi-natural or ancient woodland. The Reporters recommendation would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| | H37 South of Kenmore Road: Negative impact – non-designated archaeology, partially within SSSI, flood risk, watercourse within site, Urlur Burn classified as moderate status, River Tay classified as good status, and lack of capacity at Aberfeldy WWTW (p.39) | <u>Site H37- South of Kenmore Road</u> 2. Delete the site-specific developer requirement: “ <i>Access from Duntaylor Avenue and A827 Kenmore Road</i> ” and replace with “ <i>Access should primarily be taken from the A827 Kenmore Road and a secondary access should be sought from Duntaylor Avenue</i> ”. 3. Add the following requirements to the list of site-specific developer requirements: “ <i>Protection and enhancement of broadleaf trees and woodland within the site</i> ”; “ <i>Construction Method Statement to be provided for all aspects of the development to protect the watercourse. Methodology should provide measures to protect the watercourse from the impact of pollution and sediment so as to ensure no adverse effects on the River Tay Special area of Conservation</i> ”; “ <i>Where development is within 30 metres of the watercourse, an Otter survey should be</i> | The Reporter recommends modifications to the Site Specific Developer Requirements including the mitigation measures required under the HRA. The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |

| Issue | Issue / Impact identified through the SEA (Addendum Appendix page ref in brackets) | Reporters Recommendation | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|--|--|---|--|
| | The effects of the spatial strategy on Aberfeldy were assessed through the SEA process (ER p.55-57 and ER Addendum No.2 p.48-49) | <p><i>undertaken and a special protection plan provided, if required, so as to ensure no adverse effects on the River Ty Special area of Conservation</i>; <i>"Built form and layout of the site should respond appropriately to the landscape and strengthen the character of Aberfeldy as a distinctive place."</i></p> <p><u>New site – Moness House Hotel</u> 4. Remove open space designation on the Aberfeldy Settlement Map.</p> | Although not an issue previously assessed through the SEA process the change recommended by the Reporter is not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| 28b. Highland Perthshire Area – Birnam and Dunkeld | <p>E12 Tullymilly: Negative impacts – partially within designed landscape, partially covered by ancient woodland, part within River Tay NSA, and capacity issues at Birnam & Dunkeld WWTW (p.40)</p> <p>E12 Tullymilly: Negative impacts –partially covered by ancient woodland, part within River Tay NSA, and capacity issues at Birnam & Dunkeld WWTW (p.40)</p> | <p><u>Sites E12/E13 - Tullymilly</u> 1. Modify the fourth site-specific developer requirement to read: <i>"Built form and layout should respond appropriately to its sensitive location. Production of Design Statement to ensure that development is in keeping with the local landscape and to protect the integrity of the adjacent designated Dunkeld House Garden and Designed Landscape"</i>. 2. Add the following requirements to the list of site-specific developer requirements: <i>"Flood Risk Assessment"</i>; <i>"Feasibility study to assess the restoration of the existing culvert"</i></p> | The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| 28c. Highland Perthshire Area – Pitlochry | <p>The effects of the spatial strategy on Pitlochry were assessed through the SEA process (ER p.58-60 and ER Addendum No.2 p.62-63)</p> <p>H38: Negative impacts – partially within ancient woodland and semi-natural woodland, and flood risk (p.40)</p> <p>H39: Negative impacts – UK BAP priority species, flood risk, and watercourses within / adjacent to site (p.41)</p> | <p><u>Settlement boundary at Manse Road, Moulin</u> 1. Modify the settlement boundary on the Pitlochry Settlement Map to exclude the fields between Manse Road and the A924 and revert to the settlement boundary shown in adopted Highland Area Local Plan and Schedule 4 document 649. <u>Settlement boundary at Duff Avenue, Moulin</u> 2. Modify the settlement boundary on the Pitlochry Settlement Map to properly reflect the southern boundary of 17 and 18 Duff Avenue.</p> <p><u>Open space designations</u> 3. On the Pitlochry Settlement Map, identify open spaces at the primary school, Delta Park, The Cuilc and in the Bobbin Mill Wood / Hospital area to which policy CF1 applies.</p> <p><u>Housing site H38</u> 4. Add <i>"Flood Risk Assessment"</i> to list of site-specific developer requirements.</p> <p><u>Housing site H39</u> 5. Replace site-specific developer requirement <i>"Paths within the site linking to core path network and provide a largely off-road route to the High School"</i> with <i>"Paths within the site should link to the existing core path network to further enable a largely off-road route to the High School"</i>.</p> | <p>The Reporter recommends settlement boundary changes to Manse Road, Moulin and Duff Avenue. Although not previously assessed through the SEA process the changes recommended by the Reporter are not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary.</p> <p>The Reporter recommends the inclusion of a number of open space designations within the settlement. Although not previously assessed through the SEA process the changes recommended by the Reporter are not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary.</p> <p>This modification was a mitigation measure identified through the SEA. The Reporters recommendation would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out.</p> <p>The Reporters recommendation would not significantly change the original assessment. No further SEA requires to be carried out.</p> |
| 29a. Highland Perthshire Area – East settlements with proposals | <p>E11: Negative impacts – flood risk, partially in SSSI, River Tummel classified as moderate ecological potential, and currently only served by septic tank (p.41)</p> <p>H40: Negative impacts – UK BAP priority species, partially covered by ancient woodland, watercourses within site, flood risk, River Tummel classified as moderate ecological potential, and currently only served by septic tank (p.42)</p> | <p><u>Ballinluig – E11</u> 1. Delete reference to employment site E11 and make appropriate changes to paragraph 6.6.2. Remove designation E11 from Settlement Plan and make appropriate changes to settlement boundary. Make appropriate changes to table in paragraph 6.1.6 on page 151.</p> <p><u>Ballinluig – H40</u> 2. Modify the boundary of site H40 on the Settlement Plan to exclude the area east of the fence line that runs across the site. Make appropriate adjustments to the size and description on page 171. The maximum capacity to be maintained at 45 housing units.</p> <p>Additional modification following clarification from Reporter that the Site Specific Developer Requirements should include the HRA mitigation measures for the site as follows – <i>'In order to ensure no adverse effects on the River Tay Special Area of Conservation: - Drainage from all development should ensure no reduction in water quality. – Construction Method Statement to be provided where the development site will affect a watercourse. Methodology should provide measures to protect the watercourse from the impact of pollution and sediment. – Where the development site is within 30m of a watercourse an Otter survey should be undertaken and a</i></p> | <p>Only general enhancement measures to be delivered through the development were identified: to enhance biodiversity where appropriate. The Reporters recommendation to delete the site will not therefore impact on the delivery of any significant enhancement measures identified through the SEA.</p> <p>The Reporters recommendations would not significantly change the original assessment. No further SEA requires to be carried out.</p> |

| Issue | Issue / Impact identified through the SEA (Addendum Appendix page ref in brackets) | Reporters Recommendation | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|--|--|---|---|
| | | <i>species protection plan provided, if required.</i> | |
| | The effects of the spatial strategy on Inver were assessed through the SEA process (ER Addendum No.2 p.52-53) | <u>Inver</u> 3. Amend the first sentence of paragraph 6.16.1 to read: “ <i>Inver is a small settlement located to the south-west of Dunkeld within the River Tay (Dunkeld) National Scenic Area</i> ”. | This is a minor modification to add clarity and would not require further SEA to be carried out. |
| | E14: Negative impacts – UK BAP priority species, flood risk, and partially within River Tay NSA (p.43) | <u>Inver – E14</u> 4. Add the following requirements to the list of site-specific developer requirements: “ <i>Built form, layout and landscape framework to respond appropriately to its sensitive location and ensure development is in keeping with local landscape character</i> ”; “ <i>Drainage from all development should ensure no reduction in water quality so as to prevent any adverse effects on the River Tay Special Area of Conversation.</i> ” | The Reporters recommendation would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| | H44: No strategic environmental sensitivities noted. Negative impacts – River Tay classified as moderate status, served by public septic tank which cannot accommodate proposed development (p.45) | <u>Murthly – H44</u> 5. Delete reference to housing site H44 and make appropriate changes to paragraph 6.21.2. Remove designation H44 from the Settlement Plan and make appropriate changes to the settlement boundary. | Only general enhancement measures to be delivered through the development were identified: to enhance biodiversity where appropriate. The Reporters recommendation to delete the site will not therefore impact on the delivery of any significant enhancement measures identified through the SEA. |
| 29b. Highland Perthshire Area – West settlements with proposals | The effects of the spatial strategy on Fearnan were assessed through the SEA process (ER Addendum No.2 p.54-55) | <u>Fearnan employment site</u> 1. Delete reference to the quarry site from paragraph 6.13.2. Remove the employment land designation from Settlement Plan. | Although not an issue previously assessed through the SEA process the changes recommended by the Reporter are not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| | H41: Negative impacts – partially within SSSI, flood risk, and River Tay classified as good status (p.42) | <u>Fearnan site H41</u> 2. Delete reference to housing site H41 and make appropriate changes to paragraph 6.13.2. Remove designation H41 from the Settlement Plan and make appropriate changes to settlement boundary. | Only general enhancement measures to be delivered through the development were identified: to enhance biodiversity where appropriate. The Reporters recommendation to delete the site will not therefore impact on the delivery of any significant enhancement measures identified through the SEA. |
| | The effects of the spatial strategy on Kenmore were assessed through the SEA process (ER Addendum No.2 p.56-57) | <u>Kenmore – Sports field</u> 3. Modify the settlement boundary on the Settlement Plan to include the sports field and adjacent recreational facilities (see Schedule 4 document 024). Designate as open space to which policy CF1 applies. | Although not an issue previously assessed through the SEA process the changes recommended by the Reporter are not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| | H42: Negative impacts – UK BAP priority species, partially within designed landscape, and River Tay classified as good status (p.43) | <u>Kenmore site H42</u> 4. Modify the description of site H42 to read: “ <i>Size: 1.6ha; Number: 30 houses, 25% affordable, remainder low cost and/or mid-market housing or staff accommodation.</i> ” Modify the boundary of the site as shown on the Settlement Map to include the whole area shown on page 13 of Representation No. 00369/6/002. | The Reporter has recommended the extension of the site. The site boundary in the Strategic Sensitivities plan of the ER Addendum No.2 has been amended to reflect the extended site boundary. The Reporters recommendation would not significantly change the original assessment. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| | Existing housing site not specifically assessed | <u>Kenmore – New site (West of Primary School)</u> 5. Modify the settlement boundary on the Settlement Plan to include the whole of the housing site approved under planning permission ref. no. 03/02250/PPLB (see Schedule 4 document 024). | The Reporter has recommended a modification to the settlement boundary to include a site south west of the primary school. Although not an issue previously assessed through the SEA process the site has planning permission and therefore no further action is required under SEA. |
| | The effects of the spatial strategy on Kinloch Rannoch were assessed through the SEA process (ER Addendum No.2 p.58-59) | <u>Kinloch Rannoch</u> 6. Modify the first sentence of paragraph 6.18.1 to read: “ <i>Kinloch Rannoch is located at the east end of Loch Rannoch within the Loch Rannoch and Glen Lyon National Scenic Area</i> ”. | This is a minor modification to add clarity and would not require further SEA to be carried out. |
| | E15: Negative impacts – UK BAP priority species, partially covered by non-designated archaeology, flood risk, partially within NSA, River Tummel classified as good ecological potential, and currently only served by public septic tank (p.44) | <u>Kinloch Rannoch – E15</u> 7. Delete reference to employment site E15 and remove the designation from the Settlement Plan. Make appropriate changes to the table in paragraph 6.1.6 on page 151. | Only general enhancement measures to be delivered through the development were identified: to enhance biodiversity where appropriate. The Reporters recommendation to delete the site will not therefore impact on the delivery of any significant enhancement measures identified through the SEA. |
| | H43: Negative impacts – partially within SSSI, partially within NSA, flood risk, River Tummel classified as good ecological potential, and currently only served by public septic tank (p.44) | <u>Kinloch Rannoch – H43</u> 8. Delete reference to housing site H43 and make appropriate changes to paragraph 6.18.2. Remove designation H43 from the Settlement Plan and make appropriate changes to the settlement boundary to align with the rear of the properties in Muirlodge Place. | Only general enhancement measures to be delivered through the development were identified: to enhance biodiversity where appropriate. The Reporters recommendation to delete the site will not therefore impact on the delivery of any significant enhancement measures |

| Issue | Issue / Impact identified through the SEA (Addendum Appendix page ref in brackets) | Reporters Recommendation | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|---|--|---|--|
| 30. Highland Perthshire Area – Small settlements and Landward sites | New policy not previously assessed | <p><u>HRA combined response</u></p> <p>1. Add the following new Policy “EP15: Development within the River Tay Catchment Area” to the Proposed Plan (page 60): <i>“The Council will seek to protect and enhance the nature conservation interests within the River Tay Catchment area.</i> <i>In order to ensure no adverse effects on the River Tay Special Area of Conservation, all of the following criteria will apply to development proposals at Acharn, Balnaguard, Camserney, Croftinloan/Donavoured/East Haugh/Ballyoukan, Fortingall, Grandtully/Strathtay/Little Ballinluig, Logierait, Tummel Bridge, Concraigie, Craigie and Kinloch, and criteria (b) and (c) to development proposals at Bankfoot and Kirkmichael.</i> <i>(a) Drainage from all development should ensure no reduction in water quality.</i> <i>(b) Construction Method Statement to be provided where the development site will affect a watercourse. Methodology should provide measures to protect the watercourse from the impact of pollution and sediment.</i> <i>(c) Where the development site is within 30m of a watercourse an Otter survey should be undertaken and a species protection plan provided, if required.</i> <i>Note: Supplementary Guidance ‘River Tay Special Area of Conservation’ provides detailed advice to developers on the types of appropriate information and safeguards to be provided in support of planning applications for new projects which may affect the River Tay Special Area of Conservation.”</i></p> | <p>identified through the SEA.</p> <p>In line with mitigation measures identified within the HRA the Reporter recommended the inclusion of a new policy EP15: Development within the River Tay Catchment Area. This new policy has been assessed through the SEA process – see full assessment below.</p> |
| | These settlements were not specifically assessed | <p><u>Acharn</u> 2. At the end of paragraph 6.5.2, insert the words: “<i>Acharn lies within the River Tay Catchment Area; Policy EP15 sets out the relevant criteria for development in this settlement</i>”.</p> <p><u>Balnaguard</u> 3. At the end of paragraph 6.7.2, insert the words: “<i>Balnaguard lies within the River Tay Catchment Area; Policy EP15 sets out the relevant criteria for development in this settlement</i>”.</p> <p><u>Butterstone</u> 4. At the end of paragraph 6.8.2, insert the words: “<i>To ensure no adverse effects on the Dunkeld-Blaigowrie Lochs SAC, policy EP6 sets out the relevant criteria for development in this settlement</i>”.</p> <p><u>Camserney</u> 5. At the end of paragraph 6.9.2, insert the words: “<i>Camserney lies within the River Tay Catchment Area; Policy EP15 sets out the relevant criteria for development in this settlement</i>”. 6. Modify the settlement boundary on the Settlement Plan to include the area of land referred to in Representation No. 09085/1/006 (see Schedule 4 document 046).</p> <p><u>Croftinloan/Donavoured/East Haugh/Ballyoukan</u> 7. At the end of paragraph 6.11.2, insert the words: “<i>Croftinloan/Donavoured/East Haugh/Ballyoukan lie within the River Tay Catchment Area; Policy EP15 sets out the relevant criteria for development in this area</i>”.</p> <p><u>Fortingall</u> 8. At the end of paragraph 6.14.1, insert the words: “<i>Most of the village is within the Loch Rannoch and Glen Lyon National Scenic Area</i>” 9. At the end of paragraph 6.14.2, insert the words: “<i>Fortingall lies within the River Tay Catchment Area; Policy EP15 sets out the relevant criteria for development in this settlement</i>”.</p> <p><u>Grandtully/Strathtay and Little Ballinluig</u> 10. At the end of paragraph 6.15.2, insert the words: “<i>Grandtully/Strathtay and Little Ballinluig lie within the River Tay Catchment Area; Policy EP15 sets out the relevant criteria for development in this area</i>”. 11. Modify the settlement boundary on the Settlement Plan to exclude the area of land referred to in Representations Nos. 00306/1/002 & 08988/1/013 (see Schedule 4 document 028). 12. Modify the settlement boundary on the Settlement Plan to include the area of land referred to in Representation No. 09109/1/002 (see Schedule 4 document 028).</p> <p><u>Logierait</u> 13. Following the first sentence in paragraph 6.20.2, insert the words: “<i>Logierait lies within the River Tay Catchment Area; Policy EP15 sets out the relevant criteria for development in this</i></p> | <p>The Reporter recommended modification to the wording of the settlement strategies to include reference to the new policy EP15: Development within the River Tay Catchment Area. This policy has been assessed through the SEA process. The minor modifications to the wording of these strategies are not considered to have any SEA implications.</p> <p>The Reporter recommended modification to the wording of the settlement strategy to include reference to Policy EP6. It is not considered that this minor modification would have any SEA implications.</p> <p>The Reporter recommended modification to the wording of the settlement strategies to include reference to the new policy EP15: Development within the River Tay Catchment Area. This policy has been assessed through the SEA process. The minor modifications to the wording of these strategies are not considered to have any SEA implications.</p> <p>The Reporter recommended modification to the wording of the settlement strategy to include reference to the new policy EP15: Development within the River Tay Catchment Area. This policy has been assessed through the SEA process. The Reporter also recommends amendments to the settlement boundary to the North-west of Strathtay and to the north of Little Ballinluig. The minor modifications to the wording of the strategy and to the settlement boundary are not considered to have any SEA implications.</p> <p>The Reporter recommended modification to the wording of the settlement strategies to include reference to the new policy EP15: Development within the River Tay Catchment</p> |

| Issue | Issue / Impact identified through the SEA (Addendum Appendix page ref in brackets) | Reporters Recommendation | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>area”</p> <p><u>Tummel Bridge</u> 14. Modify the settlement boundary on the Settlement Plan to include the area of land referred to in Representation No. 00756/1. 15. At the end of paragraph 6.23.1, insert the words: “<i>The eastern edge of the village is just within the Loch Tummel National Scenic Area.</i>” 16. Following the first sentence in paragraph 6.23.2, insert the words: “<i>Tummel Bridge lies within the River Tay Catchment Area; Policy EP15 sets out the relevant criteria for development in this settlement.</i>”</p> <p><u>Weem and Boltachan</u> 17. Modify the settlement boundary on the Settlement Plan to include the area of land referred to in Representation No. 00269/1 (Schedule 4 document 029).</p> | <p>Area. This policy has been assessed through the SEA process. The minor modifications to the wording of these strategies are not considered to have any SEA implications.</p> <p>The Reporter recommends an amendment to the eastern settlement boundary and to the wording of the settlement strategy to include reference to the new policy EP15: Development within the River Tay Catchment Area. This policy has been assessed through the SEA process. The minor modifications to the settlement boundary and the wording of the strategy are not considered to have any SEA implications.</p> <p>The Reporter recommends a minor modification to the settlement boundary which is not considered to have any SEA implications.</p> |
| <p>31. Kinross-shire Area - Kinross/Milnathort Settlement</p> | <p>The effects of the spatial strategy on Kinross and Milnathort were assessed through the SEA process (ER p.46-49 and ER Addendum No.2 p.69-72)</p> | <p><u>Paragraph 7.2.2</u> 1. Modify the third section to read: “<i>In the past a significant proportion of the food retail spend for the Kinross-shire area has leaked to Perth and towns in Fife, particularly Dunfermline and Glenrothes. However the Sainsbury’s store in Kinross has improved this situation, and it is not anticipated that there will be a requirement for a further large supermarket in Kinross during the Plan period.</i>” <u>Paragraph 7.2.3</u> 2. Modify the first section to read: “<i>As the settlements lie on the edge of Loch Leven, the Waste Water Treatment Works will require to be upgraded to allow future development needs. Any such upgrading works will need a consent to discharge from SEPA who will require to be satisfied that there would be no detriment to water quality in Loch Leven. Drainage from all development should connect to Public Waste Water Treatment Works.</i>” 3. Modify paragraph 7.2.3 to include: “<i>The north western periphery of the town lies within the HSE pipeline consultation zone.</i>” <u>Kinross/Milnathort settlement boundary</u> 5. Modify the settlement boundary shown on page 209 to exclude the land west of the M90 at Turfhill.</p> | <p>Although not previously assessed through the SEA process the changes recommended by the Reporter are not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary.</p> |
| <p>32. Kinross-shire Area - Kinross/Milnathort Employment Sites</p> | <p>E16: Negative impacts – partially within Loch Leven Catchment Management area, partially within SSSI / SPA / Ramsar / NNR sites, site directly intersects an intercatchment at risk area, and flood risk (p.46)</p> <p>E18: Negative impacts – flood risk, partially within Loch Leven Catchment Management area, and site directly intersects an intercatchment at risk area (p.46)</p> <p>E20: site has planning permission – assessment not required (p.75)</p> <p>E21: part of an existing Business park, potential issues to be dealt with at planning application</p> | <p><u>E16: South Kinross</u> 1. Modify the site-specific developer requirements as follows: • “<i>noise attenuation measures adjacent to the motorway should be well designed and co-ordinated with those at E18 and E20, and should avoid obscuring views of Loch Leven, the castle, the Lomond Hills or the Ochil Hills.</i>”</p> <p><u>E18: Station Road South</u> 2. Modify the site-specific developer requirements as follows: • “<i>noise attenuation measures adjacent to the motorway should be well designed and co-ordinated with those at E16 and E20, and should avoid obscuring views of Loch Leven, the castle, the Lomond Hills or the Ochil Hills.</i>” • <i>Construction Method Statement to be provided where the development site will affect a watercourse. Methodology should provide measures to protect the watercourse from the impact of pollution and sediment so as to ensure no adverse effects on Loch Leven Special Protection Area.</i> • <i>The Sustainable Urban Drainage System for development proposals should include sufficient attenuation to protect those watercourses which flow into Loch Leven from erosion during periods of heavy rainfall.</i>”</p> <p><u>E20: Perth Road</u> 3. Modify the site-specific developer requirements as follows: • “<i>noise attenuation measures adjacent to the motorway should be well designed and co-ordinated with those at E16 and E18, and should avoid obscuring views of Loch Leven, the castle, the Lomond Hills or the Ochil Hills.</i>”</p> <p><u>E21: Auld Mart Road</u> 4. Modify the site-specific developer requirements as follows:</p> | <p>The Reporters recommendation would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out.</p> <p>The Reporters recommendation would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out.</p> <p>As an existing site with planning permission assessment was deemed not to be required and the modification recommended by the Reporter would not alter this. No action is therefore considered necessary.</p> <p>As an existing site assessment was deemed not to be required and the modification recommended by the</p> |

| Issue | Issue / Impact identified through the SEA (Addendum Appendix page ref in brackets) | Reporters Recommendation | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|---|--|---|---|
| | stage – assessment not required (p.75) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Construction Method Statement to be provided where the development site will affect a watercourse. Methodology should provide measures to protect the watercourse from the impact of pollution and sediment so as to ensure no adverse effects on Loch Leven Special Protection Area. • The Sustainable Urban Drainage System for development proposals should include sufficient attenuation to protect those watercourses which flow into Loch Leven from erosion during periods of heavy rainfall.” | Reporter would not alter this. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| | E17: Negative impacts – UK BAP priority species, flood risk, within Loch Leven Catchment Management area, and site directly intersects an intercatchment at risk area (p.46) | <u>E17 and E36: Turfhill</u> 5. Delete these proposed employment sites from the Proposed Plan. Make consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 7.1.6. | Only general enhancement measures to be delivered through the development were identified: to enhance biodiversity where appropriate. The Reporters recommendation to delete the site will not therefore impact on the delivery of any significant enhancement measures identified through the SEA. |
| | E36: existing employment site – assessment not required (p.75) | | The Reporters recommendation to delete the site has no SEA implications. |
| 33a. Kinross-shire Area - Kinross/Milnathort Large Housing Sites | H46: Negative impacts – bats recorded at site, partially covered by non-designated archaeology, site directly intersects an intercatchment at risk area, watercourse within site, flood risk, and partially within Loch Leven Catchment Management area (p.47) | <u>H46: West Kinross</u> 1. Delete proposed housing site H46, and redesignate the land as open space (Open Space Policy CF1). Make consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 7.1.14. | Only general enhancement measures to be delivered through the development were identified: to enhance biodiversity where appropriate. The Reporters recommendation to delete the site will not therefore impact on the delivery of any significant enhancement measures identified through the SEA. |
| | The effects of the spatial strategy on Kinross and Milnathort were assessed through the SEA process (ER p.46-49 and ER Addendum No.2 p.69-72) | <u>H47: Lathro Farm</u> 2. Increase proposed housing numbers to 260 (140 during Plan period). Make consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 7.1.14. 3. Add the following site specific developer requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Construction Method Statement to be provided where the development site will affect a watercourse. Methodology should provide measures to protect the watercourse from the impact of pollution and sediment so as to ensure no adverse effects on Loch Leven Special Protection Area. • The Sustainable Urban Drainage System for development proposals should include sufficient attenuation to protect those watercourses which flow into Loch Leven from erosion during periods of heavy rainfall.” | The Reporters recommendation would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| | Op12: Positive impacts – reuse of brownfield land, and potential conversion of listed building; negative impacts – site directly intersects an intercatchment at risk area, potential loss of listed building (p.48) | <u>Op12: Former High School</u> 4. Redesignate Op12 as a residential site identified as H73, suitable for 70 residential units. Make consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 7.1.14. Following clarification, this site will be identified as H75. | The Reporters recommendation would not significantly change the original assessment. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| | Op15: Negative impacts – partially covered by non-designated archaeology, flood risk, and site directly intersects an intercatchment at risk area (p.49) | <u>Op15: Lethangie</u> 5. Add the following site specific developer requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Flood Risk Assessment. • Construction Method Statement to be provided where the development site will affect a watercourse. Methodology should provide measures to protect the watercourse from the impact of pollution and sediment so as to ensure no adverse effects on Loch Leven Special Protection Area. • The Sustainable Urban Drainage System for development proposals should include sufficient attenuation to protect those watercourses which flow into Loch Leven from erosion during periods of heavy rainfall.” | The Reporters recommendation would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| 33b. Kinross-shire Area - Milnathort Small Housing Sites | Op16: Positive impacts – reuse of brownfield land; negative impacts – flood risk, and site directly intersects an intercatchment at risk area (p.49) | <u>Op16 and E19: Stirling Road</u> 1. Modify the site specific developer requirements as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Construction Method Statement to be provided where the development site will affect a watercourse. Methodology should provide measures to protect the watercourse from the impact of pollution and sediment so as to ensure no adverse effects on Loch Leven Special Protection Area. • The SUDS for development proposals should include sufficient attenuation to protect those watercourses which flow into Loch Leven from erosion during periods of heavy rainfall.” | The Reporters recommendation would not significantly change the original assessments but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the sites. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| | E19: Negative impacts – North Queich River classified as less than good, site directly intersects an intercatchment at risk area, and flood risk (p.47) | | |
| 34. Kinross-shire Area - | Op10: site currently has planning permission – assessment not required (p.75) | <u>Op10: Market Park</u> 1. Delete site Op10, and identify the site as open space (Open Space Policy CF1). | The Reporters recommendation to delete the site has no SEA implications. |

| Issue | Issue / Impact identified through the SEA (Addendum Appendix page ref in brackets) | Reporters Recommendation | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|--|---|--|---|
| Kinross/Milnathort Opportunity Sites | Op13: Positive impacts – reuse of brownfield land; negative impacts – site directly intersects an intercatchment at risk area, flood risk, and partially within SSSI / SPA / Ramsar / NNR sites (p.48) | <u>Op13: Scottish Motor Auctions</u> 2. Delete site Op13. | Only general enhancement measures to be delivered through the development were identified: to enhance biodiversity where appropriate. The Reporters recommendation to delete the site will not therefore impact on the delivery of any significant enhancement measures identified through the SEA. |
| | Op17: site has extant planning permission with an application for renewal (p.75) | <u>Op17 and Op18: Kay Trailers</u> 3. Delete sites Op17 and Op18. | The Reporters recommendation to delete the site has no SEA implications. |
| | Op18: Positive effects – reuse of brownfield land; negative impacts – flood risk, and site directly intersects an intercatchment at risk area (p.50) | | Only general enhancement measures to be delivered through the development were identified: to enhance biodiversity where appropriate. The Reporters recommendation to delete the site will not therefore impact on the delivery of any significant enhancement measures identified through the SEA. |
| 35a. Kinross-shire Area - North and East Settlements with Proposals | H52: site has planning permission – assessment not required (p.75) | <u>H52: Hattonburn</u> 1. Insert the following sentence within paragraph 7.11.3: <i>“The village is within the HSE pipeline consultation zone.”</i> | As an existing site assessment was deemed not to be required and the modification recommended by the Reporter would not alter this. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| | Op19 (listed as Op18): site has planning permission – assessment not required (p.75) | <u>Op19: Ochil Hills Hospital</u> 2. Modify site-specific developer requirements as follows: • <i>“Protect and enhance existing woodland.</i> • <i>A comprehensive woodland management plan (in consultation with Forestry Commission Scotland) and specific proposals for its implementation.”</i> | As an existing site assessment was deemed not to be required and the modification recommended by the Reporter would not alter this. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| | H54: Negative impacts – site directly intersects an intercatchment at risk area, watercourse drains within the area, flood risk, and potential capacity issues at Scotlandwell pumping station (p.52) | <u>Scotlandwell H52 (should be H54)</u> Modify site-specific developer requirements to add: • <i>“Houses to be maximum one and a half storeys in height.</i> • <i>Flood risk assessment.”</i> Following clarification, this site will be identified as H54. | The Reporters recommendation would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| 35b. Kinross-shire Area - West Settlements with Proposals | The effects of the spatial strategy on Kinross and Milnathort were assessed through the SEA process (ER p.46-49 and ER Addendum No.2 p.69-72) | <u>Transport infrastructure</u> 1. Add an additional paragraph after Paragraph 7.1.17: <i>“Transport Infrastructure</i> <i>7.1.18 The A977 is an important strategic route through Kinross-shire and the Council will support further traffic mitigation schemes between Blairingone and Kinross, including examining the need for a by-pass and potential line.”</i> | Although not an issue previously assessed through the SEA process the change recommended by the Reporter is not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| | MIR Option B (not taken forward into Proposed Plan): watercourse within site, Foulbutts Burn classified as moderate status, and Blairingone WWTW at or over capacity (p.71) | <u>Blairingone</u> 2. Identify the land at Blairingone (the portion of Site B in the Main Issues Report which lies within the settlement boundary in the Proposed Plan) as a housing site H74 for 30 units. | Although this site did not appear in the Proposed Plan it was assessed through the SEA process. The Reporters recommendation would not significantly change the original assessment. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| | H53: Negative impacts – partially within the AGLV, watercourse on the site boundary, Gairney Burn/Pow Burn classified as moderate status – no further deterioration of the waterbody will be permitted (p.51) | <u>Powmill: H53</u> 3. Reduce the allocation at H53 to restrict the site to the north side of the A977 (30 units), delete the reference to serviced business land, and modify the settlement boundary and site-specific developer requirements accordingly. | The Reporters recommendation would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| | The effects of the spatial strategy on Rumbling Bridge were assessed through the SEA process (ER Addendum No.2 p.77-78) | <u>Rumbling Bridge</u> 4. Modify the settlement boundary for Rumbling Bridge to include the area defined as R2 by the Fossoy Community Strategy Group (Schedule 4 document 034). | Although not an issue previously assessed through the SEA process the changes recommended by the Reporter are not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| 36. Kinross-shire Area - Small Settlements and Landward Sites | Settlements not specifically assessed | <u>Carnbo</u> 1. Amend the first sentence of the Infrastructure Considerations section (paragraph 7.5.3, page 215) as follows: <i>“The settlement lies within the Loch Leven Catchment Area and drainage from all development should provide appropriate mitigation measures in line with the requirements of Policy EP7 so as to ensure no adverse effects on Loch Leven Special Protection Area.”</i> | The Reporter recommended modification to the wording of the settlement strategy to include reference to policy EP7. This policy has been assessed through the SEA process. The minor modifications to the wording of these strategies are not considered to have any SEA implications. |
| | | <u>Cleish</u> 2. Amend the first sentence of the Infrastructure Considerations section (paragraph 7.6.3, page 216) as follows: <i>“The settlement lies within the Loch Leven Catchment Area and drainage</i> | The Reporter recommended modification to the wording of the settlement strategy to include reference to policy EP7. This policy has been assessed through the SEA process. |

| Issue | Issue / Impact identified through the SEA (Addendum Appendix page ref in brackets) | Reporters Recommendation | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|---|---|---|--|
| | | <i>from all development should provide appropriate mitigation measures in line with the requirements of Policy EP7 so as to ensure no adverse effects on Loch Leven Special Protection Area.</i> | The minor modifications to the wording of these strategies are not considered to have any SEA implications. |
| | | <u>Crook of Devon</u> 3. The site at Schiehallion, north west of Crook of Devon, should be included within the settlement boundary. | Although not an issue previously assessed through the SEA process the change recommended by the Reporter is not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| | | <u>Glenlomond</u> 4. The text at paragraph 7.9.3 should be corrected to <i>“Drainage from all development should connect to Private Waste Water Treatment Works.”</i> | Although not an issue previously assessed through the SEA process the change recommended by the Reporter is not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| | | <u>Greenacres</u> 5. Modify the first sentence of the Infrastructure Considerations section (paragraph 7.10.3, page 221) as follows: <i>“The settlement lies within the Loch Leven Catchment Area and drainage from all development should provide appropriate mitigation measures in line with the requirements of Policy EP7 so as to ensure no adverse effects on Loch Leven Special Protection Area.”</i> | The Reporter recommended modification to the wording of the settlement strategy to include reference to policy EP7. This policy has been assessed through the SEA process. The minor modifications to the wording of these strategies are not considered to have any SEA implications. |
| | | <u>Keltybridge and Maryburgh</u> 6. The settlement boundary on page 224 should be adjusted to exclude the area which is designated as a Garden and Designed Landscape. | Although not an issue previously assessed through the SEA process the change recommended by the Reporter is not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| | | <u>Kinnesswood</u> 7. Modify the settlement boundary to exclude the area of land at Bishop Terrace referred to in paragraphs 7.13.2 and 7.13.3 of the Proposed Plan. 8. Delete the second sentence of paragraph 7.13.2 of the Proposed Plan beginning <i>“Adjacent to Bishop Terrace...”</i> , and the final sentence of paragraph 7.13.3 beginning <i>“Development of the land at Bishop Terrace...”</i> . | Although not an issue previously assessed through the SEA process the change recommended by the Reporter is not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| | | <u>Wester Balgedie</u> 9. Modify settlement boundary to exclude triangular area shown on S4_Doc_367. 10. Modify the first sentence of the Infrastructure Considerations section (paragraph 7.18.3, page 236) as follows: <i>“The settlement lies within the Loch Leven Catchment Area and drainage from all development should provide appropriate mitigation measures in line with the requirements of Policy EP7 so as to ensure no adverse effects on Loch Leven Special Protection Area.”</i> | No. 9 is not an issue previously assessed through the SEA process however the change recommended by the Reporter is not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. The Reporter also recommended modification to the wording of the settlement strategy to include reference to policy EP7. This policy has been assessed through the SEA process. The minor modifications to the wording of these strategies are not considered to have any SEA implications. |
| 37. Strathearn Area - Auchterarder | The effects of the spatial strategy on Auchterarder were assessed through the SEA process (ER p.52-54 and ER Addendum No.2 p.86-87) | <u>Auchterarder Settlement</u> 1. Modify the settlement boundary on the Auchterarder Settlement Map to include the area of land at Abbey Park referred to in representation number 07302/2/001 (see Schedule 4 document 040). 2. In the note included in paragraph 8.2.2, add the following words: <i>“The development consortium responsible recognises that the housing proposals in the Development Framework will impact on the level of existing service provision provided by community facilities as well as a wide range of other resources such as parking provision and footpath networks. Consequently, it has been agreed that a contribution to community facilities should be made by way of a commuted payment per house to be used by the local authority to improve the wider community assets over the life of the development”.</i> | Although not previously assessed through the SEA process the changes recommended by the Reporter are not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| | E25: Negative impacts – partially covered by non-designated archaeology, The Ruthven Water is classified as being less than good, flood risk, and watercourse flows through the middle of the site (p.53) | <u>E25</u> 3. Insert the following requirement at the beginning of the list of site-specific developer requirements: <i>“Masterplan to be submitted to ensure built form and layout respond appropriately to the landscape and to neighbouring residential property”.</i> Modify the third site-specific developer requirement to read: <i>“Landscape framework, including green buffer to neighbouring residential property, green buffer to Ruthven Water, extend and retain riparian planting”.</i> | The Reporters recommendation would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| | Part of the Auchterarder Development Framework sites which were subject to separate SEA – | <u>Op20</u> 4. Add <i>“Flood Risk Assessment”</i> to the list of site-specific developer requirements. | As an existing site which had already undergone SEA, further assessment through the LDP was deemed not to be |

| Issue | Issue / Impact identified through the SEA (Addendum Appendix page ref in brackets) | Reporters Recommendation | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|---|--|---|---|
| | assessment therefore not required (p.76) | | required and the modification recommended by the Reporter would not alter this. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| | The effects of the spatial strategy on Auchterarder were assessed through the SEA process (ER p.52-54 and ER Addendum No.2 p.86-87) | <u>Open space north of settlement</u> 5. On the Auchterarder Settlement Map, remove the open space designation from the area identified on the plan submitted in response to further information request 4ii and described as “additional area of open space that planning authority suggests should be excluded from settlement boundary”. Also, exclude this area from the settlement boundary on the Auchterarder Settlement Map. | Although not previously assessed through the SEA process the changes recommended by the Reporter are not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| | The effects of the spatial strategy on Auchterarder were assessed through the SEA process (ER p.52-54 and ER Addendum No.2 p.86-87) | <u>New sites</u> 6. On the Auchterarder Settlement Map, remove the employment land designation from Ruthvenvale Mill. | Although not an issue previously assessed through the SEA process the changes recommended by the Reporter are not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| 38. Strathearn Area - Crieff | The effects of the spatial strategy on Crieff were assessed through the SEA process (ER p.43-45 and ER Addendum No.2 p.90-91) | <u>Settlement boundary north of Horseshoe Drive</u> 1. Amend settlement boundary north of Horseshoe Drive as shown on document Schedule 4 document 378. <u>Cumulative impact of proposed developments on transport network</u> 2. Insert the following words in an appropriate part of paragraph 8.3.2 of the Proposed Plan: ‘In relation to the housing allocations, it will be required to demonstrate through an appropriate transport assessment that the A85 trunk road through Crieff can accommodate the level of development proposed. Should mitigation measures be required, they must be agreed with Transport Scotland’. | Although not previously assessed through the SEA process the changes recommended by the Reporter are not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| | E26: Negative impacts – Swifts recorded, partially within Designed Landscape, partially covered by ancient woodland, Turret Burn classified as less than good ecological potential, and potential drainage constraint depending on the combination of sites brought forward in the LDP (p.53) | <u>E26 Bridgend</u> 3. Delete employment designation E26 from that area of land situated north of Alichmore Lane and return settlement boundary to that shown in adopted Strathearn Area Local Plan 2001 (see Core_Doc_007). Make appropriate amendments to description of site E26 on page 250 of Proposed Plan. Make appropriate changes to table in paragraph 8.1.8. | Only general enhancement measures to be delivered through the development were identified: to enhance biodiversity where appropriate. The Reporters recommendation to delete the site will not therefore impact on the delivery of any significant enhancement measures identified through the SEA. A replacement site is not required. |
| | MU7: Negative impacts – partially covered by Scheduled Monument, partially covered by non-designated archaeology, Turret Burn classified as less than good ecological potential, River Earn classified as good status, potential drainage constraint depending on the combination of sites brought forward in LDP (p.55) | <u>MU7 Broich Road</u> 4. Amend boundaries of MU7 on Crieff Settlement Map to reflect those shown on plan in supporting document attached to representation ref. no. 09313/8. Extend open space designation to include field to south. | Although relatively major changes are recommended by the Reporter these would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| | H55: Negative impact – site directly intersects an intercatchment at risk area, watercourse on the northern boundary, Turret Burn classified as less than good ecological potential, River Earn classified as good status, and potential drainage constraint depending on the combination of sites brought forward in the LDP (p.54) | <u>H55 Laggan Road</u> 5. Remove this site from Proposed Plan and make appropriate changes to the Crieff Settlement Plan and consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 8.1.14. | Only general enhancement measures to be delivered through the development were identified: to enhance biodiversity where appropriate. The Reporters recommendation to delete the site will not therefore impact on the delivery of any significant enhancement measures identified through the SEA. A replacement site is not required. |
| | H57: Negative impact – swifts recorded, watercourses run through the area, flood risk, Turret Burn classified as less than good ecological potential, River Earn classified as good status, and potential drainage constraint depending on the combination of sites brought forward in the LDP (p.55) | <u>H57 Wester Tomaknock</u> 6. Modify the boundaries of H57 on the Crieff Settlement Map to include the area of land shown in Figure 1 of the supporting document accompanying rep. no. 09004/20/01. Make appropriate adjustments to the size and description on page 251. Change the size of the site to 10.2 ha and capacity to 100-120 maximum. Modify the second sentence of the description to read: “Appropriate landscaping requirements, including a woodland strip, will reduce its developable area to 6.4 ha”. Make consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 8.1.14. | Although relatively major changes are recommended by the Reporter these would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| 39. Strathearn Area - Settlements with Proposals | The effects of the spatial strategy on Comrie were assessed through the SEA process (ER Addendum No.2 p.88-89) | <u>Tomperran Farm employment site</u> 1. Remove the employment land designation on the Comrie Settlement Map. | Although not previously assessed through the SEA process the change recommended by the Reporter is not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |

| Issue | Issue / Impact identified through the SEA (Addendum Appendix page ref in brackets) | Reporters Recommendation | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|--|---|---|--|
| 40. Strathearn Area - Small Settlements and Landward Sites | Braco settlement not specifically assessed | <u>Braco</u> 1. Modify the settlement boundary on the Braco Settlement Map to that shown in the adopted Strathearn Area Local Plan 2001 (Map 7). Following clarification of the 'Braco allotments site' it is agreed that no modification is required in relation to the Braco settlement boundary. | The Reporter made no recommended changes - there are, therefore, no SEA implications. |
| | Greenloaning settlement not specifically assessed | <u>Greenloaning</u> 2. Modify the settlement boundary to include land at junction of A822 and A9 (rep. no. 09810/1/001) as shown on the plan in Schedule 4 document 379. | Although not previously assessed through the SEA process the change recommended by the Reporter is not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| 41. Strathmore and the Glens Area - Alyth and New Alyth | The effects of the spatial strategy on Alyth were assessed through the SEA process (ER p.67-69 and ER Addendum No.2 p.95-97) | No modifications. | The Reporter made no recommended changes - there are, therefore, no SEA implications. |
| 42. Strathmore and the Glens Area - Blairgowrie/Rattray | E31 Welton Road: Negative impacts – partially covered by non-designated archaeology, flood risk, and risk of deterioration of status of River Ericht (p.58) | <u>E31: Welton Road</u> 1. Add the following criteria to the developer requirements section on Page 283: • <i>'Construction Method Statement to be provided for all aspects of the development to protect the watercourse. Methodology should provide measures to protect the watercourse from the impact of pollution and sediment so as to ensure no adverse effects on the River Tay Special Area of Conservation.'</i> • <i>Where the development of the site is within 30 metres of a watercourse an otter survey should be undertaken and a species protection plan provided, if required so as to ensure no adverse effects on the River Tay Special Area of Conservation.'</i> | The Reporter recommends additional developer requirements to take account of the HRA which will have positive environmental implications. The Reporters recommendation would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| | MU5 Western Blairgowrie: Negative impacts – UK BAP priority species, partially covered by non-designated archaeology, site directly intersects an intercatchment at risk area, partially within the Lunan Catchment Management Area, partially covered by ancient and semi-natural woodland, partially within a SSSI, watercourse within the site and possibly a culvert, and flood risk (p.60) | <u>MU5: Western Blairgowrie</u> 2. Add the following to the site-specific developer requirements on Page 283: • Flood Risk Assessment. • Protect local footpaths and the Ardblair Trail. • Expand woodland on west side of site. • Layout of the development to minimise impact on residential properties. | The Reporters recommendation would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| | H64 Blairgowrie South: Negative impacts – UK BAP priority species, watercourse within the site, and risk of deterioration of status of River Ericht (p.59) | <u>H64: Blairgowrie South</u> 3. Add the following to the site-specific developer requirements on Page 284: • Flood Risk Assessment and investigate potential for removing culvert. | The Reporters recommendation would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| 43. Strathmore and the Glens Area – Coupar Angus | The protection of a future by-pass line was not specifically assessed | <u>Protection of future bypass line</u> 1. Add the following text to paragraph 9.4.3: <i>"The council will not permit any development which could prejudice the construction of a bypass at a future date between Burnside Road and Dundee Road."</i> | Although not previously assessed through the SEA process the change recommended by the Reporter is not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary. |
| | E33 East of Scotland Farmers: Negative impacts – partially covered by non-designated archaeology, site directly intersects an intercatchment at risk area, and River Isla classified as moderate status (p.61) | <u>E33: East of Scotland Farmers</u> 2. Exclude the triangular area of land adjoining the roundabout at Burnside Road, shown as site 09762/1/001 on Schedule 4 document 050, from the settlement boundary. | The Reporter recommends the exclusion of a small area of land from the Town boundary to protect it from development and enable an alternative access point for East of Scotland Farmers to be explored. The Reporters recommendation would not significantly change the original assessment. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| | H65 Larghan: Negative impacts – UK BAP priority species, partial coverage by non-designated archaeology, adjacent to a scheduled monument, site directly intersects an intercatchment at risk area, River Isla classified as moderate status, and flood risk (p.61) | <u>H65: Larghan</u> 3. Exclude the most easterly field (part of which is already identified as landscaping) from site H65. | The Reporters recommendation would not significantly change the original assessment. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| 44. Strathmore and the Glens Area – Settlements with Proposals | Arder H66: Negative impacts – site directly intersects an intercatchment at risk area, Meigle Burn classified as poor ecological potential, Ardler WWTW a pressure on Meigle Burn, and flood risk (p.62) | <u>Ardler: H66</u> 1. Delete proposed housing site H66, realign the settlement boundary to exclude the site, and modify paragraph 9.5.2 accordingly. Make consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 9.1.11. | Only general enhancement measures to be delivered through the development were identified: to enhance biodiversity where appropriate. The Reporters recommendation to delete the site will not therefore impact on the delivery of any significant enhancement measures identified through the SEA. |
| | Carsie H67: Negative impacts – UK UK BAP priority species, Lunan Burn classified as | <u>Carsie: H67</u> 2. Delete proposed housing site H67, and redesignate the land as open space (Open Space | Only general enhancement measures to be delivered through the development were identified: to enhance |

| Issue | Issue / Impact identified through the SEA (Addendum Appendix page ref in brackets) | Reporters Recommendation | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|--|---|---|---|
| | moderate status, watercourses within the site, and flood risk (p.62) | Policy CF1). Make consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 9.1.11. | biodiversity where appropriate. The Reporters recommendation to delete the site will not therefore impact on the delivery of any significant enhancement measures identified through the SEA. |
| | Meigle H68: Negative impacts – UK UK BAP priority species, Meigle Burn classified as less than good, site directly intersects an intercatchment at risk area, Meigle Burn classified as poor ecological potential, Meigle WWTW pressure a on Meigle Burn, and flood risk (p.63) | <p><u>Meigle: H68</u></p> <p>3. Add the following criteria to the site-specific developer requirements section on Page 301:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Construction Method Statement to be provided for all aspects of the development to protect the watercourse. Methodology should provide measures to protect the watercourse from the impact of pollution and sediment so as to ensure no adverse effects on the River Tay Special Area of Conservation.</i> • <i>Where the development of the site is within 30 metres of a watercourse an otter survey should be undertaken and a species protection plan provided, if required so as to ensure no adverse effects on the River Tay Special Area of Conservation”</i> | The Reporter recommends additional developer requirements to take account of the HRA and these will have positive environmental implications. The Reporters recommendation would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out. |
| 45. Strathmore and the Glens Area - Small Settlements | Settlements were not specifically assessed | <p><u>Bridge of Cally</u></p> <p>1. Adjust settlement boundary as shown on Schedule 4 document 358.</p> <p><u>Concraigie, Craigie, Kirkmichael, Kinloch</u></p> <p>2. Incorporate the following new policy ‘EP15: Development within the River Tay Catchment Area’ into the Plan (page 60): <i>“The Council will seek to protect and enhance the nature conservation interests within the River Tay Catchment area. In order to ensure no adverse effects on the River Tay Special Area of Conservation, all of the following criteria will apply to development proposals at Acharn, Balnaguard, Camserney, Croftinloan/Donavourd/East Haugh/Ballyoukan, Fortingall, Grantully/Strathtay/Little Ballinluig, Logierait, Tummel Bridge, Concraigie, Craigie and Kinloch, and criteria (b) and (c) to development proposals at Bankfoot and Kirkmichael.</i> <i>(a) Drainage from all development should ensure no reduction in water quality.</i> <i>(b) Construction Method Statement to be provided where the development site will affect a watercourse. Methodology should provide measures to protect the watercourse from the impact of pollution and sediment.</i> <i>(c) Where the development site is within 30m of a watercourse an Otter survey should be undertaken and a species protection plan provided, if required.</i> <i>Note: supplementary Guidance ‘River Tay Special Area of Conservation’ provides a detailed advice to developers on the types of appropriate information and safeguards to be provided in support of planning applications for new projects which may affect the River Tay Special Area of Conservation”</i></p> <p>3. Update <u>Policy EP6: Lunan Valley Catchment Area</u> to include a new paragraph after “...to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority in conjunction with the Scottish Environment Protection Agency”, which begins <i>“The following criteria will also apply to development proposals at Butterstone, Concraigie, Craigie and Kinloch so as to ensure no adverse effects on the Dunkeld-Blairgowrie Special Area of Conservation:”</i> and insert the same criteria as listed above, but reference them (d) to (f).</p> <p><u>Concraigie</u></p> <p>4. Update the Spatial Strategy Considerations section (paragraph 9.9.2, page 296) to read: <i>“Concraigie lies within the Lunan Lochs and River Tay Catchment Areas; Policies EP6 and EP15 set out the relevant criteria for development within these areas.”</i></p> <p><u>Craigie</u></p> <p>5. Update the Spatial Strategy Considerations section (paragraph 9.10.2, page 297) to read: <i>“Craigie lies within the Lunan Lochs and River Tay Catchment Areas; Policies EP6 and EP15 set out the relevant criteria for development within these areas.”</i></p> <p><u>Kirkmichael</u></p> <p>6. Update the Spatial Strategy Considerations section (paragraph 9.13.2, page 300) to read: <i>“Kirkmichael lies within the River Tay Catchment Area; Policy EP15 sets out the relevant criteria for development within this area.”</i></p> <p><u>Kinloch</u></p> <p>7. Update the Spatial Strategy Considerations section (paragraph 9.12.2, page 299) to read: <i>“Kinloch lies within the Lunan Lochs and River Tay Catchment Areas; Policies EP6 and EP15</i></p> | <p>Although not previously assessed through the SEA process the change recommended by the Reporter is not considered to be a matter of strategic environmental significance. No action is therefore considered necessary.</p> <p>In line with mitigation measures identified within the HRA the Reporter recommended the inclusion of a new policy EP15: Development within the River Tay Catchment Area. This new policy has been assessed through the SEA process (see assessment in policy section above).</p> <p>The Reporter recommended modification to the wording of the above settlement strategies to include reference to the new policy EP15. The minor modifications to the wording of these strategies are not considered to have any SEA implications.</p> |

| Issue | Issue / Impact identified through the SEA (Addendum Appendix page ref in brackets) | Reporters Recommendation | Impact of Reporters Recommendation |
|-------|---|---|------------------------------------|
| | | <i>set out the relevant criteria for development within these areas."</i> | |