

**DRAFT HABITATS REGULATIONS APPRAISAL
POST MODIFICATION ASSESSMENT**

1. INTRODUCTION

Addendum to the Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA)

- 1.1 The Council is required to modify the Proposed Local Development Plan in line with the Reporters recommendations following the examination of the unresolved representations to the Proposed LDP. The recommendations for modifying the plan include amendments to polices, introduction of new policies and amendments or deletion of proposals and sites within the plan.
- 1.2 Given the modifications that are to be made to the plan it was considered necessary to update the Habitats Regulations Appraisal for the various changes and determine whether any further action is required. This addendum sets out for each of the Reporters recommendations: the issue/proposal to which it refers; the original HRA screening determination; and any subsequent impacts of the Reporter's recommendations in terms of HRA.

2. VISION, KEY OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES SCREENING

- 2.1 The HRA identified six reasons why the Plan's vision, objectives and policies were screened out from the need for further assessment. These were identified in HRA table 5.1, an extract of which is replicated below for ease of reference.

Reason for Screening Determination
(a) General policy statements/criteria based policies which set out the Council's aspirations for a certain issue
(b) Policies intended to protect the natural environment , including biodiversity, or to conserve or enhance the natural, built or historic environment, where enhancement measures will not be likely to have any negative effect on a European site
(c) Policies which will not themselves lead to development or change , e.g. because they relate to design or other qualitative criteria for development or other kinds of change
(d) Policies which make provision for change but which could have no conceivable effect on a European site, because there is no link or pathway between them and the qualifying interests, or any effect would be a positive effect, or would not otherwise undermine the conservation objectives for the site
(e) Policies which make provision for change but could have no significant effect on a European site, because any potential effects would be trivial, or 'de minimis' or so restricted that they would not undermine the conservation objectives for the site
(f) Policies for which effects on any particular European site cannot be identified, because the policy is too general , e.g. it is not known where, when or how the proposal may be implemented, or where effects may occur, or which sites, if any, may be affected

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendations	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
1. Vision and Objectives	Screened out under criterion a) (p.22-23).	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>	No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendation would not change the original screening determination.
2. Strategy	Under the methodology agreed with SNH (p.15 para.3.5) the Plan's strategy section was not specifically assessed in the appraisal of the proposed plan.	<p>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></p> <p>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></p> <p>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></p> <p>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</i></p>	The Reporter makes a number of modifications but none that would necessitate any change to the original methodology for carrying out the HRA.

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendations	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<i>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>	
3. Placemaking	Policy PM1 was originally screened out under criterion a) (p. 23); and RD1 screened out under criterion f) (p. 27)	<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> <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>	No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendations would not change the original screening determination.
4. Infrastructure Contributions		<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 the following: <i>"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."</i>	No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendations would not change the original screening determination.
5. Economic Development	Policy ED1 screened in for further assessment (p.23). The Appropriate Assessment identified no adverse impact, subject to addition of specified	<u>Glossary</u> 1. Add a definition for "tourism-related development" to the Proposed Plan's glossary to read as follows: <i>"Development in hospitality, leisure and retail facilities and infrastructure where the primary purpose is to attract tourism visits</i>	In respect of the recommendations for Glossary and Policy ED3, there are no HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendations would not change the original screening determination.

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendations	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
	<p>wording (p.91).</p> <p>Policy ED3 was originally screened out under criterion f) (p.24).</p>	<p><i>(overnight and/or leisure day visits) thereby generating revenues and employment within the local economy."</i></p> <p><u>Policy ED1A</u></p> <p>2. Add the following text as a Note: <i>"Supplementary guidance prepared in relation to Policy TA1: Transport Standards and Accessibility Requirements will explain when a travel and transport assessment is required."</i></p> <p>3. Add the following text to the policy as item (e): <i>"Proposals for waste management facilities can be considered to be acceptable subject to detailed site specific considerations."</i></p> <p>4. Add the following text to the policy as item (f): <i>"Proposals should not result in adverse impacts, either individually or in combination, on the integrity of any European designated site."</i></p> <p><u>Policy ED3</u></p> <p>5. Delete sentence 4 of the introduction to the policy and insert the following: <i>"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."</i></p> <p>6. Amend the first clause of paragraph 2 of the introduction to the policy to read as follows: <i>"New and existing tourism-related development will be supported...."</i></p>	<p>In respect of Policy ED1A, recommendations 2 and 3 would not change the original screening determination.</p> <p>In respect of Policy ED1A recommendation 4, the Reporter's recommendation is to insert text from the HRA. No further action is therefore required.</p> <p>For Policy ED3, there are no HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendations would not change the original screening determination.</p>
<p>6. Tourism</p>	<p>Policy ED4 and ED5 both screened in for further assessment (p.24 & 25). In respect of Policy ED4, the Appropriate Assessment identified no adverse impact, subject to the addition of specified wording (p.92).</p> <p>In relation to Policy ED5, the Appropriate Assessment</p>	<p><u>Policy ED4:Caravan Sites, Chalets and Timeshare Developments</u></p> <p>1. In the section of the policy headed "In all cases" add the following text: <i>"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</i></p>	<p>No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendations would not change the original screening determination.</p>

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendations	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
	<p>identified no adverse impact, subject to the addition of specified wording (p.92) and indicated that further SEA/HRA assessment may be required at any future planning application stage.</p>	<p><i>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.</i>"</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>7. Retail and Commercial Development</p>	<p>Policies RC1, RC2 and RC4 were all screened in for further assessment (p.25). The Appropriate Assessment identified the no adverse impact for all 3 policies, subject to the addition of specified wording to each policy (p.94-97).</p> <p>The Reporter has recommended the insertion of new Policy RC5 which has not previously undergone HRA screening.</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></p> <p><i>(a) It can be demonstrated that there will be no significant impact (individual or cumulative) on any town centre.</i></p> <p><i>(b) It can be demonstrated that the proposal helps meet quantitative or qualitative deficiencies in existing provision.</i></p> <p><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></p> <p><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></p> <p><i>(e) It is of an appropriate scale.</i></p> <p><i>(f) Any detrimental impacts identified in the transport assessment are mitigated.</i></p> <p><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>The new Policy RC5 requires HRA screening. Using the reasons set out in table 5.1 'Reason for Screening Determination', Policy RC5 is screened out under criterion f) because the policy is too general and the effects on any European site could not be identified (see below for full text).</p> <p>In respect of Policies RC1, RC2 and RC4 recommendation 4, the Reporter's recommendation is to insert text from the HRA. No further action is therefore required.</p>

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendations	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<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 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. 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>	

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendations	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<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>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). 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. 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</i></p>	

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendations	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<p><i>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"> • <i>town centre,</i> • <i>edge of town centre,</i> • <i>other commercial centres identified in the development plan,</i> • <i>out of centre locations that are or can be made easily accessible by a choice of transport modes.</i> <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"> • <i>town centre,</i> • <i>edge of town centre,</i> • <i>other commercial centres identified in the development plan,</i> • <i>out of centre locations that are or can be made easily accessible by a choice of transport modes.</i> <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>	

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendations	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<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><i>(a) It can be demonstrated that a proposal helps meet quantitative and qualitative deficiencies in existing provision.</i></p> <p><i>(b) It is supported by a favourable sequential assessment.</i></p> <p><i>(c) It is of an appropriate scale.</i></p> <p><i>(d) It provides improved distribution and accessibility of shopping provision.</i></p> <p><i>(e) It provides for accessibility to public transport and non car modes of transport.</i></p> <p><i>(f) Any detrimental effects identified in the transport assessment are mitigated.</i></p> <p><i>(g) 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</i></p>	

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendations	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<i>species protection plan provided, if required, so as to ensure no adverse effects on the River Tay Special Area of Conservation.</i>	
8a. Housing in the Countryside	Policy RD3 screened in for further assessment (p.27). The Appropriate Assessment identified the mitigation measures to be applied. These included additional text to be added to the policy (p.97).	<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>	No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendation would not change the original screening determination.
		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 Reporter's recommendation is to insert text from the HRA. No further action is therefore required.
8b. Settlement Boundaries	Given this is a new policy it has not previously undergone HRA screening. However the settlements were considered in terms of HRA (p.58-79, para 5.6-5.8 and table 5.6). As noted in paragraph 5.6, the Plan does not clearly define the specific scale and / or nature of development which is likely to occur through infill proposals at these settlements so it is difficult to screen the potential for significant impacts. A more general screening exercise was therefore undertaken to highlight the possible considerations for Natura 2000 sites in order to	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."	The insertion of the new policy does not change the screening determination for these settlements which do not have site allocations. For settlements with allocations these will have been or will be assessed individually. In terms of the new policy itself this requires screening under the HRA. Using the reasons set out in table 5.1 'Reason for Screening Determination' policy PM4 is screened out because the effects on any particular European site cannot be identified, because the policy is too general (see below for full text).

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendations	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
	ensure any potential significant impacts are considered in more detail through the development management process.		
9. Affordable and Particular Needs Housing	Policy RD4 was originally screened out under criterion a) (p.27)	<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>	No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendation would not change the original screening determination.
10. Transport and Accessibility	Policies TA1 and CF2 were both originally screened out under criterion a) and b) respectively (p.27).	<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>	No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendation would not change the original screening determination.

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendations	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<p><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></p>	

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendations	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
11. Community Facilities, Sport and Recreation	Policy CF1 was originally screened out under criterion b) (p. 27)	<p><u>Policy CF1: Open Space Retention and Provision</u></p> <p>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></p> <p><u>Policy CF1A</u></p> <p>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></p> <p>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></p> <p>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></p> <p>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></p> <p>6. Modify criterion (d) by adding the following at the start: <i>"Where a proposal would involve the loss of a sports pitch..."</i></p> <p><u>Policy CF1B: Open Space within New Developments</u></p> <p>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></p> <p>6. A consequential amendment is required at the third paragraph of the policy as follows: delete, <i>"an adequate</i></p>	No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendations would not change the original screening determination.

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendations	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<p><i>quantity of accessible open space;" and insert, "an adequate supply of accessible open space of an appropriate quality".</i></p> <p>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>	
	Policy CF3 was originally screened out under criterion f)	<u>Policy CF3: Community Facilities</u> 8. Rename the policy as follows: "Policy CF3: Social and	No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendation would not change

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendations	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
	(p. 27)	Community Facilities".	the original screening determination.
12. The Historic Environment	This policy group (including the existing Conservation Area Appraisals) was screened out under criterion b) (p. 27-28)	<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><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> <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. 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><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>	No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendation would not change the original screening determination.
13. The Natural	Policy NE1(A-D) was originally	<u>Policy NE1A International Nature Conservation Sites</u>	No HRA implications – the Reporter's

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendations	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
Environment	screened out under criterion b) (p. 28)	<p>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> <u>Policy NE1B National Designations</u></p> <p>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> <u>NE1C Local designations</u></p> <p>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> <u>NE1D European Protected Species</u></p> <p>4. Delete the policy.</p>	recommendations would not change the original screening determination. Part D is to be deleted and moved to Policy NE3.
	Policy NE2 was originally screened out under criterion f) (p. 28)	<p><u>NE2 general</u></p> <p>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> <u>NE2A</u></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,</i></p>	No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendations would not change the original screening determination.

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendations	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<p><i>sport and recreation and environment;</i></p> <p><i>(b) protect existing trees, woodland, especially those with high natural, historic and cultural heritage value;</i></p> <p><i>(c) seek to expand woodland cover in line with the guidance contained in the Perth and Kinross Forestry and Woodland Strategy;</i></p> <p><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></p> <p><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></p> <p><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></p> <p><u>NE2B</u></p> <p>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></p> <p><u>NE2 note</u></p>	

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendations	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<p>8. Modify the first bullet point to read as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“promote multi-objective woodland management that delivers environmental, economic and social benefits;”</i> <p>9. Modify the sixth bullet point to read as follows:</p> <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> <p>10. Modify the seventh bullet point to read as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“promote community participation in woodland planning and management;”</i> <p>11. Modify the eighth bullet point to read as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“promote the value of trees and woodlands as a sustainable tourism asset.”</i> <p>12. Add an additional bullet point, worded as follows:</p> <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>Policy NE3 was originally screened out under criterion b) (p. 28)</p>	<p><u>NE3 Biodiversity</u></p> <p>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></p> <p>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></p> <p>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</i></p>	<p>No HRA implications – the Reporter makes a recommendation to modify the policy wording and inserts text on European Protected Species previously included under Policy NE1. This issue has already undergone HRA screening under Policy NE1. Neither of these recommendations would therefore change the screening determination.</p>

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendations	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<p><i>have an adverse effect upon European protected species (listed in Annex IV of the Habitats Directive (Directive 92/43/EEC)) 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>	
	<p>Policy NE4 was originally screened out under criterion b) (p. 28)</p>	<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</i></p>	<p>No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendations would not change the original screening determination.</p>

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendations	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<p><i>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>	
14. Green Belt	Policy NE5 was originally screened out under criterion f) (p. 28)	No modifications.	No HRA implications
15a. Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation and Electricity transmission Infrastructure	Policy ER1 was originally screened out under criterion a) (p. 28)	<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: ‘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</p>	No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendations do not change the original screening determination.

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendations	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<p>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>	
<p>15b. Minerals and Other Extractive Activities</p>	<p>Policy ER4A was originally screened in (p. 28-29) and the Appropriate Assessment identified the mitigation measures to be applied (p. 98).</p> <p>Policy ER4B was originally screened out under criterion a) (p. 29)</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>No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendations do not change the original screening determination.</p> <p>In respect of Policy ER4A, the Reporter's recommendation is to insert text from the HRA. No further action is therefore required.</p>

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendations	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<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>.</p> <p>Following clarification, a consequential amendment will be made to Policy EP9B to ensure consistency.</p>	<p>The consequential amendment to Policy EP9B has no HRA implications and does not change the original screening determination.</p>
15c. Prime Agricultural Land	<p>Policy ER5 was originally screened out under criterion f) (p. 29)</p>	<p>No modification to policy ER5.</p>	<p>No HRA implications</p>
15d. Managing Future Landscape Change	<p>Policy ER6 was originally screened out under criterion b) (p. 29)</p>	<p><u>Policy ER6</u></p> <p>1. Replace the second sentence of the introductory paragraph with the words: <i>'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.'</i></p>	<p>No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendation does not change the original screening determination.</p>
16. Climate Change	<p>Policy EP1 was originally screened out under criterion f) (p. 29)</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</p>	<p>No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendations would not change the original screening determination.</p>

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendations	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<p>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.</i> Insert the following text at end: <i>'New buildings should include a minimum 5% carbon dioxide emissions abatement through the use of Low and Zero-Carbon Generating Technology'</i>. • 2020 Non-domestic - insert following text at end: 'a 	

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendations	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<p><i>minimum 5% of this emissions improvement should come from the use of Low and Zero-Carbon Generating Technology '.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2022 - amend to cover both domestic and non-domestic; insert following text at end: <i>'including a minimum 6% carbon dioxide abatement through the use of Low and Zero-Carbon Generating Technology '.</i> • In first point of the note delete the word <i>'development'</i> and replace with <i>'building'</i>. 	
	New policy	<p><u>Proposed policy EP1A (to follow policy EP1)</u> 3. Add the following policy wording: <i>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.</i></p>	It is noted that in some cases where a policy is split into separate parts the HRA considered each part separately where several different screening determinations were appropriate. Given this is a new part to policy EP1 which has not previously undergone HRA screening it is considered appropriate to assess it separately to the overall assessment of policy EP1. Using the reasons set out in table 5.1 'Reason for Screening Determination' policy EP1A is screened out under criterion (b) because it is intended to protect the natural environment (see below for full text).
17a. New Development and Flooding	Policy EP2 was originally screened out under criterion a) (p. 29)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Modify the diagram on page 52 where it refers to Category ii to read as follows: <i>"...development acceptable here subject to a satisfactory flood risk assessment if required by the Council."</i> 2. 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: <i>"Suitable for most forms of development but may be subject to a flood risk assessment."</i> 	No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendations would not change the original screening determination.

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendations	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
17b. Water Environment and Drainage	Policy EP3A was originally screened out under criterion b) (p. 29)	<u>Policy EP3A: Water Quality</u> 1. Policy EP3A should be re-titled " <i>Water Environment</i> ". The existing wording of the policy should be deleted and replaced with text as follows: <i>"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."</i>	No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendation would not change the original screening determination.
	Policy EP3B was originally screened in for further assessment (p.29). A 'straight-forward' mitigation measure was applied involving the deletion of part of the policy (p.86). This meant the policy did not require to go forward for Appropriate Assessment.	<u>Policy EP3B: Foul Drainage</u> 2. Delete paragraph 2	The Reporter's recommendation reflects the HRA proposed mitigation measure. No further action is therefore required.
17c. Lunan Valley and Loch Leven Catchment Areas	Policy EP6 was originally screened in for further assessment (p.30) and the Appropriate Assessment identified the mitigation measures to be applied (p. 98-100).	<u>Policy EP6: Lunan Valley Catchment Area</u> 1. Replace Policy EP6 with the following: <i>"The Council will protect and seek to enhance the nature conservation and landscape interests of the Lunan Valley Catchment Area. Within the area:</i> <i>(a) there will be a presumption against built development except: within settlements; for renovations or alterations to existing buildings; and developments necessary 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> <i>(b) recreational pursuits like power water sports, likely to</i>	The existing policy is to be replaced with a reworded version which has been agreed with SEPA and SNH (HRA p.98). The Reporter's recommendation reflects the outcome of the Appropriate Assessment. No further action is therefore required.

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendations	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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>Policy EP7 was originally screened in for further assessment (p.30) and the Appropriate Assessment identified the mitigation measures to be applied (p.100).</p>	<p><u>Policy EP7 Drainage within the Loch Leven Catchment Area</u></p> <p>2. Amend the 'Note' at the start of Policy EP7 on page 56 to read:</p> <p><i>"Note: Development within the catchment must comply with the general drainage policies as well as policies relating to</i></p>	<p>The Reporter's recommendations reflect the outcome of the Appropriate Assessment. No further action is therefore required.</p>

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendations	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<p><i>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>18. Environmental Protection and Public Safety</p>	<p>Policies EP4 and EP9 were originally screened out under criterion c) (p. 30).</p> <p>Binn Farm was not identified for future development and was not originally screened.</p> <p>Policy EP10 was originally screened in for further assessment (p. 30) and the Appropriate Assessment identified the mitigation measures to be applied (p. 100-102).</p> <p>The majority of Policy EP12 was originally screened out under criterion d) (p. 31-34), and the Appropriate Assessment identified that a precautionary approach should be taken with regard to specified SACs and SPAs (p. 102-103).</p>	<p><u>Policy EP4: Health and Safety Consultation Zones</u></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><u>Policy EP9A: Existing Waste Management Infrastructure</u></p> <p>2. Modify Policy EP9A to refer to existing and consented waste management sites.</p> <p><u>Policy EP9B: New Waste Management Infrastructure</u></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</i></p>	<p>In respect of Policies EP4 and EP9, the Reporter's recommendations would not change the original screening determination. Following clarification, the amendment to the wording of EP9B (l) would not change the original screening determination.</p>

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendations	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<p><i>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>Following clarification, the wording of the last sentence of item (l) will be <i>"...explored and utilised where it is demonstrated to be viable."</i></p> <p>6. Delete the second sentence of the final paragraph and replace with the following: <i>"In some cases it may be that restoration bonds will be required to be lodged."</i></p> <p><u>Binn Farm</u></p> <p>7. Below paragraph 5.9.1 insert: <i>"Note: A masterplan will be developed by way of Supplementary Guidance which at a minimum will:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>justify the site boundaries</i> • <i>identify the uses to be accommodated on the site and the processes and technologies to be accommodated</i> • <i>identify the impacts on the environment and any appropriate mitigation necessary</i> • <i>hours of working</i> • <i>address the array of consequential traffic matters and explain how these will be dealt with."</i> <p><u>Policy EP10: Management of Inert and Construction Waste</u></p> <p>8. Add as item (e) the following: <i>"(e) they will not result in adverse impacts, either individually or in combination, on the integrity of a European designated site(s)."</i></p> <p><u>Policy EP12: Contaminated Land</u></p> <p>9. Delete the second sentence and replace with the following:</p> 	<p>The Reporter recommends a modification to prepare a masterplan for future development at Binn Farm. The site already has planning permission for its current uses and the area shown in the plan represents the extent of existing planning consents. Although not specifically identified as a proposal in the plan, the supplementary guidance masterplan will determine the uses, processes, technologies and will identify the impacts on the environment and any appropriate mitigation necessary. Without knowing these proposed uses, it is not possible to assess the impacts at this stage. Using the reasons set out in Table 5.4: Reasons for Screening 'Out' the Plan's Proposals, the Binn Farm masterplan is screened out under criterion (f) policies for which effects on any particular European site cannot be identified, because the policy is too general. Screening and further HRA assessment will be required at the supplementary guidance and planning application stages.</p> <p>In respect of Policies EP10 and EP12, the Reporter's recommendation reflects the outcome of the Appropriate Assessment. No further action is therefore required.</p>

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendations	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<p><i>"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)."</i></p>	
<p>19. Airfield Safeguarding</p>	<p>Policy EP13 was originally screened out under criterion c) (p. 34).</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>The existing policy is to be replaced with a reworded version, which has no HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendation would not change the original screening determination.</p>
<p>20a. TAYplan Spatial Strategy</p>	<p>Under the methodology agreed with SNH (p.15 para.3.5) the application of the TAYplan</p>	<p>No modifications.</p>	<p>No modifications made to this section therefore no HRA implications.</p>

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendations	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
	spatial strategy to the LDP was not specifically assessed in the appraisal of the proposed plan.		
20b. Employment Land Strategy	Under the methodology agreed with SNH (p.15 para 3.5) the employment land strategy was not specifically assessed in the appraisal of the proposed plan.	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 that period and beyond. Some sites, including the James Hutton Institute at Invergowrie, are identified for specialist employment."</i>	No modifications made to this section therefore no HRA implications.
20c. Housing Land Strategy	Under the methodology agreed with SNH (p.15 para.3.5) the housing land strategy was not specifically assessed in the appraisal of the proposed plan.	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 HRA implications.
20d. Effectiveness of Strategic Sites		No modifications.	No modifications made, therefore no HRA implications.
20e. HMA Specific Housing Strategy Issues	Under the methodology agreed with SNH (p.15 para.3.5) the spatial strategy for each housing market area was not specifically assessed in the appraisal of the proposed plan.	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.	The Reporter makes only a minor modification and this would not necessitate any change to the original methodology for carrying out the HRA.
20f. Greenfield Land and Housing Density	Under the methodology agreed with SNH (p.15 para.3.5) the Plan's spatial strategy section, including the paragraphs on greenfield land and housing density, was not specifically assessed in the appraisal of the	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	Given that each site has already been assessed this minor addition is not considered to have HRA implications.

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendations	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
	proposed plan.	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.	
		<p>2. Modify the first clause in the second paragraph of Policy PM1A to read: "<i>The design, density and siting of development.</i>"</p> <p>3. Modify Policy PM1B at its item (c) to read: "<i>The design and density should complement...</i>"</p>	No HRA implications – Policy PM1 was screened out under criterion a) general policy statements / criteria based policy and the Reporter's recommendations would not change this screening determination.

Full screening determination for new policies

Relevant Aspect of the Plan	Screened In/Out	Reason for Screening Determination and Natura 2000 site likely to be affected
GROUP: RETAIL AND COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT		
RC5	Out	(f) Effects on any particular European site cannot be identified, because the policy is too general.

Relevant Aspect of the Plan	Screened In/Out	Reason for Screening Determination and Natura 2000 site likely to be affected
GROUP: PLACEMAKING		
PM4: Settlement Boundaries	Out	(f) Effects on any particular European site cannot be identified, because the policy is too general.

Relevant Aspect of the Plan	Screened In/Out	Reason for Screening Determination and Natura 2000 site likely to be affected
GROUP: ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND PUBLIC SAFETY		
EP1A: Climate Change, Carbon Reduction and Sustainable Construction	Out	b) Intended to protect the natural environment, including biodiversity, or to conserve or enhance the natural, built or historic environment, where enhancement measures will not be likely to have any negative effect on a European site.

3. PROPOSALS SCREENING

The HRA identified four reasons why sites were screened out from the need for further assessment. These were identified in HRA table 5.4, an extract of which is replicated below for ease of reference.

Reason for Screening Determination
(a) Proposals which make provision for change but which could have no conceivable effect on a European site, because there is no link or pathway between them and the qualifying interests, or any effect would be a positive effect, or would not otherwise undermine the conservation objectives for the site;
(b) Proposals which make provision for change but could have no significant effect on a European site, because any potential effects would be trivial, or 'de minimis' or so restricted that they would not undermine the conservation objectives for the site;
(c) Proposals which make provision for change but already have planning permission , therefore it is assumed that the proposal has already undergone screening for the need for an Appropriate Assessment, and where required it has been undertaken and appropriate mitigation measures developed.
(d) Projects excluded from the appraisal because they are not proposals generated by this Plan.

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation								
<p>21. Perth Strategic Development Area - West/North West Perth</p>		<p><u>Almond Valley Village</u></p> <p>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.</p> <p>2. Add site-specific developer requirements for that site as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="920 501 1626 639"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="920 501 1010 549">Ref</th> <th data-bbox="1010 501 1178 549">Location</th> <th data-bbox="1178 501 1274 549">Size</th> <th data-bbox="1274 501 1626 549">Number</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="920 549 1010 639">H73</td> <td data-bbox="1010 549 1178 639">Almond Valley Village</td> <td data-bbox="1178 549 1274 639"></td> <td data-bbox="1274 549 1626 639">Approximately 1500</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 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. 	Ref	Location	Size	Number	H73	Almond Valley Village		Approximately 1500	<p>The Reporter's modification relates to a site which was considered as a planning application and subject to EIA. The mitigation measures will be incorporated into the masterplan for the site and no further action is required.</p>
Ref	Location	Size	Number								
H73	Almond Valley Village		Approximately 1500								

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
	<p>E38 was screened out under criterion (a) (p. 37).</p> <p>H7 was screened in due to potential impact on River Tay SAC from Bertha Loch and river Almond (p.38). The Appropriate Assessment recommended a number of mitigation measures to protect the watercourse and otter (p. 103-104).</p> <p>Site H70 was screened out under criteria (a +b) (p. 38).</p>	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <p>⇒ 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.</p> <p>⇒ 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> </div> <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. <u>Site E38 Ruthvenfield Road</u></p> <p>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. <u>Site H7 Bertha Park</u></p> <p>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,</i></p>	<p>No HRA Implications – none of the Reporter's recommendation would change the original screening determination for this site</p> <p>No HRA implications the reporter's modifications include the mitigation measures from the Appropriate Assessment.</p>

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation								
		<p><i>linking the site to the A9/A85 junction, has been 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> <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><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="920 1150 1630 1286"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="920 1150 1010 1193">Ref</th> <th data-bbox="1010 1150 1176 1193">Location</th> <th data-bbox="1176 1150 1279 1193">Size</th> <th data-bbox="1279 1150 1630 1193">Number</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="920 1193 1010 1286">H70</td> <td data-bbox="1010 1193 1176 1286">Perth West</td> <td data-bbox="1176 1193 1279 1286"></td> <td data-bbox="1279 1193 1630 1286">A maximum of 550 with employment space and/or primary school</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Ref	Location	Size	Number	H70	Perth West		A maximum of 550 with employment space and/or primary school	<p>No HRA Implications – none of the Reporter's recommendation would change the original screening determination for this smaller site</p>
Ref	Location	Size	Number								
H70	Perth West		A maximum of 550 with employment space and/or primary school								

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<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>	
22. Perth Area (within Core) - Green Belt	Policy NE5 (Green Belt) was screened out under criterion (f) (p. 28); and site H3 was screened out under criterion (a) (p. 37).	1. Modify the green belt boundary adjacent to site H3 to reflect that proposed in representation 10152/2.	No HRA implications – none of the Reporter's recommendations would change the original screening
23a. Perth Area (within Core) -	H4 was screened out under criterion (a) (p. 38)	H4: <u>Marshalling Yards, Tulloch</u> 1. Relocate the reference to site H4 on page 78 to page 80	No HRA implications – none of the Reporter's recommendation

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
<p>Perth City Proposals</p>	<p>MU1 was screened out under criterion (a) (p. 38)</p> <p>E1 was screened out under criterion (a) (p. 37)</p> <p>E2 was screened out under criterion (a) (p. 37)</p> <p>E3 was screened out under criterion (a) (p. 37)</p> <p>H3 was screened out under criterion (a) (p. 37)</p> <p>Op7 was screened out under criterion (c) (p. 40)</p> <p>OP8 was screened out under criterion (a) (p. 40)</p> <p>Op2 was screened out under</p>	<p>so that it follows the reference to site H3 under the heading "Residential Sites".</p> <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 Pitheavlis which is included within the boundary of planning application 11/00933/FLM.</p> <p><u>E1: The Triangle, Dunkeld Road</u></p> <p>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></p> <p><u>E2: Broxden</u></p> <p>4. Extend the site boundary to include the location of the former Broxden farmhouse.</p> <p><u>E3: Arran Road</u></p> <p>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></p> <p><u>H3: Gannochy Road</u></p> <p>6. Modify the site boundary in the proposals map to reflect the extended boundary set out in the plan at Schedule 4 document 478.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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></p> <p><u>Op7: Newton Farm</u></p> <p>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</p>	<p>would change the original screening determination for any of these sites.</p>

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
	criterion (a) (p. 39)	<p>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></p> <p>10. Make consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 5.1.11. <u>Op8: Friarton Road</u></p> <p>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></p> <p><u>Op2: Thimblelow Car Park</u></p> <p>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></p> <p>And <i>"Scheme to incorporate an element of public car parking."</i></p>	
23b. Perth Area (within Core) - Perth City New Sites	Policy ED1 was screened out for this location (p. 23-24).	<u>Auction Mart</u> Remove the " <i>Employment Land – existing</i> " designation from the land to the west of the Crieff Road roundabout.	No HRA implications –the Reporter's recommendation to change the policy framework to RD1 would not change the original screening determination for the site.
24. Perth Area (within Core) - Transport Infrastructure		No modifications.	No modifications made, therefore no HRA implications.

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
<p>25a. Perth Area (within Core) - North Settlements</p>	<p>H27 was screened in due to the proximity of the River Tay SAC (p. 45). The Appropriate Assessment recommended a number of mitigation measures to protect the watercourse and otter (p. 103-104).</p> <p>Sites in Stanley were screened out under criterion (a) or (c) (p. 46)</p>	<p><u>Luncarty South H27</u></p> <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. <u>Stanley</u> 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” 	<p>The Reporter's recommendations include the mitigation measures from the appropriate assessment none of the other modifications have any HRA implications and therefore there is no need for any further action</p> <p>Stanley No HRA implications – none of the Reporter's recommendation would change the original screening determination for any of these sites.</p>

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<p>9. Modify the second site-specific developer requirement to read as follows: <i>“Development phased to ensure that there is adequate infrastructure to accommodate it.”</i></p> <p>10. Make consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 5.1.11. <u>Stanley H30</u></p> <p>11. Modify the site-specific developer requirements for sites H30-H34 by adding an additional requirement as follows: <i>“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.”</i></p>	
<p>25b. Perth Area (within Core) - East Settlements</p>	<p>Kinfauns site RT1 was screened out under criterion (d) (p. 44)</p> <p>H29 Scone was screened out under criterion (a) (p. 45)</p> <p>Policy CF1 open space was screened out under criterion (b) (p. 27)</p>	<p><u>Kinfauns: Transport Infrastructure Site: RT1</u></p> <p>1. Add the following to the site specific developer requirements: <i>“a transport assessment with appropriate attention to the impact of vehicular emissions, noise and light pollution on nearby properties.”</i></p> <p><u>H29:Scone North</u></p> <p>2. Delete the first site-specific developer requirement. Replace with the following: <i>“Masterplanning required for entire site (allowing for only 100 houses in advance of the CTRL becoming a committed project). The first stage of this masterplanning process will establish broad land use and placemaking principles for the site.”</i></p> <p>3. Delete the second and third site-specific developer requirements. <u>Woollcombe Square</u></p> <p>4. Identify the small grass area at Woollcombe Square as <i>open space</i>. Following clarification, the Reporter has confirmed this pertains to land east of Stormont Road.</p>	<p>Kinfauns No HRA implications – none of the Reporter's recommendation would change the original screening determination for any of these sites.</p> <p>Scone No HRA implications – none of the Reporter's recommendation would change the original screening determination for any of these sites.</p>
<p>25c. Perth Area (within Core) - South Settlements</p>	<p>Oudendarde (which includes a potential site for a rail halt) was screened out under criterion (a)</p>	<p><u>Bridge of Earn and Oudendarde settlement</u></p> <p>1. Add an additional sentence under 5.10.3 to read as follows:</p>	<p><u>Bridge of Earn and Oudendarde settlement</u> No HRA implications – none of</p>

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
	<p>page 41</p> <p>H72 is effectively an extension to site H14 which was screened out under criterion (a) (p. 41).</p>	<p><i>"The development will be required to provide a new rail station, subject to this receiving funding and support from Transport Scotland."</i></p> <p><u>H15: Oudendarde</u></p> <p>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></p> <p><u>Bridge of Earn and Oudendarde new sites</u></p> <p>3. Modify the Bridge of Earn and Oudendarde 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.</p> <p>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."</i> <i>"Site will be phased to reflect the construction of the new school at Oudendarde."</i> <i>"Landscaping to be provided along the southern site boundary to create an appropriate village edge, enhance biodiversity and create new habitats."</i></p> <p>5. Make consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 5.1.1.</p>	<p>the Reporter's recommendation would change the original screening determination for any of these sites</p>
<p>25d. Perth Area (within Core) - West Settlements</p>		<p>No modifications.</p>	<p>No HRA implications</p>
<p>26a. Perth Area (outwith Core) – North Settlements</p>	<p>Bankfoot – The HRA screening identified potential for significant impacts and mitigation options were identified (p.59-60).</p>	<p><u>Bankfoot</u></p> <p>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</i></p>	<p>The Reporter recommends a modification to incorporate HRA mitigation measure option A into the Plan. No further action is therefore required.</p>

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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></p>	
	Burrelton / Woodside settlement boundaries – proposed allocations were screened (p.41)	<p><u>Burrelton/Woodside settlement boundaries</u></p> <p>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).</p> <p>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).</p>	No HRA implications – the Reporter's modifications to the settlement boundary would not change the screening determination for any allocated site.
	Burrelton / Woodside E8 was screened out under criterion a) (p.41)	<p><u>Burrelton/Woodside E8</u></p> <p>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></p>	No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendation would not change the original screening determination.
	Burrelton / Woodside H16 was screened out under criterion a) (p.41)	<p><u>Burrelton/Woodside H16</u></p> <p>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).</p> <p>6. Make consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 5.1.11.</p>	The Reporter recommends the deletion of this site from the plan however it is not considered that this would have any HRA implications.
	Damside / Saucher – The HRA did not identify the potential for	<p><u>Damside/Saucher</u></p> <p>7. Delete section 5.15 and the accompanying settlement</p>	No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendation

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
	significant impacts (p.60)	plan from the plan.	would not change the original screening determination.
	Wolfhill H35 was screened out under criterion a) (p.47)	<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.	The Reporter recommends the deletion of this site from the plan however it is not considered that this would have any HRA implications.
26b. Perth Area (outwith Core) - East Settlements and Landward Sites	Errol – The HRA did not identify the potential for significant impacts (p. 60). Errol Airfield/Grange H21 was screened out under criteria a) & b) (p. 43). Rait – The HRA did not identify the potential for significant impacts (p. 62).	<u>Errol</u> 1. Delete the word “ <i>principal</i> ” in paragraph 5.17.1. <u>Errol Airfield/Grange H21</u> 2. Add to the site-specific developer requirements: “ <i>Flood risk assessment</i> ”. <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.	No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendations would not change the original screening determination.
26c. Perth Area (outwith Core) South Settlements and Landward	Aberargie – The HRA did not identify the potential for significant impacts (p.59)	<u>Aberargie</u> 1. Modify the settlement boundary to follow that delineated in the adopted Perth Area Local Plan.	No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendation would not change the original screening determination.
	Forgandenny – H22: County Place was screened out under criterion a) (p.43)	<u>Forgandenny</u> 2. Delete site H22 from the Plan.	The Reporter recommends the deletion of this site from the plan however it is not considered that this would have any HRA implications.
	Abernethy – proposed allocations were screened (p.40)	<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 minor modification would not have any HRA implications.
	Abernethy H8: Hatton Road was screened out under criterion a) (p.40)	4. Delete site H8 from the Plan.	The Reporter recommends the deletion of this site from the plan however it is not considered that this would have any HRA implications.

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
	Abernethy H9: Station Road was screened out under criterion a) (p.40)	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> "	No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendation would not change the original screening determination.
	Abernethy H10: Newburgh Road (south) was screened out under criterion a) (p.40)	7. Delete H10 from the Plan.	The Reporter recommends the deletion of this site from the plan however it is not considered that this would have any HRA implications.
	Abernethy H11: Newburgh Road (North) was screened out under criterion a) (p.40)	8. Delete H11 and replace as a Mixed Use opportunity.	No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendation would not change the original screening determination.
	Glenfarg H23: Duncrieve Road was screened out under criterion a) (p.43)	<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> "	No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendation would not change the original screening determination.
26d. Perth Area (outwith Core) West Settlements	Clathymore H19 was screened in due to the potential significant impact on the Methven Moss SAC but screened out under criterion a) in relation to potential impacts on the South Tayside Goose Roosts SPA (p.42). The Appropriate Assessment recommended a number of mitigation measures for the site including number of units, drainage issues and mitigation in relation to nutrient loading (p.104)	<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.	The Reporter recommends the deletion of this site from the plan however it is not considered that this would have any HRA implications.
	Dunning – proposed allocations were screened (p.43)	<u>Dunning settlement</u> 4. Designate as Open Space all of the field to the west of	It is not considered that this modification would have any

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
	Dunning H20: Auchterarder Road was screened out under criterion a) (p.43)	the road between Dunning and Newton of Pitcairns. <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.	significant HRA implications. It is not considered that this modification would have any significant HRA implications
	Tibbermore – The HRA did not identify the potential for significant impacts (p.62)	<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.	It is not considered that this modification would have any significant HRA implications
27. Dundee Housing Market Area Settlements	Longforgan H25 & H26: South Longforgan sites were screened out under criterion a) (p. 44-45).	1. Delete sites H25 and H26 from the Plan.	The Reporter recommends the deletion of these sites from the plan and it is not considered that this would have any HRA implications.
28a. Highland Perthshire Area – Aberfeldy	E10: Borlick was screened out under criterion a) (p.47)	<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).	No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendation would not change the original screening determination.
	H37: South of Kenmore Road was screened in due to the potential significant impact on the River Tay Special Area of Conservation (p.47). The Appropriate Assessment identified the mitigation measures which were to be applied and in this case additional Site Specific Developer Requirements (p.103)	<u>Site H37- South of Kenmore Road</u> 2. Delete the site-specific developer requirement: "Access from Duntaylor Avenue and A827 Kenmore Road" and replace with "Access should primarily be taken from the A827 Kenmore Road and a secondary access should be sought from Duntaylor Avenue". 3. Add the following requirements to the list of site-specific developer requirements: "Protection and enhancement of broadleaf trees and woodland within the site"; "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	The Reporter recommends modifications to the Site Specific Developer Requirements including the mitigation measures required under the HRA. No further action is therefore required.

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<p><i>area of Conservation</i>"; <i>"Where development is within 30 metres of the watercourse, an Otter survey should be 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>28b. Highland Perthshire Area – Birnam and Dunkeld</p>	<p>E12 & E13: Tullymilly, Dunkeld were screened out under criterion a) (p.48)</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>	<p>The Reporter recommends the removal of an open space designation within the settlement however this is not considered to have any HRA implications.</p> <p>No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendation would not change the original screening determination.</p>
<p>28c. Highland Perthshire Area – Pitlochry</p>	<p>Proposed allocations were screened (p.49)</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</p>	<p>It is not considered that these modifications would have any significant HRA implications.</p>

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		Settlement Map to properly reflect the southern boundary of 17 and 18 Duff Avenue.	
		<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.	It is not considered that these modifications would have any significant HRA implications.
	H38: Middleton of Fonab was screened out under criterion a) (p.49)	<u>Housing site H38</u> 4. Add " <i>Flood Risk Assessment</i> " to list of site-specific developer requirements.	No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendation would not change the original screening determination.
	H39: Robertson Crescent was screened out under criterion a) (p.49)	<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> ".	No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendation would not change the original screening determination.
29a. Highland Perthshire Area – East settlements with proposals	Ballinluig – E11: West of Ballinluig/A9 was screened in due to the potential significant impact on the River Tay SAC and Shingle Islands SAC (p.47). It was considered that the application of any mitigation measures, short of avoidance, would not remove the threat to the SAC. It was therefore recommended that the site be deleted from the Plan (p.87)	<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.	The Reporter supported the recommendation that the site is removed from the plan. No further action is therefore required.
	Ballinluig – H40 Ballinluig North was screened in due to the potential significant impact on the River Tay SAC but screened out	<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	The Reporter has recommended modifications to the boundary to exclude the area to the east. It is not considered that this would

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
	under criterion a) in relation to potential impacts on the Shingle Islands SAC (p.48)	<p>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 species protection plan provided, if required.'</i></p>	<p>have any HRA implications.</p> <p>The Reporter recommends modifications to the Site Specific Developer Requirements to include the mitigation measures required under the HRA. No further action is therefore required.</p>
	Inver – proposed allocations were screened (p.48)	<p><u>Inver</u></p> <p>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>.</p>	This minor modification would not have any HRA implications.
	Inver – E14: Inver Park was screened in due to the potential significant impact on the River Tay SAC (p.48). The Appropriate Assessment identified the mitigation measure to be applied and in this case an additional Site Specific Developer Requirement (p.105)	<p><u>Inver – E14</u></p> <p>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"; "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></p>	The Reporter recommends modifications to the Site Specific Developer Requirements including the mitigation measures required under the HRA. No further action is therefore required.
	Murthly – H44: South of Station Road was screened out under	<p><u>Murthly – H44</u></p> <p>5. Delete reference to housing site H44 and make</p>	The Reporter recommends the deletion of this site from the plan

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
	criterion a) (p.49)	appropriate changes to paragraph 6.21.2. Remove designation H44 from the Settlement Plan and make appropriate changes to the settlement boundary.	however it is not considered that this would have any HRA implications.
29b. Highland Perthshire Area – West settlements with proposals	Fearnan – proposed allocations were screened (p.48)	<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.	The Reporter recommends deletion of the employment land designation from the plan however it is not considered that this would have any HRA implications.
	Fearnan – H41: Fearnan North was screened out under criterion a) (p.48)	<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.	The Reporter recommends deletion of the site from the plan however it is not considered that this would change the screening determination of the HRA.
	Kenmore – proposed allocations were screened (p.48)	<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.	It is not considered that this would have any HRA implications.
	Kenmore – H42: East of Primary School was screened out under criterion a) (p.48)	<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.	No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendation would not change the original screening determination.
		<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 site has planning permission and therefore no further action is required under HRA.
		<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</i>	It is not considered that this would have any HRA implications.

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<i>Rannoch within the Loch Rannoch and Glen Lyon National Scenic Area</i> ".	
	Kinloch Rannoch E15 was screened out under criterion a) (p.49)	<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.	The Reporter recommends deletion of the site from the plan however it is not considered that this would have any HRA implications.
	Kinloch Rannoch H43: Innerhaddon was screened out under criterion a) (p.49)	<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.	The Reporter recommends deletion of the site from the plan however it is not considered that this would have any HRA implications.
30. Highland Perthshire Area – Small settlements and Landward sites	New policy	<u>HRA combined response</u> 1. Add the following new Policy " <i>EP15: Development within the River Tay Catchment Area</i> " 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. 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> (a) <i>Drainage from all development should ensure no reduction in water quality.</i> (b) <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.</i> (c) <i>Where the development site is within 30m of a watercourse an Otter survey should be undertaken and</i>	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. No further action is required.

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<p><i>a species protection plan provided, if required.</i></p> <p><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>Acharn – The HRA screening identified potential for significant impacts and mitigation options were identified (p.62).</p>	<p><u>Acharn</u></p> <p>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>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. It is not considered that this would have any HRA implications.</p>
	<p>Balnaguard – The HRA screening identified potential for significant impacts and mitigation options were identified (p.63).</p>	<p><u>Balnaguard</u></p> <p>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>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. It is not considered that this would have any HRA implications.</p>
	<p>Butterstone – The HRA screening identified potential for significant impacts and mitigation options were identified (p.63).</p>	<p><u>Butterstone</u></p> <p>4. At the end of paragraph 6.8.2, insert the words: “<i>To ensure no adverse effects on the Dunkeld-Blairgowrie Lochs SAC, policy EP6 sets out the relevant criteria for development in this settlement</i>”.</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 modification would have any HRA implications.</p>
	<p>Camserney – The HRA screening identified potential for significant impacts and mitigation options were identified (p.64).</p>	<p><u>Camserney</u></p> <p>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</i></p>	<p>The Reporter recommended modification to the wording of the settlement strategy to include reference to the new</p>

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<p><i>this settlement</i>’.</p> <p>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>policy EP15: Development within the River Tay Catchment Area. It is not considered that this would have any HRA implications.</p>
	<p>Croftinloan/Donavoured/East Haugh/Ballyoukan – The HRA screening identified potential for significant impacts in these settlements and mitigation options were identified (p.65).</p>	<p><u>Croftinloan/Donavoured/East Haugh/Ballyoukan</u></p> <p>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>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. It is not considered that this would have any HRA implications.</p>
	<p>Fortingall – The HRA screening identified potential for significant impacts and mitigation options were identified (p.66).</p>	<p><u>Fortingall</u></p> <p>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></p> <p>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>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. It is not considered that this would have any HRA implications.</p>
	<p>Grandtully/Strathtay and Little Ballinluig – The HRA screening identified potential for significant impacts in these settlements and mitigation options were identified (p.67).</p>	<p><u>Grandtully/Strathtay and Little Ballinluig</u></p> <p>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>.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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>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. The Reporter also recommends amendments to the settlement boundary to the North-west of Strathtay and to the north of Little Ballinluig. Neither of these modifications are considered to have any HRA implications.</p>
	<p>Logierait – The HRA screening identified potential for significant</p>	<p><u>Logierait</u></p> <p>13. Following the first sentence in paragraph 6.20.2, insert</p>	<p>The Reporter recommended modification to the wording of</p>

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
	impacts and mitigation options were identified (p.68).	the words: " <i>Logierait lies within the River Tay Catchment Area; Policy EP15 sets out the relevant criteria for development in this area</i> "	the settlement strategy to include reference to the new policy EP15: Development within the River Tay Catchment Area. It is not considered that this would have any HRA implications.
	Tummel Bridge – The HRA screening identified potential for significant impacts and mitigation options were identified (p.69).	<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> "	The Reporter recommends an amendment to the eastern settlement boundary. The Reporter also recommends modification to the wording of the settlement strategy to include reference to the new policy EP15: Development within the River Tay Catchment Area. Neither of these modifications are considered to have any HRA implications.
	Weem and Boltachan – The HRA did not identify the potential for significant impacts (p.69)	<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).	The Reporter's recommendation is to insert text from the HRA. No further action is therefore required.
31. Kinross-shire Area - Kinross/Milnathort Settlement		<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</i>	No HRA implications – the Reporter's did not agree with the position of the Council, however his recommendations would not change the original screening determination. No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendations

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<p><i>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></p> <p>3. Modify paragraph 7.2.3 to include: <i>"The north western periphery of the town lies within the HSE pipeline consultation zone."</i></p> <p><u>Kinross/Milnathort settlement boundary</u></p> <p>4. Modify the settlement boundary shown on page 209 to exclude the land west of the M90 at Turfhill.</p>	<p>would not change the original screening determination.</p> <p>The site was assessed under the HRA, however its exclusion from the Plan will not change the original screening determination.</p>
<p>32. Kinross-shire Area - Kinross/Milnathort Employment Sites</p>	<p>E16 South Kinross was screened out under criterion a) (p.50)</p> <p>E18 Station Road South was screened in due to potential impact on Loch Leven SPA (p. 50). The Appropriate Assessment recommended a number of mitigation measures to protect the watercourse and the Loch (p. 105-106).</p> <p>E20 Old Perth Road was screened out under criterion c) (p. 51-52)</p> <p>E21 Auld Mart Road was screened</p>	<p><u>E16: South Kinross</u></p> <p>1. Modify the site-specific developer requirements as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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><u>E18: Station Road South</u></p> <p>2. Modify the site-specific developer requirements as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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</i> 	<p>No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendations would not change the original screening determination.</p> <p>The additional developer requirements take account of the HRA appraisal, there are no further HRA implications from these recommendations</p> <p>No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendations</p>

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
	<p>in due to potential impact on Loch Leven SPA (p. 50). The Appropriate Assessment recommended a number of mitigation measures to protect the watercourse and the Loch (p. 105-106).</p> <p>E17 Turfhill was screened in due to potential impact on Loch Leven SPA (p. 50). The Appropriate Assessment recommended a number of mitigation measures to protect the watercourse and the Loch (p. 105-106).</p> <p>E36 Turfhill was screened out under criterion c) (p. 50)</p>	<p><i>Loch Leven from erosion during periods of heavy rainfall."</i></p> <p><u>E20: Perth Road</u></p> <p>3. Modify the site-specific developer requirements as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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><u>E21: Auld Mart Road</u></p> <p>4. Modify the site-specific developer requirements as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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><u>E17 and E36: Turfhill</u></p> <p>5. Delete these proposed employment sites from the Proposed Plan. Make consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 7.1.6.</p>	<p>would not change the original screening determination.</p> <p>The additional developer requirements take account of the HRA appraisal, there are no further HRA implications from these recommendations</p> <p>No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendations would not change the original screening determination.</p>
<p>33a. Kinross-shire Area - Kinross/Milnathort Large Housing Sites</p>	<p>H46 West Kinross was screened out under criterion b) (p. 50)</p> <p>H47 Lathro Farm was screened in due to potential impact on Loch Leven SPA (p. 50). The Appropriate Assessment recommended a number of</p>	<p><u>H46: West Kinross</u></p> <p>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.</p> <p><u>H47: Lathro Farm</u></p> <p>2. Increase proposed housing numbers to 260 (140 during Plan period). Make consequential modifications to the table</p>	<p>The site screened out of the HRA, the exclusion of the site from the Plan therefore has no HRA implications</p> <p>The additional developer requirements take account of the</p>

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
	<p>mitigation measures to protect the watercourse and the Loch (p. 105-106).</p> <p>Op12 Former High School was screened out under criterion a) (p. 51)</p> <p>Op15 Lethangie was screened in due to potential impact on Loch Leven SPA (p. 51). The Appropriate Assessment recommended a number of mitigation measures to protect the watercourse and the Loch (p. 105-106).</p>	<p>under paragraph 7.1.14.</p> <p>3. Add the following site specific developer requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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><u>Op12: Former High School</u></p> <p>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.</p> <p><u>Op15: Lethangie</u></p> <p>5. Add the following site specific developer requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Flood Risk Assessment.</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>HRA appraisal, there are no further HRA implications from these recommendations</p> <p>The site screened out of the HRA, the exclusion of the site from the Plan therefore has no HRA implications</p> <p>The additional developer requirements take account of the HRA appraisal, there are no further HRA implications from these recommendations</p>
33b. Kinross-shire Area - Milnathort Small Housing	Op16 and E19 Stirling Road were screened in due to potential impact on Loch Leven SPA (p. 52 and 51)	<p><u>Op16 and E19: Stirling Road</u></p> <p>1. Modify the site specific developer requirements as follows:</p>	The additional developer

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
Sites	respectively). The Appropriate Assessment recommended a number of mitigation measures to protect the watercourse and the Loch (p. 105-106).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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 SUDS for development proposals should include sufficient attenuation to protect those watercourses which flow into Loch Leven from erosion during periods of heavy rainfall.”</i> 	requirements take account of the HRA appraisal, there are no further HRA implications from these recommendations
34. Kinross-shire Area - Kinross/Milnathort Opportunity Sites	Op10 Market Park was screened out under criterion c) (p. 50) Op13 Scottish Motor Auctions was screened in due to potential impact on Loch Leven SPA (p. 51). The Appropriate Assessment recommended a number of mitigation measures to protect the watercourse and the Loch (p. 105-106). Op17 and Op18 Kay Trailers were screened out under criterion b) (p. 52)	<u>Op10: Market Park</u> 1.Delete site Op10, and identify the site as open space (Open Space Policy CF1). <u>Op13: Scottish Motor Auctions</u> 2. Delete site Op13. <u>Op17 and Op18: Kay Trailers</u> 3. Delete sites Op17 and Op18.	Op10 :The site screened out of the HRA, the exclusion of the site from the Plan therefore has no further HRA implications Op 13: The site was assessed under the HRA, however, its deletion from the Plan has no further HRA implications Op17 & Op18: Op10 :These sites were screened out of the HRA, the exclusion of these sites from the Plan therefore have no further HRA implications
35a. Kinross-shire Area - North and East Settlements with Proposals	H52 Hattonburn; and Op19 Ochil Hills Hospital were screened out under criterion c) (p. 53). H54 Scotlandwell was screened out under criterion a) (p. 54; and p. 4-5 of Addendum 1)	<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> <u>Op19: Ochil Hills Hospital</u> 2. Modify site-specific developer requirements as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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> <u>Scotlandwell H52 (should be H54)</u> Modify site-specific developer requirements to add: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Houses to be maximum one and a half storeys in height.</i> 	H52: No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendations would not change the original screening determination. Op19: The site was screened out of the HRA, however the addition of the developer requirements has no implications for HRA H54: The site was screened out

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Flood risk assessment.</i>" Following clarification, this site will be identified as H54.	of the HRA, however the addition of the developer requirements has no implications for HRA
35b. Kinross-shire Area - West Settlements with Proposals	Blairingone was screened out under criterion a) (p. 4 of Addendum 1) H53 Powmill was screened out under criterion a) (p. 53-54)	<u>Transport infrastructure</u> 1. Add an additional paragraph after Paragraph 7.1.17: " <i>Transport Infrastructure 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> " <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. <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. <u>Rumbling Bridge</u> 4. Modify the settlement boundary for Rumbling Bridge to include the area defined as R2 by the Fossoway Community Strategy Group (Schedule 4 document 034).	<u>Transport Infrastructure:</u> No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendations would not change the original screening determination. <u>Blairingone</u> Blairingone lies outwith the Loch Leven Catchment Area and there are no HRA implications arising from this allocation. Note: this issue was considered in the January 2013 HRA Addendum, where it was screened out under criterion a). <u>Powmill: H53</u> The site was screened out of the HRA, the reduction of the size of the designated housing site has no further HRA implications <u>Rumbling Bridge</u> This minor modification has no HRA implications
36. Kinross-shire Area - Small Settlements and Landward Sites	Carnbo, Cleish, Greenacres, Wester Balgedie – The HRA screening identified potential for significant impacts and mitigation options were identified (p.69-73).	<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</i>	The additional developer requirements within Carnbo and Cleish take account of the HRA appraisal, there are no further

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
	<p>Crook of Devon, Glenlomond, Keltybridge & Maryburgh, Kinnesswood – The HRA screening did not identify potential for significant impacts (p. 70-72)</p>	<p><i>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></p> <p><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 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></p> <p><u>Crook of Devon</u> 3. The site at Schiehallion, north west of Crook of Devon, should be included within the settlement boundary.</p> <p><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></p> <p><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></p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p>8. Delete the second sentence of paragraph 7.13.2 of the Proposed Plan beginning <i>"Adjacent to Bishop Terrace..."</i>,</p>	<p>HRA implications from these recommendations</p> <p><u>Crook of Devon</u> This minor boundary modification has no HRA implications</p> <p><u>Glenlomond</u> This minor textual change will have small positive HRA benefits</p> <p><u>Greenacres</u> The additional text takes account of the HRA appraisal, there are no further HRA implications from these recommendations</p> <p><u>Keltybridge and Maryburgh</u> The exclusion of an area from the settlement boundary does not have any HRA implications</p> <p><u>Kinnesswood</u> This minor amendment to the settlement boundary and associated text does not have any HRA implications</p> <p><u>Wester Balgedie</u></p>

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<p>and the final sentence of paragraph 7.13.3 beginning "<i>Development of the land at Bishop Terrace...</i>".</p> <p><u>Wester Balgedie</u></p> <p>9. Modify settlement boundary to exclude triangular area shown on S4_Doc_367.</p> <p>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>"</p>	The exclusion of the small area does not have any HRA implications. The additional developer requirements within Wester Balgedie take account of the HRA appraisal; there are no further HRA implications from this recommendation.

Full screening determination for new site

Relevant Aspect of the Plan	Screened In/Out	Reason for Screening Determination and Natura 2000 site likely to be affected
Kinross-shire Housing Market Area		
H71: Blairingone	Out	(a) Proposals which make provision for change but which could have no conceivable effect on a European site, because there is no link or pathway between them and the qualifying interests, or any effect would be a positive effect, or would not otherwise undermine the conservation objectives for the site.

Issue	Original HRA screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
37. Strathearn Area - Auchterarder	E25 and Op20 were screened out under criterion a) (p. 54).	<p><u>Auchterarder Settlement</u></p> <p>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</p>	The Reporter's recommendation to modify the settlement boundary was made to reflect a planning consent and there are

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<p>Schedule 4 document 040).</p> <p>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>.</p> <p><u>E25</u></p> <p>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>.</p> <p><u>Op20</u></p> <p>4. Add <i>"Flood Risk Assessment"</i> to the list of site-specific developer requirements.</p> <p><u>Open space north of settlement</u></p> <p>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 <i>"additional area of open space that planning authority suggests should be excluded from settlement boundary"</i>. Also, exclude this area from the settlement boundary on the Auchterarder Settlement Map.</p> <p><u>New sites</u></p> <p>6. On the Auchterarder Settlement Map, remove the</p>	<p>therefore no HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendation would not change the original screening determination.</p> <p>The Reporter's other recommendations are minor and would not change the original screening determination.</p>

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
<p>38. Strathearn Area - Crieff</p>	<p>E26, E27, H55, H57, MU7 and Op21 were all originally screened out under criterion a) (p. 54-55).</p>	<p>employment land designation from Ruthvenvale Mill.</p> <p><u>Settlement boundary north of Horseshoe Drive</u> 1. Amend settlement boundary north of Horseshoe Drive as shown on document Schedule 4 document 378.</p> <p><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'.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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</p>	<p>The Reporter's recommendation to modify the settlement boundary was made to reflect the adopted Local Plan and there are therefore no HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendation would not change the original screening determination.</p> <p>The Reporter recommends the partial deletion of E26, and the deletion of H55 from the plan however it is not considered that this would have any HRA implications.</p> <p>In respect of MU7 and H57, although relatively major changes are recommended by the Reporter, these would not change the original screening determination.</p> <p>The Reporter's other recommendations are minor and would not change the original screening determination.</p>

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		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: " <i>Appropriate landscaping requirements, including a woodland strip, will reduce its developable area to 6.4 ha</i> ". Make consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 8.1.14.	
39. Strathearn Area - Settlements with Proposals	Comrie – H58 Cowden Road was originally screened out under criterion a) (p. 55-56).	<u>Tomperran Farm employment site</u> 1. Remove the employment land designation on the Comrie Settlement Map.	This minor modification would not have any HRA implications.
40. Strathearn Area - Small Settlements and Landward Sites	Braco – The HRA did not identify the potential for significant impacts (p. 73-74). Greenloaning – The HRA did not identify the potential for significant impacts (p. 74-75).	<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. <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.	No HRA implications – the Reporter's recommendations would not change the original screening determination.
41. Strathmore and the Glens Area - Alyth and New Alyth		No modifications.	The Reporter's recommendation is for no modifications. There are therefore no HRA implications.
42. Strathmore and the Glens Area - Blairgowrie/Rattray	E31 Welton Road was screened in due to potential impact on River Tay SAC (p. 56). The Appropriate Assessment recommended a number of mitigation measures to protect the watercourse (p. 103-104). MU5 Western Blairgowrie; and H64 Blairgowrie South were screened out under criteria a) (p. 56)	<u>E31: Welton Road</u> 1. Add the following criteria to the developer requirements section on Page 283: <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</i> 	The Reporter's recommendation is to insert text from the HRA. No further action is therefore required.

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<p><i>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><u>MU5: Western Blairgowrie</u></p> <p>2. Add the following to the site-specific developer requirements on Page 283:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p><u>H64: Blairgowrie South</u></p> <p>3. Add the following to the site-specific developer requirements on Page 284:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood Risk Assessment and investigate potential for removing culvert. 	<p>The Reporter's recommendation is to add to the developer requirements for this site, there are no HRA implications.</p> <p>The addition of a requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment for this site has no HRA implications.</p>
<p>43. Strathmore and the Glens Area – Coupar Angus</p>	<p>E33 East of Scotland Farmers; and H65 Larghan were screened out under criteria a) (p. 57)</p>	<p><u>Protection of future bypass line</u></p> <p>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></p> <p><u>E33: East of Scotland Farmers</u></p> <p>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.</p> <p><u>H65: Larghan</u></p> <p>3. Exclude the most easterly field (part of which is already identified as landscaping) from site H65.</p>	<p>The Reporter's recommendation is to protect the line of any future bypass for Coupar Angus, there are no HRA implications for the Plan</p> <p>The Reporter's recommendation excludes a small area from the Town boundary for Coupar Angus, there are no HRA implications for the Plan.</p> <p>The Reporter's recommendation excludes part of the site from the Plan, there are no resultant HRA implications.</p>
<p>44. Strathmore and the Glens Area –</p>	<p>H66 Ardler; and H67 Carsie were screened out under criteria a) (p.</p>	<p><u>Ardler: H66</u></p> <p>1. Delete proposed housing site H66, realign the settlement</p>	<p>The Reporter's recommendation is to remove the site from the</p>

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
Settlements with Proposals	57) H68 Ardler Road, Meigle was screened in due to potential impact on River Tay SAC (p. 58). The Appropriate Assessment recommended a number of mitigation measures to protect the watercourse (p. 103-104).	boundary to exclude the site, and modify paragraph 9.5.2 accordingly. Make consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 9.1.11. <u>Carsie: H67</u> 2. Delete proposed housing site H67, and redesignate the land as open space (Open Space Policy CF1). Make consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 9.1.11. <u>Meigle: H68</u> 3. Add the following criteria to the site-specific developer requirements section on Page 301: <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> 	Plan, this has no HRA implications. The Reporter's recommendation is to remove the site from the Plan, this has no HRA implications. The Reporter's recommendation is to insert text from the HRA. No further action is therefore required.
45. Strathmore and the Glens Area - Small Settlements	Bridge of Cally – The HRA did not identify the potential for significant impacts (p. 75). Concraigie, Craigie; Kirkmichael, Kinloch – The HRA screening identified potential for significant impacts and mitigation options were identified (p.76-78).	<u>Bridge of Cally</u> 1. Adjust settlement boundary as shown on Schedule 4 document 358. <u>Concraigie, Craigie, Kirkmichael, Kinloch</u> 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</i>	The Reporter's recommendation is a minor amendment to the settlement boundary for Kirkmichael, which has no HRA implications The Reporter's recommendation is to insert text from the HRA, in the form of a new policy. No

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<p><i>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></p> <p><i>(a) Drainage from all development should ensure no reduction in water quality.</i></p> <p><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></p> <p><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></p> <p><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 Policy EP6: Lunan Valley Catchment Area to include a new paragraph after "...to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority in conjunction with the Scottish Environment Protection Agency", which begins "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:" 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: "Concraigie lies within the Lunan Lochs and River Tay Catchment Areas; Policies EP6 and EP15 set out the relevant criteria for development</p>	<p>further action is therefore required.</p> <p>The Reporter's recommendation is to insert text from the HRA. No further action is therefore required.</p> <p>The Reporter's recommendation is to insert text from the HRA. No further action is therefore required.</p> <p>The Reporter's recommendation is to insert text from the HRA. No further action is therefore required.</p>

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<p><i>within these areas."</i></p> <p><u>Craigie</u> 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> 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> 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 set out the relevant criteria for development within these areas."</i></p>	<p>The Reporter's recommendation is to insert text from the HRA. No further action is therefore required.</p> <p>The Reporter's recommendation is to insert text from the HRA. No further action is therefore required.</p>
<p>46. Whole Plan Issues</p>		<p><u>Glossary</u> 1. Modify the definition of "Town centre" to refer to "local development plans" rather than "local plans". 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> 3. Modify the definition of "Retail park" to refer to "out of town centre" rather than "off centre". <u>Maps</u> 4. Add to the landward maps for each of the Plan's sub-</p>	<p>None of the Reporter's recommendations are considered to have any HRA implications.</p>

Issue	Original HRA Screening Determination (page ref in brackets)	Reporter's Recommendation	Impact of Reporter's Recommendation
		<p>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>	