

Appendix E – Kinross-shire Area Site Assessments

Site Name: Balado1	Source of site suggestion: Ballantyne partners who are the landowner		Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals: Residential development approved for 10 houses to east of this proposal 10/01143/FLL
Settlement: Balado	GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref: Balado 1 Proposed Plan Ref: H145	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? Dislocated from Balado and the existing settlement boundary	
OS Grid Ref: 702083 308368	Site Size (ha): 2.6 hectares	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? No	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc).
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc):	Proposed Use: Residential use for approximately 20 homes.	Comments LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and its tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas. There are already sufficient housing opportunities within Balado. This means that the justification for any additional site in a non-tiered settlement site has to be about delivering benefits and it is considered that there are no significant wider benefits to this proposal. In any case the proposal is also considered inappropriate as the scale proposed is beyond Balado's specific needs, and changes the character of	Comprising fairly flat agriculture land bounded by woodland (outwith the site to the west).

Agricultural use		the area, plus the site is remote from the main settlement of Balado.	
------------------	--	---	--



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	Possibly. The groundwater status is good.	Check on OS map GIS Landuse	-	Policy Water Environment, Foul Drainage, and Drainage within the Loch Leven Catchment	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				layer Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer			
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes it lies close enough to the existing network (but small works with limited capacity).	GIS Layer for existing network	0	Policy: Water Environment and Drainage	0
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	No	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	0	N/a	0
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	There are no relevant designations, or non-designated features or known protected species interests within this site. However the site lies within the Loch Leven Catchment area.	GIS layers SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay	0	Policy Drainage within the Loch Leven Catchment	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Catchment			
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		There are no local geodiversity sites or known geodiversity interests within the site.	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI, and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0	n/a	0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	No it will not affect habitat connectivity.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth Air Quality Management Area or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	There is not sufficient capacity in Kinross Primary school to cope with the projected growth.	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Proportional developer contributions will be sought towards primary education provision.	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	There is potential for open space provision to be sought in accordance with policy	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	Application of Policy on Provision of Open Space ensures appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development proposals. Also opportunity to connect to wider access network/core path network which exists at Balado junction.	+
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	No	Check CFS form	0	N/a	0
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Greenfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	n/a	-
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	The site lies within a 3.1 classification which is prime agricultural land and has no peat.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	--	Reuse good soils locally	-
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	Yes	Check CFS form	+	n/a	+
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	Development could make use of open south facing elevations; and has woodland to the west which offers some protection from the prevailing winds	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	+	Siting and design of buildings to take account of solar orientation.	+
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?	There are no known capacity issues	Check CFS form, aerial map and site visit	0	In accordance with the Roads Authority	0
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	The site is not within easy access of services and facilities but lies relatively close to a bus stop (within 400 m walking distance).	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities	-	none	-
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	n/a	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				<p>buffer</p> <p>Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised)</p> <p>Check for pylons on OS map and on site visit</p>			
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	No, the proposal is contrary to TAYplan spatial strategy.	Check NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	--	n/a	--
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	n/a	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs, Regional Scenic Areas, and local landscape designations?	Landscape	There are no landscape designated sites within the site.	GIS layers for NSA, and SLA	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	The site lies outwith the settlement boundary but is adjacent to a permitted development of 10 homes. It is softened in most views by woodland/trees. However the scale of new development in this rural location is considered to be inappropriate.	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available Site visit	-	none	-
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	N/a	GIS layer greenbelt	0	N/a	0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	N/a	GIS layer for waste management sites	n/a	n/a	n/a


	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	N/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	n/a	N/a	n/a
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	There is no cultural heritage asset within the site.	GIS layers Listed building, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape, Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit	0	N/a	0
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	It will not result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access.		0	N/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	Yes it would be compatible with houses permitted to the east and the woodland to the west as long as development is suitably set back from the woodland.	OS map and site visit	0	Set development suitably back from the woodland.	+
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	No	Check CFS form	0	N/a	0

Site Name: Balado2	Source of site suggestion: R T Hutton Planning consultancy on behalf of the George Lawrie landowner and Gordon Baillie Premier Properties Ltd		Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals: This site lies adjacent to west of a residential development approved in principle (07/01226/IPM) and the current settlement boundary.
Settlement: Balado	GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: 116 Pre-MIR Site Ref: Balado 2 Proposed Plan Ref: H146	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? Outside, adjacent to the west of the existing boundary.	
OS Grid Ref: 702286 309060	Site Size (ha): 1.2 hectares	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? No	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc). Comprising fairly flat agriculture land bounded by woodland (outwith the site to the north).
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc):	Proposed Use: Residential use extending an existing residential allocation further east.	Officer Comments LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and its tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas. There are already sufficient housing opportunities within Balado. This means that the justification for any additional site in a non-tiered settlement site has to be about delivering benefits and it is considered that there are no significant wider benefits to this proposal. . Also the proposal is considered to be inappropriate because the scale	

Agricultural use

proposed (in addition to existing allocations/permissions) is beyond Balado's specific needs and would affect its character, and it is on prime agricultural land. The site is also currently open to the west so although framework planting to the west could help visually contain the proposal (this would take time to establish).



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	Possibly It is classified as having good groundwater status	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer	-	Policy Water environment, Foul Drainage, and Drainage within the Loch Leven Catchment	0
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Need feedback from SW but suggested that there is insufficient sewage capacity in this area for direct Scottish water mains connection	GIS Layer for existing network	-	Policy Foul Drainage	0
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	No, although there is a low risk for surface water flooding outwith the site to the north	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	0	N/a	0
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	There are no relevant designations, or non-designated features or known protected species interests related to this site.	GIS layers SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protecte	-	Drainage within the Loch Leven Catchment	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			However the site it lies within the Loch Leven Catchment area.	d species Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment			
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		There are no local geodiversity sites or known geodiversity interests that could be affected.	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI, and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0	n/a	0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	No it will not affect habitat connectivity.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth Air Quality Management Area or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	There is not sufficient capacity in Kinross Primary school to cope with the projected growth.	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Proportional developer contributions will be sought towards education provision.	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	There is potential for open space provision to be sought in accordance with CF1.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	Policy on Provision of Open Space	+
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	N/a	Check CFS form	0	N/a	0
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Greenfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	n/a	-
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	The site lies within a 3.1 classification which is prime agricultural land and has no peat.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland),	-	n/a	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)			
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	Yes	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	Development could make use of open south facing elevations; the site is fairly open to prevailing winds.	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	0	Planting outwith the site to the west could in time provide a shelterbelt	+
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?	In accordance with the Roads Authority.	Check CFS form, aerial map and site visit	0	Existing road will be improved to the site entrance.	0
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	The site is not within easy access of main services and facilities which lie in Kinross but lies relatively close to a bus stop (within 400 m walking distance).	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities	-	Improved bus stop and safe crossing facilities (condition of 07/01226/IPM)	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	n/a	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised) Check for pylons on OS map and on site visit	0	n/a	0
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	No, the proposal is contrary to TAYplan spatial strategy and does not offer sufficient wider public benefits.	Check NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	--	n/a	--
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	n/a	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Landscape Designated sites							

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	It will not affect any landscape designated sites.	GIS layers for NSA, and SLA	0	n/a	0
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	The site lies outwith the settlement boundary, is softened in view from the A977 by trees, and is open to views from the west.	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available Site visit	-	Planting to the west of the site (but it is not established whether this is within the owners control) and it would take time to establish.	-
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	N/a	GIS layer greenbelt	0	N/a	0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	N/a	GIS layer for waste management sites	n/a	N/a	n/a


	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	N/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	n/a	N/a	n/a
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	It will not affect any cultural heritage asset.	GIS layers Listed building, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape, Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit	0	N/a	0
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	It will not result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access.		0	N/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	It would be compatible with the residential allocation to the east; however it is close to Balado Sand and Gravel Quarry	OS map and site visit	0	n/a	0
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets		Check CFS form	0	N/a	0

Site Name: Balado 3	Source of site suggestion: All landowners/interested parties identified/aware?	DM Hall Baird Lumsden Surveyors on behalf of the landowner Mr Robertson	Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals: Change of use of former MOD property to office accommodation approved 11.10.2010 (09/01686/FLL) relating to existing buildings at the base to Class 4 office use (the 2 buildings involved include the Administration Block and the Police Post to the north of the site)
Settlement: Balado	GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: E35 Pre-MIR Site Ref: Balado 3 Proposed Plan Ref: MU147	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? No	
OS Grid Ref: 702843 309463	Site Size (ha): 3.4 hectares	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? No	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc).
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc): Brownfield site - former MOD site	Proposed Use: Mixed Use residential/tourism	Officer Comments LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and its tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas. There are already sufficient housing opportunities within Balado. This means that the justification for any additional site in a non-tiered settlement site has to be about delivering benefits and it is considered that there are no significant wider benefits to this proposal. The site is not suitable for residential/tourism/leisure development; it has been identified for employment uses as this would be compatible with existing neighbouring uses. The site	Satellite ground navigation station (golf ball) comprising of buildings and football/rugby pitch and other amenity land. It is a fairly flat site with a watercourse running along the southern edge of the site.

lies within 400m of an active sand and gravel quarry to the west. The site is also within 200m of two poultry farms and 300 metres from another, each of which lay to the north.

Pollution from Agricultural Activity paragraph 13.14 states 'When designing new buildings, consider their siting in relation to residential accommodation, and avoid sites within 400m of such developments.'



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	A watercourse runs through the southern edge of the site. It is classified as having good groundwater status. It is not in a waste water drainage hotspot.	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer	-	No culverting as per Policy on Reinstatement of natural watercourses and development will need to be set back from the watercourse	0
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes it is already connected to the public sewerage system.	GIS Layer for existing network	0	Policy Foul Drainage	0
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	The southern part of the site lies within medium probability area for river flood risk. A FRA will be required to establish the developable area of the site.	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	-	Flood risk assessment required to establish the developable area of the site.	0
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	There are no relevant designations, or non-designated features or known protected species interests related to this site.	GIS layers SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protecte	0	No culverting and development will need to be set back from the watercourse	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				d species Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment			
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		There are no local geodiversity sites or known geodiversity interests that could be affected.	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI, and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0	n/a	0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	A watercourse runs through the southern edge of the site.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	No culverting and development will need to be set back from the watercourse	0
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth Air Quality Management Area or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	No		0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)		There is not sufficient capacity in Kinross Primary school to cope with the projected growth.	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Proportional developer contributions will be sought towards education provision if the proposal includes mainstream housing as opposed to holiday or housing for elderly people.	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	There is potential for open space provision to be sought in accordance with policy.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	Policy on Provision of Open Space	+
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	The proposal is a mixed use proposal including tourism so it has some potential to create employment opportunities	Check CFS form	0	Require a broader mix of uses to include class 4 uses	+
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Brownfield and greenfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	+	Consider retention of Radar housing, consider the appropriate extent of the site (this is a proposed expansion of the LDP E35 site to the east)	++

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	The site lies within a 3.2 classification which is just out with the prime agricultural land and has no peat.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	0	n/a	0
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	Yes	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	Development could make use of open south facing elevations; the site is fairly open to prevailing winds.	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	0	Considering potential for planting along the watercourse could potentially provide some shelter	+
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?	In accordance with the Roads Authority		0	n/a	0
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	The site is not within easy access of services and facilities but lies close to a bus stop which provides a connection.	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active	-	n/a	-


	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities			
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	n/a	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised) Check for pylons on OS map and on site visit	0	n/a	0
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic	Material Assets	No, the proposal is contrary to TAYplan spatial strategy.	Check NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	--	n/a	--

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Development Plan?						
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	Possibly	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	Consider retention of Radar housing	+?
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs, Regional Scenic Areas, and local landscape designations?	Landscape	It will not affect any landscape designated sites.	GIS layers for NSA, and SLA	0		0
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	The site is highly visible site from the A977. The golf ball is a very distinctive landmark feature in the landscape.	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available Site visit	-	Consider whether the golf ball can be kept. Consider potential for woodland planting associated to the watercourse	+
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	N/a	GIS layer greenbelt	0	N/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	N/a	GIS layer for waste management sites	0	N/a	0
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	N/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	0	N/a	0
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	It includes the radio station/satellite ground terminal/golf ball and is part of the wider Balado Bridge airfield/RAF Balado site.	GIS layers Listed building, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape, Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit	0	Consider whether the golf ball can be kept. Archaeological assessment required?	+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	It includes the radio station/satellite ground terminal/golf ball and is part of the wider Balado Bridge airfield/RAF Balado site but there may be little scope to keep existing buildings in any redevelopment.		0	Consider whether the golf ball/ interpretation information of its previous use can be kept.	+
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	No the site lies within 400m of an active sand and gravel quarry to the west. The site is also within 200m of two poultry farms and 300 metres from another, each of which lay to the north. Pollution from Agricultural Activity paragraph 13.14 states ‘When designing new buildings, consider their siting in relation to residential accommodation, and avoid sites within 400m of such developments.’	OS map and site visit	--	The site is not suitable for residential/ tourism/leisure development; it has been identified for employment uses as this would be compatible with existing neighbouring uses.	--
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	Marketability due to neighbouring uses	Check CFS form	--	Restrict to employment uses	--

Site Name: Balado E35	Source of site suggestion: Existing LDP site which no longer benefits from planning permission		Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals: Change of use of former MOD property to office accommodation approved 11.10.2010 (09/01686/FLL) relating to existing buildings at the base to Class 4 office use (the 2 buildings involved include the Administration Block and the Police Post to the north of the site). E35 allocation in the LDP for general employment use with site specific requirements for consideration of retention of Radar housing and for Flood Risk Assessment.
Settlement: Balado	GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: E35 Pre-MIR Site Ref:	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? No	
OS Grid Ref: 309474 702907	Site Size (ha): 3.4 hectares	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? No	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc). Satellite ground navigation station (golf ball) comprising of buildings and football/rugby pitch and other amenity land. It is a fairly flat site with a watercourse running along the southern edge of the site.
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc): Brownfield site - former MOD site	Proposed Use: General employment uses	Officer Comments As a brownfield site, it should be supported for reuse. The site is not suitable for residential/ tourism/leisure development; it has been identified for employment uses. This would be compatible with existing neighbouring uses (the site lies within 400m of an active sand and gravel quarry to the west and within 200m of two poultry farms and 300 metres from another, each of which lay to the north.)	



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	Possibly. The groundwater status is good. A watercourse runs through the southern edge of the site. It is not in a waste water drainage hotspot.	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage hotspots	-	No culverting and development will need to be set back from the watercourse Provided by application of policies on Water Environment and Drainage within Loch Leven Catchment which offer potential to	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer		avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – connection to public sewerage system + must meet discharge consents at the waste water treatment works, and requiring appropriate SUDS.	
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes it is already connected to the public sewerage system.	GIS Layer for existing network	+	Policy Foul Drainage	+
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	The southern part of the site lies within medium probability area for river flood risk. A FRA will be required to establish the developable area of the site	GIS Layers for flood risk	-	Flood risk assessment required to establish the developable area of the site.	0
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	There are no relevant designations, or non-designated features or known protected species interests related to this site.	GIS layers SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay	0	No culverting and development will need to be set back from the watercourse	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Catchment			
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		There are no local geodiversity sites or known geodiversity interests that could be affected.	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0	n/a	0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	A watercourse runs through the southern edge of the site.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	No culverting and development will need to be set back from the watercourse	0
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth Air Quality Management Area or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	There is not sufficient capacity in Kinross Primary school to cope with the projected growth; however the proposal is for employment uses so	GIS Layers for school catchments	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			will not impact on this.				
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	There is potential for open space provision to be sought in accordance with policy	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	Policy on Provision of Open Space	+
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	The allocation is for general employment so it has some potential to create employment opportunities	Check CFS form	0	n/a	+
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Brownfield and greenfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	+	Consider retention of Radar housing	++
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	The site lies within a 3.2 classification which is just out with the prime agricultural land and has no peat content.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K))	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	Yes	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	Development could make use of open south facing elevations; the site is fairly open to prevailing winds.	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	0	Considering potential for planting along the watercourse could potentially provide some shelter from prevailing winds	+
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?	There are no known capacity issues	Check CFS form, aerial map and site visit	0	Access road would need to be to the satisfaction of the Council as Roads Authority	0
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	The site is not within easy access of services and facilities but lies close to a bus stop which provides a connection.	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities	-	n/a	-
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons,	Material Assets and Population and Human	n/a	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, network rail	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	underground gas pipelines etc.	Health		buffer Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised) Check for pylons on OS and site visit			
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	n/a	Check NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	0	n/a	0
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	Possibly	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	Consider retention of Radar housing	+
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	It will not affect any landscape designated sites.	GIS layers for NSA, LLA	0	n/a	0
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	The site is highly visible site from the A977. The golf ball is a very distinctive landmark feature in the landscape.	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available Site visit	-	Consider whether the golf ball can be kept. Consider potential for woodland planting associated to the watercourse.	+
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	N/a	GIS layer greenbelt	0	N/a	0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	N/a	GIS layer for waste management sites	0	N/a	0
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	N/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	0	N/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	It includes the radio station/satellite ground terminal/golf ball and is part of the wider Balado Bridge airfield/RAF Balado site.	GIS layers Listed building, SAMs, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape Battlefields, Archaeology Site VIsit	0	Consider whether the golf ball can be kept. Archaeological assessment required?	+
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	It includes the radio station/satellite ground terminal/golf ball and is part of the wider Balado Bridge airfield/RAF Balado site but there may be little scope to keep existing buildings in any redevelopment.		0	Consider whether the golf ball/ interpretation information of its previous use can be kept.	+
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	Yes the site lies within 400m of an active sand and gravel quarry to the west. The site is also within 200m of two poultry farms and 300 metres from another, each of which lay to the north. Pollution from Agricultural Activity	OS map and site visit	0	The site is not suitable for residential/ tourism/leisure development; it has been identified for employment uses as this would be compatible with existing neighbouring uses.	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			<p>paragraph 13.14 states ‘When designing new buildings, consider their siting in relation to residential accommodation, and avoid sites within 400m of such developments.’</p> <p>Allocation is for general employment uses so these would be compatible.</p>				
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	Marketability issues due to neighbouring uses	Check Call for Sites form	-	Restrict to employment uses	-

Site Name: Blairforge1	Source of site suggestion: All landowners/interested parties identified/aware? Shand Architecture on behalf of the landowner Mrs E Nelson.		Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals: There is currently no settlement boundary for Blairforge. The proposal was considered in LDP it was not an identified settlement so considered that it was more appropriately assessed against housing in the countryside policy and supplementary guidance. Resisted through previous LDP, and reporter agreed with Council's position.
Settlement: Blairforge1	GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref: Blairforge 1 Proposed Plan Ref: H148	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? Outwith	
OS Grid Ref: 313841 696343	Site Size (ha): 1.9 hectares	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? No	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc). Open to the north and west but bounded by the Kinnaird burn, and bounded by the B996 to the south and the existing properties in Blairforge to the east.
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc): Vacant unused and it is suggested that it is brownfield having been previously used to deposit road planning from the nearby B9097. However there has been no built development on this site.	Proposed Use: Residential	Officer Comments LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and its tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas. Blairforge is not considered to be a suitable location for significant new development as there are no services within easy active travel distance and therefore there is no settlement boundary identified in the LDP for it.	

		<p>In any case there are also site specific concerns relating to possible loss of trees along the southern boundary and relating to the size and scale of the proposal, and to maintaining an appropriate rural character to the area.</p>	
--	--	--	--



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a	Water	Possibly.	Check on OS	-	Apply policy Water	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)		The groundwater status is poor.	map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer		Environment to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – and require appropriate SUDS	
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	No there is no public drainage system to connect to.	GIS Layer for existing network	-	Policy Foul Drainage	0
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	Significant areas of SEPA surface water flood risk to the north of the site. The developable area will be affected by flooding issues.	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	--	Requirement for a DIA and for design and layout to reflect its outcomes. Apply policy Surface Water Drainage re SUDS	0
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	Possible but it is not within the Loch Leven catchment and there are no designated sites.	GIS layers SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment	0	Policy Biodiversity. Policy Foul Drainage	+
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		No	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI, and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0	n/a	0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	There are a lot of trees on this site.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	--	Retention of trees where possible and compensatory planting if necessary, but there would be loss of mature trees to the south to give the houses suitable amenity.	-
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)						
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	No Cleish primary school is already over capacity.	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Proportional developer contributions will be sought towards primary education provision.	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	There are no core paths within the site and there is no maintained open space within the site.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	Application of Policy Provision of Open Space ensures appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development proposals. Create a path network alongside the Kinnaird burn for the community.	+
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	Possibly as houses will be designed to encourage home working with studio/offices	Check CFS form	+	n/a	+
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and	Greenfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	Greenfield	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
		Soils					
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	There is no peat content but it is prime agricultural land.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	-	Reuse soils locally. Deal with contamination issues from previous use of the site.	-
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	Yes	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	The site layout could make the most of the south facing slope and aspect but is relatively open to prevailing winds.	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	-	Design and layout to maximise opportunities for solar gain.	-
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors	No known capacity issues	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	0	In accordance with the Roads Authority	0
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	Partially lies within 400 m of an existing bus stop, but the primary school is in Cleish, and there are no local facilities within easy active travel distance.	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within	--	Smaller site/limited housing	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			The scale of development may not be sustainable for housing in the countryside given the size of the site.	easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities			
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	Yes the northern part of the site is within a Scottish Gas Pipeline band or interest	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised) Check for pylons on OS map and on site visit	-	Requirement to consult on pipeline issue and limit development accordingly	0
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a	Material Assets	LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and it's tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal	Check NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	--	There is no significant wider benefit to justify allocation of this proposal however a small proposal could be	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?		settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas.			considered under the Councils Housing in the Countryside policies.	
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs, Regional Scenic Areas, and local landscape designations?	Landscape	It lies within the Loch Leven and Lomond Hills SLA and there is woodland within the Scottish natural woodland inventory.	GIS layers for NSA, and SLA	-	Retain woodland within the SNWI to the north of the site	-
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	The scale of the site identified suggests that the level of development would be inappropriate, and out of character	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available Site visit	--	Reduce the size and scale of the proposal, and ensure appropriate rural character of development.	0
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity	Popl and human health	No	GIS layer greenbelt	0	n/a	0


	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	of the greenbelt?	or material assets					
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	N/a	GIS layer for waste management sites	n/a	n/a	n/a
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	N/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	n/a	n/a	n/a
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	The forge is a listed building to the south of the site.	GIS layers Listed building, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape, Battlefields, Archaeology	-	Need to respect the setting of the listed building and the	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Site visit			
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	N/a		n/a	n/a	n/a
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	It is compatible with residential areas nearby	OS map and site visit	0	n/a	0
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	No	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0

<p>Site Name: Blairingone1</p>	<p>Source of site suggestion: All landowners/interested parties identified/aware?</p> <p>Holder Planning on behalf of the landowner Johnny Stewart (northern site) and Mr James Manclark (southern site)</p>		<p>Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals:</p> <p>This proposal is partially within a current housing allocation H74 and partially outwith the settlement boundary for Blairingone.</p>
<p>Settlement: Blairingone</p>	<p>GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref: Blairingone1 Proposed Plan Ref: H149</p>	<p>Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? Partially inside and outwith the existing settlement boundary.</p>	
<p>OS Grid Ref: 2982 6968</p>	<p>Site Size (ha): 10.4 hectares</p>	<p>Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? No</p>	<p>Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc).</p> <p>Consists of relatively flat agricultural land with a burn and some woodland to the south, the A977 running through the middle, with the local primary school lying to the immediate east.</p>
<p>Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc):</p> <p>Currently in agricultural use</p>	<p>Proposed Use:</p> <p>Residential development</p>	<p>Officer Comments</p> <p>LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and its tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas.</p> <p>This may be a suitable site (if scale of development is still restricted to 30 homes within the LDP period) as it: fits with the pattern of development and comfortably within the landscape contained by a burn and woodland to the south, is easily serviced, and offers</p>	

opportunity to address local issue if it can help sustain the primary school, and help address the traffic issues on the A977.

A public consultation February 2017 will help establish the local support/opposition to the site and the potential community benefits it could bring, and this consultation will inform the Council's decision.



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	Possibly. The groundwater status is poor but the pressure is mining and quarrying of coal.	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer	-	No culverting, and restoration of watercourses that have been previously diverted And development should be set back from the watercourse. Provided by application of policies Water Environment which offers potential to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – connection to public sewerage system + must meet discharge consents at the waste water treatment works, and requiring appropriate SUDS.	0
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes but an upgrade to the WWTW will be required.	GIS Layer for existing network	-	Policy Foul Drainage	0
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	There is no SEPA flood risk identified within the site.	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	0	n/a	0
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and	Bio flora and	There is a burn and woodland to the	GIS layers	-	Survey required of woodland.	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	fauna interests?	fauna	south of this site.	SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment		Retention of woodland in line with policy. Setback development from the burn. Retain important trees and provide appropriate planting, set development sufficiently back from existing and proposed woodland Conservation of the burn and its banks and wider biodiversity and to provide open space adjacent to the burn to enhance its landscape and biodiversity interest	
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		There are no local geodiversity sites or interests that could be affected.	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI, and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0		0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	Possibly due to watercourse and woodland within the site.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	Survey required of woodland. Retention of woodland in line with policy. Setback development from the burn.	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
						<p>Retain important trees and provide appropriate planting, set development sufficiently back from existing and proposed woodland</p> <p>Conservation of the burn and its banks and wider biodiversity and to provide open space adjacent to the burn to enhance its landscape and biodiversity interest</p>	
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	No	GIS Layers	0		0
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	There is sufficient capacity in Blairingone Primary school to cope with the projected growth and more development could help sustain this facility.	GIS Layers for school catchments	++	The developer offers potential/discretionary benefits of a community hall and village store.	++
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity	Popl and human health	There are no core paths within the site and there is no maintained open	GIS layers for core paths	0	Application of Policy Provision of Open space ensures	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	or material assets	space within the site.	and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations		appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development proposals.	
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	The site is proposed for solely residential purposes.	Check CFS form	-	n/a	-
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	The site was previously used for mining.	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	n/a	0
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	<p>There is no peat within the soils and it does not lie within prime agricultural land.</p> <p>There were coal mining activities in the past and an assessment was carried out for the northern part of this site.</p> <p>The southern part has not been assessment but it is believed it has been previously infilled.</p>	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	-	Updated ground condition investigations will be required.	-
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within	Material	It is indicated that it can be delivered	Check CFS	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	the LDP timeframe?	assets	within the LDP timeframe.	form			
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	The site does have a principal south facing aspect and there is some woodland to the south.	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	-	The site is south-facing which provides opportunities to make best use of solar gain through the detailed layout and siting of the new development.	0
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?	In accordance with the Roads Authority	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	-	Potential for traffic calming measures on the A977 should be considered	+
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	There is no longer an operational bus service however the site lies within close proximity of the primary school.	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities	-	n/a	-
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	There are no known constraints of this nature apart from the pylons which run through the northern edge of the site.	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer	-	There will be no built development in the area affected by the pylons.	0


	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				<p>Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised)</p> <p>Check for pylons on OS map and on site visit</p>			
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	No, the proposal is contrary to TAYplan spatial strategy	Check NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	--	n/a	--
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	It will not affect any designated sites.	GIS layers for NSA, and SLA	0	n/a	0
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	<p>The site lies within the settlement boundary.</p> <p>The David Tyldesley and Associates Settlement Strategy Landscape Capacity Study identifies this land to north as: being visually contained if confined to lower slopes; would detract from linear form but fit within infilled areas to south; and forms part of the village setting.</p> <p>Similar observations regarding settlement pattern are made for the southern part and that this land is prominent from the A977 descending from the church which would require further mitigation if to be screened from bypass</p> <p>The site has some mature trees on the southern boundary which help contain the site but which may be at risk from any potential bypass line.</p>	<p>Check existing LDP</p> <p>GIS layer wild land</p> <p>Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available</p> <p>Site visit</p>	-	<p>LVIA required informing proposal.</p> <p>Retain important trees and provide appropriate planting, set development sufficiently back from existing and proposed woodland.</p> <p>Conservation of the burn and its banks and wider biodiversity and to provide open space adjacent to the burn to enhance its landscape and biodiversity interest.</p> <p>Phasing development to ensure that early landscaping has chance to mature before full development has been built.</p>	-
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	N/a	GIS layer greenbelt	0	n/a	0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the	Material Assets and Human	N/a	GIS layer for waste management	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	waste handling operation?	Health		sites			
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	N/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	0	n/a	0
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	There are no features that would be affected by this proposal.	GIS layers Listed building, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape, Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	There are no features that would be affected by this proposal. However the scale of the proposal is significant in the landscape and would change the character of the village.		-	LVIA to inform proposal, also slow phasing of development could ensure some landscaping/planting has chance to mature before full development is fully built.	-
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	The sites potential residential development would be compatible with the nearby residential areas and the primary school	OS map and site visit	-	n/a	-
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	Ground conditions and marketability may limit viability/development by traditional delivery methods.	Check CFS form	--		--

Site Name: Blairingone H74	Source of site suggestion: Existing LDP site added by the Reporter so full assessment was not completed last time.		Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals: Within a current housing allocation H74
Settlement: Blairingone	GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref: Blairingone H74	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? Inside the settlement boundary	
OS Grid Ref: 2982 6968	Site Size (ha): 2 hectares	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? No	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc). Consists of relatively flat agricultural land with the existing the local primary school and woodland lying to the immediate east with the A977 to the south.
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc): Currently in agricultural use	Proposed Use: Residential development	Officer Comments This is a suitable site as it: fits with the pattern of development and comfortably within the landscape contained by the woodland to the east and the village to the west, is easily serviced, and offers opportunity to address local issue of need to sustain the primary school, and possibly help address any traffic issues on the A977. However there are known constraints. It is unclear due to ground conditions whether this site is viable	



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	Possibly. The groundwater status is poor, but the pressure is mining and quarrying of coal. It is not in a waste water drainage hotspot.	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage	-	Provided by application of policies regarding Water Environment and Drainage which offer potential to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment –	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer		connection to public sewerage system + must meet discharge consents at the waste water treatment works, and requiring appropriate SUDS.	
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes it lies close enough to the existing network (but awaiting further comment from Scottish Water regarding capacity – it is understood that an upgrade will be required)	GIS Layer for existing network	-	Policy: Water Environment and Drainage	0
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	There is no SEPA flood risk identified within the site.	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	0	n/a	0
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	There is woodland to the east of this site.	GIS layers SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species Loch Leven Catchment	-	Survey required of woodland. Set development sufficiently back from existing woodland	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment			
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		There are no local geodiversity sites or interests that could be affected.	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI, and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0	n/a	0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	Possibly due to woodland to the east of the site.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	Survey required of woodland. Retention of woodland in line with policy on Forestry, Woodland and Trees. Set development sufficiently back from existing woodland	0
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)		There is sufficient capacity in Blairingone Primary school to cope with the projected growth and more development could help sustain this facility.	GIS Layers for school catchments	++	n/a	++
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets		GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	Application of Policy concerned with Open Space Retention and Provision ensures appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development proposals.	+
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	The site is proposed for solely residential purposes.	Check CFS form	-	n/a	-
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	The site was previously used for mining.	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	n/a	0
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	There is no peat within the soils and it does not lie within prime agricultural land.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows	-	Updated ground condition investigations will be required.	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			There were coal mining activities in the past and an assessment was carried out.	whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)			
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	It is unclear due to ground conditions whether this site is viable.	Check CFS form	--	n/a	--
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	The site does have a principal south facing aspect and there is some existing development to the west and southwest which could provide some limited shelter from prevailing winds.	Check CFS form, aerial map and site visit	0	The site is south-facing which provides opportunities to make best use of solar gain through the detailed layout and siting of the new development.	+
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?		Check CFS form, aerial map and site visit	-	Access road would need to be to the satisfaction of the Council as Roads Authority. Potential for traffic calming measures on the A977 should be considered	+
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	There is no longer an operational bus service however the site lies within close proximity of the primary school.	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to	-	n/a	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				local services and amenities			
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	There are no known constraints of this nature apart from the pylons which run through the northern edge of the site.	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised) Check for pylons on OS and site visit	-	There will be no built development in the area affected by the pylons.	0
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	No	NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	0	n/a	0
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	It will not affect any designated sites.	GIS layers for NSA, SLA	0	n/a	0
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	The site lies within the settlement boundary. The David Tyldesley and Associates Settlement Strategy Landscape Capacity Study identifies this land to north as: being visually contained if confined to lower slopes; would detract from linear form but fit within infilled areas to south; and forms part of the village setting.	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available Site visit	+	Set development sufficiently back from existing woodland.	+
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	N/a	GIS layer greenbelt	n/a		n/a
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	N/a	GIS layer for waste management sites	n/a		n/a


	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	N/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	n/a		n/a
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	There are no features that would be affected by this proposal.	GIS layers Listed building, SMS, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit	0	n/a	0
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	There are no features that would be affected by this proposal.		0	n/a	0
Constraints							

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	The sites potential residential development would be compatible with the nearby residential areas and the primary school	OS map and site visit	-	n/a	-
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	There are known constraints. It is unclear due to ground conditions whether this site is viable.	Check CFS Sites form	--	n/a	--

Site Name: Carnbo	Source of site suggestion: Landowner J Russell Esq represented by Montagu Evans LLP		Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals: Considered as a Call for Site to LDP1. A planning permission has been granted to the immediate east of this site 29.7.15 for 4 houses.
Settlement: Carnbo	GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref: Proposed Plan Ref: H150	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? Outside	
OS Grid Ref: 703129 305214	Site Size (ha): 0.63 hectares	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier?	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc). The site is covered in scrub and has a watercourse running through it along the southern boundary. The site has areas of hedging within it and on the southern boundary with the road. The site would form the entry to Carnbo from the West. The site is fairly flat but drops on the western side towards the river.
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc): Agricultural	Proposed Use: Housing	Officer Comments: LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and it's tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas. No Carnbo has no services, other than a village hall. There are already sufficient housing infill opportunities available within Carnbo, as evidenced by the planning permission for 4 houses to the immediate east of the site, and the permission for 5 homes to the south side of Carnbo. This means that the justification for any additional site has to be about delivering benefits and it is considered that there are insufficient wider benefits to this	

		<p>proposal.</p> <p>Also taken together with other proposals it would not be of a scale appropriate for Carnbo and would not be able to successfully integrate with the existing community here.</p> <p>This site lies outwith the settlement envelope and would extend the existing form of the settlement. In terms of setting planting to the north and east could help make the case for this site in the future.</p> <p>There are doubts about the effectiveness of the proposal as the policy and SG for drainage within Loch Leven catchment would be applied but because of the scale of development it is perhaps unlikely to be able to meet this requirement and find acceptable mitigation measures.</p> <p>The proposal is to set development back from the watercourse however SEPA comments on the planning permission to the east suggests that this lade is not functional and in terms of following settlement pattern it would be better to bring development close to the road frontage.</p>	
--	--	--	--

--



© Crown copyright [and database rights] 2017 OS 10001697.1
You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data.
You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation//Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	A FRA carried out for another site locally looked into the condition of this lade that runs along the southern part of this site and it found that it was no longer functioning but there could be a number of small field drains located along the former route of the lade. The groundwater status is good.	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer	-	Apply policy Water Environment to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – connection to public sewerage system + and requiring appropriate SUDS If any land drains are encountered during the construction of the dwellings, contact should be made with the flood prevention authority and SEPA.	0
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	No, and the site lies within Loch Leven catchment	GIS Layer for existing network	--	Application of Loch Leven policy and SG, but unclear whether an acceptable solution can be provided	-
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human	There is SEPA medium river flood risk within the site at the Southern end.	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	-	FRA may be required (A FRA carried out for another site locally looked into the condition of this lade that runs along the southern part of this site and it	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation//Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
		Health				<p>found that it was no longer functioning) and avoidance of areas at a medium risk as per SPP.</p> <p>Locally there are a number of flooding issues due to surface water runoff. It is imperative that the runoff from this development is controlled and released at greenfield runoff rates.</p>	
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	Lies within the Loch Leven Catchment	GIS layers SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment	--	Policy and SG for drainage within Loch Leven catchment, but because of the scale of development proposed it is perhaps unlikely to be able to meet this requirement and find acceptable mitigation measures.	-
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected		No	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation//Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	by the proposal?			Review sites, SSSI, and Tayside Geodiversity Sites			
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	It will not result in habitat fragmentation or better connectivity.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	It could benefit from planting to the east and north to help contain/provide a setting for the development	0
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	It lies within the catchment of Fossoway Primary School and it is not currently a catchment where contributions will be sought	GIS Layers for school catchments	0		0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity	Popl and human health or material	There is no existing open space or core paths/rights of way within the site.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of	0	Application of open space policy ensures appropriate provision of informal and	+

Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation//Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	assets		way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations		formal open space alongside any development proposals.	
Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	No	Check CFS form	0		0
Soils						
Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Greenfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	-		-
Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	There is no peatland within the soil. This is non-prime but arable quality.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	-	Good quality soils should be removed for use in other parts of Perth and Kinross.	0
Deliverability/sustainability constraints						
Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	There is unlikely to be a market for this scale of development in this location when you take other infill opportunities into account.	Check CFS form	--	n/a	--

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation//Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	The site has a south facing aspect and it has some shelter from woodland to the west.	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	+	Siting and design of buildings to take account of solar orientation.	+
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?	There are no known capacity issues	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	0	Access roads would need to be delivered to the satisfaction of the Council as Roads Authority.	0
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	<p>No Carnbo has no services other than a village hall.</p> <p>A bus service is available which runs twice weekly and an additional school bus runs during the school term.</p> <p>A single post box and telephone box are available on the main road.</p> <p>Settlement on the A91, nearest main settlement is Milnathort/Kinross approximately 5 miles to the East.</p>	<p>GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance</p> <p>Check distance to local services and amenities</p>	--	n/a	--
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons,	Material Assets and Population and Human		GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks	0		0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation//Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	underground gas pipelines etc.	Health		<p>network rail buffer</p> <p>Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised)</p> <p>Check for pylons on OS map and on site visit</p>			
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or is it consistent with the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	<p>No when you consider the permitted infill developments already within the settlement boundary this extension would undermine the spatial strategy by its scale.</p> <p>LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and its tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas.</p>	Check NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	--		--
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	-		-


	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation//Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	It lies within the Ochil Hills Special landscape Area	GIS layers for NSA, and SLA	-	Ensure any woodland planting is native or other suitable species	-
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	<p>The settlement strategy landscape capacity study for the Kinross Local Plan 2005 did not cover this area.</p> <p>This site lies outwith the settlement envelope and would extend the existing form of the settlement.</p> <p>The proposal is to set development back from the watercourse however SEPA comments on the planning permission to the east suggests that this lade to the south is not functional and in terms of following settlement pattern it would be better to bring development close to the road frontage.</p>	<p>Check existing LDP</p> <p>GIS layer wild land</p> <p>Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available</p> <p>Site visit</p>	-	<p>A requirement for new native woodland planting toward the north and west would minimise the landscape the visual impact of the development.</p> <p>Also sensitive/high quality design and layout following the existing pattern and bringing development close to the road frontage.</p>	-
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	No	GIS layer greenbelt	0		0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation//Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	No	GIS layer for waste management sites	0		0
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	N/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	0		0
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	No	GIS layers Listed building, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape, Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit	0		0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation//Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	No		0		0
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	Taken together with other proposals no it would not be of a scale appropriate for Carnbo and would not be able to successfully integrate	OS map and site visit	-		-
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	Yes marketability of this scale of development in this location	Check CFS form	-		-

Site Name: Crook of Devon 1	Source of site suggestion: All landowners/interested parties identified/aware? Tullibole Developments		Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals: The site lies outwith but adjacent to the settlement boundary.
Settlement: Crook of Devon	GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref: part of Crook of Devon 2 (but just land north of the railway) Proposed Plan Ref: H151	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? outwith	
OS Grid Ref: 303083 699819	Site Size (ha): 1.1 hectares	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? No	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc). The site is triangular and bounded by the rear gardens of the houses on West Crook Way, private access road to Hairlaw Farm and the old unadopted road to Harelaw Farm.
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc): It is the residual element of the Glebe land of the Fossoway St Serfs Devonside church and comprises a single fallow field.	Proposed Use: Housing	Officer Comments There are 2 proposals suggested on this land, the proposal for a manse and community carparking has not been assessed as this is properly assessed against the policies of the LDP and would not result in an allocation in the LDP. However the proposal for residential assessment could potentially be an allocation in the LDP and therefore needs to be assessed. LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and its tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the	

		<p>majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas.</p> <p>There are already sufficient housing opportunities within Crook of Devon. This means that the justification for any additional site in a non-tiered settlement site has to be about delivering benefits and it is considered that there are no significant wider benefits to this proposal.</p> <p>There are also landscape and visual settlement form impacts associated to this proposal, and potential for odour nuisance from the nearby sewerage works.</p>	
--	--	--	--



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	Possibly. The groundwater status is good.	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage	-	Apply policy Water Environment to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – and require appropriate SUDS	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer		.	
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes but with regard to any capacity issues in the public drainage network (Scottish Water will advise further).	GIS Layer for existing network	-	Policy Foul Drainage	0
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	Significant areas of SEPA surface water probability to north and west of the site. The landowner states that remedial drainage works are underway in the field opposite the garage. The developable area will be affected by surface water issues.	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	0		0
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	Possible but it is not within the Loch Leven catchment and there are no designated sites.	GIS layers SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/	0	Policy Biodiversity. Policy Foul Drainage	+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				TPO/protected species Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment			
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		No	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI, and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0	n/a	0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	The current landuse is agricultural. It will not result in habitat fragmentation. There are some trees bounding the site.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	Retention of trees where possible and compensatory planting if necessary.	0
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)						
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	Yes the current spare capacity of Fossoway primary is limited.	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Proportional developer contributions will be sought towards primary education provision.	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	There are no core paths within the site and there is no maintained open space within the site.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	Application of Policy Provision of Open Space ensures appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development proposals.	+
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	No	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Greenfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	Greenfield	-
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site?	Material Assets and	It is mineral soil with no peat content and it does not have any prime	GIS Layers for carbon	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	(see notes)	Soils	agricultural land.	richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)			
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	Yes	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	The site layout could make the most of the south facing aspect but is relatively open and lacking in shelter.	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	-	Design and layout to maximise opportunities for solar gain and shelter planting to the south and west.	0
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?		Check CFS form, aerial map and site visit	0	Delivered in accordance with the Roads Authority.	0
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	Partially lies within 400 m of an existing bus stop, but the primary school is at the opposite end of the village.	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance	-	n/a	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Check distance to local services and amenities			
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	No	<p>GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer</p> <p>Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised)</p> <p>Check for pylons on OS map and on site visit</p>	0	n/a	0
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and it's tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main	Check NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	--	n/a	--

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			<p>settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas.</p> <p>This means that the justification for any new site has to be about delivering benefits and it is considered that there are no wider benefits to this proposal.</p>				
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	It will not impact any designated area.	GIS layers for NSA, and SLA	0	n/a	0
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	<p>The David Tyldesley and associates Landscape Capacity Study does not identify this as land with development potential it identifies this as a sensitive edge of the settlement with important landscape features or views beyond it.</p> <p>The open fields here are considered to give a strong rural character and it is identified as conspicuous land on prominent slopes.</p>	<p>Check existing LDP</p> <p>GIS layer wild land</p> <p>Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available</p> <p>Site visit</p>	--	A strong landscape framework provided by planting to the southern and western edges would help contain the site better.	-


	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	No	GIS layer greenbelt	0	n/a	0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	N/a	GIS layer for waste management sites	n/a	n/a	n/a
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	N/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	n/a		n/a
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	No	GIS layers Listed building, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape, Battlefields,	n/a	n/a	n/a

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Archaeology Site visit			
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	N/a		n/a	n/a	n/a
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	It is compatible with residential areas nearby however the western end of the site lies close to the sewage works and so part of this area may need to be left undeveloped to provide a suitable buffer.	OS map and site visit	-	The nearest property on West Crook Way is c. 38 metres from the sewage works and a similar buffer zone distance could be defined in relation to the site if necessary. Possible requirement for an odour assessment to assess impact and other mitigation measures such as planting could be considered through the planning application process.	-
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	Potentially marketability issues given proximity to the sewerage works	Check CFS form	-	n/a	-

Site Name: Crook of Devon 2	Source of site suggestion: All landowners/interested parties identified/aware? Suggested by Newbigging partnership of Harelaw Farm		Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals: This site was previously considered through the adopted LDP and the Reporter backed the Council's decision to exclude this site stating that "The development of the substantial open field to the east of the village hall would erode the countryside gap between Crook of Devon and the outlying hamlet of Drum, and would be prominent on the approach to the village from the east. Even if there were a need for further housing in the village this site would not be suitable."
Settlement: Crook of Devon	GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref: Crook of Devon 2 Proposed Plan Ref: H152	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? outwith	
OS Grid Ref: 303510 700037	Site Size (ha): 4.5 hectares	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? No	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc). Bounded to the west by the A977 and the village hall, to the north by the B9097, to the east by the woodland of the Crook Moss, and to the south. There is potential for a layout which makes most of south/north aspect and run parallel to the A977 and there is some shelter from existing woodland/ settlement to the east and west respectively.
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc): Undeveloped, pasture used for grazing.	Proposed Use: Housing	Officer Comments As per TAYplan "LDPs can provide for some development in settlements that are not defined as principal settlements where this can be accommodated and supported by the settlement....provided that the development genuinely contributes to the outcomes of this Plan and meets specific local needs or supports regeneration of the respective settlement." In this case there is merit in considering this site to see whether it can deliver benefit in terms of supporting public drainage improvements and potentially junction/pedestrian safety	

		<p>improvements.</p> <p>However there is concern that this level of development (approximately 100+ homes) in a non-tiered settlement would still be contrary to the TAYplan spatial strategy regardless of the wider benefits it could secure. There are already sufficient housing opportunities available within Crook of Devon. There are also significant landscape, settlement pattern/form, along with surface water issues associated to the development of this site.</p>	
--	--	--	--

--



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	Identified in the landscape capacity study as physically constrained due to wetlands within site. Also areas of SEPA surface water probability to north and west of the	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer	-	Apply policy Water Environment to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment –	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			site. Identified as having good groundwater status.	Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer		and require appropriate SUDS It is likely that the developable area will be affected by surface water issues. 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.	
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes but there are capacity issues in the public drainage network	GIS Layer for existing network	--	Policy Foul Drainage	0
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	Significant areas of SEPA surface water probability to north and west of the site. The landowner states that remedial drainage works are underway in the field opposite the garage.	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	--	Drainage impact assessment required at the planning application stage to define area at risk and appropriate detailed layout and levels and SUDS It is likely that the developable area will be affected by surface water issues.	0
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and	Bio flora and fauna	Whilst the majority of Crook of Devon is outwith the catchment this site lies within the Loch Leven	GIS layers SAC/SPA/SSSI/	-	Policy Biodiversity. Policy Water Environment	+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	fauna interests?		catchment..	<p>NNR/ TPO/protected species</p> <p>Loch Leven Catchment</p> <p>Lunan Valley catchment</p> <p>River Tay Catchment</p>		<p>Crook of Devon was previously screened out from HRA as it is largely outwith the Local Leven Catchment. Although this site lies within the catchment it is being included to help secure public drainage improvements and therefore it is anticipated that it would have a neutral impact and potentially beneficial impact as there are existing properties that cannot secure connection to the mains drainage at the moment.</p> <p>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 SPA.</p>	
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		No	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI, and Tayside Geodiversity	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Sites			
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	The current landuse is improved pasture. It will not result in habitat fragmentation.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	At planning application stage ensure sufficient setback from the woodland to the east of the site.	0
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	Yes the current spare capacity of Fossoway primary is limited.	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Proportional developer contributions will be sought towards primary education provision.	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	There are no core paths within the site and there is no maintained open space within the site.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open	0	Application of Policy Provision of Open Space ensures appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development proposals.	+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				space allocations			
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	No	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Greenfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	Greenfield	-
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	The majority of the site is class 5 in terms of its peat content but it does not have any prime agricultural land.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	--	If development would disturb carbon rich soils, development should be informed by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An appropriate peat survey and management plan; • Any disturbance or excavation be minimised; and • Suitable mitigation measures implemented to abate carbon emissions 	-
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	Yes	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	The site layout could make the most of the south facing aspect by running parallel with the A977 to the north, and there is some woodland to the south, and housing to the west which could provide some shelter.	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	0	Design and layout to maximise opportunities for solar gain.	+
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?	Transport statement showed that the roundabout is not required, other measures suggested bus shelters and new crossing point.	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	0	n/a	0
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	It lies within 400 m of an existing bus stop, and the primary school	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities	0	n/a	0
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	No	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				<p>Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised)</p> <p>Check for pylons on OS map and on site visit</p>			
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	This level of development in a non-tiered settlement would be considered to be contrary to the TAYplan spatial strategy.	Check NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	--	n/a	--
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	The David Tyldesley and associates Landscape Capacity Study identifies “wetland and ground conditions” as being a physical constraint here, and that the “old moss is an important landscape feature characteristic of the area”. The study also considers	GIS layers for NSA, and SLA	--	High quality design and layout, and landscaping (perhaps limiting development in northern part of this site/ or splitting the site in two with development associated to Drum junction then having a	--

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			that development of this area “would not link to settlement pattern, would blur distinction between Crook of Devon and Drum”, and would be a “conspicuous site from main roads”			<p>landscaping gap before development associated to the village hall) could help retain some sense of a gap between Crook of Devon and Drum.</p> <p>If a high quality design and layout addresses the A977 road frontage then because it is prominent it could have a significant positive contribution to the village as a gateway development.</p> <p>However the settlement form impact would still be a significant as it takes development south of the old railway line.</p>	
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	The David Tyldesley and associates Landscape Capacity Study identifies “wetland and ground conditions” as being a physical constraint here, and that the “old moss is an important landscape feature characteristic of the area”. The study also considers that development of this area “would not link to settlement pattern, would blur distinction between Crook of Devon and Drum”, and would be a “conspicuous site from main roads”	<p>Check existing LDP</p> <p>GIS layer wild land</p> <p>Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available</p> <p>Site visit</p>	--	<p>Well-designed proposal meeting the criteria of Policy on Placemaking.</p> <p>The scale of the proposal would still be an issue for the character of the place if over LDP period, and development would affect the setting of Crook of Devon and Drum.</p>	-


	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	No	GIS layer greenbelt	0	n/a	0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	N/a	GIS layer for waste management sites	n/a	n/a	n/a
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	N/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	n/a	n/a	n/a
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	No	GIS layers Listed building, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed	n/a	n/a	n/a

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Landscape, Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit			
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	N/a		n/a	n/a	n/a
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	The proposal is compatible with the adjacent village hall, residential areas, and Crook Moss.	OS map and site visit	0	n/a	0
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	Question mark over be viability of this level of development if it needs to provide significant roads infrastructure (roundabout) Also doubt about demand for this scale of development here.	Check CFS form	-	Does not need roundabout but market demand remains a doubt.	-

<p>Site Name: Crook of Devon 3</p>	<p>Source of site suggestion: All landowners/interested parties identified/aware?</p> <p>Suggested by Newbigging partnership of Harelaw Farm</p>		<p>Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals:</p> <p>This site was previously considered through the adopted LDP and the Reporter backed the Council's decision to exclude this site stating that "The development of the substantial open field to the east of the village hall would erode the countryside gap between Crook of Devon and the outlying hamlet of Drum, and would be prominent on the approach to the village from the east. Even if there were a need for further housing in the village this site would not be suitable."</p>
<p>Settlement: Crook of Devon</p>	<p>GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref: Crook of Devon 3 Proposed Plan Ref: H153</p>	<p>Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary?</p> <p>outwith</p>	
<p>OS Grid Ref: 303510 700037</p>	<p>Site Size (ha): 37 hectares</p>	<p>Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier?</p> <p>No</p>	<p>Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc).</p> <p>Bounded to the west by the A977 and the village hall, to the north by the B9097, to the east by the woodland of the Crook Moss, and to the south there is the Gairney Water. There is potential for a layout which makes most of south/north aspect and runs parallel to the A977 but the land to the southwest is currently open.</p>
<p>Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc):</p> <p>Undeveloped, pasture used for grazing.</p>	<p>Proposed Use: Mixed – housing, community facilities, employment/industrial space and possibly a bypass for the village</p>	<p>Officer Comments</p> <p>LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and it's tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas</p> <p>This means that the justification for any site has to be about delivering benefits and it is considered that there are no significant wider benefits to this proposal.</p> <p>However this level of development in a non-tiered settlement is considered to</p>	

		<p>be contrary to the TAYplan spatial strategy and unsustainable and out of character to Crook of Devon regardless of other benefits it may provide. There is also doubt about the deliverability, marketability and viability of this scale of development with the associated level of investment in infrastructure that would be required.</p> <p>There are already sufficient housing opportunities available within Crook of Devon. There are also both significant landscape, settlement pattern issues and also some surface water issues associated to the development of this site.</p>	
--	--	--	--

(Crook of Devon 3 also includes Crook of Devon 2 on map below)



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	<p>Identified in the landscape capacity study as physically constrained due to wetlands within site.</p> <p>Also areas of SEPA surface water within the site.</p> <p>The groundwater status is good.</p>	<p>Check on OS map</p> <p>GIS Landuse layer</p> <p>Waste water drainage</p>	-	<p>Apply policy water environment to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – and require appropriate SUDS</p> <p>It is likely that the developable area will be affected by surface</p>	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer		water issues. 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.	
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes but there are capacity issues in the public drainage network	GIS Layer for existing network	--	Policy Foul Drainage This proposal could be the growth project that leads to public drainage improvements.	0
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	Significant areas of SEPA surface water probability within the site. The landowner states that remedial drainage works are underway in the field opposite the garage.	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	--	Drainage impact assessment required at the planning application stage to define area at risk and appropriate detailed layout and levels and SUDS It is likely that the developable area will be affected by surface water issues.	0
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	Whilst the majority of Crook of Devon is outwith the catchment this site lies within the Loch Leven	GIS layers SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/	-	Policy: Biodiversity. Policy: Water Environment and Drainage	+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			catchment..	TPO/protected species Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment		Crook of Devon was previously screened out from HRA as it is largely outwith the Local Leven Catchment. Although this site lies within the catchment it is being included to help secure public drainage improvements and therefore it is anticipated that it would have a neutral impact and potentially beneficial impact as there are existing properties that cannot secure connection to the mains drainage at the moment. 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 SPA.	
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		No	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI, and Tayside Geodiversity	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Sites			
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	The current landuse is improved pasture. It will not result in habitat fragmentation.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	At planning application stage ensure sufficient setback from the woodland to the east of the site, and the watercourses.	0
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	Yes the current spare capacity of Fossoway primary is limited.	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Proportional developer contributions will be sought towards primary education provision and the proposal includes community facilities.	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	There is a core path within the site but no formal open space.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing	-	Application of Open Space Policy ensures appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development proposals and the core path will need to be	+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				LDP for open space allocations		retained.	
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	No	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Greenfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	Greenfield	-
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	There are class 5 soils with probable peat content, but it does not have any prime agricultural land.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	--	<p>Apply policy on climate change and carbon reduction to minimise disturbance of carbon rich soils.</p> <p>Where exceptions allow for development that would disturb carbon rich soils, development should be informed by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An appropriate peat survey and management plan; • Any disturbance or excavation be minimised; and • Suitable mitigation measures implemented to abate carbon emissions 	-
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	No, due to the scale of development this would not be desirable or possible	Check CFS form	-	n/a	-
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	The site layout could make the most of the south facing aspect by running parallel with the A977 to the north, and there is some woodland to the south, and housing to the west which could provide some shelter. However the southwest portion of the site is open.	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	-	Design and layout to maximise opportunities for solar gain and landscape framework to include structural planting.	-
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?	Possible issue with existing A97 B9097 junction? Suggestion that this could help deliver a bypass	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	0	Transport assessment to define requirements	0
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	Partially lies within 400 m of an existing bus stop, and the primary school	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities	-	Extend bus services within the site	-
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any	Material Assets and	No but pylons run through the southern part of the site.	GIS layers for pylons, gas	0	Design and layout to respond to this constraint.	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Population and Human Health		<p>pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer</p> <p>Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised)</p> <p>Check for pylons on OS map and on site visit</p>			
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	This level of development in a non-tiered settlement would be contrary to the TAYplan spatial strategy.	Check NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	--	n/a	--
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected –	Landscape	No designated area will be affected	GIS layers for	0	n/a	0


	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	including NSAs and local landscape designations?			NSA, and SLA			
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	The David Tyldesley and associates Landscape Capacity Study identifies “wetland and ground conditions” as being a physical constraint here, and that the “old moss is an important landscape feature characteristic of the area”. The study also considers that development of this area “would not link to settlement pattern, would blur distinction between Crook of Devon and Drum”, and would be a “conspicuous site from main roads”	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available Site visit	--	High quality design and layout, and landscaping (perhaps limiting development in northern part of this site) could help retain some sense of a gap between Crook of Devon and Drum. If a high quality design and layout addresses the A977 road frontage then because it is prominent it could have a significant positive contribution to the village as a gateway development.	-
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	No	GIS layer greenbelt	0	n/a	0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	N/a	GIS layer for waste management sites	n/a	n/a	n/a

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	N/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	n/a	n/a	n/a
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	No	GIS layers Listed building, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape, Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit	n/a	n/a	n/a
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	N/a		n/a	n/a	n/a

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	The proposal is compatible with the adjacent village hall, residential areas, and Crook Moss but is not of a suitable scale for the character of the place.	OS map and site visit	--	n/a	--
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	Question mark over be viability of this level of development.	Check CFS form	--	n/a	--

Site Name: Crook of Devon 4	Source of site suggestion: All landowners/interested parties identified/aware?		Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals: The site lies outwith the settlement boundary. Site was previously rejected at LDP Proposed Plan stage, Reporter agreed and supported this position.
Settlement: Crook of Devon	GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref: Crook of Devon 4 Proposed Plan Ref: H154	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? outwith	
OS Grid Ref: 303949 700869	Site Size (ha): 5 hectares	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? No	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc). Field to the north western edge of Crook of Devon bounded by a road to the north and properties at Wester Crosslands to the south, a track to the west and further properties to the east.
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc): Agricultural field.	Proposed Use: Housing (15-20 houses)	Officer Comments LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and its tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas. There are already sufficient housing opportunities within Crook of Devon. This means that the justification for any additional site in a non-tiered settlement site has to be about delivering benefits and it is considered that there are no significant wider benefits to this proposal. The proposal for 15-20 homes in this location would be out of character to the linear roadside development here. It is very prominent approaching from	

the west and does not have a footpath connection to the village. This area of land was considered through the David Tydesley and associates Landscape Capacity Study which identifies it as 'Open, rising ground in the Devon Valley detached from the villages, (with a) strong rural character' and developing it 'would detract from the linear form of Drum and Crook of Devon and the settlement pattern between them.'



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	Possibly. The groundwater status is good.	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer	-	Apply policy Water environment to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – and require appropriate SUDS.	0
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes but with regard to any capacity issues in the public drainage network (Scottish Water will advise further).	GIS Layer for existing network	-	Policy Foul Drainage	0
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human	No	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
		Health					
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	Possible it does lie within the Loch Leven catchment but there are no designated sites within the site.	GIS layers SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment	0	Policy Biodiversity. Policy Foul Drainage	0
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		No	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI, and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0	n/a	0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	The current landuse is agricultural. It will not result in habitat fragmentation. There are some trees bounding the site to the south that could need to be removed to secure an access into	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	Retention of trees where possible and compensatory planting if necessary.	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			the site.				
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	Yes the current spare capacity of Fossoway primary is limited.	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Proportional developer contributions will be sought towards primary education provision.	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	There are no core paths within the site and there is no maintained open space within the site.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	Application of Policy on Open space ensures appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development proposals.	+
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment	Population	The proposal suggests that one of the projects on which Glendevon	Check CFS form	0	There is no way that the Council can ensure that housing would	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	land/opportunities?		Energy is currently working involves the design of a 900KW power generation facility utilising the River Devon. This hydro generation scheme would be at the forefront of current technology, but involves a high cost in terms of design and construction. The construction of 20 houses as proposed would help to offset these front end costs and provide a degree of comfort to the company. It is also suggested that Glendevon Energy, who would hope that their business would expand, with a consequent increase in staff numbers, when their domestic installations are showcased in Crook of Devon.			help cross fund Glendevon Energy's project as it is not a reasonable, related or enforceable condition on development.	
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Greenfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	Greenfield	-
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	It is mineral soil with no peat content and it does not have any prime agricultural land.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	Yes	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	The site layout could make the most of the south facing aspect but is relatively open and lacking in shelter.	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	-	Design and layout to maximise opportunities for solar gain.	-
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?	Delivered in accordance with the Roads Authority. No footpath connection into the village	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	-	n/a	-
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	Partially lies within 400 m of an existing bus stop, and the primary school.	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities	-	n/a	-
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons,	Material Assets and Population and Human	No	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	underground gas pipelines etc.	Health		<p>networks network rail buffer</p> <p>Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised)</p> <p>Check for pylons on OS map and on site visit</p>			
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and it's tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas. It should be noted that the Reporter when considering LDP1 took a very strict interpretation of this approach and removed or reduced the size of a number of sites in the smaller settlements with limited services. One example of this being the	Check NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	--	There is no wider benefit to justify further consideration of this proposal.	--

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			reduction of a site in Powmill from 120 units to 30 units. This means that the justification for any site has to be about delivering benefits and it is considered that there are no wider benefits to this proposal				
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	No designated area will be affected	GIS layers for NSA, and SLA	0	n/a	0
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	Very prominent approaching from the west. This area of land was considered through the David Tyldesley and associates Landscape Capacity Study which identifies it as ‘Open, rising ground in the Devon Valley detached from the villages, (with a) strong rural character’ and developing it ‘Would detract from the linear form of Drum and Crook of Devon and the settlement pattern between them.’ Proposal for 15-20 houses here would not fit with the linear roadside	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available Site visit	--	n/a	--


	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			settlement pattern here.				
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	No	GIS layer greenbelt	0	n/a	0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	N/a	GIS layer for waste management sites	n/a	n/a	n/a
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	N/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	n/a	n/a	n/a
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	No	GIS layers Listed building, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Landscape, Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit			
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	N/a		n/a	n/a	n/a
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	It is compatible with residential areas nearby	OS map and site visit	0	n/a	0
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	There are no known constraints	Check CFS form	0		0

Site Name: Crook Moss MIR site	Source of site suggestion: All landowners/interested parties identified/aware? Suggested by members		Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals: This site was previously considered through the adopted LDP and the Reporter backed the Council's decision to exclude this site stating that "The development of the substantial open field to the east of the village hall would erode the countryside gap between Crook of Devon and the outlying hamlet of Drum, and would be prominent on the approach to the village from the east. Even if there were a need for further housing in the village this site would not be suitable."
Settlement: Crook of Devon	GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref: part of Crook of Devon 2 (but just land north of the railway) Proposed Plan Ref: H266	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? outwith	
OS Grid Ref: 303510 700037	Site Size (ha): 3.1 hectares	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? No	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc). Bounded to the west by the A977 and the village hall, to the north by the B9097, to the east by the woodland of the Crook Moss, and to the south by the old railway line. There is potential for a layout which makes most of south/north aspect and run parallel to the A977 and there is some shelter from existing woodland/ settlement to the east and west respectively.
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc): Undeveloped, pasture used for grazing.	Proposed Use: Housing	Officer Comments Some concern that this level of development in a non-tiered settlement could be considered to be contrary to the TAYplan spatial strategy. However as per TAYplan "LDPs can provide for some development in settlements that are not defined as principal settlements where this can be accommodated and supported by the settlement....provided that the development genuinely contributes to the outcomes of this Plan and meets specific local needs or supports regeneration of the respective settlement." In this case there is merit in considering this site to see whether	

		<p>it can deliver benefit in terms of supporting public drainage improvements and potentially junction/pedestrian safety improvements.</p> <p>The two reasons for the potential inclusion of this site: were potential to help address traffic issues and improved drainage within the Loch Leven Catchment and they are already supported by the adopted Plan (Paragraphs 7.1.15 and 7.1.18). The transport statement subsequently submitted to the Council has clarified that the roundabout would not be required for this level of development. It has also been clarified that the traveller's site will provide a growth project and that this site would drain to the Devon.</p> <p>Officers appreciate the landowner may offer to provide a roundabout and now We welcome this generosity but any requirements asked of a developer by a planning authority needs to meet tests in circular 3/2012 Planning Obligations and Good neighbour Agreements (for it to be secure).</p> <p>For avoidance of doubt for the Council there are still challenges and risks associated with such an arrangement if pursued, and so from an officer perspective the benefits potentially secured through this process are unlikely to override the issue of its lack of conformity with the TAYplan strategy or the landscape impact of the proposal. There are also some</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>landscape, settlement pattern, and surface water impacts/challenges associated to the development of this site.</p> <p>A public consultation February 2017 was carried out to help establish the local support/opposition to the site and the potential community benefits it could bring. This consultation will inform the Council's decision. There were 53 objections to the proposal, and 26 supportive comments (of which 8 are qualified and would retract their support if it is only delivering the benefits the Council can definitely insist upon). There were also 6 comments which did not express a clear preference.</p>	
--	--	--	--



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	<p>Identified in the landscape capacity study as physically constrained due to wetlands within site.</p> <p>Also areas of SEPA surface water probability to north and west of the site.</p> <p>The groundwater status is good.</p>	<p>Check on OS map</p> <p>GIS Landuse layer</p> <p>Waste water drainage hotspots</p> <p>Private water</p>	-	<p>Apply Water Environment policy to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – and require appropriate SUDS</p> <p>It is likely that the developable area will be affected by surface</p>	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				supplies (risk assessed) layer		<p>water issues.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>A maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide should be provided between the watercourse and built development.</p>	
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes but there are capacity issues in the public drainage network	GIS Layer for existing network	--	Policy Foul Drainage	0
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	<p>Significant areas of SEPA surface water probability to north and west of the site.</p> <p>The landowner states that remedial drainage works are underway in the field opposite the garage.</p>	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	--	<p>Drainage impact assessment required at the planning application stage to define area at risk and appropriate detailed layout and levels and SUDS</p> <p>It is likely that the developable area will be affected by surface water issues.</p>	0
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and	Bio flora and	Whilst the majority of Crook of Devon is outwith the catchment this	GIS layers	-	Policy Biodiversity.	+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	fauna interests?	fauna	site lies within the Loch Leven catchment..	SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment		Policy Foul Drainage Crook of Devon was previously screened out from HRA as it is largely outwith the Local Leven Catchment. Although this site lies within the catchment it is being included to help secure public drainage improvements and therefore it is anticipated that it would have a neutral impact and potentially beneficial impact as there are existing properties that cannot secure connection to the mains drainage at the moment. 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 SPA.	
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		No	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI, and Tayside	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Geodiversity Sites			
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	The current landuse is improved pasture. It will not result in habitat fragmentation.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	At planning application stage ensure sufficient setback from the woodland to the east of the site.	0
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	Yes the current spare capacity of Fossoway primary is limited.	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Proportional developer contributions will be sought towards primary education provision.	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	There are no core paths within the site and there is no maintained open space within the site.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing	0	Application of Open Space Policy ensures appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development proposals.	+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				LDP for open space allocations			
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	No	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Greenfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	Greenfield	-
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	It is mineral soil with no peat content and it does not have any prime agricultural land.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	0	n/a	0
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	Yes	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	The site layout could make the most of the south facing aspect by running parallel with the A977 to the north, and there is some woodland to the south, and housing to the west which	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	0	Design and layout to maximise opportunities for solar gain.	+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			could provide some shelter.				
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?	Possible issue with existing A977 B9097 junction/ speed of vehicles	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	0	There is not a planning requirement for the roundabout but the landowner still offers this. Given it is not necessary there is dubiety over the securement of this potential benefit.	0
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	It lies within 400 m of an existing bus stop, and the primary school	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities	0	n/a	0
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	No	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer Check the health and safety	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				<p>consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised)</p> <p>Check for pylons on OS map and on site visit</p>			
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	This level of development in a non-tiered settlement would be considered to be contrary to the TAYplan spatial strategy if it does not deliver wider benefit.	Check NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	--	<p>The two reasons for the potential inclusion of this site: were potential to help address traffic issues and improved drainage within the Loch Leven Catchment and they are already supported by the adopted Plan (Paragraphs 7.1.15 and 7.1.18). The transport statement subsequently submitted to the Council has clarified that the roundabout would not be required for this level of development. It has also been clarified that the traveller's site will provide a growth project for drainage improvements.</p> <p>However a revised proposal was prepared including provision of</p> <p>There has been a</p>	--

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
						<p>consultation on potential other wider community benefits that could be delivered here. There were 53 objections to the proposal, and 26 supportive comments (of which 8 are qualified and would retract their support if it is only delivering the benefits the Council can definitely insist upon). There were also 6 comments which did not express a clear preference</p> <p>Officers appreciate the landowner may offer to provide them and we welcome this generosity but any requirements asked of a developer by a planning authority needs to meet tests in circular 3/2012 Planning Obligations and Good neighbour Agreements (for it to be secure). For avoidance of doubt for the Council there are still challenges and risks associated with such an arrangement if pursued, and so from an officer perspective I do not feel any benefits potentially secured through this process would override the issue of its lack of conformity with the TAYplan strategy or the</p>	

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
						landscape impact of the proposal.	
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	No designated site will be affected	GIS layers for NSA, and SLA	0	n/a	0
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	The David Tyldesley and associates Landscape Capacity Study identifies “wetland and ground conditions” as being a physical constraint here, and that the “old moss is an important landscape feature characteristic of the area”. The study also considers that development of this area “would not link to settlement pattern, would blur distinction between Crook of Devon and Drum”, and would be a “conspicuous site from main roads”	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available Site visit	--	High quality design and layout, and landscaping (possibly limiting development in northern part of this site/ or splitting the site in two with development associated to Drum junction then having a landscaping gap before development associated to the village hall) could help retain some sense of a gap between Crook of Devon and Drum. However if a high quality design and layout fronts/addresses the A977 road frontage then because it is prominent it could	-


	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
						have a positive contribution to the village as a gateway development.	
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	No	GIS layer greenbelt	0	n/a	0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	N/a	GIS layer for waste management sites	n/a	n/a	n/a
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	N/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	n/a	n/a	n/a
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with	No	GIS layers Listed building, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas,	n/a	n/a	n/a

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
		landscape)		Gardens and Designed Landscape, Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit			
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	N/a		n/a	n/a	n/a
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	The proposal is compatible with the adjacent village hall, residential areas, and Crook Moss.	OS map and site visit	0	n/a	0
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	Question mark over the viability of this level of development if it needs to provide significant roads infrastructure (roundabout) but increasing the level of development would cause an issue for compliance with TAYplan strategy.	Check CFS form	--	The landowner has submitted details supporting the viability of the scheme but there is doubt over the marketability of this level of housing development and also about the demand for the business units and café proposed.	-

Benson17B Site Name: Crook of Devon Naemoor Road	Source of site suggestion: All landowners/interested parties identified/aware? G S Brown		Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals: The site lies outwith the settlement boundary. This site was previously rejected by the Council through the LDP1, and Reporter agreed and supported this position.
Settlement: Crook of Devon	GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref: Proposed Plan Ref: H155	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? outwith	When this site was considered through the Kinross Local Plan review. The high cost of servicing the site was identified as a constraint. The upfront cost to construct a new bridge over the river Devon, uncertainty whether suitable land is within the control of the developer and the drainage infrastructure costs all remain issues.
OS Grid Ref: 700230 303095	Site Size (ha): 7.6 hectares	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? No	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc). The site is an extensive, undulating arable field on the edge of the settlement, there are trees along the Devon to the south and along the roadside to the north.
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc): Agricultural field.	Proposed Use: Housing (and if this was proposed at medium density this could potentially accommodate 190 homes)	Officer Comments LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and its tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas. There are already sufficient housing opportunities. This means that the justification for any additional site in a	

		<p>non-tiered settlement site has to be about delivering benefits. Development here would include a new bridge to improve access but it is considered that there are not significant enough wider benefits to this proposal to override the TAYplan strategy.</p> <p>The high cost of servicing the site was identified as a constraint. The upfront cost to construct a new bridge over the river Devon, and uncertainty whether suitable land is within the control of the developer remain issues.</p> <p>The proposal of 190 homes in this location would be difficult to successfully integrate into the existing community.</p>	
--	--	---	--

--



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	Possibly. The groundwater status here is good.	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage	-	Apply Water Environment policy to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – and require appropriate SUDS	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer			
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes but there might not be existing capacity for the scale of development this site could accommodate.	GIS Layer for existing network	0	Policy Foul Drainage	0
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	There is some fluvial flood risk associated to the immediate vicinity of the River Devon.	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	-	FRA and application of flood risk policy and avoidance of medium risk areas.	0
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	Possibly	GIS layers SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species	-	Policy Biodiversity. Policy Water drainage Retention of trees along River Devon and along the road.	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment			
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		No	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI, and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0	n/a	0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	The current landuse is agricultural. It will not result in habitat fragmentation. There are some trees bounding the site to the south that could need to be removed to secure an access into the site.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	Policy on Forestry, woodland and trees, with compensatory planting if any felling is necessary.	0
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)						
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	Developer contributions are not sought towards Fossoway Primary. However this scale of development could impact on this position.	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Potentially seek developer contributions	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	There are no core paths within the site and there is no maintained open space within the site.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	Application of Policy ensures appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development proposals.	+
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	No	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Greenfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	Greenfield	-
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	It is mineral soil with no peat content and it does not have any prime agricultural land.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)			
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	The scale of the proposal suggests that it would not be marketable/effective within the LDP timeframe. The high cost of servicing the site was identified as a constraint. The upfront cost to construct a new bridge over the river Devon, uncertainty whether suitable land is within the control of the developer all remain issues.	Check submission	--		--
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	The site layout could make the most of the south facing aspect but it is relatively open and lacking in shelter.	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	-	Design and layout to maximise opportunities for solar gain.	0
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?	Delivered in accordance with the Roads Authority.	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	-	n/a	-
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed	Climatic factors and	It well related to the village centre and services, and the bus stops on	GIS layer for bus stops has	+	n/a	+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	by public transport?	human health	the A977	<p>a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance</p> <p>Check distance to local services and amenities</p>			
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	No	<p>GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer</p> <p>Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised)</p> <p>Check for pylons on OS map and on site visit</p>	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or is it consistent with the Strategic Development Plan?"	Material Assets	<p>LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and it's tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas. It should be noted that the Reporter when considering LDP1 took a very strict interpretation of this approach and removed or reduced the size of a number of sites in the smaller settlements with limited services. One example of this being the reduction of a site in Powmill from 120 units to 30 units.</p> <p>This means that the justification for any site has to be about delivering benefits. Development here would include a new bridge to improve access but it is considered that there are not significant enough wider benefits to this proposal to override the TAYplan strategy.</p>	Check NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	--	Development here would include a new bridge to improve access	-
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	0		0
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected –	Landscape	No designated areas will be affected.	GIS layers for	0		0


	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	including NSAs and local landscape designations?			NSA, and SLA			
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	This area of land was considered through the David Tyldesley and associates Landscape Capacity Study which identifies it as an area with development potential, and as potentially well contained visually.	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available Site visit	+	Retain trees as per policy	++
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	No	GIS layer greenbelt	0		0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	N/a	GIS layer for waste management sites	n/a		n/a

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	N/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	n/a		n/a
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	No, the road bridge here is an archaeological record but it may not be affected as the previous proposal was to take a new access and bridge across the Devon at the west end of the site	GIS layers Listed building, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape, Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit	-	take a new access and bridge across the Devon at the west end of the site	0
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	N/a		n/a		n/a

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	It is compatible with residential areas nearby	OS map and site visit	0		0
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	The high cost of servicing the site was identified as a constraint. The upfront cost to construct a new bridge over the river Devon, uncertainty whether suitable land is within the control of the developer all remain issues	Check CFS form	--		--

<p>Site Name: Crook of Devon South of village hall</p>	<p>Source of site suggestion: All landowners/interested parties identified/aware?</p> <p>Cllr Michael Barnacle, the landowner did not put forward this proposal</p>		<p>Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals:</p> <p>The site lies outwith the settlement boundary.</p>
<p>Settlement: Crook of Devon</p>	<p>GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref: Proposed Plan Ref: E156</p>	<p>Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary?</p> <p>outwith</p>	
<p>OS Grid Ref:</p> <p>700073 303839</p>	<p>Site Size (ha): 1.3 hectares</p>	<p>Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier?</p> <p>No</p>	<p>Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc).</p> <p>The site sits beyond the cusp, and the old railway line, and the land slopes gently down from this point towards the south. The woodland at Crook Moss lies to the immediate east and south, and to the west it is bounded by the peat gate road.</p>
<p>Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc):</p> <p>Agricultural field.</p>	<p>Proposed Use:</p> <p>Employment</p>	<p>Officer Comments</p> <p>LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and it's tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas. This proposal would be contrary to that strategy and there are no significant community benefits could outweigh this position.</p> <p>It is also considered that this site has</p>	

impacts on settlement form, and other landscape and visual impacts. By taking development beyond the railway line it takes development out on limb from the rest of the village. Its development would also impact on the distinction between Crook of Devon and Drum as per the landscape capacity study. It is unclear how this site would be accessed and whether it is a viable and effective site.



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	Possibly. The groundwater status is good.	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer	-	Apply Water Environment policy to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – and require appropriate SUDS	0
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes	GIS Layer for existing network	0	Policy Foul Drainage	0
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	There is some surface water flood risk shown in a few medium sized areas within the site.	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	-	FRA and DIA, and application of flood risk and water environment and drainage policies	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	Possibly	GIS layers SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment	-	Policy Biodiversity Policy Water drainage Retention of trees along River Devon and along the road.	0
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		No	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI, and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0	n/a	0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	There are no trees/woodlands or wetlands/ watercourses within this site. The crook moss lies to the immediate east.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	Secure sufficient setback from woodland of Crook Moss	0
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)						
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)		N/a for employment proposal	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Potentially seek developer contributions	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	There are no core paths within the site and there is no maintained open space within the site, but station road is a core path	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	n/a	0
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	No	Check CFS form	0		0
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Greenfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	Greenfield	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	The majority of site lies within class 5 in terms of carbon rich soils .It does not have any prime agricultural land.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	--	Apply policy on climate change and carbon reduction to minimise disturbance of carbon rich soils. Where exceptions allow for development that would disturb carbon rich soils, development should be informed by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An appropriate peat survey and management plan; • Any disturbance or excavation be minimised; and • Suitable mitigation measures implemented to abate carbon emissions 	-
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	It is unclear what level of demand there would be for employment uses	Check submission	-	n/a	-
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	The site layout could make the most of the south facing aspect but it is relatively open and lacking in shelter from prevailing winds	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	-	Design and layout to maximise opportunities for solar gain.	0
	Vehicular Access constraints or	Material	Delivered in accordance with the	Check CFS	-	n/a	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	assets and climatic factors?	Roads Authority.	form, aerial map and site visit			
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	It well related to the village centre and services, and the bus stops on the A977	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities	+		+
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	No	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				digitised) Check for pylons on OS map and on site visit			
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or is it consistent with the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and it's tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas. It should be noted that the Reporter when considering LDP1 took a very strict interpretation of this approach and removed or reduced the size of a number of sites in the smaller settlements with limited services. One example of this being the reduction of a site in Powmill from 120 units to 30 units. This means that the justification for any site has to be about delivering benefits.	Check NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	--	n/a	--
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	0		0
Landscape Designated sites							

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	No	GIS layers for NSA, and SLA	0		0
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	This area of land was considered through the David Tyldesley and associates Landscape Capacity Study which identifies this as “part of the old moss which it an important landscape feature characteristic of the area” it also considers it “would have no link to settlement pattern and further blur the separation of Crook and Drum” and is conspicuous from the main road” Development here would also be out on a limb from the rest of the linear form of the village.	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available Site visit	--		--
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	No	GIS layer greenbelt	0		0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	N/a	GIS layer for waste management sites	n/a		n/a

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	N/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	n/a		n/a
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	No	GIS layers Listed building, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape, Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit	0		0
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	N/a		n/a		n/a

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	Yes as long as restricted to employment uses compatible with adjacent residential areas.	OS map and site visit	0		0
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	Viability and effectiveness are not established	Check CFS form	-		-

Site Name: Hatchbank	Source of site suggestion: Landowner J Russell Esq represented by Montagu Evans LLP		Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals: Considered as a Call for Site to LDP1.
Settlement: Hatchbank	GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref: Proposed Plan Ref: H157	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? Hatchbank does not merit a settlement boundary to encourage growth	
OS Grid Ref: 698792 312338	Site Size (ha): 22 hectares	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier?	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc). Extends from the M90 to the existing residential properties at Hatchbank, and is bounded to the north by Hatchbank Road.
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc): Agricultural	Proposed Use: Housing as well as local services or community facilities	Officer Comments: Hatchbank lies within the wider countryside and any proposal here are best considered under the LDP housing in the countryside policy. However the scale of the proposal would need to be in line with the policy, rather than the significant scale proposed here. This scale of proposal would be out of character with the pattern of small discrete housing groups within open countryside. Also the likelihood of a drainage proposal which meets the terms of the Loch Leven catchment is considered remote. The integration of	

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation//Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	The groundwater status is good.	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer	-	Apply policy Water Environment to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – connection to public sewerage system + and requiring appropriate SUDS	0
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	No, and the site lies within Loch Leven catchment	GIS Layer for existing network	--	n/a	--
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	There is SEPA medium river flood risk within the site at the Southern end.	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	-	FRA would be required and avoidance of areas at a medium risk as per SPP.	0
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal	Bio flora and	Lies within the Loch Leven	GIS layers	--	Policy for drainage within Loch	--

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation//Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	fauna	Catchment	SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment		Leven catchment, but the scale of development proposed is high unlikely to be able to meet this requirement and find acceptable mitigation measures.	
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		No	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI, and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0	n/a	0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	It will not result in habitat fragmentation or better connectivity.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or	Air	No	GIs Layers	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation//Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)						
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	Proposal includes unspecified community facilities. It lies within the catchment of Kinross Primary School	GIS Layers for school catchments	0	The Council has invested in a replacement Kinross Primary Schools to support future development so a contribution will be sought.	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	There is no existing open space or core paths/rights of way within the site.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations		Application of open space policy ensures appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development proposals.	+
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	No	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Greenfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	n/a	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation//Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	There is no peatland within the soil. This is non-prime but arable quality.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	-	Good quality soils should be removed for use in other parts of Perth and Kinross.	0
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	There is unlikely to be a market for this scale of development in this location.	Check CFS form	--	n/a	--
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	The site has a south facing aspect but it is a pretty open unsheltered site.	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	-	Siting and design of buildings to take account of solar orientation.	-
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?	The local road network may struggle to cope with development on this scale.	Check CFS form, aerial map and site visit	-	Access roads would need to be delivered to the satisfaction of the Council as Roads Authority.	-
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	No the nearest public transport available in Gairney Bank. No pedestrian footpath to this area.	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see	--	n/a	--


	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation//Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			Nearest service centre in Kinross.	if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities			
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	No	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised) Check for pylons on OS map and on site visit	0	n/a	0
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning	Material Assets	No it would undermine the spatial strategy.	Check NPF3 and TAYplan	--	n/a	--

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation//Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Framework national priority or is it consistent with the Strategic Development Plan?		LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and its tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas.	SDP			
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	n/a	-
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	No designated landscapes will be affected	GIS layers for NSA, and SLA	0	n/a	0
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	The pattern of development here is small and discrete housing groupings within open countryside. This proposal would change this character and would be more urban in character. It would also be highly visible from the motorway.	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available Site visit	--	A requirement for new native woodland planting toward the open rural landscape to the east and west, and south to minimise the landscape the visual impact of the development. Also sensitive/high quality design and layout.	--

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation//Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	No	GIS layer greenbelt	0		0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	No	GIS layer for waste management sites	0	n/a	0
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	N/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	0	n/a	0
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	There is an archaeological records for a ring ditch and fairy knowe	GIS layers Listed building, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape, Battlefields,	-	Impacts on the historic environment will be avoided wherever possible through appropriate scheme location and design	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation//Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Archaeology Site visit			
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	There is an archaeological records for a ring ditch and fairy knowe		-	Recording of any features found in investigation	+
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	No it would not be of a scale appropriate with surrounding communities and would not be able to successfully integrate	OS map and site visit	-	n/a	-
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	Yes marketability of this scale of development in this location	Check CFS form	-	n/a	-

Site Name: Hattonburn H52	Source of site suggestion: Existing LDP site		Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals: Planning permission for 22 houses (05/01622/FUL), renewed under 12/01339/FLL, further application for renewal (17/00203/FLL) under consideration.
Settlement: Hattonburn	GIS Site Ref: H52 MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref:	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? Within the existing settlement boundary	
OS Grid Ref: 312802 705529	Site Size (ha): 4 hectares	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? No	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc). Site is located to the north east of Milnathort but is separated from it by the M90. Access to the site is via a B road and an unclassified farm road. There are several farm buildings on the site and a large proportion of the site is wooded. The site is bounded by fields to the east and west. To the north east is a row of houses with Hattonburn House to the west and Hattonburn Farmhouse to the south. The site is relatively prominent particularly on approach from the south.
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc): Part brownfield part greenfield (woodland)	Proposed Use: Conversion of existing buildings plus up to 20 new houses, total not to exceed 30.	Officer Comments C Listed Hattonburn House outwith the site to the west. A number of traditional farm buildings on the site. Requirement for the sympathetic conversion of traditional buildings and also a requirement to protect the setting of Hattonburn House There is a requirement to retain existing trees. The designation includes an area for indicative landscaping to the east which will help reduce impact of the new build development from the B road.	



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	<p>Possibly.</p> <p>The groundwater status here is good.</p> <p>It is not in a waste water drainage hotspot.</p> <p>The Hatton Burn runs through the site north to south</p>	<p>Check on OS map</p> <p>GIS Landuse layer</p> <p>Waste water drainage hotspots</p> <p>Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer</p>	-	<p>Provided by application of policies Water Environment and Drainage and Drainage within Loch Leven Catchment which offer potential to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – connection to public sewerage system + must meet discharge consents at the waste water treatment works, and requiring appropriate SUDS.</p> <p>Requirement for open watercourses to be retained and protected from pollution with a minimum 6m buffer strip.</p> <p>Opportunities should be sought to further improve the water environment through development e.g. links to blue/green networks, restoration opportunities etc.</p>	0
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes it lies close enough to the existing network	GIS Layer for existing network	+	Policy Foul Drainage	+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	Fairly large pockets of SEPA medium risk for surface water flooding affecting eastern and southern parts of the site. Smaller areas at high risk. Whole eastern part at medium risk of river flooding.	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	-	Flood Risk Assessment with site layout plan will be required at planning application stage to assess the risk of flooding.	0
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	It lies within the Loch Leven Valley catchment so there is a possible impact on this.	GIS layers SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment	-	Policy: Biodiversity. Retain and enhance the watercourse. Requirement to retain existing trees and prepare a woodland management plan. HRA identified mitigation (not previously assessed but likely to be along the lines of the following). HRA identifies the following criteria to the developer requirements section: 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 SPA.	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
						<p>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.</p> <p>Existing measures within the LDP will provide an additional safeguard against any impact of this policy include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy International Nature Conservation Sites Policy Water Quality Policy Foul Drainage Policy Surface Water Drainage Policy Drainage within the Loch Leven Catchment Area Loch Leven SPA and Ramsar Site Advice for planning applicants for phosphorous and foul drainage in the catchment Supplementary Guidance 	
	<p>Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?</p>		<p>There are no local geodiversity sites or interests that could be affected.</p>	<p>GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI and Tayside Geodiversity Sites</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>0</p>

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	Site contains large wooded areas which form part of a green network which extends throughout the whole settlement. The Hatton Burn is also likely to have significant habitat value.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	-	Retain and enhance existing green network connections. Where appropriate, measures to enhance biodiversity will be implemented. Such measures may include seeding locally native species on roadside verges and other schemes, the use of locally native tree species in landscape schemes, habitat creation, habitat creation for protected species (e.g. barn owl boxes, log pile holts for otters) and the creation of greenways and wildlife corridors along transport corridors, footpaths and cycleways, to encourage the movement of species.	0
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0
Service Infrastructure							

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)		There is not sufficient capacity in Milnathort Primary school to cope with the projected growth.	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Proportional developer contributions will be sought towards primary education provision.	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	Core path close to the northern boundary of the site. Much of the site is woodland rather than open space.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	Application of Policy on the provision of open space ensures appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development proposals including secure new woodland planting and a management plan for its maintenance. Specific requirement for improvements to the core path network.	+
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	The site is proposed for solely residential purposes.	Check CFS form	-	n/a	-
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Largely greenfield but with brownfield elements	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	Restrict development to the brownfield parts of the site.	+
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	There is no peat within the soils. Entire site is prime agricultural land. No known contamination issues.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there	--	Remove good quality soils for use in other part of Perth & Kinross.	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)			
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	General market conditions have been poor so with these improving it is anticipated that it can be delivered.	Check CFS form	+	n/a	+
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	Extensive tree cover likely to provide protection from wind but may limit scope for solar gain.	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	0	Opportunities to make best use of solar gain through the detailed layout and siting of the new development. Include sustainable design and construction techniques and incorporate energy efficiency measures and make them resilient to the projected climatic changes in precipitation and temperature.	+
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?	Road access is currently from a B road and an unclassified farm road.	Check CFS form, aerial map and site visit	-	Access roads would need to be to the satisfaction of the Council as Roads Authority. Requirement to consider a second access road to Hattonburn Road.	0
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	There are no bus stops and the site is outwith the bus stop buffer. There are no services or facilities in	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer	-	n/a	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			Hattonburn itself although facilities are available in nearby Milnathort.	so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities			
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	The majority of the site lies within a consultation zone for BP pipeline.	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised) Check for pylons on OS and site visit	-	Consult HSE and operator and ensure appropriate design and layout and mitigation measures.	0
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	No – outwith a tiered settlement	NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	--	n/a	--

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	Yes – conversion of existing farm buildings	GIS aerial map/site visit	++	n/a	++
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	The site lies outwith the Loch Leven and Lomond Hills Special Landscape Area.	GIS layers for NSA, SLA	0	n/a	0
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	The site lies within the settlement boundary. Existing tree cover across much of the site.	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available Site visit	-	Requirement to retain existing trees. Designation includes an area for indicative landscaping to the east which will help reduce impact of the new build development from the B road.	0
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	No	GIS layer greenbelt	0	n/a	0
Material assets							

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	No	GIS layer for waste management sites	0	n/a	0
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	n/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	0	n/a	0
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	C Listed Hattonburn House outwith the site to the west. A number of traditional farm buildings on the site.	GIS layers Listed building, SMs, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit	-	Impacts on the historic environment will be avoided wherever possible through appropriate scheme location and design. Requirement for the sympathetic conversion of traditional buildings and also a requirement to protect the setting of Hattonburn House.	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	n/a		0	n/a	0
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	Residential development is compatible with adjacent uses.	OS map and site visit	0	Ensure appropriate design layout and building specification.	0
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	There are no known constraints, general market conditions have affected delivery of the existing LDP sites but with this improving there should be no continuing constraint.	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0

Site Name: Keltybridge 1	Source of site suggestion: All landowners/interested parties identified/aware? Lomond Group on behalf of the landowner James and John Thomson		Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals: The site lies outwith but adjacent to the settlement boundary. Resisted through previous LDP, and reporter agreed with Council's position.
Settlement: Keltybridge	GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref: Keltybridge1 Proposed Plan Ref: H158	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? outwith	
OS Grid Ref: 313911 695624	Site Size (ha): 3 hectares	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? No	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc). There is new housing to the west, open countryside to the north and east. To the south of the site existing residential properties and the Community Hall. To the north lies a substantial mature tree belt and avenue of trees originally forming part of the Blairadam estate. At the south western edge of the site is a community garden.
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc): Arable land.	Proposed Use: Residential low density 15 – 20 units and parking facilities for the adjacent Community Hall.	Officer Comments LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and its tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas. There are already sufficient housing opportunities within Keltybridge. This means that the justification for any	

		<p>additional site in a non-tiered settlement site has to be about delivering benefits and it is considered that there are no significant wider benefits to this proposal.</p> <p>Also the proposal is in a very prominent position, the scale is considered inappropriate. There would be an impact on historic character of Keltybridge and there is no defensible natural boundary to the east. The landowner could consider advance strategic planting to the north and east as this would lessen the landscape impact and improve future prospects for allocation.</p>	
--	--	---	--

Insert Location Plan

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer			
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes but with regard to current capacity in the public drainage network (Scottish Water will advise further).	GIS Layer for existing network	-	Policy Foul Drainage	0
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	No only very slight areas affected along the northern boundary which would be required for structural planting.	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	0	Apply Water Environment policy re SUDs	0
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	Possible but it is not within the Loch Leven catchment and there are no designated sites.	GIS layers SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species	0	Policy Biodiversity. Policy Foul Drainage	+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment			
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		No	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI, and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0	n/a	0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	The current landuse is agricultural. It will not result in habitat fragmentation. There are some trees bounding the site.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	Retention of trees where possible and compensatory planting if necessary, and requirement for a suitable landscape framework and strategic planting to the north and east of the site	+
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)						
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	No Cleish primary school is currently over capacity.	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Proportional developer contributions will be sought towards primary education provision.	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	There are no core paths within the site and there is no maintained open space within the site.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	Application of Open Space Policy ensures appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development proposals. A new footpath could be created linking the village directly to Lochore Meadows in Fife	+
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	No	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Greenfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	Greenfield	-
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	It is mineral soil with no peat content and it does not have any prime agricultural land.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)			
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	Yes	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	The site is relatively open to north and east. Rising levels and residential development to the west provide some protection from prevailing winds	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	-	Design and layout to maximise opportunities for solar gain.	0
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?		Check CFS form, aerial map and site visit	0	In accordance with the Roads Authority	0
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	Lies within 400 m of an existing bus stop, but the primary school is in Cleish, and services in Kelty are beyond easy active travel distance.	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services	-	n/a	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				and amenities			
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	No	<p>GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer</p> <p>Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised)</p> <p>Check for pylons on OS map and on site visit</p>	0	n/a	0
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and it's tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas.	Check NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	--	There is no significant wider benefit to justify further consideration of this proposal although it does propose additional parking for the community hall which if needed would be some benefit. That said whether this potential benefits would meet the tests	--

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
						of circular (necessary, related etc) and whether we could be secure about its delivery is questionable.	
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	No designated area will be affected.	GIS layers for NSA, and SLA	0	n/a	0
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	The site is very open to the north and east and is not well defined or contained by landscape features.	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available Site visit	--	Strategic planting to the north and east but this will take some time to establish.	-
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity	Popl and human health or material	No	GIS layer greenbelt	0		0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	of the greenbelt?	assets					
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	N/a	GIS layer for waste management sites	n/a	n/a	n/a
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	n/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	n/a	n/a	n/a
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	There are listed buildings to the south and west of the site with the potential to affect the setting of these.	GIS layers Listed building, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape, Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit	-	Protect the setting of nearby listed buildings	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	N/a		n/a		n/a
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	It is compatible with residential areas nearby	OS map and site visit	0	0	0
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	Potentially marketability given its scale.	Check CFS form	-		-


Site Name: OP24	Source of site suggestion: Adopted LDP Existing site		Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals:
Settlement: Kinross	GIS Site Ref: OP24 MIR Site Ref: E Pre-MIR Site Ref: Proposed Plan Ref: OP24	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? Inside settlement boundary	<p>This is an allocated site within the 2014 adopted Local Development Plan.</p> <p>Planning applications were made by the previous owner to convert the building and land into various uses. The block of flats on the previous Town Hall land located to the east were built in 2014 as part of the overall development but the conversion element to the existing buildings were never carried out.</p> <p>Planning and listed building applications are currently under consideration for change of use and alterations to former hall, public library and post office for form 9 flats and replacement windows and doors.</p> <p>This site is supported in the current LDP but did not benefit from a full SEA assessment.</p>
OS Grid Ref: 703228 311024	Site Size (ha):	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? Tier 2	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc). This is a brownfield site for the conversion of an existing building within the settlement boundary for Kinross.
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc):	Proposed Use: Conversion to accommodate one or more of the following uses: community, retail, office, hotel, residential.	Officer Comments This is an allocated site within the 2014 adopted Local Development Plan for the redevelopment of Kinross Town Hall.	

Brownfield/Conversion

The site lies within the conservation area for Kinross. There are two listed buildings within the site boundary:

- category C listed building – Carnegie Public Library
- category B listed building Former Town Hall

The proposal seeks to make use of these buildings and ensure a sympathetic scheme for the restoration and reuse of listed buildings.



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	The groundwater waterbody classification is good.	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer	-	Provided by application of policies on water environment and drainage and on drainage within Loch Leven which offer potential to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – connection to public sewerage system + must meet discharge consents at the waste water treatment works, and requiring appropriate SUDS.	0
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes it lies close enough to the existing network	GIS Layer for existing network	+	N/A	+
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	No known flood risk.	Checked all the GIS Layers for flood risk	+	N/A	+
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and	Bio flora and	There are no relevant designations, or non-designated features within	GIS layers	--	Where appropriate, measures to enhance biodiversity will be	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	fauna interests?	fauna	<p>this site.</p> <p>It lies within the Loch Leven Valley catchment so there is a possible impact on this.</p>	<p>SAC/SPA/SSSI/NNR/TPO/protected species</p> <p>Loch Leven Catchment</p> <p>Lunan Valley catchment</p> <p>River Tay Catchment</p>		<p>implemented.</p> <p>Policies Water Environment and Drainage and Loch Leven.</p> <p>Where activities could directly, indirectly or in combination with other proposals affect the interests of a Natura 2000 site, the Council will carry out an Habitat Regulations Appraisal to identify appropriate mitigation and to determine if proposals would have an adverse effect on the integrity of the site</p>	
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		There are no local geodiversity sites or known geodiversity interests within the site.	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI, and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0	N/A	0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	<p>This site is located within a built up settlement and involved the reuse of an existing so it is unlikely to result in habitat fragmentation.</p> <p>However development on this site could create more habitats within the built up area.</p>	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	Where appropriate, measures to enhance biodiversity will be implemented.	+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	No	GIS layers	0	N/A	0
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	This would be dependent on the use. If it were residential, there is not sufficient capacity in Kinross Primary school to cope with the projected growth.	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Proportional developer contributions will be sought towards primary education provision.	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	This development is unlikely to have a significant effect on open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	N/A	0
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	Dependant on use - could potentially create employment opportunities.	Check CFS form	0	N/A	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Brownfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	+	N/A	+
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	This site is within a built up area with no carbon rich soils or prime agricultural land.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	0	N/A	0
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	Yes	Check CFS form	0	N/A	0
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	This is in an existing built up environment and stands taller than neighbouring building so could make use of solar gain.	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	+	Design of buildings to take account of solar orientation.	+
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of	Material assets and climatic	The site could be accessed off Kinross High Street.	Site visit Check CFS form	+	Access road would need to be delivered to the satisfaction of the Council as Roads Authority	+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	accommodating traffic generated?	factors?		Aerial map			
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	The site is well located for active travel access to shops and schools and the town centre.	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities	+	N/A	+
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	No	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised)	0	N/A	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Check for pylons on OS map and site visit			
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	This site is in line with the TAYplan hierarchy of development.	NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	+	N/A	+
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	Yes, development of this site includes the conversion of an existing building.	GIS aerial map/site visit	+	N/A	+
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	There are no landscape designated sites within the site. Retaining the existing town hall will have a positive impact on the townscape of Kinross.	GIS layers for NSA, SLA	+	N/A	+
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	No	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using	0	N/A	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				capacity study if one is available Site visit			
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	No	GIS layer greenbelt	0	N/A	0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	No	GIS layer for waste management sites	0	N/A	0
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	N/A	Check Zero Waste Plan	0	N/A	0
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological	The site lies within the conservation area for Kinross. There are two listed buildings within	GIS layers Listed building, SAMs,	++	Sensitive conversion and refurbishment.	++


	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
		heritage (and links with landscape)	<p>the site boundary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> category C listed building – Carnegie Public Library category B listed building Former Town Hall <p>The proposal seeks to make use of these buildings and ensure a sympathetic scheme for the restoration and reuse of listed buildings.</p>	<p>Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape Battlefields, Archaeology</p> <p>Site visit</p>			
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	This site will include the redevelopment of listed buildings and so enhance the historic environment.		++		++
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	Yes this is a built up area in the centre of the town.	OS map and site visit	+		+
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	Being a listed building means that there are some abnormal costs associated to its redevelopment , general market conditions have	Check CFS form	0		0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			affected delivery of the existing LDP sites but with this improving there should be no significant continuing constraint.				

Site Name: OP11 Turfhill Motorway Service Area	Source of site suggestion: Adopted LDP allocated site		Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals: This is an allocated site within the 2014 adopted Local Development Plan. Planning permission most recently granted 14/00403/FLM. It is now thought to have lapsed 16 May 2017 as there is no record of commencement of development.
Settlement: Kinross	GIS Site Ref: Op11 MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref: Proposed Plan Ref:	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? Outside settlement boundary. The M90 motorway forms the western boundary of the settlement and the motorway services area lies immediately west of that	
OS Grid Ref: 702898 310804 (from GIS)	Site Size (ha): 5	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? Tier 2	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc). The topography of the site is generally flat with open fields and tree belts. There is a small cluster of roadside services and retailing in the area with the filling station on this site, and a hotel and garden centre and some isolated houses to the west. To the east across the M90 motorway junction lies the town of Kinross, however pedestrian access across this elevated roundabout is not easy and the services although near to the town are divorced from its population.
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc): Motorway service area	Proposed Use: The Adopted LDP encourages improvements to existing motorway service area and creation of tourism related retailing targeted at the travelling public using the strategic road network	Officer Comments This is an allocated site within the 2014 adopted Local Development Plan. In principle the existing motorway service area is at an important junction on the M90 motorway and the A977 trunk road. Its proposed redevelopment would remain appropriate as it is focused on serving travellers' needs and not local needs However almost all the site is now within a SEPA medium risk of river flooding. The flood water on this site is derived from the South Queich with the out of bank flow path originating 3km to the west of the site. This out	

		<p>of bank flow transects numerous fields and enters the development site. As a result there is significant uncertainty regarding the flood map in this area and SEPA feel it does not warrant the removal of this allocation, but request a flood risk assessment is required as a developer requirement.</p>	
--	--	--	--

--



© Crown copyright [and database rights] 2016 OS [100016971]. You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data. You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	<p>There are no watercourses at the site but the Ury Burn passes along the north boundary.</p> <p>Groundwater classification is overall good, with no identified pressures. Associated with the Strathmore/Fife nitrate vulnerable zone; and the Kinross sand and gravel, and the Carnbo drinking water protection zones.</p> <p>Not in a waste water drainage hot spot</p>	<p>Check on OS map</p> <p>GIS Landuse layer</p> <p>Waste water drainage hotspots</p> <p>Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer</p>	-	Provided by application of policies on water environment and drainage and on drainage within Loch Leven which offer potential to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – connection to public sewerage system + must meet discharge consents at the waste water treatment works, and requiring appropriate SUDS.	0
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes it lies close enough to the existing network, but awaiting further comment from Scottish Water	GIS Layer for existing network	+	n/a	+
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	<p>Almost all the site is now within a SEPA medium risk of river flooding.</p> <p>The flood water on this site is derived from the South Quiech with the out of bank flow path originating</p>	Checked all the GIS Layers for flood risk	--	A flood risk assessment is required as a developer requirement.	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			3km to the west of the site. This out of bank flow transects numerous fields and enters the development site. As a result there is significant uncertainty regarding the flood map in this area and SEPA feel it does not warrant the removal of this allocation, but request a flood risk assessment is required as a developer requirement.				
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	<p>There are no relevant designations, or non-designated features within this site.</p> <p>It lies within the Loch Leven Valley catchment so there is a possible impact on this.</p>	<p>GIS layers</p> <p>SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species</p> <p>Loch Leven Catchment</p> <p>Lunan Valley catchment</p> <p>River Tay Catchment</p>	--	<p>Where appropriate, measures to enhance biodiversity will be implemented.</p> <p>Policies Water Environment and Drainage and Loch Leven.</p> <p>Where activities could directly, indirectly or in combination with other proposals affect the interests of a Natura 2000 site, the Council will carry out an Habitat Regulations Appraisal to identify appropriate mitigation and to determine if proposals would have an adverse effect on the integrity of the site</p>	0
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		There are no local geodiversity sites or known geodiversity interests within the site.	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI, and	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Tayside Geodiversity Sites			
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	This site is on the periphery of the settlement and adjacent to the M90 motorway and A977 trunk road. Because it is already in use as a motorway service area, it is unlikely to contribute to habitat. The fields to the north and west are open in character but in agricultural use.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	Where appropriate, measures to enhance biodiversity will be implemented.	+
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	Redevelopment of this site for enhanced motorway service area and tourism related retailing would not necessarily increase the volume of traffic on the motorway but it would result in more vehicles stopping at the service area than currently do so. There is no Air Quality Management Area in the town.	GIS layers	-	Application of environmental protection policy on Air Quality Motorway Service Area could be equipped with clean technology to allow use by electric and other zero emission vehicles	0
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	The proposal is not expected to serve the local community in which it is located. It's next to a roundabout on the strategic road network and would be expected to serve only those travellers and not serve a local	GIS Layers for school catchments	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			need.				
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	This development is unlikely to have a significant effect on open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space. There is no open space at the site and no rights of way or core paths in the area	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	n/a	0
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	Dependant on use - could potentially create employment opportunities. Increased employment opportunities are forecast	Check CFS form	+	n/a	+
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Brownfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	+	n/a	+
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	This site is already a built up area with no carbon rich soils or prime agricultural land.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	Yes	Check CFS form	0	N/A	0
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	This is in an existing built up site and could make good use of solar gain.	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	+	Design of buildings to take account of solar orientation.	+
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?	The site is accessed directly from the busy A977 trunk road. This makes it convenient for motorway and trunk road traffic (customers) but less convenient for the relatively low number of staff who may wish to cycle, walk or take public transport.	Site visit Check CFS form Aerial map	0	Application of transport and accessibility policy, that requires consideration of the impact of the proposal on the transport network	+
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	The site is remote from the town's High Street, where the majority of public services are located. The nearest bus stops are at Kinross Park and Ride; and Station Road, both of which lie across the motorway junction.	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities	-	Application of transport and accessibility policy that requires development proposals to be well served and easily accessible by all modes of transport, while reducing travel demand by car	+
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any	Material Assets and	The site is approx. 1 Km south east of the BP pipeline consultation zone.	GIS layers for pylons, gas	-	Application of airfield safeguarding policy that	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Population and Human Health	There are other consultation zones nearby although further away. It is also within the Balado airfield safeguarding consultation zone	pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised) Check for pylons on OS map and site visit		requires consultation with the airfield operator in respect of any development proposals	
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets		NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	0	n/a	0
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No, the proposal is for demolition of the existing buildings and redevelopment of the site	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Landscape Designated sites							



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	The site is on the periphery of the town but there are no landscape designated sites within the site.	GIS layers for NSA, SLA	+	n/a	+
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	This site is already in use.	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available Site visit	0	A landscaping framework could improve its setting.	+
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	No	GIS layer greenbelt	0	n/a	0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	The nearest recycling point is nearby at Sainsbury's superstore	GIS layer for waste management sites	0	N/A	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	n/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	0	N/A	0
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	<p>The site lies on the historic site of the Turfhills Military Camp and immediately to the west outside the site boundary is Turfhills House, which is a Category B listed building.</p> <p>The nearby Balado Bridge airfield to the west is also identified as of archaeological importance</p> <p>The proposal seeks to make use of these buildings and ensure a sympathetic scheme for the restoration and reuse of listed buildings.</p>	<p>GIS layers</p> <p>Listed building, SAMs, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape Battlefields, Archaeology</p> <p>Site visit</p>	-	Application of historic environment policy, which presumes against development that would have an adverse impact on archaeology and protects areas of known archaeological interest and their setting	0


	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	None		0	n/a	0
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	Yes the existing motorway service area is at an important junction on the M90 motorway and the A977 trunk road. Its proposed redevelopment would remain appropriate as it is focused on serving travellers' needs and not local needs. It is not near large housing areas where it's operation would impact on nearby residents.	OS map and site visit	+	n/a	+
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	None	Check CFS form	0		0

Site Name: Perth Road Cemetery Proposal	Source of site suggestion: PKC suggested site.		Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals: No previous significant site history
Settlement: Milnathort	GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref:	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? Adjacent to settlement boundary.	
OS Grid Ref: 313858 705113	Site Size (ha): 15.3ha	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? Adjacent to Kinross/Milnathort Tier 2	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc). Relatively flat site, with open aspect. Burleigh burn running through the centre of the site. Accesses from Perth Road to the north. Residential properties to the north and west of the site.
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc): Agricultural land	Proposed Use: Cemetery – Area of Search	Officer Comments Edge of settlement site. Current agricultural use. Generally flat site with some minor undulations. Very little natural screening, Burleigh Castle and further agricultural land to the south of the site. Some high risk of surface and river flooding on site. Perth Road to the north with existing access points.	

Kinross and Milnathort

-  Settlement Boundary
-  Proposed Cemetery

N
1:9,000



© Crown copyright [and database rights] 2017 OS 100016971
You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data.
You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	Burleigh Burn runs through the site. No known field drains on site. No waste water drainage hotspot.	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer	-	Accord with SEPA guidelines for the burial of bodies. Application of Water Environment and Drainage policies offer potential to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment; connection to public sewerage system and meet discharge consents at the waste water treatment works. Drainage impact assessment/hydrology study required where development has the potential to affect natural hydrology systems and or adversely affects water resources. Sustainable drainage system required.	0
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Assume connection could be made if required.	GIS Layer for existing network	-	Application of Water Environment and Drainage policies.	0
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional	Water, Climatic Factors and	Minor parts of site at high, medium and low probability for surface water flooding. Risk of river flooding at	Check all the GIS Layers for	-	Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment likely to be required to assess	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	flood risk elsewhere?	Human Health	Burleigh burn.	flood risk		the risk of flooding, including from any required infrastructure.	
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	Site falls within the Loch Leven Catchment area. Riparian environment adjacent to Burleigh Burn.	GIS layers SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment	-	Application of Loch Leven catchment policy. Protection of riparian environment adjacent to Burleigh Burn, particularly during any construction works. Retention of important trees and woodland, where applicable.	0
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		No	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI, and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	n/a	n/a	n/a
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	Site is currently an open agricultural field setting with burn running through the middle.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	-	Riparian area adjacent to Burleigh Burn to be protected through application of Biodiversity Policies.	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
					0	Where appropriate, measures to enhance biodiversity will be implemented. Such measures may include seeding locally native species on roadside verges and other schemes, the use of locally native tree species in landscape schemes, habitat creation, habitat creation for protected species (e.g. barn owl boxes) and the creation of greenways and wildlife corridors along transport corridors, footpaths and cycleways, to encourage the movement of species.	+
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	No	GIS Layers	n/a	n/a	n/a
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	Proposal would enhance community facilities in the form of providing extra cemetery capacity and would increase the amount of functional	GIS Layers for school catchments	+		+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			open space on the edge of the settlement.				
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	As proposal is for cemetery, the site would remain as open space so no amenity value would be lost. Core paths within the site to be retained.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	+	Proposal would result in the creation of a new formal open space and through the application of Transport and Accessibility policies, connectivity and accessibility to the site would be optimised including linking in with existing paths network, including core paths.	++
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	No	Check CFS form	n/a	N/A	n/a
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Loss of greenfield land.	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	Re-use any valuable soil resource in local area.	-
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	Mineral soil (no peat). An area of approximately 1.9ha of agricultural land to the north east of the site is within Class 3.1 (prime).	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	-	Good quality soils should be removed for use in other parts of Perth and Kinross.	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	Potentially, although an allocation would provide long term certainty for future cemetery provision in Kinross.	Check CFS form	n/a		n/a
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	South facing site with limited shelter to the western section of the site from existing building to west and south.	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	0	n/a	0
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?	Existing accesses on to Perth Road could be upgraded.	Site visit Check CFS form aerial map	0	Access roads would need to be delivered to the satisfaction of the Council as Roads Authority.	0
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	Pedestrian access to bus stop and wider services in the settlement.	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities	0	Extension of bus services should be considered to serve visitors to the cemetery – the bus service may be better utilised.	+
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any	Material Assets and	No. Overhead cables running through eastern section of the site.	GIS layers for pylons, gas	0		0


	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Population and Human Health		<p>pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer</p> <p>Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised)</p> <p>Check for pylons on OS map and on site visit</p>			
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	No	Check NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	n/a		n/a
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	n/a	GIS aerial map/site visit	n/a		n/a
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs, and local landscape designations?	Landscape	The site falls within the Loch Leven and Lomond Hills Special Landscape Area (SLA).	GIS layers for NSA, and SLA	-	<p>Application of landscape policies and Landscape SG.</p> <p>The site would require to be sensitively planned with</p>	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
						appropriate landscaping and boundary treatments to ensure the character, setting and landscape value of the SLA is preserved.	
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	Site is generally open in aspect and the open fields provide views of the Lomond Regional Hills and wider area from the north.	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available Site visit	-	Application of landscape policies and Landscape SG. The site would require to be sensitively planned with appropriate landscaping and boundary treatments to ensure the character, setting and landscape value of the SLA is preserved.	0
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	No	GIS layer greenbelt	n/a		n/a
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	No	GIS layer for waste management sites	n/a		n/a

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	n/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	n/a		n/a
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	<p>Burleigh Castle (Scheduled Ancient Monument) is located to the south of the site.</p> <p>There are two archaeological sites (Huttonburn Bridge and Burleigh Rectilinear enclosure) within the eastern section of the field which would require protection and/or further investigative works.</p>	GIS layers Listed building, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape, Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit	-	<p>Impacts on the historic environment will be avoided wherever possible through appropriate scheme location and design in line with historic environment policies.</p> <p>Archaeological sites located within the site will be protected through appropriate site design and layout. Further investigative studies may be required based on site layout and proximity of proposed development to sites.</p>	0
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with	Archaeological sites within the site.		0	Existing archaeological sites within the site proposal could incorporate measures to improve accessibility and education of these assets.	+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
		landscape					
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	Neighbouring uses are residential and agricultural (with an employment land allocation to the north) and would generally be compatible.	OS map and site visit	0		0
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	Site not owned by PKC.	Check CFS form	n/a		n/a

Site Name: Kinross 1	Source of site suggestion: All landowners/interested parties identified/aware? Wallace Land Investment & Management on behalf of J Russell Esq		Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals: Sits within the settlement boundary within an open space allocation. It was supported by the Council up until the Proposed Plan stage but the Reporter took it out at Examination stage principally due to concerns about cutting off the link between the park and housing and the lack of an access to the north onto Gallowhill road, and a lack of need for additional housing land.
Settlement: Kinross	GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: E Pre-MIR Site Ref: Kinross1 Proposed Plan Ref: H136	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? Inside settlement boundary	
OS Grid Ref: 703228 311024	Site Size (ha): 8.5 hectares	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? Tier 2	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc). Site is agricultural land to the west of Kinross running along the eastern edge of the motorway.
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc): Greenfield	Proposed Use: Residential	Officer Comments Issues which led to it being removed from the last LDP still remain, and there are better alternative options.	



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	Possibly. There is some field drainage in the northern part of the site. The groundwater status is good. It is not in a waste water drainage hotspot.	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer	-	Provided by application of policies (water environment) and (Loch Leven) which offer potential to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – connection to public sewerage system + must meet discharge consents at the waste water treatment works, and requiring appropriate SUDS. Drainage impact assessment/hydrology study required where development has the potential to affect natural hydrology systems and or adversely affects water resources.	0
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes it lies close enough to the existing network	GIS Layer for existing network	+	Policy Water Environment and Drainage	+
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human	Some high probability of surface water issues to the north of site associated to field drain and also small areas adjacent Torridon Place	Checked all the GIS Layers for flood risk	-	Basic FRA required at planning application stage to define area at risk and appropriate detailed design layout and levels.	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
		Health	<p>and Tummel Place.</p> <p>Historic records of flooding in the Kinross area. Potential for development of the site to increase the probability of flooding elsewhere</p>				
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	<p>There are no relevant designations, or non-designated features within this site.</p> <p>It lies within the Loch Leven Valley catchment so there is a possible impact on this.</p> <p>There is a <i>Pipistrellus pipistrellus</i> (Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Schedule 5) recorded siting within the southern part of the site.</p>	<p>GIS layers</p> <p>SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species</p> <p>Loch Leven Catchment</p> <p>Lunan Valley catchment</p> <p>River Tay Catchment</p>	-	<p>Policy Biodiversity.</p> <p>Retention of important trees, structural planting, hedgerows etc and require additional structural planting along the western edge of the site.</p> <p>Design Brief must include a landscape character assessment which should identify trees and woodland that require to be retained within development site.</p> <p>Policies Water Environment and Drainage and Loch Leven.</p> <p>Where activities could directly, indirectly or in combination with other proposals affect the interests of a Natura 2000 site, the Council will carry out an Habitat Regulations Appraisal to identify appropriate mitigation and to determine if proposals would have an adverse effect</p>	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
						<p>on the integrity of the site</p> <p>This site was screened out during the HRA process because:</p> <p>The Ury Burn is culverted under the southern part of the site. It enters from the west and flows eastwards under the town before resurfacing north of Sunny Park, then flowing on into Loch Leven (SPA). However, due to the distance of the site proposal from the SPA (approximately 2170m away) it is considered that any potential significant effects will be minimal.</p>	
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		There are no local geodiversity sites or known geodiversity interests within the site.	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI, and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0	n/a	0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	There is some woodland screening to the south western edge of the site.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	<p>Retaining woodland in line with Scottish Government Control of Woodland Removal policy.</p> <p>Require structural planting along the western edge of the site.</p>	+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	No	GIS layers	0	n/a	0
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	There is not sufficient capacity in Kinross Primary school to cope with the projected growth.	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Proportional developer contributions will be sought towards primary education provision.	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	There is a core path running along the eastern boundary of the site. Proposal is for section of this from Springfield road to behind Katrine to be widened and made into a vehicular access for the development. The remaining pathway is proposed to be maintained as is. There is an amenity/accessibility impact on Davies Park amenity greenspace from the access road.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	-	Application of Policy Open Space ensuring appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development proposals. If possible take a direct access off the roundabout/A922 to avoid/minimise amenity/accessibility impacts on the park.	-
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment	Population	No	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	land/opportunities?						
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Greenfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	n/a	-
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	There is no peat within the soil. The northern portion of the site opposite Renton Drive lies within prime agricultural land.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	-	Good quality soils should be removed for use in other parts of Perth and Kinross.	0
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	Unclear how they can address the issues with the access	Check CFS form	-	n/a	-
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	The site is west facing and has some shelter in the southern part of it from existing planting along its boundary with the motorway.	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	--	Require structural shelter planting Design of buildings to take account of solar orientation.	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	<p>Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities -</p> <p>Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?</p>	Material assets and climatic factors?	<p>Needs an access onto Gallowhill Road, and for a direct access from the roundabout/A922 to be investigated.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment would be undertaken to accompany any planning application for this site to demonstrate that the site will not impact on the road networks.</p>	<p>Site visit</p> <p>Check CFS form</p> <p>Aerial map</p>	--	<p>Requires an access onto Gallowhill (but this is not being proposed and it is unclear whether there is the necessary landowner support to deliver this)</p> <p>Consider a direct access from the roundabout/A922</p>	--
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	<p>The site is relatively well located for active travel access to shops and schools and the town centre.</p> <p>The site lies close to bus stops on Morlich Place and Sutherland Drive and Gallowhill Road.</p>	<p>GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance</p> <p>Check distance to local services and amenities</p>	+	n/a	+
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	Overhead power cables run along the eastern boundary of the site, crossing the preferred access point towards the south.	<p>GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer</p> <p>Check the health and</p>	-	Divert power cables	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised) Check for pylons on OS map and site visit			
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	No but the proposal is within a Tier 2 settlement	NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	0	n/a	0
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	There are no landscape designated sites within the site.	GIS layers for NSA, SLA	0	n/a	0
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to	Landscape	Site would be very visible from the motorway to the west and Gallowhill Road to the north. Existing planting on the southern boundary would	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild	-	Structural planting along the western boundary with the motorway.	0


	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	accommodate it? (see notes)		screen the site from Station Road. The David Tyldesley and Associates Settlement Strategy Landscape Capacity Study identifies this area as having potential for development without significant effects on landscape character or visual amenity.	land Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available Site visit			
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	N/a	GIS layer greenbelt	0	n/a	0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	N/a	GIS layer for waste management sites	0	n/a	0
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	N/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	0		0
Cultural Heritage							

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	There is an archaeological record for the Kinross Turfmill Military Camp in the southern part of the site.	GIS layers Listed building, SAMs, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit	-	Impacts on the historic environment will be avoided wherever possible through appropriate scheme location and design Recording of any features found in investigation	0
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	Possibly		-	Recording of any features found in investigation	+
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	Motorway to the West. Noise assessment would be required.	OS map and site visit	-	Noise assessment would be required. Noise impacts will be reduced with the use of low noise road surfacing, landscaping and acoustic screening, if this is appropriate to the surrounding area.	0
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership,	Material	Question mark over ability to provide	Check CFS	-	Landowner agreement to	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	marketability etc.	Assets	vehicular access onto the Gallowhill road	form		enable vehicular access onto the Gallowhill Road	

<p>Site Name: Kinross 2</p>	<p>Source of site suggestion: All landowners/interested parties identified/aware?</p> <p>Wallace Land Investment & Management on behalf of J Russell Esq</p>		<p>Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals:</p> <p>Sits outwith the settlement boundary within an open space allocation. A site here was supported by the Council up until the Proposed Plan stage but the Reporter took it out at Examination stage.</p>
<p>Settlement: Kinross</p>	<p>GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: B Pre-MIR Site Ref: Kinross2 Proposed Plan Ref: E137</p>	<p>Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? Outside settlement boundary</p>	
<p>OS Grid Ref: 310580 702466</p>	<p>Site Size (ha): 48 hectares (estimated 18 hectares deliverable subject to FRA)</p>	<p>Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier?</p> <p>Tier 2</p>	<p>Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc).</p>
<p>Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc):</p> <p>Greenfield and roads depot</p>	<p>Proposed Use:</p> <p>Employment and related uses - a range of uses such as leisure, speciality shopping and commercial including a 60 bed hotel. In addition, 'traditional' employment opportunities such as small workshops and serviced offices could be created to meet local needs. The site also includes green buffer to Balado.</p>	<p>Officer Comments</p> <p>The town centre first policy of TAYplan encourages land uses that generate significant footfall in town centres ahead of other locations (including retail, commercial leisure, offices)</p> <p>The Reporter recommended this site was removed from the current LDP and the reasons of: sufficient supply within more appropriate locations east of the M90; abnormal infrastructure costs; need for active travel improvements to junction 6 of the M90, which are still considered to be relevant.</p> <p>Whilst the Council has previously supported part of this site for general employment uses there is already sufficient flexibility and choice of</p>	<p>Land at Turfhill, Kinross the majority of which is in agricultural use but the eastern part of the site also includes the Council's Roads Depot adjacent to the M90, some woodland, and some natural scrubland. The Depot contains three warehouse sheds. A bungalow is located on the northern edge of the site. The boundary of the site to the motorway is generally open.</p>

effective sites for this purpose within Kinross.



Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
---	---------------------------------	---------	---	--------------------------	--	---------------------------

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	Possibly. The South Queich runs through part of the site. The groundwater status is good. It is not in a waste water drainage hotspot.	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer	-	Provided by application of policies Water Environment and Drainage and for Loch Leven which offer potential to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – connection to public sewerage system + must meet discharge consents at the waste water treatment works, and requiring appropriate SUDS. Drainage impact assessment/hydrology study required where development has the potential to affect natural hydrology systems and or adversely affects water resources.	0
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes it lies close enough to the existing network (but awaiting further comment from Scottish Water regarding capacity)	GIS Layer for existing network	+	Policy Water Environment and Drainage	+
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	Large areas in the southern part of the site are at medium risk of River flooding. Also large areas of surface water high probability south of the depot	Checked all the GIS Layers for flood risk	-	Detailed FRA required at planning application stage to define area at risk and appropriate detailed design layout and levels.	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			<p>and a smaller area west of the Gardeners Cottage.</p> <p>Historic records of flooding in the Kinross area. Potential for development of the site to increase the probability of flooding elsewhere.</p>				
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	<p>There are no relevant designations, or non-designated features within this site.</p> <p>It lies within the Loch Leven Valley catchment so there is a possible impact on this.</p> <p>There is a European otter (Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Schedule 5) recorded siting within the site.</p>	<p>GIS layers</p> <p>SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species</p> <p>Loch Leven Catchment</p> <p>Lunan Valley catchment</p> <p>River Tay Catchment</p>	-	<p>Policy Biodiversity.</p> <p>Retention of important trees, structural planting, hedgerows etc. Provision of a landscape plan identifying further planting and appropriate measures.</p> <p>Policies Water Environment and Drainage and for Loch Leven.</p> <p>Where activities could directly, indirectly or in combination with other proposals affect the interests of a Natura 2000 site, the Council will carry out an Habitat Regulations Appraisal to identify appropriate mitigation and to determine if proposals would have an adverse effect on the integrity of the site</p> <p>HRA identifies the following criteria to the developer requirements section:</p> <p>Construction Method</p>	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
						<p>Statement to be provided where the development site will affect a watercourse.</p> <p>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 SPA.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Existing measures within the LDP will provide an additional safeguard against any impact of this policy include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy International Nature Conservation Sites Policy Water Quality Policy Foul Drainage Policy Surface Water Drainage Policy Drainage within the Loch Leven Catchment Area Loch Leven SPA and Ramsar Site Advice for planning applicants for phosphorous and foul drainage in the catchment 	

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
						<p>Supplementary Guidance</p> <p>Where appropriate, measures to enhance biodiversity will be implemented. Such measures may include seeding locally native species on roadside verges and other schemes, the use of locally native tree species in landscape schemes, habitat creation, habitat creation for protected species (e.g. barn owl boxes, log pile holts for otters) and the creation of greenways and wildlife corridors along transport corridors, footpaths and cycle ways, to encourage the movement of species.</p>	
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		There are no local geodiversity sites or known geodiversity interests within the site.	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0	n/a	0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or	Bio flora and fauna	There is some woodland screening to the south western edge of the site.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	<p>Retaining woodland in line with Scottish Government Control of Woodland Removal policy.</p> <p>Require structural planting</p>	+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	greater connectivity?					<p>along the western edge of the site.</p> <p>Where appropriate, measures to enhance biodiversity will be implemented. Such measures may include seeding locally native species on roadside verges and other schemes, the use of locally native tree species in landscape schemes, habitat creation, habitat creation for protected species (e.g. barn owl boxes, log pile holts for otters) and the creation of greenways and wildlife corridors along transport corridors, footpaths and cycleways, to encourage the movement of species.</p>	
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on	Popl and	Proposal looks to create new	GIS Layers for	--	n/a	--

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	human health or material assets	facilities. The town centre first policy of TAYplan encourages land uses that generate significant footfall in town centres ahead of other locations (including retail, commercial leisure, offices)	school catchments			
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	There is no protected open space onsite.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	-	Application of Policy Open space retention and provision ensuring appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development proposals.	0
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	Yes but there are sufficient alternative opportunity sites within Kinross	Check CFS form	+	n/a	+
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Greenfield/the Roads depot	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	n/a	-
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	There is no peat within the soil. There is an area of prime agricultural land within the eastern part of the site.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime	-	Good quality soils should be removed for use in other parts of Perth and Kinross.	-

Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			agricultural land (LCA 50K)			
Deliverability/sustainability constraints						
Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	Developer suggests it could be.	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0
Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	The site could make the most of the south facing aspect in its layout but is currently quite an open site for the prevailing winds.	Check CFS form, aerial map and site visit	--	Require structural shelter planting Design of buildings to take account of solar orientation. Include sustainable design and construction techniques and incorporate energy efficiency measures and make them resilient to the projected climatic changes in precipitation and temperature	0
Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?	A Transport Assessment would be undertaken to accompany any planning application for this site to demonstrate that the site will not impact on the road networks.	Check CFS form, aerial map and site visit	0	Access road would need to be delivered in conjunction with adjacent site proposals to the satisfaction of the Council as Roads Authority.	0
Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	The site is relatively well located for active travel distance to the supermarket but is 1,000m plus from the High St and there is a need to improve pedestrian linkages to east	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within	--	New bus stops, pedestrian crossings to connect the development to existing public transport services and existing	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			of the M90.	easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities		footways. There is a need to improve pedestrian linkages to east of the M90.	
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	The site has some power lines running through the southern part of the site.	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised) Check for pylons on OS and site visit	0	Power lines could be diverted if necessary.	0
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic	Material Assets	No the town centre first policy of TAYplan encourages land uses that generate significant footfall in town centres ahead of other locations	NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	--	n/a	--

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Development Plan?		(including retail, commercial leisure, offices)				
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	There are no landscape designated sites within the site.	GIS layers for NSA, SLA	0	n/a	0
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	<p>The site lies beyond the current limits of the settlement on the other side of the M9 and if developed as suggested would not retain much of a gap with Balado. It is also quite an open/highly visible site in approaches from the west (Balado) and the north/south.</p> <p>The David Tyldesley and Associates Settlement Strategy Landscape Capacity Study does not identify this area as having potential for development, and suggests that development south of the A977 should be avoided if possible but the highways depot should be subject to a strategic landscaping scheme to mitigate its impact on the landscape and visual amenity.</p>	<p>Check LDP</p> <p>GIS layer wild land</p> <p>Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available</p> <p>Site visit</p>	--	Develop a landscape strategy and identify structural planting opportunities to mitigate the impact and scale back the extent of the site particularly to the south.	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	N/a	GIS layer greenbelt	0	n/a	0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	N/a	GIS layer for waste management sites	0	n/a	0
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	N/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	0	n/a	0
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	There are no relevant cultural heritage designations within the site. There is B listed Turfmills House to the north whose setting could potentially be affected.	GIS layers Listed building, SAMs, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape Battlefields,	-	Impacts on the historic environment will be avoided wherever possible through appropriate scheme location and design	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Archaeology Site visit			
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	N/a		0	n/a	0
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	Motorway immediately to the west. Noise assessment would be required.	OS map and site visit	-	Noise assessment would be required. Noise impacts will be reduced by identifying mitigation measures.	0
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	There are no known constraints	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0

<p>Site Name: Kinross 3</p>	<p>Source of site suggestion: All landowners/interested parties identified/aware?</p> <p>David Wilson Homes/ Barratt Homes on behalf of the Lethangie Trust</p>		<p>Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals:</p> <p>Sits within the settlement boundary as an opportunity site 15 for primary school. At Examination stage the Council suggested it would raise no objection to the site uses to including 'Primary School with Residential on the remainder of the site developed through a Masterplan'. However because this was not consulted on through the MIR or Proposed Plan of the LDP and there was adequate provision elsewhere this was not supported by the Reporter.</p>
<p>Settlement: Kinross</p>	<p>GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: N/a Pre-MIR Site Ref: Kinross3 Proposed Plan Ref: H138</p>	<p>Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? Inside settlement boundary</p>	
<p>OS Grid Ref: 703683 311988</p>	<p>Site Size (ha): 5.5 hectares</p>	<p>Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier?</p> <p>Tier 2</p>	<p>Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc).</p> <p>Relatively level agricultural land which lies to the east of the Loch Leven community campus and south of school playing fields and is well contained with a mature setting of woodland to the east and south.</p>
<p>Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc):</p> <p>Greenfield</p>	<p>Proposed Use: Residential with ancillary uses as required.</p>	<p>Officer Comments</p> <p>There is planning merit in considering this site for residential/or community and residential as a non-preferred option, it is visually well contained and is well related to services.</p>	

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	Possibly. The groundwater waterbody classification is good. It is not in a waste water drainage hotspot.	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer	-	Provided by application of policies on water environment and drainage and on drainage within Loch Leven which offer potential to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – connection to public sewerage system + must meet discharge consents at the waste water treatment works, and requiring appropriate SUDS.	0
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes it lies close enough to the existing network	GIS Layer for existing network	+	Policy on waste water drainage	+
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	Also small pocket of surface water low probability at south east corner of the site and small pocket of medium probability surface water flood risk in the south western corner.	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	-	Detailed FRA required at planning application stage to define area at risk and appropriate detailed design layout and levels and SUDS.	0
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	<p>There are no relevant designations, or non-designated features within this site.</p> <p>It lies within the Loch Leven Valley catchment so there is a possible impact on this.</p> <p>There is a Water vole (Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Schedule 5) recorded siting to the north of the site.</p>	<p>GIS layers</p> <p>SAC/SPA/SSSI/NNR/TPO/protected species</p> <p>Loch Leven Catchment</p> <p>Lunan Valley catchment</p> <p>River Tay Catchment</p>	-	<p>Policy Biodiversity.</p> <p>Retention of important trees. Provision of a landscape plan.</p> <p>Landscaping/tree planting to be an integral part of all development schemes, designed to enhance the setting and development site and mitigate effects of climate change and mitigate effects of climate change.</p> <p>Where activities could directly, indirectly or in combination with other proposals affect the interests of a Natura 2000 site, the Council will carry out an Habitat Regulations Appraisal to identify appropriate mitigation and to determine if proposals would have an adverse effect on the integrity of the site</p> <p>HRA identifies the following criteria to the developer requirements section:</p> <p>Construction Method Statement to be provided where the development site will affect a watercourse.</p> <p>Methodology should provide measures to protect the watercourse from the impact of</p>	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
						<p>pollution and sediment so as to ensure no adverse effects on Loch Leven SPA.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Existing measures within the LDP will provide an additional safeguard against any impact of this policy include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy International Nature Conservation Sites Policy Water Quality Policy Foul Drainage Policy Surface Water Drainage Policy: Drainage within the Loch Leven Catchment Area Loch Leven SPA and Ramsar Site Advice for planning applicants for phosphorous and foul drainage in the catchment Supplementary Guidance <p>Where appropriate, measures to enhance biodiversity will be implemented. Such measures may include seeding locally native species on roadside</p>	

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
						verges and other schemes, the use of locally native tree species in landscape schemes, habitat creation, habitat creation for protected species (e.g. barn owl boxes, log pile holts for otters) and the creation of greenways and wildlife corridors along transport corridors, footpaths and cycleways, to encourage the movement of species.	
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		There are no local geodiversity sites or known geodiversity interests within the site.	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI, and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0	n/a	0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	There is some non-coniferous/coniferous woodland immediately outwith the site on the eastern edge.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	Require Landscape framework including additional planting. Set development well back from existing and proposed woodland.	+
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)						
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	Proposal acknowledges the potential for ancillary uses as required. There is not sufficient capacity in Kinross Primary school to cope with the projected growth.	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Need to establish whether part of this site should be retained for education/cemetery provision Proportional developer contributions will be sought towards primary education provision.	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	There is no protected open space onsite.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	Application of Policy Open Space provision ensuring appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development proposals.	0
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	No	Check CFS form	0		0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Greenfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	-		-
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	There is no peat within the soil. The entire site is prime agricultural land.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	--	Good quality soils should be removed for use in other parts of Perth and Kinross.	-
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	Developer suggests it could be.	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	The site could make the most of the south facing aspect in its layout and has some protection from prevailing winds from the Community campus to the west and Burnbank meadows and woodland to the south.	Check CFS form, aerial map and site visit	-	Design of buildings to take account of solar orientation. Include sustainable design and construction techniques and incorporate energy efficiency measures and make them resilient to the projected climatic changes in precipitation and temperature	0
	Vehicular Access constraints or	Material assets and	Access proposed to be taken from the country road to the south of the	Check CFS form, aerial	-	Road and access improvements to the satisfaction of the Roads	0


	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	climatic factors?	site. A Transport Assessment would be undertaken to accompany any planning application for this site to demonstrate that the site will not impact on the road networks.	map and site visit		Authority	
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	The site is well located for the facilities at Loch Leven community campus and medical centre but is quite a distance for walking to the main shopping opportunities of Kinross or Milnathort. The site does lie within walking distance of bus stops.	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities	-	Ensure appropriate footpath connections are made with the campus and town centre.	0
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	There are no constraints of this nature within the site.	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				are not digitised) Check for pylons on OS and site visit			
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	No	NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	0	n/a	0
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	There are no landscape designated sites within the site but it lies adjacent to the Loch Leven and Lomond Hills Special Landscape Area	GIS layers for NSA, SLA	0		0
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	The site is fairly well contained benefiting from mature woodland on the eastern and southern boundaries. The David Tyldesley and Associates Settlement Strategy Landscape Capacity Study does not identify this area as having potential for	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using capacity study	-	Develop a landscape framework and identify structural planting opportunities.	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			development, and suggests that Kinross should not expand further north towards Milnathort as this would quickly close the gap between the towns. However this proposal does not impinge further on the sense of gap between the Kinross and Milnathort with the Loch Leven Community Campus having being built subsequent to this assessment.	if one is available Site visit			
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	N/a	GIS layer greenbelt	0	n/a	0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	N/a	GIS layer for waste management sites	0	n/a	0
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	N/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	0		0
Cultural Heritage							

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	Lethangie/ Lathro Cottage non-designated archaeology site enclosed settlement? Pit group, rectilinear enclosure and corn drying overlaps slightly into the western part of the site. There are no other relevant cultural heritage designations within the site	GIS layers Listed building, SAMs, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit	0	Impacts on the historic environment will be avoided wherever possible through appropriate scheme location and design. Conservation of existing walls on and adjacent to the site	0
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	n/a		0	n/a	0
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	Yes residential/educational development would be compatible with adjacent Community campus and nearby residential areas.	OS map and site visit	0	n/a	0
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	There are no known constraints	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0

Site Name: Kinross 5	Source of site suggestion: All landowners/interested parties identified/aware? Henderson's Chartered Surveyors on behalf of Mr and Mrs Bridgeman		Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals: The north western section of the site including the existing house, outbuildings and woodland fringes lie outwith the open space designation. However most of the site sits within an open space allocation. A wider site here was supported by the Council up until the Proposed Plan stage but the Reporter took it out at Examination stage principally due to concerns about cutting off the link between the park and housing and the lack of an access to the north onto Gallowhill road and a lack of need for additional housing land.
Settlement: Kinross	GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: E Pre-MIR Site Ref: Kinross5 Proposed Plan Ref: H140	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? Inside settlement boundary	
OS Grid Ref: 703546 311015	Site Size (ha): 2.1 hectares	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? Tier 2	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc). Site is agricultural land with associated residential dwelling and associated equestrian activity including outbuildings and paddock areas to the west of Kinross running along the eastern edge of the motorway.
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc): Greenfield	Proposed Use: Residential approximately 50 homes	Officer Comments Issues which led to the wider site being removed from the last LDP still remain.	



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	Possibly. The groundwater status is good. It is not in a waste water drainage hotspot.	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer	-	Provided by application of policies on Water Environment and drainage within Loch Leven catchment which offer potential to	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer		avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – connection to public sewerage system + must meet discharge consents at the waste water treatment works, and requiring appropriate SUDS. Drainage impact assessment/hydrology study required where development has the potential to affect natural hydrology systems and or adversely affects water resources.	
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes it lies close enough to the existing network (but awaiting further comment from Scottish Water regarding capacity)	GIS Layer for existing network	+	Policy Foul Drainage	+
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	Some high probability of surface water issues to the south of site associated to field drain. Historic records of flooding in the Kinross area. Potential for development of the site to increase the probability of flooding elsewhere	Checked all the GIS Layers for flood risk	-	Basic FRA required at planning application stage to define area at risk and appropriate detailed design layout and levels.	0
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	<p>There are no relevant designations, or non-designated features within this site.</p> <p>It lies within the Loch Leven Valley catchment so there is a possible impact on this.</p>	<p>GIS layers</p> <p>SAC/SPA/SSSI/NNR/TPO/protected species</p> <p>Loch Leven Catchment</p> <p>Lunan Valley catchment</p> <p>River Tay Catchment</p>	-	<p>Policy Biodiversity.</p> <p>Retention of important trees, structural planting, hedgerows etc and require additional structural planting along the western edge of the site.</p> <p>Policies Water Environment and drainage to Loch Leven.</p> <p>Where activities could directly, indirectly or in combination with other proposals affect the interests of a Natura 2000 site, the Council will carry out an Habitat Regulations Appraisal to identify appropriate mitigation and to determine if proposals would have an adverse effect on the integrity of the site</p> <p>This site was screened out during the HRA process because:</p> <p>The Ury Burn is culverted under the southern part of the site. It enters from the west and flows eastwards under the town before resurfacing north of Sunny Park, then flowing on into Loch Leven (SPA). However, due to the distance of the site proposal from the SPA (approximately 2170m away) it is considered that any potential</p>	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
						significant effects will be minimal.	
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		There are no local geodiversity sites or known geodiversity interests within the site.	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0	n/a	0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	There is some woodland screening to the south western edge of the site.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	Retaining woodland in line with Scottish Government Control of Woodland Removal policy. Require structural planting along the western edge of the site and planting of native trees/hedgerows at strategic locations to enhance the current green network within the area.	+
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	There is not sufficient capacity in Kinross Primary school to cope with the projected growth.	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Proportional developer contributions will be sought towards primary education provision.	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	There is a core path running along the eastern boundary of the site. Proposal is for section of this from Springfield road to behind Katrine to be widened and made into a vehicular access for the development. The remaining pathway is proposed to be maintained as is. There is an amenity/accessibility impact on Davies Park amenity greenspace from the access road.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	-	Application of Policy on provision of open space ensuring appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development proposals. If possible take a direct access off the roundabout/A922 to avoid/minimise amenity/accessibility impacts on the park.	-
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	No	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Greenfield and some redevelopment of outbuildings	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	n/a	0
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	There is no peat within the soil. The site lies within prime agricultural land.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows	-	Good quality soils should be removed for use in other parts of Perth and Kinross.	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)			
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	There are no known constraints	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	The site is west facing and is fairly open to prevailing winds.	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	--	Require structural shelter planting Design of buildings to take account of solar orientation.	-
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?	No comment	Check CFS form, aerial map and site visit	-	Access road would need to be delivered to the satisfaction of the Council as Roads Authority.	0
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	The site is relatively well located for active travel access to shops and schools and the town centre. The site lies close to bus stops on	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within	+		+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			Morlich Place and Sutherland Drive and Gallowhill Road.	easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities			
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	There are no known servicing constraints	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised) Check for pylons on OS and site visit	0		0
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic	Material Assets	No but the proposal is within a Tier 2 settlement	NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	0		0



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Development Plan?						
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	There are some existing older buildings which could form part of a redevelopment proposal	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	Existing older buildings could be redeveloped.	+
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	There are no landscape designated sites within the site.	GIS layers for NSA, SLA	0	n/a	0
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	Site would be very visible from the motorway to the west and Gallowhill Road to the north.. The David Tyldesley and Associates Settlement Strategy Landscape Capacity Study identifies this area as having potential for development without significant effects on landscape character or visual amenity.	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available Site visit	-	Structural planting along the western boundary with the motorway	0
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	N/a	GIS layer greenbelt	0	n/a	0
Material assets							

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	No	GIS layer for waste management sites	0	n/a	0
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	N/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	0	n/a	0
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	There are no cultural heritage sites within the site.	GIS layers Listed building, SAMs, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	There are no cultural heritage sites within the site.		0		0
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	Motorway to the West. Noise assessment would be required.	OS map and site visit	-	Noise assessment would be required. Noise impacts will be reduced with the use of low noise road surfacing, landscaping and acoustic screening, if this is appropriate to the surrounding area.	0
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	No	Check CFS form	0		0

Site Name: Milnathort E20 Old Perth Road	Source of site suggestion: Existing LDP site which no longer benefits from planning permission		Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals: This site is supported in the current LDP but did not benefit from a full SEA assessment because at the time it benefitted from an outline planning permission which has since lapsed.
Settlement: Milnathort	GIS Site Ref: E20 MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref: E20	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? Within the existing settlement boundary	
OS Grid Ref: 705277 313012	Site Size (ha): 2.9 hectares	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? Tier 2	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc). To the western end of the site is an open watercourse (Burleigh Burn), to the north the embankment of the M90 motorway and to the south the Old Perth Road (B996).The M90 is elevated in relation to the land providing a backdrop to the site and land rises to the north beyond the motorway.
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc): Agriculture	Proposed Use: General employment use	Officer Comments The site is close to the motorway, and the site would extend Milnathort further west. However new planting, together with the existing planting to the western and eastern edges of the site would provide a strong landscape framework to the site and secure a satisfactory landscape fit. When considering the planning application here land to the western edge of the site is low lying and was identified as liable to flood. Following a detailed flood appraisal and liaison with SEPA the suggested layout was amended to avoid the development of	

		<p>this part of the application site. The effect of this change is to move any buildings and activities further away from the nearest noise sensitive properties to the west of the site. Also Noise Impact Assessments were submitted in relation to activities proposed but on the basis of the site specific assessments Environmental Health were satisfied that the proposals would be unlikely to result in complaints of noise nuisance.</p> <p>The area is considered to have archaeological potential given its proximity to prehistoric burial remains. Requirement for a programme of archaeological works and impacts on the historic environment to be avoided wherever possible through appropriate scheme location and design.</p>	
--	--	---	--



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	Possibly. The groundwater status is good. It is not in a waste water drainage hotspot.	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer	-	Provided by application of policies on Water Environment and drainage within Loch Leven catchment which offer potential to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – connection to public sewerage system + must meet discharge consents at the waste water treatment works, and requiring appropriate SUDS. Setback from watercourse as per water environment and drainage policy	0
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes it lies close enough to the existing network (but awaiting further comment from Scottish Water regarding capacity)	GIS Layer for existing network	+	Policy Foul Drainage	+
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	Historic record of flooding within the Milnathort area (including Hattonburn) When considering the planning application here land to the western	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	0	Following a detailed flood appraisal and liaison with SEPA the suggested layout was amended to avoid the development of this part of the	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			<p>edge of the site is low lying and was identified as liable to flood.</p> <p>There is a small area of SEPA medium river flood risk at the western end and pockets of surface water flood risk throughout the site.</p>			<p>application site.</p> <p>The FRA requirement would remain and DIA would also be required at the planning application stage to define area at risk and appropriate detailed layout and levels and SUDS.</p>	
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	It lies within the Loch Leven Valley catchment so there is a possible impact on this.	<p>GIS layers</p> <p>SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species</p> <p>Loch Leven Catchment</p> <p>Lunan Valley catchment</p> <p>River Tay Catchment</p>	-	<p>Policy Biodiversity.</p> <p>There is a need for a landscape framework incorporating structural planting and this should be native species.</p> <p>HRA identified mitigation (not previously assessed but likely to be along the lines of the following).</p> <p>HRA identifies the following criteria to the developer requirements section:</p> <p>Construction Method Statement to be provided where the development site will affect a watercourse.</p> <p>Methodology should provide measures to protect the watercourse from the impact of pollution and sediment so as to ensure no adverse effects on</p>	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
						<p>Loch Leven SPA.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Existing measures within the LDP will provide an additional safeguard against any impact of this policy include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy International Nature Conservation Sites Policy Water Quality Policy Foul Drainage Policy Surface Water Drainage Policy Drainage within the Loch Leven Catchment Area Loch Leven SPA and Ramsar Site Advice for planning applicants for phosphorous and foul drainage in the catchment Supplementary Guidance 	
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		There are no local geodiversity sites or interests that could be affected.	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI and	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Tayside Geodiversity Sites			
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	There is a need for survey of existing trees.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	-	There is a need for survey of existing trees and new native planting screen planting to the north of the site to screen the site from the motorway.	+
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	N/A	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	N/A	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	Burleigh burn runs through the southern edge of the site.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing	0	There is a need for survey of existing trees and new native planting screen planting to the north of the site to screen the site from the motorway.	+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				LDP for open space allocations		Development will need to be sufficiently setback from the Burleigh Burn.	
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	Yes the proposal is for employment generating uses	Check CFS form	+	n/a	+
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Greenfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	n/a	-
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	There is no peat within the soils but it does involve class 3.1 prime agricultural land.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	--	Good quality soils should be removed for use in other parts of Perth and Kinross.	-
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	General market conditions have been poor so with these improving it is anticipated that it can be delivered.	Check CFS form	+	n/a	+
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing	Climatic factors	The site does have a principal south facing aspect	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site	-	The site is south-facing which provides opportunities to make best use of solar gain through the detailed layout and siting of	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	winds?			visit		the new development.	
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?	No comment	Check CFS form, aerial map and site visit	-	Access road would need to be to the satisfaction of the Council as Roads Authority.	0
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	The site lies within a reasonable active travel distance (within 800 m) of a bus stop and the shops in Milnathort but lies some distance from the enhanced shopping of Kinross.	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities	0	n/a	0
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	No	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer Check the health and safety consultations	0	n/a	0


	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised) Check for pylons on OS and site visit			
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	No	NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	0	n/a	0
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	The site lies outwith the Loch Leven and Lomond Hills Special Landscape Area but immediately adjacent to it.	GIS layers for NSA, SLA	0	Ensure high quality design and layout.	0
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	The site lies within the settlement boundary. The David Tyldesley and Associates Settlement Strategy Landscape Capacity Study did not specifically assess this area and identified it as	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape	-	However this site would make a logical edge to the settlement here and new planting, together with the existing planting to the western and eastern edges of the site would provide a strong landscape	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			one of the sensitive edges to Milnathort with important landscape features or views beyond.	impact using capacity study if one is available Site visit		framework to the site and secure a satisfactory landscape fit. However scenic views from the motorway would be affected by its development.	
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	N/a	GIS layer greenbelt	0	n/a	0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	N/a	GIS layer for waste management sites	0	n/a	0
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	N/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	0	n/a	0
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and	No archaeological sites are currently known within the proposed application site.	GIS layers Listed building, SMs, Conservation	-	However the area is considered to have archaeological potential given its proximity to prehistoric burial remains.	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
		archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)		Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit		Requirement for a programme of archaeological works and impacts on the historic environment to be avoided wherever possible through appropriate scheme location and design.	
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	N/A		0	N/A	0
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	Proposed uses could potentially have impact on residential property bordering on the western edge of the site.	OS map and site visit	-	During planning application process Noise Impact Assessments were submitted in relation to activities proposed but on the basis of the site specific assessments Environmental Health were satisfied that the proposals would be unlikely to result in complaints of noise nuisance. In relation to the potential issue of air quality, the imposition of a suitably worded condition on any planning approval could	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
						<p>reserve for future approval mitigation measures for the control of air quality, odour and fumes arising from the activities of the proposed users.</p> <p>In relation to the potential issue of lighting the setback of built development from the western part of the site should ensure any injury to amenity from lighting at the site should not be materially significant.</p>	
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	There are no known constraints, general market conditions have affected delivery of the existing LDP sites but with this improving there should be no continuing constraint.	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0

Site Name: Milnathort E21	Source of site suggestion: All landowners/interested parties identified/aware? Hatrick Bruce Properties Ltd		Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals: Applications for residential development (07/00716/FLL and 03/00130/OUT) refused on grounds of loss of employment land. The former application was appealed but the reporter was not convinced that the site was not required for industrial or business uses. The reporter was also concerned about it adjoining a predominantly industrial site. This site is supported in the current LDP but did not benefit from a full SEA assessment.
Settlement: Perth	GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref: Proposed Plan Ref: E21	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? Inside	
OS Grid Ref: 311908 704149	Site Size (ha): 0.66 ha	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? Tier1	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc). The site has an existing access from Auld Market Road. There is existing industrial to the north, business uses to the west and housing to the south and east. The site together with the surrounding area once formed part of Milnathort railway station and goods yard. The site is relatively flat in profile.
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc): Undeveloped land adjacent to existing business users, with residential areas nearby.	Proposed Use: Employment	Officer Comments The site is a good and suitable location for employment uses. Due to proximity to residential area it is important that employment uses are compatible/sensitive to this. It is also important to retain employment land supply/business opportunities and it offers good starter/lower value business opportunity. The site lies close to river flood risk areas and requires a FRA.	



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	Possibly The groundwater status is good.	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer	-	Apply Water Environment policy to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – connection to public sewerage system + and requiring appropriate SUDS. SuDS should include sufficient attenuation to protect those watercourses which flow into Loch Leven from erosion during periods of heavy rainfall.	0
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes it lies close enough to the existing network	GIS Layer for existing network	0	Policy Foul Drainage	0
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human	There are adjacent medium SEPA river flood risk areas affecting or adjacent to this site.	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	0	FRA required.	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
		Health					
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	It will not affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests.	GIS layers SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment	0	n/a	0
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		No	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI, and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0	n/a	0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	It will not result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	no	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material	Employment uses proposed so minimal impact on facilities.	GIS Layers for school catchments	0	n/a	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	The site has no open space function. There is a core path that runs up to Auld Mart road and connects into Loch Leven routes.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	Applications of open space policies ensure appropriate provision of appropriate landscaping.	+
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	It proposed that the site would accommodate employment uses class 4, 5 and 6.	Check CFS form	++	n/a	++
Soils							

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Brownfield (once formed part of Milnathort railway station and goods yard)	GIS aerial map/site visit	+	n/a	+
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	There is no peat content in the soils here and it is not prime agricultural land.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	+	n/a	+
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	It is an existing allocated site which is considered to be effective for development.	Check submission	0	n/a	0
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	There is opportunity to take advantage of principal south facing aspect.	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	-	Siting and design of buildings to take account of solar orientation.	0
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic	Material assets and climatic factors?	A Transport statement is likely to be required to support development.	Check CFS form, aerial map and site visit	-	Access road would need to be delivered to the satisfaction of the Council as Roads Authority.	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	generated?						
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	This site lies within easy active travel distance of a bus stop and reasonable active travel (within 800 m) of the shops in Milnathort primary school but lies some distance from the services and enhanced shopping of Kinross.	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities	+	n/a	+
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	No	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised) Check for	0	n/a	0


	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				pylons on OS map and on site visit			
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or is it consistent with the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	No	Check NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	0	n/a	0
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	No it will not affect any designated site. It does lie close to the Loch Leven and Lomond Hills Special Landscape Area. It lies within the existing urban area.	GIS layers for NSA, and SLA	0	Appropriate design and layout and meeting placemaking policy.	0
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	The site lies within the existing urban area and is an appropriate site for development.	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Site visit			
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	No	GIS layer greenbelt	0	n/a	0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	No	GIS layer for waste management sites	0	n/a	0
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	No	Check Zero Waste Plan	0	n/a	0
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	No	GIS layers Listed building, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Gardens and	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Designed Landscape, Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit			
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	N/a		0	n/a	0
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	Yes it lies adjacent to industrial, business and residential uses.	OS map and site visit	0	Sensitive layout, landscaping and design (placemaking policy).	0
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	There are no known constraints	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0

Site Name: Milnathort H48 Pitdownie	Source of site suggestion: Existing LDP site		Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals:
Settlement: Milnathort	GIS Site Ref: H48 MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref:	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? Within the existing settlement boundary	<p>07/00442/OUT for residential development approved March 2008. Time extended Jan 2012 (11/0153/IPM), July 2013 (13/00436/IPM) and May 2015 (15/00240/IPM). Application for reserved matters to be submitted by March 2018.</p> <p>This site is supported in the current LDP but did not benefit from a full SEA assessment because it benefitted from an outline planning permission.</p>
OS Grid Ref: 704976 311766	Site Size (ha): 3 hectares	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? Tier 2	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc). The site is relatively flat grassland sloping upwards towards the northern part of the site.
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc): Agriculture	Proposed Use: Residential with an indicative capacity for 40 houses.	Officer Comments The site lies close to the motorway but it is considered that planting, acoustic barriers, layout and building specification can sufficiently address this. Also new woodland planting to the west will help better integrate the development. A proposed core path runs through the northern part of the site but there is opportunity to improve the amenity of this by enhancing with new native planting/linear park here. The northern part of the site should be designed so as not to have a significant adverse impact on the B-Listed Orwell Parish Church.	The site is bounded by the M90 to the north and north west, housing to the east and south east, and agricultural land to the south west.

--	--	--	--



© Crown copyright [and database rights] 2010 OS [100016971]. You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data. You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	Possibly. The groundwater status here is good. It is not in a waste water drainage hotspot.	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer	-	Provided by application of policies Water Environment and Drainage and Drainage within Loch Leven Catchment which offer potential to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – connection to public sewerage system + must meet discharge consents at the waste water treatment works, and requiring appropriate SUDS. Requirement for open watercourses to be retained and protected from pollution with a minimum 6m buffer strip. Opportunities should be sought to further improve the water environment through development e.g. links to blue/green networks, restoration opportunities etc.	0
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes it lies close enough to the existing network	GIS Layer for existing network	+	Policy Foul Drainage	+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	Medium risk of surface water flooding and risk of river flooding from the Fochy Burn along the south western boundary.	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	-	Flood Risk Assessment with site layout plan will be required at planning application stage to assess the risk of flooding.	0
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	It lies within the Loch Leven Valley catchment so there is a possible impact on this.	GIS layers SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment	-	Policy: Biodiversity. It is envisaged that the new development would incorporate formal and informal green spaces and recreational areas. Retain the watercourse and mature trees on the boundaries of the site and enhance them with landscaping. Requirement for woodland screen planting along the western edge of the site. HRA identified mitigation (not previously assessed but likely to be along the lines of the following). HRA identifies the following criteria to the developer requirements section: Construction Method Statement to be provided	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
						<p>where the development site will affect a watercourse.</p> <p>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 SPA.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Existing measures within the LDP will provide an additional safeguard against any impact of this policy include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy International Nature Conservation Sites Policy Water Quality Policy Foul Drainage Policy Surface Water Drainage Policy Drainage within the Loch Leven Catchment Area <p>Loch Leven SPA and Ramsar Site Advice for planning applicants for phosphorous and foul drainage in the catchment Supplementary Guidance</p>	

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		There are no local geodiversity sites or interests that could be affected.	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0	n/a	0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	Site is largely an open field with some scattered trees along the boundary. Most value likely to be along the corridor of the burn.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	-	<p>May be an opportunity through development to make new green network connections though the site especially to the east and south.</p> <p>Where appropriate, measures to enhance biodiversity will be implemented. Such measures may include seeding locally native species on roadside verges and other schemes, the use of locally native tree species in landscape schemes, habitat creation, habitat creation for protected species (e.g. barn owl boxes, log pile holts for otters) and the creation of greenways and wildlife corridors along transport corridors, footpaths and cycleways, to encourage the movement of species.</p>	+
Air Quality							

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)		There is not sufficient capacity in Milnathort Primary school to cope with the projected growth.	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Proportional developer contributions will be sought towards primary education provision.	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	Core path close to the northern boundary of the site.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	Application of Policy on the provision of open space ensures appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development proposals including secure new woodland planting and a management plan for its maintenance. Specific requirement for the provision of a multi-user core path through woodland planting.	+
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	The site is proposed for solely residential purposes.	Check CFS form	-	n/a	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Greenfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	n/a	-
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	There is no peat within the soils. No prime agricultural land. There are possible contamination issues.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	-	Scheme to deal with contamination to include nature, extent and types, and measures to treat/remove	0
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	General market conditions have been poor so with these improving it is anticipated that it can be delivered.	Check CFS form	+	n/a	+
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	Northern part of the site is on a south facing slope.	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	0	Opportunities to make best use of solar gain through the detailed layout and siting of the new development. Include sustainable design and construction techniques and incorporate energy efficiency measures and make them resilient to the projected climatic changes in precipitation and temperature.	+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?	Road access to be formed from both Manse Road and Curlers' Crescent. No known capacity constraints.	Check CFS form, aerial map and site visit	-	Access roads would need to be to the satisfaction of the Council as Roads Authority.	0
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	The site lies within easy active travel distance of a bus stop, the shops in Milnathort and the primary school but lies some distance from the Secondary school/services and enhanced shopping in Kinross.	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities	0	n/a	0
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	Approximately half the site lies within a consultation zone for BP pipeline.	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not	-	Consult HSE and operator and ensure appropriate design and layout and mitigation measures.	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				digitised) Check for pylons on OS and site visit			
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	Yes – within a tiered settlement	NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	++	n/a	++
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	The site lies outwith the Loch Leven and Lomond Hills Special Landscape Area.	GIS layers for NSA, SLA	0	n/a	0
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	The site lies within the settlement boundary. The David Tyldesley and Associates Settlement Strategy Landscape Capacity Study identifies this area as having development potential with no landscape, settlement form and pattern or visual constraints.	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available	+	New woodland planting to the west will help better integrate the development and buffer it from the motorway.	++


	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Site visit			
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	No	GIS layer greenbelt	0	n/a	0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	No	GIS layer for waste management sites	0	n/a	0
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	n/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	0	n/a	0
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	B Listed Orwell House outwith the site to the east.	GIS layers Listed building, SMS, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape Battlefields,	-	Impacts on the historic environment will be avoided wherever possible through appropriate scheme location and design.	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Archaeology Site visit			
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	n/a		0	n/a	0
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	Residential development is compatible with adjacent residential areas. The motorway could be an issue in terms of amenity.	OS map and site visit	-	Ensure appropriate design layout and building specification, plus acoustic screening and planting to suitably address noise.	0
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	There are no known constraints, general market conditions have affected delivery of the existing LDP sites but with this improving there should be no continuing constraint.	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0

Site Name: Milnathort H49 Pacehill	Source of site suggestion: Existing LDP site which no longer benefits from planning permission		Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals: This site is supported in the current LDP but did not benefit from a full SEA assessment because it benefitted from an outline planning permission which has since lapsed.
Settlement: Milnathort	GIS Site Ref: H49 MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref:	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? Within the existing settlement boundary	
OS Grid Ref: 705160 312334	Site Size (ha): 3.5 hectares	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? Tier 2	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc). The site has relatively flat grassland sloping gently upwards to the southern part of the site. The site lies on north facing sloping land immediately to the north of Linden Park Road and immediately south of the motorway whilst to the east it is fringed by woodland and to the west lies North St.
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc): Agriculture	Proposed Use: Residential with an indicative capacity for around 50 homes.	Officer Comments The site lies close to the motorway but it is considered that planting, acoustic barriers, layout and building specification can sufficiently address this. A proposed core path runs through the northern part of the site but there is opportunity to improve the amenity of this by enhancing with new native planting/linear park here. The western part of the site including the entrance to the site should be designed so as not to have a significant adverse impact on the B-Listed Orwell Parish Church.	

Agricultural land

Some north and eastern areas lie within a consultation zone for BP pipeline so design, layout and mitigation measures should be applied after consultation with HSE and operator. This did not seem to be picked up on at planning application stage previously and should be added as a specific developer requirement.



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	Possibly. The groundwater status here is good. It is not in a waste water drainage hotspot. There is not wetlands or boggy areas within the site.	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer	-	Provided by application of policies Water Environment and Drainage and Drainage within Loch Leven Catchment which offer potential to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – connection to public sewerage system + must meet discharge consents at the waste water treatment works, and requiring appropriate SUDS.	0
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes it lies close enough to the existing network	GIS Layer for existing network	+	Policy Foul Drainage	+
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human	Historic record of flooding within the Milnathort area (including Hattonburn) The site is not affected by any of the	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
		Health	SEPA flood risk layers for river, coastal or surface water risk.				
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	It lies within the Loch Leven Valley catchment so there is a possible impact on this.	GIS layers SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment	-	<p>Policy: Biodiversity.</p> <p>It is envisaged that the new development would incorporate formal and informal green spaces and recreational areas.</p> <p>There is a need for survey of existing trees and a management plan and new native planting screen planting to the north of the site (as part of a linear park).</p> <p>HRA identified mitigation (not previously assessed but likely to be along the lines of the following).</p> <p>HRA identifies the following criteria to the developer requirements section:</p> <p>Construction Method Statement to be provided where the development site will affect a watercourse.</p> <p>Methodology should provide measures to protect the watercourse from the impact of pollution and sediment so as to</p>	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
						<p>ensure no adverse effects on Loch Leven SPA.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Existing measures within the LDP will provide an additional safeguard against any impact of this policy include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy International Nature Conservation Sites Policy Water Quality Policy Foul Drainage Policy Surface Water Drainage Policy Drainage within the Loch Leven Catchment Area <p>Loch Leven SPA and Ramsar Site Advice for planning applicants for phosphorous and foul drainage in the catchment Supplementary Guidance</p>	
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		There are no local geodiversity sites or interests that could be affected.	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites,	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				SSSI and Tayside Geodiversity Sites			
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	There is a need for survey of existing trees.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	-	There is a need for survey of existing trees and a management plan and new native planting screen planting to the north of the site (as part of a linear park).	+
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)		There is not sufficient capacity in Milnathort Primary school to cope with the projected growth.	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Proportional developer contributions will be sought towards primary education provision.	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space	Popl and human health or material assets	There is a core path that runs along the proposed northern linear park through the proposed woodland planting. There is opportunity	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and	0	Application of Policy on provision of open space ensures appropriate provision of informal and formal open space	+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	or result in a loss of open space?		therefore to improve the amenity of this route.	maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations		alongside any development proposals including secure new woodland planting and a management plan for its maintenance.	
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	The site is proposed for solely residential purposes.	Check CFS form	-	n/a	-
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Greenfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	n/a	-
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	There is no peat within the soils. There is some class 3.1 prime agricultural land.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	--	Good quality soils should be removed for use in other parts of Perth and Kinross.	-
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	General market conditions have been poor so with these improving it is anticipated that it can be delivered.	Check CFS form	+	n/a	+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	The site does have a principal south facing aspect but it is on a north facing slope.	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	-	The site is south-facing which provides opportunities to make best use of solar gain through the detailed layout and siting of the new development.	0
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?	A Transport Statement would be undertaken to accompany any planning application for this site to demonstrate that the site will not impact on the road networks.	Check CFS form, aerial map and site visit	-	Access road would need to be to the satisfaction of the Council as Roads Authority.	0
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	The site lies within easy active travel distance of a bus stop and the shops in Milnathort, and within a reasonable active travel (within 800 m) of the primary school but lies some distance from the Secondary school/services and enhanced shopping of Kinross.	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities	0	n/a	0
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	The north and eastern areas lie within a consultation zone for BP pipeline.	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer	-	Consult HSE and operator and ensure appropriate design and layout and mitigation measures.	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised) Check for pylons on OS and site visit			
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	No	NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	0	n/a	0
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	The site lies outwith the Loch Leven and Lomond Hills Special Landscape Area.	GIS layers for NSA, SLA	0	n/a	0
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to	Landscape	The site lies within the settlement boundary.	Check existing LDP	+	Could reduce the prominence of existing buildings.	++


	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	accommodate it? (see notes)		The David Tyldesley and Associates Settlement Strategy Landscape Capacity Study identifies this area as having development potential with no landscape, settlement form and pattern or visual constraints.	GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available Site visit		New woodland planting to the north will help better integrate the development.	
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	N/a	GIS layer greenbelt	0	n/a	0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	N/a	GIS layer for waste management sites	0	n/a	0
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	N/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	0	n/a	0
Cultural Heritage							

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	Of significance is the setting of the B Listed Orwell Parish Church to the west of the site.	GIS layers Listed building, SMs, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit	-	Impacts on the historic environment will be avoided wherever possible through appropriate scheme location and design and particular consideration will be given to the setting of the B Listed Orwell Parish Church.	0
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	N/A		0	N/A	0
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	The sites potential residential development is compatible with adjacent woodland and residential areas. The motorway could be an issue in terms of amenity.	OS map and site visit	-	Ensure appropriate design layout and building specification, plus acoustic screening and planting to suitably address noise.	0
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	There are no known constraints, general market conditions have affected delivery of the existing LDP	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			sites but with this improving there should be no continuing constraint.				

Site Name: Milnathort H50 Old Perth Road	Source of site suggestion: Existing LDP site		Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals:
Settlement: Milnathort	GIS Site Ref: H50 MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref:	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? Within the existing settlement boundary	<p>05/01263/OUT for up to 5 houses and community woodland approved Jan 2006. 08/00805/AML for 5 houses approved June 2014. Current application (17/00885/FLL) for the installation of drainage infrastructure.</p> <p>This site is supported in the current LDP but did not benefit from a full SEA assessment because it benefitted from an outline planning permission.</p>
OS Grid Ref: 705180 312674	Site Size (ha): 1.8 hectares	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? Tier 2	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc). <p>Relatively flat site but rises to the north. Separated from the Pace Hill H49 housing site to the west by a band of mature trees. Part of the site identified for community woodland which will help form a landscape buffer from the M90 to the north. Residential to the south.</p>
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc): Agriculture	Proposed Use: Residential with an indicative capacity for 7 houses.	Officer Comments <p>The site lies close to the motorway but it is considered that planting, acoustic barriers, layout and building specification can sufficiently address this.</p> <p>A proposed core path runs through the northern part of the site but there is opportunity to improve the amenity of this by enhancing with new native planting/linear park here.</p> <p>The woodland to the west is currently being made a TPO however overall the</p>	

planning balance is likely to favour a vehicular access being taken through this to link with Pacehill and H49, with compensatory planting provided particularly to the north.



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	Possibly. The groundwater status here is good. It is not in a waste water drainage hotspot.	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer	-	<p>Provided by application of policies Water Environment and Drainage and Drainage within Loch Leven Catchment which offer potential to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – connection to public sewerage system + must meet discharge consents at the waste water treatment works, and requiring appropriate SUDS.</p> <p>Requirement for open watercourses to be retained and protected from pollution with a minimum 6m buffer strip.</p> <p>Opportunities should be sought to further improve the water environment through development e.g. links to blue/green networks, restoration opportunities etc.</p>	0
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes it lies close enough to the existing network	GIS Layer for existing network	+	Policy Foul Drainage	+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	High risk of surface water flooding in the middle and eastern parts of the site. Risk of river flooding from the Burleigh Burn along the eastern boundary.	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	-	Flood Risk Assessment with site layout plan will be required at planning application stage to assess the risk of flooding.	0
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	It lies within the Loch Leven Valley catchment so there is a possible impact on this.	GIS layers SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment	-	Policy: Biodiversity. Retain the watercourse and mature trees on the boundaries of the site and enhance them with landscaping. Requirement for new woodland planting to the north of the site. HRA identified mitigation (not previously assessed but likely to be along the lines of the following). HRA identifies the following criteria to the developer requirements section: 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	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
						<p>Loch Leven SPA.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Existing measures within the LDP will provide an additional safeguard against any impact of this policy include:</p> <p>Policy International Nature Conservation Sites</p> <p>Policy Water Quality</p> <p>Policy Foul Drainage</p> <p>Policy Surface Water Drainage</p> <p>Policy Drainage within the Loch Leven Catchment Area</p> <p>Loch Leven SPA and Ramsar Site Advice for planning applicants for phosphorous and foul drainage in the catchment</p> <p>Supplementary Guidance</p>	
	<p>Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?</p>		<p>There are no local geodiversity sites or interests that could be affected.</p>	<p>GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI and Tayside Geodiversity</p>	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Sites			
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	Site is largely an open field with an established tree belt along the western boundary and smaller tree belts along the southern boundary and in the east of the site.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	-	<p>May be an opportunity through development to make additional green network connections though the site especially to the east, west and south.</p> <p>There is woodland to the west which is currently going through process to be made a TPO. It is likely the planning balance will favour some removal of woodland here to provide a vehicular access through to H49 Pacehill.</p> <p>Where appropriate, measures to enhance biodiversity will be implemented. Such measures may include seeding locally native species on roadside verges and other schemes, the use of locally native tree species in landscape schemes, habitat creation, habitat creation for protected species (e.g. barn owl boxes, log pile holts for otters) and the creation of greenways and wildlife corridors along transport corridors, footpaths and cycleways, to encourage the movement of species.</p>	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)		There is not sufficient capacity in Milnathort Primary school to cope with the projected growth.	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Proportional developer contributions will be sought towards primary education provision.	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and health or material assets	Core path runs along the northern boundary.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	Application of Policy on the provision of open space ensures appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development proposals including secure new woodland planting and a management plan for its maintenance. Specific requirement for the provision of multi-user route from Pace Hill to Old Perth Road.	+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	The site is proposed for solely residential purposes.	Check CFS form	-	n/a	-
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Greenfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	n/a	-
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	There is no peat within the soils. The northern half of the site is class 3.1 prime agricultural land. No known contamination issues.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	--	Good quality soils should be removed for use in other parts of Perth and Kinross.	-
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	General market conditions have been poor so with these improving it is anticipated that it can be delivered.	Check CFS form	+	n/a	+
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	The site has an open aspect.	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	0	Use opportunities to make best use of solar gain through the detailed layout and siting of the new development. Include sustainable design and construction techniques and incorporate energy efficiency	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
						measures and make them resilient to the projected climatic changes in precipitation and temperature.	
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?	A Transport Statement would be undertaken to accompany any planning application for this site to demonstrate that the site will not impact on the road networks.	Check CFS form, aerial map and site visit	-	Access road would need to be to the satisfaction of the Council as Roads Authority.	0
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	The site lies within reasonable active travel distance of a bus stop and the shops in Milnathort, but is further from the primary school and lies some distance from the Secondary school/services and enhanced shopping of Kinross.	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities	0	n/a	0
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	None known	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer Check the health and safety consultations	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised) Check for pylons on OS and site visit			
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	Yes – within a tiered settlement	NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	++	n/a	++
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	The site lies outwith the Loch Leven and Lomond Hills Special Landscape Area.	GIS layers for NSA, SLA	0	n/a	0
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	The site lies within the settlement boundary. The David Tyldesley and Associates Settlement Strategy Landscape Capacity Study identifies this area as having development potential with no landscape, settlement form and	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using	+	New woodland planting to the north will help better integrate the development.	++

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			pattern or visual constraints.	capacity study if one is available Site visit			
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	No	GIS layer greenbelt	0	n/a	0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	No	GIS layer for waste management sites	0	n/a	0
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	n/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	0	n/a	0
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and	No	GIS layers Listed building, SMs, Conservation Areas, Gardens and	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/ Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
		links with landscape)		Designed Landscape Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit			
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	n/a		0	n/a	0
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	Residential development is compatible with adjacent woodland and residential areas. The motorway could be an issue in terms of amenity.	OS map and site visit	-	Ensure appropriate design layout and building specification, plus acoustic screening and planting to suitably address noise.	0
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	There are no known constraints, general market conditions have affected delivery of the existing LDP sites but with this improving there should be no continuing constraint.	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0

<p>Site Name: Milnathort 1</p>	<p>Source of site suggestion: All landowners/interested parties identified/aware?</p> <p>John Handley Associates on behalf of Kinross Estate Company</p>		<p>Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals:</p> <p>This proposal was previously considered and assessed as part of the LDP Main Issues Report in 2011 as proposed Housing Sites C. This site was not supported in the Proposed Plan and there was no objection to its exclusion so it did not get considered through Examination of the LDP.</p>
<p>Settlement: Milnathort</p>	<p>GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref: 92 Proposed Plan Ref: H141</p>	<p>Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? Adjacent of the existing settlement boundary</p>	
<p>OS Grid Ref:</p> <p>704514 312708</p>	<p>Site Size (ha): 5 hectares</p>	<p>Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? Tier 2</p>	<p>Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc).</p> <p>This site lies within relatively flat farmland immediately to the south of Burleigh Road and immediately west of Burleigh Castle.</p>
<p>Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc): Agricultural land</p>	<p>Proposed Use:</p> <p>Residential and in combination with the Old Perth Road sites they are proposed to have a capacity for 250 to 300 homes</p>	<p>Officer Comments</p> <p>The same sensitives/constraints still exist for this sites development and there is still a lack of housing land requirement for this site.</p> <p>The David Tyldesley and Associates Settlement Strategy Landscape Capacity Study does not identify this land as a possible area for development, identifying it beyond the settlement edge with sensitive landscape features or views beyond and identifying that it would have an adverse effect on the setting of Burleigh Castle, views of town from the east and views to Lomond Hills.</p>	

--	--	--	--



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water	Water	Possibly.	Check on OS map	-	Provided by application of policies Water Environment and	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	environment? (see notes)		<p>The groundwater status here is good.</p> <p>It is not in a waste water drainage hotspot.</p>	<p>GIS Landuse layer</p> <p>Waste water drainage hotspots</p> <p>Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer</p>		<p>Drainage within Loch Leven Catchment which offer potential to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – connection to public sewerage system + must meet discharge consents at the waste water treatment works, and requiring appropriate SUDS.</p>	
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes it lies close enough to the existing network (but awaiting further comment from Scottish Water regarding capacity)	GIS Layer for existing network	+	Policy Foul Drainage	+
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	<p>Historic record of flooding within the Milnathort area (including Hattonburn)</p> <p>Potential for development of the site to increase the probability of flooding elsewhere</p> <p>Small areas at south east corner of the site next to the Burleigh burn appear within the SEPA medium risk of river flooding.</p> <p>Small central area and small area to</p>	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	-	<p>Detailed FRA required at planning application stage to define the area at risk and appropriate detailed design layout and levels, and also take into account culverts at the site</p> <p>Open space dedicated next to the watercourse must be defined by a FRA and protected in perpetuity for flood risk reasons</p>	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			the south within the site area are a SEPA medium risk of surface water flooding.				
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	<p>It lies within the Loch Leven Valley catchment so there is a possible impact on this.</p> <p>Immediately north of the site there is a protected species recorded siting of swallow (Bern Convention Appendix 2)</p>	<p>GIS layers</p> <p>SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species</p> <p>Loch Leven Catchment</p> <p>Lunan Valley catchment</p> <p>River Tay Catchment</p>	-	<p>Policy Biodiversity.</p> <p>It is envisaged that the new development would incorporate formal and informal green spaces and recreational areas. These will be designed to ease the transition between the development and the open countryside to the east and would provide managed access to the countryside beyond.</p> <p>HRA identified mitigation (not previously assessed but likely to be along the lines of the following).</p> <p>HRA identifies the following criteria to the developer requirements section:</p> <p>Construction Method Statement to be provided where the development site will affect a watercourse.</p> <p>Methodology should provide measures to protect the watercourse from the impact of</p>	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
						<p>pollution and sediment so as to ensure no adverse effects on Loch Leven SPA.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Existing measures within the LDP will provide an additional safeguard against any impact of this policy include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy International Nature Conservation Sites Policy Water Quality Policy Foul Drainage Policy Surface Water Drainage Policy Drainage within the Loch Leven Catchment Area <p>Loch Leven SPA and Ramsar Site Advice for planning applicants for phosphorous and foul drainage in the catchment Supplementary Guidance</p>	
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected		There are no local geodiversity sites or interests that could be affected.	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	by the proposal?			Review sites, SSSI and Tayside Geodiversity Sites			
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	There is the Burleigh burn immediately east of this site.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	-	Development should be well set back from watercourse	0
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	There is not sufficient capacity in Milnathort Primary school to cope with the projected growth.	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Proportional developer contributions will be sought towards primary education provision.	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space	Popl and human health or material assets	There is an adopted core path that runs along the Burleigh Road; a series of core paths from this provides a link to the Loch Leven	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained	0	Application of Policy Provision on open space ensures appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	or result in a loss of open space?		Heritage Trail.	open space and existing LDP for open space allocations		proposals.	
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	The site is proposed for solely residential purposes.	Check CFS form	-	n/a	-
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Greenfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	n/a	-
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	There is no peat within the soils. It lies within class 3.1 prime agricultural land.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	-	Good quality soils should be removed for use in other parts of Perth and Kinross.	-
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	It is indicated that it can be delivered within the LDP timeframe.	Check CFS form	0		0
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing	Climatic factors	The site does have a principal south facing aspect but is open to prevailing winds from the South	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site	-	The site is south-facing which provides opportunities to make best use of solar gain through the detailed layout and siting of	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	winds?		West.	visit		the new development. Consider shelter planting through landscape framework.	
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?	A Transport Assessment would be undertaken to accompany any planning application for this site to demonstrate that the site will not impact on the road networks.		-	Access road would need to be to the satisfaction of the Council as Roads Authority.	0
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	The site lies within easy active travel distance of a bus stop and the shops in Milnathort but lies some distance from the Secondary school/services and enhanced shopping of Kinross.	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities	-		-
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	The site is not significantly affected by these constraints however there are small overhead pylons to south of site	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer Check the	-	Relocation of overhead cables if necessary	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised) Check for pylons on OS and site visit			
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	No	NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	0	n/.a	0
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	The site lies within the Loch Leven and Lomond Hills Special Landscape Area	GIS layers for NSA, SLA	--	Ensure particular care over the layout and design of the development and improve the biodiversity and habitat linkages with Loch Leven through the Landscape Framework and set development well back from the burn. Open spaces should be	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
						designed to ease the transition between the development and the open countryside to the east and to protect views to Burleigh Castle.	
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	<p>The site lies outwith the settlement boundary.</p> <p>The David Tyldesley and Associates Settlement Strategy Landscape Capacity Study does not identify this land as a possible area for development, identifying it beyond the settlement edge with sensitive landscape features or views beyond and identifying that it would have an adverse effect on the setting of Burleigh Castle, views of town from the east and views to Lomond Hills.</p>	<p>Check existing LDP</p> <p>GIS layer wild land</p> <p>Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available</p> <p>Site visit</p>	--	<p>Ensure particular care over the layout and design of the development and improve the biodiversity and habitat linkages with Loch Leven through the Landscape Framework and proposed woodland and set development well back from the burn.</p> <p>Open spaces should be designed to ease the transition between the development and the open countryside to the east and to protect views to Burleigh Castle.</p> <p>There is opportunity to create a defined and attractive settlement edge.</p> <p>Potentially developable areas not to extend further east than existing Balfour Crescent?</p>	-
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity	Popl and human health	N/a	GIS layer	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	of the greenbelt?	or material assets		greenbelt			
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	N/a	GIS layer for waste management sites	0	n/a	0
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	N/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	0	n/a	0
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	<p>Of significance are the spires of the Town Hall and Church located in the centre of the settlement and the Burleigh Castle to the east of this site which is a Schedule Monument and Category A listed building.</p> <p>There is also a Circus Rectilinear enclosure non- designated archaeological record.</p>	<p>GIS layers</p> <p>Listed building, SMs, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape Battlefields, Archaeology</p> <p>Site visit</p>	-	Impacts on the historic environment will be avoided wherever possible through appropriate scheme location and design. Particular consideration will be given to the setting of Burleigh Castle and a landscape buffer will be incorporated into the design in order to protect and enhance this scheduled monument. There will be a need to safeguard other important views, particularly those of the	0


	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
						<p>Milnathort Church and Milnathort Town Hall</p> <p>Particular consideration will be given to the setting of Burleigh Castle and a landscape buffer/open space will be incorporated into the design in order to protect and enhance this scheduled monument.</p> <p>Potentially developable areas not to extend further east than existing Balfour Crescent?</p> <p>Surveys will be undertaken prior to the implementation of schemes to determine whether they will affect sites of archaeological importance and the setting of archaeological features.</p>	
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape			0	n/a	0
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA	The sites potential residential development is compatible with		0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
		topics depending on neighboring uses	adjacent farmland and residential areas.				
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	There are known constraints	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0

<p>Site Name: Milnathort 1 (Old Perth road sites)</p>	<p>Source of site suggestion: All landowners/interested parties identified/aware?</p> <p>John Handley Associates on behalf of Kinross Estate Company</p>		<p>Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals:</p> <p>Proposals at Old Perth across 2 sites. These were previously considered and assessed as part of the LDP Main Issues Report in 2011 as proposed Housing Sites A, B. These were not supported in the Proposed Plan and the Reporter agreed that this area currently forms part of the attractive landscape setting to Milnathort, with views across the site to Burleigh Castle, Loch Leven, the Lomond Hills and Benarty Hill.</p>
<p>Settlement: Milnathort</p>	<p>GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: A, B, Pre-MIR Site Ref: 92 Proposed Plan Ref: H142</p>	<p>Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? Adjacent of the existing settlement boundary</p>	
<p>OS Grid Ref: 705008 312952</p>	<p>Site Size (ha): 15.2 hectares</p>	<p>Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier?</p> <p>Tier 2</p>	<p>Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc).</p> <p>These two adjacent sites lie within relatively flat farmland immediately to the south of old Perth Road and the Burleigh burn runs between the sites with Burleigh Castle lying further to the south.</p>
<p>Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc):</p>	<p>Proposed Use:</p> <p>Residential and in combination with the Burleigh Road site they are proposed to have a capacity for 250 to 300 homes</p>	<p>Officer Comments</p> <p>The same sensitives/constraints still exist for this sites development and there is still a lack of housing land requirement for this site. The area affected by SEPA medium risk flooding has reduced however there are still significant areas affected by SEPA medium surface water risk of flooding. Impacts on public views to Benarty Hills and Loch Leven would be significant, particularly for development west of the burn. Given that there is adequate provision elsewhere in</p>	

Agricultural land

Kinross and Milnathort there is no need to release this site to satisfy the housing requirement during the Plan period and there is a better alternative option.



Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
---	---------------------------------	---------	---	--------------------------	--	---------------------------

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	<p>The Burleigh burn runs between the 2 sites.</p> <p>Located close to Burleigh Burn – sensitivity to sewage discharges</p> <p>The groundwater status is good.</p> <p>It is not in a waste water drainage hotspot.</p>	<p>Check on OS map</p> <p>GIS Landuse layer</p> <p>Waste water drainage hotspots</p> <p>Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer</p>	-	<p>No culverting, and restoration of watercourses that have been previously diverted, policy on Reinstatement of Natural Watercourses.</p> <p>And development should be set back from the watercourse.</p> <p>Provided by application of policies on Water Environment and Drainage within Loch Leven Catchment which offer potential to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – connection to public sewerage system + must meet discharge consents at the waste water treatment works, and requiring appropriate SUDS.</p>	0
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes it lies close enough to the existing network (but awaiting further comment from Scottish Water regarding capacity)	GIS Layer for existing network	+	Policy Foul Drainage	+
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	<p>Historic record of flooding within the Milnathort area (including Hattonburn).</p> <p>Potential for development of the site to increase the probability of</p>	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	-	Detailed FRA required at planning application stage to define the area at risk and appropriate detailed design layout and levels, and also take	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			<p>flooding elsewhere.</p> <p>Small areas of the site next to the Burleigh burn appear within the SEPA medium risk of river flooding.</p> <p>Many small areas within the site area are at a SEPA medium risk of surface water flooding.</p>			<p>into account culverts at the site</p> <p>Open space dedicated next to the watercourse must be defined by a FRA and protected in perpetuity for flood risk reasons</p>	
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	<p>There is a record for hedgehog in the western site - ANIMALS WHICH MAY NOT BE KILLED BY CERTAIN METHODS (Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Schedule 6)</p> <p>It lies within the Loch Leven Valley catchment so there is a possible impact on this.</p>	<p>GIS layers</p> <p>SAC/SPA/SSSI/NNR/TPO/protected species</p> <p>Loch Leven Catchment</p> <p>Lunan Valley catchment</p> <p>River Tay Catchment</p>	-	<p>Policy Biodiversity.</p> <p>It is envisaged that the new development would incorporate formal and informal green spaces and recreational areas. These will be designed to ease the transition between the development and the open countryside to the east and would provide managed access to the countryside beyond.</p> <p>There are non-coniferous woodlands areas to the north and south of this site that potentially planting within this site could help improve green network links between.</p> <p>HRA identified mitigation (not previously assessed but likely to be along the lines of the following).</p>	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
						<p>HRA identifies the following criteria to the developer requirements section:</p> <p>Construction Method Statement to be provided where the development site will affect a watercourse.</p> <p>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 SPA.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Existing measures within the LDP will provide an additional safeguard against any impact of this policy include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy International Nature Conservation Sites Policy Water Quality Policy Foul Drainage Policy Surface Water Drainage Policy Drainage within the Loch Leven Catchment Area 	

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
						Loch Leven SPA and Ramsar Site Advice for planning applicants for phosphorous and foul drainage in the catchment Supplementary Guidance	
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		There are no local geodiversity sites or interests that could be affected.	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0		0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	There is the Burleigh burn running between the two sites.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	-	Securing new planting in line with the Perth and Kinross Forestry and Strategy. Standard mitigation of no culverting, and restoration of watercourses that have been previously diverted and that development is well set back from watercourses	0
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new	Air	Need to consider district heating potential here (identify need to investigate for strategic sites).	GIS Layers	0		0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)						
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	There is not sufficient capacity in Milnathort Primary school to cope with the projected growth. Need to try and get NHS to provide information on pressures? (COME BACK TO THIS but you can answer re schools)	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Proportional developer contributions will be sought towards primary education provision.	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	There is no existing open space or pathways within this site.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	Application of Policy on provision of open space ensures appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development proposals.	0
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	The site is proposed for solely residential purposes.	Check CFS form	-	The proposal could assist with the delivery of the currently allocated employment site E20 - Old Perth Road, Milnathort by way of a new roundabout on Perth Road which would also serve the access into this allocated employment site	0
Soils							

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Greenfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	n/a	-
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	There is no peat within the soils. It lies within class 3.1 prime agricultural land.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	-	Good quality soils should be removed for use in other parts of Perth and Kinross.	-
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	It is indicated that it can be delivered within the LDP timeframe.	Check CFS form	0		0
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	The site does have a principal south facing aspect but is open to prevailing winds from the South West.	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	0	The sites are generally south-facing which provides opportunities to make best use of solar gain through the detailed layout and siting of the new development. Consider shelter planting through landscape framework.	+
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic	Material assets and climatic factors?	A Transport Assessment would be undertaken to accompany any planning application for this site to demonstrate that the site will not impact on the road networks.	Check CFS form, aerial map and site visit	0	Access road would need to be delivered in conjunction with E20 proposals to the satisfaction of the Council as Roads Authority.	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	generated?						
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	The majority of the western part of the site lies within active travel distance of a bus stop and the shops in Milnathort but lies some distance from the Secondary school/services and enhanced shopping of Kinross.	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities	--	Possibly new bus stop provision before the eastern part of the site is occupied/ or reduced allocation within active travel distance.	-
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	The site is not significantly affected by these constraints however there are overhead cables running north to south through central areas	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised) Check for	-	Potential relocation of overhead cables?	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				pylons on OS and site visit			
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	No	NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	0	n/a	0
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	The site lies within the Loch Leven and Lomond Hills Special Landscape Area	GIS layers for NSA, SLA	--	Ensure particular care over the layout and design of the development and improve the biodiversity and habitat linkages with Loch Leven through the Landscape Framework and proposed woodland and set development well back from the burn. Open spaces should be designed to ease the transition between the development and the open countryside to the east and to protect views to Burleigh Castle.	-
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed	Landscape	The site lies outwith the settlement boundary.	Check LDP Check existing	--	Ensure particular care over the layout and design of the	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)		The David Tyldesley and Associates Settlement Strategy Landscape Capacity Study does not identify this land as a possible area for development, identifying it beyond the settlement edge with sensitive landscape features or views beyond and identifying that it would have an adverse effect on the setting of Bureligh Castle, views of town from the east and views to Lomond Hills	LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available Site visit		development and improve the biodiversity and habitat linkages with Loch Leven through the Landscape Framework and proposed woodland and set development well back from the burn. Open spaces should be designed to ease the transition between the development and the open countryside to the east and to protect views to Burleigh Castle. Potentially developable areas not to extend further east than existing Balfour Crescent/Burleigh burn? There is opportunity to create a defined and attractive settlement edge.	
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	N/a	GIS layer greenbelt	0	n/a	0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	N/a	GIS layer for waste management sites	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	N/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	0	n/a	0
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	Of significance are the spires of the Town Hall and Church located in the centre of the settlement and the Burleigh Castle to the south of this site which is a Schedule Monument and Category A listed building	GIS layers Listed building, SMS, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit	-	Impacts on the historic environment will be avoided wherever possible through appropriate scheme location and design. Particular consideration will be given to the setting of Burleigh Castle and a landscape buffer will be incorporated into the design in order to protect and enhance this scheduled monument. There will be a need to safeguard other important views, particularly those of the Milnathort Church and Milnathort Town Hall	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape			-	Particular consideration will be given to the setting of Burleigh Castle and a landscape buffer/open space will be incorporated into the design in order to protect and enhance this scheduled monument. Protect core path linkages between the sites.	0
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	The sites potential residential development is compatible with adjacent farmland and residential areas.	OS map and site visit	0	n/a	0
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	There are known constraints	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0

<p>Site Name: Milnathort 2</p>	<p>Source of site suggestion: All landowners/interested parties identified/aware?</p> <p>Scott Strachan Architect on behalf of Stephen Clark</p>		<p>Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals:</p> <p>This proposal is currently an existing employment area in the LDP.</p>
<p>Settlement: Milnathort</p>	<p>GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref: 92 Proposed Plan Ref: H143</p>	<p>Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? Inside the existing settlement boundary</p>	
<p>OS Grid Ref:</p> <p>704343 311965</p>	<p>Site Size (ha): 0.6 hectares</p>	<p>Within a TAY plan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? Tier 2</p>	<p>Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc).</p> <p>Consists of relatively flat land including existing buildings Moss Road yard offices and workshop adjacent to another yard to the north, with residential areas to the south. It has some attractive mature trees on its eastern boundary. The access out of the site has very compromised visibility looking right (due to a high stone wall).</p>
<p>Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc):</p> <p>Existing builders yard, offices and workshop and MB cars premises.</p>	<p>Proposed Use:</p> <p>Residential development for 6 homes.</p>	<p>Officer Comments</p> <p>Better to retain as an employment site given the need to ensure sufficient opportunity for employment opportunities and the lack of need for and better options for residential development. Given that there is adequate provision elsewhere in Kinross and Milnathort there is no need to release this site to satisfy the housing requirement during the Plan period and there is a better alternative option.</p>	

--	--	--



Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water						
Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	Possibly. The groundwater status is good. It is not in a waste water drainage hotspot.	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer	-	Provided by application of policies on Water Environment and Drainage within Loch Leven which offer potential to avoid/reduce/mitigate and	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer		enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – connection to public sewerage system + must meet discharge consents at the waste water treatment works, and requiring appropriate SUDS.	
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes it lies close enough to the existing network (but awaiting further comment from Scottish Water regarding capacity)	GIS Layer for existing network	+	Policy Foul Drainage	+
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	Small area within the southern site (eastern end of) with a SEPA medium risk of surface water flooding.	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	-	Detailed FRA required and avoid areas within functional flood plain.	0
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	It lies within the Loch Leven Valley catchment so there is a possible impact on this.	GIS layers SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species Loch Leven	-	HRA identified mitigation (not previously assessed but likely to be along the lines of the following). HRA identifies the following criteria to the developer	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment		requirements section: 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 SPA. 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. Existing measures within the LDP will provide an additional safeguard against any impact of this policy include: Policy: International Nature Conservation Sites Policy: Water Quality Policy Foul Drainage Policy Surface Water Drainage Policy Drainage within the Loch Leven Catchment Area Loch Leven SPA and Ramsar Site Advice for planning applicants	

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
						for phosphorous and foul drainage in the catchment Supplementary Guidance	
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		There are no local geodiversity sites or interests that could be affected.	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0	n/a	0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	It is not likely to affect habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on	Popl and	There is not sufficient capacity in	GIS Layers for	-	Proportional developer	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	human health or material assets	Milnathort Primary school to cope with the projected growth.	school catchments		contributions will be sought towards primary education provision.	
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	There is a pathway that runs along the southern edge of the site. There is an adopted core path that runs along South Street; a series of core paths from Auld Mart Road provides a link to the Loch Leven Heritage Trail.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	Application of Policy on Provision of Open Space ensures appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development proposals. Retention of footpath along the southern edge and which also connects with Auld Mart Road.	0
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	The site is proposed for solely residential purposes.	Check CFS form	-	n/a	-
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Greenfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	n/a	-
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	There is no peat within the soils and it does not lie within prime agricultural land.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	0	.n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	It is indicated that it can be delivered within the LDP timeframe.	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	The site does have a principal south facing aspect and existing housing provides some shelter from prevailing winds.	Check CFS form, aerial map and site visit	-	The site is south-facing which provides opportunities to make best use of solar gain through the detailed layout and siting of the new development.	0
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?	There is a high stone wall at the junction with South Street which severely affects visibility to the right. This is unlikely to be within the landowner's control.	Check CFS form, aerial map and site visit	-	Access road would need to be to the satisfaction of the Council as Roads Authority.	-
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	The site lies within easy active travel distance of a bus stop and the shops in Milnathort but lies some distance from the secondary schools/services and enhanced shopping of Kinross.	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities	-		-
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons,	Material Assets and Population and Human	There are no known constraints of this nature	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	underground gas pipelines etc.	Health		networks network rail buffer Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised) Check for pylons on OS and site visit			
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	No	NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	0	n/a	0
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	It will not affect any designated sites.	GIS layers for NSA, SLA	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	<p>The site lies within the settlement boundary.</p> <p>The David Tyldesley and Associates Settlement Strategy Landscape Capacity Study identifies this land as being within the settlement.</p> <p>The site has some mature trees on the eastern boundary which contain the site.</p>	<p>Check existing LDP</p> <p>GIS layer wild land</p> <p>Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available</p> <p>Site visit</p>	0	Retain trees on eastern boundary.	0
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	N/a	GIS layer greenbelt	0	n/a	0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	N/a	GIS layer for waste management sites	0	n/a	0
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in	Material Assets	N/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	0	n/a	0


	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?						
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	There are no features that would be affected by this proposal.	GIS layers Listed building, SMs, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit	0	N/a	0
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	n/a		0	n/a	0
Constraints							

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	The sites potential residential development would be directly adjacent to a builders yard to the north	OS map and site visit	-	n/a	-
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	There are known constraints	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0

<p>Site Name: Milnathort 3</p>	<p>Source of site suggestion: All landowners/interested parties identified/aware?</p> <p>Joe Fitzpatrick on behalf of Adam Neilson Ltd</p>		<p>Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals:</p> <p>This proposal is currently employment designation E21 in the LDP. The use of this site for residential has previously been explored through Planning application 07/00716/FLL which was refused by the Council and a subsequent appeal dismissed. The site lies adjacent to an established industrial area to the north, which raises concerns about compatibility issues in particular noise.</p>
<p>Settlement: Milnathort</p>	<p>GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref: 249 Proposed Plan Ref: H144</p>	<p>Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? Inside the existing settlement boundary</p>	
<p>OS Grid Ref: 704194 311903</p>	<p>Site Size (ha): 2 hectares</p>	<p>Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? Tier 2</p>	<p>Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc).</p> <p>Consists of relatively flat land with one unused derelict building at the northern end of the site. There are existing business uses operating in the northern part of the site out of the old barns. There is a yard in the southern portion of the site and there are offices and there are offices adjacent to the south and west of the site.</p>
<p>Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc):</p> <p>Brownfield industrial land, part of the existing Auld Mart Business Park with derelict buildings and storage yard</p>	<p>Proposed Use:</p> <p>Residential development</p>	<p>Officer Comments</p> <p>Better to retain as an employment site given the need to ensure sufficient employment opportunities and the lack of need for and better options for residential development.</p> <p>The new SEPA flood risk data shows a much reduced area (western edge) is at risk of flooding whereas previously the whole site lay within a 1 in 200</p>	

		<p>year River Flood risk.</p> <p>Given that there is adequate provision elsewhere in Kinross and Milnathort there is no need to release this site to satisfy the housing requirement during the Plan period and there is a better alternative option.</p>	
--	--	---	--

Insert Location Plan



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	Possibly. Groundwater status is good. It is not in a waste water drainage hotspot.	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer	-	Provided by application of policies on Water Environment and Drainage within Loch Leven Catchment which offer potential to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – connection to public sewerage system + must meet discharge consents at the waste water treatment works, and requiring appropriate SUDS.	0
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes (but awaiting any further comment from Scottish Water)	GIS Layer for existing network	+	Policy Foul Drainage	+
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	Small area on the western edge of the site lies within a SEPA medium risk of surface water flooding.	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	-	Basic FRA required at planning application stage to define area at risk and appropriate detailed design layout and levels.	0
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and	Bio flora and	It lies within the Loch Leven Valley catchment so there is a possible	GIS layers	-	HRA identified mitigation (not previously assessed but likely to	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	fauna interests?	fauna	impact on this.	SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment		<p>be along the lines of the following).</p> <p>HRA identifies the following criteria to the developer requirements section:</p> <p>Construction Method Statement to be provided where the development site will affect a watercourse.</p> <p>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 SPA.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Existing measures within the LDP will provide an additional safeguard against any impact of this policy include:</p> <p>Policy International Nature Conservation Sites</p> <p>Policy Water Quality</p> <p>Policy Foul Drainage</p> <p>Policy: Surface Water Drainage</p>	

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
						Policy: Drainage within the Loch Leven Catchment Area Loch Leven SPA and Ramsar Site Advice for planning applicants for phosphorous and foul drainage in the catchment Supplementary Guidance	
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		There are no local geodiversity sites or interests that could be affected.	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0	n/a	0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	It is not likely to affect habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area	Air	No	GIS Layers	0		0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	(AQMA)? (see notes)						
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)		There is not sufficient capacity in Milnathort Primary school to cope with the projected growth.	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Proportional developer contributions will be sought towards primary education provision.	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	To the east there is an adopted core path that runs alongside the watercourse up till it meets with Auld Mart Road which eventually provides connection with the Loch Leven Heritage Trail. To the west there is a core path along South Street.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	Application of Policy on Provision of Open Space ensures appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development proposals. A more direct footway connection between the core paths east and west of the site could be provided north of Kingfisher house and north of Station house.	0
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	The site is proposed for solely residential purposes and would represent a loss of land allocated for employment.	Check CFS form	--	Allocation as a mixed use site retaining some employment land is serviced alongside any housing development.	-
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Brownfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	n/a	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	There is no peat within the soils or prime agricultural land.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	0	n/a	0
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	It is indicated that it can be delivered within the LDP timeframe.	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	The site does have a principal south facing aspect and there is development to the south which will provide some protection from prevailing winds.	Check CFS form, aerial map and site visit	0	The site is south-facing which provides opportunities to make best use of solar gain through the detailed layout and siting of the new development.	+
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?	Check with Transport team as necessary? - are we going circulate the sites to them for input? A Transport Assessment would be undertaken to accompany any planning application for this site to demonstrate that the site will not impact on the road networks.	Check CFS form, aerial map and site visit	-	Access road would need to be to the satisfaction of the Council as Roads Authority.	0
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	The site lies within easy active travel distance of a bus stop and the shops in Milnathort but lies some distance from the secondary schools/services	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see	-	n/a	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			and enhanced shopping of Kinross.	if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities			
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	The site does not appear to be affected by these constraints.	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised) Check for pylons on OS and site visit	0	n/a	0
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a	Material Assets	No	NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?						
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No, the existing buildings are not appropriate for conversion for residential use but appear suitable for the businesses currently located here.	GIS aerial map/site visit	--	n/a	--
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs, Regional Scenic Areas, and local landscape designations?	Landscape	It would not affect any designated sites.	GIS layers for NSA, SLA	0	n/a	0
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	The site lies within the settlement boundary. The David Tyldesley and Associates Settlement Strategy Landscape Capacity Study identifies this land as being within the settlement.	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available Site visit	--	n/a	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	N/a	GIS layer greenbelt	0	n/a	0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	N/a	GIS layer for waste management sites	0	n/a	0
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	N/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	0	n/a	0
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	The site boundary slightly overlaps at its western edge with a non-designated archaeology site for Milnathort Station.	GIS layers Listed building, SMS, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape Battlefields, Archaeology	-	Possibly surveys undertaken prior to the implementation of schemes to determine whether they will affect sites of archaeological importance and the setting of archaeological features.	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Site visit			
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape			-	Possibly surveys will be undertaken prior to the implementation of schemes to determine whether they will affect sites of archaeological importance and the setting of archaeological features.	0
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	The sites development for residential would be compatible with the offices and residential areas nearby but the existing use is also compatible.	OS map and site visit	0	n/a	0
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	There are known constraints	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0

Site Name: OP19	Source of site suggestion: Adopted LDP Existing site		Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals: This is an allocated site within the 2014 adopted Local Development Plan. Consent was granted in outline in 2007 for the principle of a residential development with an indicative layout of 35 dwellinghouses (Ref 05/02085/OUT). Erection of 35 dwellinghouses (approval of matters specified in conditions) at the former Ochil Hills Hospital Milnathort (ref 10/02159/AMM) was approved 6/12/11. It is not clear whether a material start has been made to this development.
Settlement: Ochil Hills Hospital	GIS Site Ref: OP19 MIR Site Ref: OP19 Pre-MIR Site Ref: OP19 Proposed Plan Ref: OP19	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? Inside settlement boundary	
OS Grid Ref: 707367 309716	Site Size (ha):	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? Un-tiered	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc). This is a brownfield site within the settlement boundary for Ochil Hill Hospital. It comprises the landscaped grounds and site of the former Ochil Hills hospital (now demolished) and is located on the upper Ochil slopes above Tillyrie near Milnathort. The site features a few remaining, derelict hospital buildings, areas of hard-surfacing and woodland areas. The main hospital building was demolished in 2003. The site is accessed by way of the minor road from Tillywhally to Tillyrie which culminates in the private lane serving the former hospital
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc): Brownfield	Proposed Use: Residential maximum of 35 houses/ hotel or leisure/ institutional use	Officer Comments This is an allocated site within the 2014 adopted Local Development Plan. In the longer term the proposals offer many positive visual benefits to the site and this part of the SLA through the removal of derelict buildings the reinstatement of open waterways; and the introduction of new woodland areas.	



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a	Water	There are several small waterways	Check on OS	-	Application of policies on the	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)		<p>and a small loch within the site.</p> <p>Ground water classification – Good.</p> <p>No impact on GWDTEs; not in a waste water drainage hotspot.</p> <p>Within the Loch Leven Catchment Area.</p>	<p>map</p> <p>GIS Landuse layer</p> <p>Waste water drainage hotspots</p> <p>Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer</p>		<p>Water Environment and Drainage offer potential to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment.</p> <p>Drainage impact assessment/hydrology study will be required where development has the potential to affect natural hydrology systems and or adversely affects water resources. Sustainable drainage system required.</p> <p>Requirement for open watercourses to be retained and protected from pollution with a minimum 6m buffer strip.</p> <p>Opportunities should be sought to further improve the water environment through development e.g. links to blue/green networks, restoration opportunities etc.</p>	
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Due to the rural location it is unlikely that it will connect to the public foul sewer.	GIS Layer for existing network	-	Provision of a public drainage system with capacity to accommodate the surrounding development would be required.	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	Areas of Low and medium surface water flood risk within and areas of low, medium and high surface water flood risk immediately adjacent to the site.	Checked all the GIS Layers for flood risk	-	FRA and DIA required at planning application stage to define area at risk and appropriate detailed design layout and levels.	0
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	<p>There are no recorded biodiversity assets within this area.</p> <p>There is existing woodland in this area.</p> <p>This site is within the Loch Leven Catchment area.</p>	<p>GIS layers</p> <p>SAC/SPA/SSSI/NNR/TPO/protected species</p> <p>Loch Leven Catchment</p> <p>Lunan Valley catchment</p> <p>River Tay Catchment</p>	--	<p>Assessment and mitigation of any potential impacts on the existing native woodland.</p> <p>Where appropriate, measures to enhance biodiversity will be implemented.</p> <p>Assessment and mitigation of any potential impacts on the Loch Leven SPA. Where activities could directly, indirectly or in combination with other proposals affect the interests of a Natura 2000 site, the Council will carry out an Habitat Regulations Appraisal to identify appropriate mitigation and to determine if proposals would have an adverse effect on the integrity of the site</p>	0
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity		No	GIS Layers for Geological	0	N/A	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	interests that could be affected by the proposal?			Conservation Review sites, SSSI and Tayside Geodiversity Sites			
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	This is likely to be an area of relatively high biodiversity value due to the existing woodland and water environment. There is the potential to enhance this further and create connections through the site.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	Retaining woodland in line with Scottish Government Control of Woodland Removal policy. Where appropriate, measures to enhance biodiversity will be implemented. Such measures may include seeding locally native species on roadside verges and other schemes, the use of locally native tree species in landscape schemes, habitat creation, habitat creation for protected species (e.g. barn owl boxes, log pile holts for otters) and the creation of greenways and wildlife corridors along transport corridors, footpaths and cycleways, to encourage the movement of species.	+
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	N/A	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)						
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	This site is within the catchment for Milnathort Primary school which has limited capacity.	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Proportional developer contributions will be sought towards primary education provision.	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	There is no maintained open space within or immediately adjacent to this site however a core path runs through the site.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	Application of policy on provision of open space ensuring appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development proposals. Retain existing core path and its amenity. Improve existing core path and its connection to the wider core path network.	+
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	No	Check CFS form	N/A	N/A	N/A
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Brownfield.	GIS aerial map/site visit	+	N/A	+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	Part of the site is class 3.1 prime agricultural land. There are no carbon rich soils within this site.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	-	Good quality soils should be removed for use in other parts of Perth and Kinross.	-
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	Yes	Check CFS form	0	N/A	0
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	Yes	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	+	Design & layout to ensure solar gain and shelterbelt planting to west and south of the site would limit effects of prevailing SW winds. Include sustainable design and construction techniques and incorporate energy efficiency measures and make them resilient to the projected climatic changes in precipitation and temperature	+
	Vehicular Access constraints or	Material assets and climatic	The site could be accessed from the A91 however an improved access	Check CFS form, aerial map and site	-	Access road would need to be delivered to the satisfaction of	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	factors?	would be required.	visit		the Council as Roads Authority. Condition 8 of the outline consent requires a scheme of off-site improvement to the public road between Tillywhally and Upper Tillyrie to be agreed between the developer and the Council and implemented ahead of any site works. The private road to the site is required by condition 9 of the outline consent to be upgraded to adoptable standard ahead of the occupation of any new dwelling.	
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	The site is relatively rural with the nearest services being in Milnathort.	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities	-	Application of policies on Transport and Accessibility which require development proposals to be easily accessible to all modes of transport should be applied.	0
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	No	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks	0	N/A	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				<p>network rail buffer</p> <p>Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised)</p> <p>Check for pylons on OS and site visit</p>			
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	Potentially contrary to TAYplan strategy to focus new development in tiered although will provide development on brownfield land.	NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	0	N/A	0
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No existing building on site – they have been demolished.	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	N/A	0
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	The site is within the Ochil Hill SLA and there is an area of ancient woodland within and adjacent to the site.	GIS layers for NSA, SLA	-	Landscape policies will apply. As well as this a landscape framework should be required to ensure there are no adverse impacts on the SLA.	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
						All existing woodland should be retained in line with the forestry and woodland polices.	
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	The site is an area of brownfield land. It is thought that development of this site is likely to have a positive impact on the surrounding landscape.	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available Site visit	+	A landscape framework should be required to ensure there are no adverse impacts on the surrounding landscape.	++
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	Not within the green belt.	GIS layer greenbelt	0		0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	No	GIS layer for waste management sites	N/A	N/A	N/A

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	N/A	Check Zero Waste Plan	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	The Ochil Hill Hospital Archaeological Site lies within the site boundary.	GIS layers Listed building, SAMs, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit	-	An archaeological survey may be required to ensure there are no negative impacts on the archaeological site as a result of development.	0
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	The site is could improve access to the archaeological assets if appropriate.		0	N/A	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	Yes, surrounding uses are mainly agricultural.	OS map and site visit	0	N/A	0
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	No	Check CFS form	0	N/A	0

Site Name: H53	Source of site suggestion: Adopted LDP Existing site		Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals:
Settlement: Powmill	GIS Site Ref: H53 MIR Site Ref: H53 Pre-MIR Site Ref: H53 Proposed Plan Ref: H53	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? Inside settlement boundary	<p>This is an allocated site within the 2014 adopted Local Development Plan. Planning permission was granted for formation of 12 house plots on the western part of this site, this was time extended but it expired March 2016. Outline planning permission was also granted in January 2006 for residential development to the east of the former hotel, which has also expired.</p> <p>This site is supported in the current LDP but did not benefit from a full SEA assessment because it benefitted from an outline planning permission.</p>
OS Grid Ref: 697933 301720	Site Size (ha): 3.2ha	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? Un-tiered	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc).
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc): Brownfield	Proposed Use: Housing – 30 units	Officer Comments This is an allocated site for housing within the 2014 adopted Local Development Plan. It is a brownfield site and fits within the existing settlement pattern. It is an important site for the village and its prominence means it will require careful design/layout and a landscape framework to help integrate it.	This is a site within the settlement boundary for Powmill and comprises the site of the former Gartwhinzean Hotel with derelict farm buildings on the western edge. It is prominent site on the approach from the south and visually separates Powmill and Gartwhinzean Feus.

--	--	--	--



Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water						
Could the option result in a negative impact on the water	Water	There are no watercourses within or immediately adjacent to the site.	Check on OS map	0	Opportunities should be sought to further improve the water environment through	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	environment? (see notes)		Ground water classification – Poor, but the pressure is mining and quarrying of coal. No impact on GWDTEs; not in a waste water drainage hotspot.	GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer		development e.g. links to blue/green networks, restoration opportunities etc.	
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water		GIS Layer for existing network	0		0
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	Small areas of low probability surface water flooding immediately adjacent to the western boundary of the site. The nearby gairny burn is an area of medium probability flooding but this does not appear to directly affect this site.	Checked all the GIS Layers for flood risk	-	A FRA required at planning application stage to ensure the site is not a risk from flooding from the nearby Gairney Burn.	0
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	An area of native woodland lies adjacent to the southwestern boundary of the site.	GIS layers SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species	0	Assessment and mitigation of any potential impacts on the existing native woodland. Where appropriate, measures to enhance biodiversity will be	+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment		implemented. Potential to increase biodiversity by providing more habitats within the site.	
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		No	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0	N/A	0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	There is the potential to enhance existing habitats and create connections through the site.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	Retaining woodland in line with Scottish Government Control of Woodland Removal policy. Where appropriate, measures to enhance biodiversity will be implemented. Such measures may include seeding locally native species on roadside verges and other schemes, the use of locally native tree species in landscape schemes, habitat creation, habitat creation for protected species (e.g. barn owl boxes, log pile holts for otters) and the creation of greenways and wildlife corridors along	+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
						transport corridors, footpaths and cycleways, to encourage the movement of species.	
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	N/A	0
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	Yes the current spare capacity of Fossoway primary is limited.	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Proportional developer contributions will be sought towards primary education provision.	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	A core path follows the southern boundary of the site. There is no maintained open space within the site.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	Application of Policy on provision of open space ensuring appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development proposals. Core path routes could be extended into the site.	+
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment	Population	No	Check CFS	0	N/A	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	land/opportunities?			form			
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Brownfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	+	N/A	+
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	It is mineral soil with no peat content and it does not have any prime agricultural land.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	0	N/A	0
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	Yes	Check CFS form	0	N/A	0
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	Yes	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	0	Design and layout to maximise opportunities for solar gain and shelter planting to the south	0
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of	Material assets and climatic	A transport assessment would be required to ensure the most appropriate accesses provide.	Check CFS form, aerial map and site	-	Access road would need to be delivered to the satisfaction of the Council as Roads Authority.	0


	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	accommodating traffic generated?	factors?		visit			
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	Lies within 400 m of an existing bus stop, but the primary school is in Crook of Devon.	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities	-	N/A	-
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	No	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised)	0	N/A	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Check for pylons on OS and site visit			
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	Potentially contrary to TAYplan strategy to focus new development in tiered although will provide development on brownfield land.	NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	0	N/A	0
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	There are large redundant farm buildings onsite, planning permission (now expired) was previously granted for demolition and formation of serviced plots.	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	The buildings are not appropriate for redevelopment.	-
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	No designated areas would be affected	GIS layers for NSA, SLA	0	N/A	0
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	The site is an area of brownfield land. It is thought that development of this site is likely to have a positive impact on the surrounding landscape.	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is	+	A landscape framework should be required to ensure there are no adverse impacts on the surrounding landscape.	++

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				available Site visit			
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	Not within the green belt.	GIS layer greenbelt	0	N/A	0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	No	GIS layer for waste management sites	0	N/A	0
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	N/A	Check Zero Waste Plan	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	No	GIS layers Listed building, SAMs, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed	0	N/A	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Landscape Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit			
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	The site is unlikely to improve access to the historic environment.		0	N/A	0
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	No surrounding uses are mainly agricultural or residential.	OS map and site visit	0	Noise assessment would be required. Noise impacts will be reduced with the use of low noise road surfacing, landscaping and acoustic screening, if this is appropriate to the surrounding area.	0
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	No	Check CFS form	0	N/A	0

Site Name: E23 Powmill Cottage	Source of site suggestion: All landowners/interested parties identified/aware? Richstream Ltd		Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals: Planning application approved (11/00600/IPL, 12/01157/FLL & 12/01181/FLL). Road and drainage work being undertaken. LRB refused a planning application to remove condition retaining business use in perpetuity recognising that to do so would allow unrestricted residential use.
Settlement: Powmill	GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref: Proposed Plan Ref: E23	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? Inside	
OS Grid Ref: 301763 698423	Site Size (ha): 1.5 ha	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier?	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc). The site has an existing access site from the Craigton Farm Road in the north of Powmill. It lies to the north of the Gairney Burn and associated woodland.
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc): Undeveloped agricultural land	Proposed Use: Employment with associated residential uses	IOfficer Comments The site is a good and suitable location for employment and associated residential development. It requires a suitable landscape framework including enhancement of riparian strip to ensure suitable integration of the site. The employment uses will need to be restricted to ensure compatibility with associated residential uses.	



© Crown copyright [and database rights] 2016 OS [100016971]. You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data. You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
material							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	Possibly The groundwater status is poor but the pressure is mining and quarrying of coal.	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer	-	Apply Water Environment policy to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – connection to public sewerage system + and requiring appropriate SUDS.	0
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes it lies close enough to the existing network and existing permissions have identified that they propose to connect to the public drainage system.	GIS Layer for existing network	0	Policy Foul Drainage	0
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional	Water, Climatic Factors and Human	There are adjacent medium SEPA river flood risk areas adjacent to this site.	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	0	FRA required.	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	flood risk elsewhere?	Health					
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	Possible but it is not within the Loch Leven catchment and there are no designated sites	GIS layers SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment	0	Policy Biodiversity. Policy Foul Drainage	+
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		No	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI, and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0	n/a	0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	It will not result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	no	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	Employment uses and associated residential. Yes the current spare capacity of Fossoway primary is limited.	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Proportional developer contributions will be sought towards primary education provision.	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	The site has no open space function. There is a core path that runs along the road to the north of the allocation.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	n/a	0
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	It is proposed that the site would accommodate employment uses class 4, 5 and 6.	Check CFS form	++	n/a	++

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Greenfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	n/a	-
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	There is no peat content in the soils here and it is class 3.2 - not prime agricultural land.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	+	n/a	+
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	It is an existing allocated site which is considered to be effective for development.	Check submission	0	n/a	0
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	There is opportunity to take advantage of principal south facing aspect.	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	-	Siting and design of buildings to take account of solar orientation.	0
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of	Material assets and climatic	There are no known capacity issues	Check CFS form, aerial map and site	0	Access would need to be delivered to the satisfaction of the Council as Roads Authority.	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	accommodating traffic generated?	factors?		visit			
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	Partially lies within 400 m of an existing bus stop, but the primary school is in Crook of Devon	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities	-	n/a	-
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	No	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised)	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Check for pylons on OS map and on site visit			
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or is it consistent with the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	No	Check NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	0	n/a	0
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	No it will not affect any designated site.	GIS layers for NSA, and SLA	0	n/a	0
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	The site was not considered through the David Tyldesley landscape capacity study. It was considered beyond a sensitive edge with important landscape features or views beyond	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available	-	Appropriate design and layout and meeting placemaking policy. Requirement for landscape framework including enhancement of riparian strip	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Site visit			
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	No	GIS layer greenbelt	0		0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	No	GIS layer for waste management sites	0		0
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	No	Check Zero Waste Plan	0		0
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	No	GIS layers Listed building, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Gardens and	0		0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Designed Landscape, Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit			
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	N/a		0		0
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	Yes the type of employment uses will be restricted to ensure compatibility with the associated residential/	OS map and site visit	-	Sensitive layout, landscaping and design (placemaking policy).	0
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	There are no known constraints	Check CFS form	0		0

<p>Site Name: Powmill 1</p>	<p>Source of site suggestion: All landowners/interested parties identified/aware?</p> <p>Curious W.W Ltd on behalf of the landowner Bob Kay.</p>		<p>Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals:</p> <p>The site lies outwith but adjacent to the settlement boundary.</p>
<p>Settlement: Powmill</p>	<p>GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref: Powmill 1 Proposed Plan Ref: MU159</p>	<p>Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary?</p> <p>outwith</p>	
<p>OS Grid Ref: 302177 698369</p>	<p>Site Size (ha): 8.8 hectares</p>	<p>Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier?</p> <p>No</p>	<p>Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc).</p> <p>Bounded to the north by the Aldi road, by Powmill Farm steading and the Gairney Burn to the south, by the A977 to the east and by Craiglawn poultry farm to the west.</p>
<p>Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc):</p> <p>Largely undeveloped arable grazing farmland but does include the café and associated access and car park.</p>	<p>Proposed Use:</p> <p>Mixed Use with energy centre, farm shop, crèche, business hub, equestrian centre, assisted living and residential.</p>	<p>Officer Comments</p> <p>LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and it's tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas.</p> <p>There are already sufficient housing opportunities available within Powmill. This means that the justification for any site has to be about delivering benefits and it is considered that there are no significant (deliverable) wider benefits to this proposal.</p>	

		<p>This proposal is proposed to replace existing allocations in the village but the preferred strategy is to support the brownfield development of the Gartwhinzean Hotel and steading which has planning permission until 31st March 2016.</p> <p>The scale of the proposal is considered to be inappropriate, there is a flood risk issue to south (which also causes an issue with connection to existing settlement), access difficulties, and it is conspicuous on high ground and could dominate the village, and would detract from linear form, important to landform of the burn, and relationship of village with Gairney Burn.</p> <p>There is also a poultry farm to the immediate east of the site and residential development would need to be sufficiently set back, Scottish Government guidance suggests 400 m back and this would have a significant impact on proposals.</p>	
--	--	---	--

--



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	Possibly. The groundwater status is poor but the pressure is mining and quarrying of coal.	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage hotspots	-	Apply Water Environment policy to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – and require appropriate SUDS.	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer			
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes but with regard to current capacity in the public drainage network (Scottish Water will advise further).	GIS Layer for existing network	-	Policy Foul Drainage	0
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	Significant areas of SEPA river flooding to the south of the site. The developable area will be affected by flooding issues. There are also field drains to the north of the site	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	--	Requirement for a FRA and for design and layout to reflect its outcomes. Apply Water Environment policy re SUDs	0
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	Possible but it is not within the Loch Leven catchment and there are no designated sites.	GIS layers SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species	0	Policy Biodiversity. Policy Foul Drainage	+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment			
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		No	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI, and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0	n/a	0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	The current landuse is agricultural. It will not result in habitat fragmentation. There are some trees bounding the site.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	Retention of trees where possible and compensatory planting if necessary, and requirement for a suitable landscape framework	0
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)						
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	Yes the current spare capacity of Fossoway primary is limited.	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Proportional developer contributions will be sought towards primary education provision.	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	There are no core paths within the site and there is no maintained open space within the site.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	Application of Open Space Policy ensures appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development proposals.	+
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	The proposal is for a mixed use development including employment uses and could help an existing business to relocate and expand.	Check CFS form	++	n/a	++
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Greenfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	Greenfield	-
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site?	Material Assets and	It is mineral soil with no peat content and it does not have any prime	GIS Layers for carbon richness	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	(see notes)	Soils	agricultural land.	(which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)			
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	Yes	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	The site layout could make the most of the south facing slope and aspect but is relatively open.	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	-	Design and layout to maximise opportunities for solar gain and shelter planting to the south.	0
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?	Difficulty to provide an appropriate access strategy here and appropriate connections to the existing road network (only one access indicated from Aldi road).	Check CFS form, aerial map and site visit	-	n/a	-
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	Partially lies within 400 m of an existing bus stop, but the primary school is in Crook of Devon.	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to	-	n/a	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				local services and amenities			
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	No	<p>GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer</p> <p>Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised)</p> <p>Check for pylons on OS map and on site visit</p>	0	n/a	0
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and it's tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas. It	Check NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	--	There is no significant wider benefit (when compared against the existing allocations in the village to redevelop brownfield land) to justify further consideration of this proposal.	--

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			should be noted that the Reporter when considering LDP1 took a very strict interpretation of this approach and removed or reduced the size of a number of sites in the smaller settlements with limited services. One example of this being the reduction of a site in Powmill from 120 units to 30 units. This means that the justification for any site has to be about delivering benefits and it is considered that there are no wider benefits to this proposal				
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs local landscape designations?	Landscape	No designated areas would be affected	GIS layers for NSA, and SLA	0	n/a	0
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	The David Tyldesley and associates Landscape Capacity Study identifies this as conspicuous on high ground and could dominate the village, detracts from linear form, important to landform of the burn, and relationship of village with Gairney	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using	--	A strong landscape framework provided by planting to the southern and western edges would help contain the site better.	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			Burn.	capacity study if one is available Site visit			
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	No	GIS layer greenbelt	0	n/a	0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	N/a	GIS layer for waste management sites	n/a	n/a	n/a
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	N/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	n/a	n/a	n/a
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological	No	GIS layers Listed building, Scheduled	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
		heritage (and links with landscape)		Monuments, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape, Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit			
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	N/a		0	n/a	0
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	It is compatible with residential areas nearby however it lies immediately east of Craiglaw Poultry Farm. Scottish Government publication Prevention of Environmental Pollution from Agricultural Activity paragraph 13.14 states ‘When designing new buildings, consider their siting in relation to residential accommodation, and avoid sites within 400m of such developments.’	OS map and site visit	--	Ensure that the residential properties are a sufficient distance away from the Poultry farm.	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	Potentially marketability given proximity to the sewerage works	Check CFS form	-	n/a	-

<p>Site Name: Rumbling bridge X (reduced site)</p>	<p>Source of site suggestion: All landowners/interested parties identified/aware?</p> <p>Alternative to developer's proposal, as there was some Member and public support for the larger proposal.</p>		<p>Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals:</p> <p>The site lies outwith but adjacent to the settlement boundary. A larger site was resisted through previous LDP, and reporter agreed with Council's position. Planning application was refused by the Council and dismissed at appeal during 2014 and a further planning application which was also contrary to the Development Plan was refused December 2015.</p>
<p>Settlement: Rumbling Bridge</p>	<p>GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: Post-MIR Site Ref: Rumbling bridge X (reduced) Proposed Plan Ref: H265</p>	<p>Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary?</p> <p>adjacent</p>	
<p>OS Grid Ref: 699767 301582</p>	<p>Site Size (ha): 0.6</p>	<p>Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier?</p> <p>No</p>	<p>Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc).</p> <p>The site is bounded by the nursing home and River Devon to the south, with roads and properties to the north (to Naemoor road in Crook of Devon) and to the west (Main road), whilst it is open to the east.</p>
<p>Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc):</p> <p>Building materials storage, equestrian use, open fallow grassland.</p>	<p>Proposed Use:</p> <p>Residential linear development alongside the main road to the west.</p>	<p>Officer Comments</p> <p>LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and its tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas.</p> <p>There are already sufficient housing opportunities available within Rumbling Bridge. However this proposal would</p>	

		<p>be a small scale opportunity that would not negatively the TAYplan strategy</p> <p>For LDP1 the Reporter concluded that, “a landscape capacity study highlighted that this open field (R3) near the gorge is an important feature of the landscape character of this part of the village. Its development for housing, even at a low density, would detract from the attractive rural character of the village, and is unnecessary having regard to the other opportunities for infill development within the settlement boundary.”</p> <p>These conclusions remain relevant however this reduced site would allow some road frontage development but retain the amenity of the rest of the field to the east and safeguard the undulating characterful landscape features here. This suggestion would also fit better with the pattern of development here which is linear along the road. However there is still some negative landscape impact.</p> <p>A public consultation was carried out February 2017 to inform the Proposed Plan. There was a mixed response. From within Rumbling Bridge itself the comments were generally not in favour of the proposal. The feedback received will inform the Council's decision on the Proposed Plan.</p>	
--	--	--	--

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	Possibly. The groundwater status is good.	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer	-	Apply Water Environment policy to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – and require appropriate SUDS	0
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	No, there is no public system in Rumbling Bridge.	GIS Layer for existing network	-	Policy Foul Drainage	0
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human Health	No	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	0	n/a	0
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	Possible but it is not within the Loch Leven catchment and there are no designated sites.	GIS layers SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment	0	Policy Biodiversity. Policy Foul Drainage	+
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		No	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI, and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0	n/a	0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	The current landuse is agricultural. It would not result in habitat fragmentation. There are some trees adjacent to and bounding the site.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	There is a suitable setback from existing trees adjacent to the site, and the hedging to the west should be retained.	+
Air Quality							

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	Fossoway primary school is nearing capacity.	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Proportional developer contributions will be sought towards primary education provision. The developer offers potential/discretionary benefits of a play area, parking, shelter and interpretation boards for the gorge.	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	There are no core paths within the site and there is no maintained open space within the site.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	Application of Policy on Open Space ensures appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development proposals. Additional connection to core path to the gorge could be sought. The developer also offers a play area which would normally be secured with development of this scale.	+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	No, it is suggested that the landowner would be open to a shop being part of the proposal, but this seems unlikely to happen.	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Greenfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	Greenfield	-
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	It is mineral soil with no peat content and it does not have any prime agricultural land.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	0	n/a	0
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	Yes	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	The site has a east facing aspect, and there is some shelter from prevailing winds	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	0	Design and layout to maximise opportunities for solar gain.	+
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities -	Material assets and	No issues envisaged.	Check CFS form, aerial	0	In accordance with the Roads Authority	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	climatic factors?		map and site visit			
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	Lies within 400 m of an existing bus stop, but the primary school and services in Crook of Devon are beyond easy active travel distance.	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities	-	n/a	-
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	No	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised)	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Check for pylons on OS map and on site visit			
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or is it consistent with the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and it's tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas.	Check NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	--	The proposed site has a limited capacity ensuring only small scale development. However there are other infill opportunities already available within the village and there has proportionally been a lot of development here over recent history.	-
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	No designated site will be affected	GIS layers for NSA, and SLA	0	n/a	0
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	This site was considered by the David Tyldesley and Associates Landscape Capacity Study which identified this area of land as a sensitive edge to the settlement with important landscape features or views beyond. The conclusion of this report states	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape	--	Still residual landscape impacts from this proposal.	-



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			<p>that ‘Development of the open field in the village north of the nursing home would (be) inappropriate’ identifying both landscape constraints and development not being consistent with the settlement pattern.’</p> <p>This proposal would be consistent with the settlement pattern for roadside development and retains the amenity of the rest of the field to the east and safeguards the undulating characterful landscape feature here.</p>	<p>impact using capacity study if one is available</p> <p>Site visit</p>			
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	No	GIS layer greenbelt	0	n/a	0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	N/a	GIS layer for waste management sites	n/a	n/a	n/a
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in	Material Assets		Check Zero Waste Plan	n/a		n/a

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?						
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	No	GIS layers Listed building, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape, Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit	0	n/a	0
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	N/a		n/a	n/a	n/a

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	It is compatible with residential areas nearby.	OS map and site visit	0	0	0
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	No	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0

<p>Site Name: Rumbling bridge 1</p>	<p>Source of site suggestion: All landowners/interested parties identified/aware?</p> <p>Cockburn Consultants on behalf of the landowner the Johnson family</p>		<p>Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals:</p> <p>The site lies outwith but adjacent to the settlement boundary. Resisted through previous LDP, and reporter agreed with Council's position. A planning application was refused by the Council and dismissed at appeal during 2014 and a new planning application has recently been submitted which is also contrary to the Development Plan.</p>
<p>Settlement: Rumbling Bridge</p>	<p>GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref: Rumbling bridge 1 Proposed Plan Ref: H160</p>	<p>Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary?</p> <p>outwith</p>	
<p>OS Grid Ref: 301597 699823</p>	<p>Site Size (ha): 1.5 hectares</p>	<p>Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier?</p> <p>No</p>	<p>Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc).</p> <p>The site is bounded by the nursing home and River Devon to the south, with roads and properties to the north (to Naemoor road in Crook of Devon) and to the west (Main road), whilst it is open to the east. It is an undulating site and there is a mound within the eastern part of the site.</p>

<p>Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc):</p>	<p>Proposed Use:</p>	<p>Officer Comments</p>	
<p>Building materials storage, equestrian use, open fallow grassland.</p>	<p>Residential courtyard style proposal although the landowner would be open to a local shop being provided as part of the proposal.</p>	<p>LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and it's tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas.</p> <p>There are already sufficient housing opportunities available within Rumbling Bridge. This means that the justification for any additional site has to be about delivering benefits and it is considered that there are insufficient wider benefits to this proposal (it is considered unlikely that a shop would be interested in this location and no evidence of interest is provided).</p> <p>For LDP1 the Reporter concluded that, "a landscape capacity study highlighted that this open field (R3) near the gorge is an important feature of the landscape character of this part of the village. Its development for housing, even at a low density, would detract from the attractive rural character of the village, and is unnecessary having regard to the other opportunities for infill development within the settlement boundary."</p> <p>These conclusions still remain relevant and this site is not considered an option in the MIR.</p>	



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	Possibly. The groundwater status is good.	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer	-	Apply Water Environment policy to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – and require appropriate SUDS.	0
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	No there is no public system in Rumbling Bridge.	GIS Layer for existing network	-	Policy Foul Drainage	0
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human	No	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
		Health					
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	Possible but it is not within the Loch Leven catchment and there are no designated sites.	GIS layers SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment	0	Policy Biodiversity. Policy Foul Drainage	+
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		No	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI, and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0	n/a	0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	The current landuse is agricultural. It would not result in habitat fragmentation. There are some trees adjacent to and bounding the site.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	Suitable setback from existing trees adjacent to the site	+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	Fossoway primary school is nearing capacity.	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Proportional developer contributions will be sought towards primary education provision.	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	There are no core paths within the site and there is no maintained open space within the site.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	Application of Open Space Policy ensures appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development proposals.	+
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	No, it is suggested that the landowner would be open to a shop being part of the proposal, but this	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			seems unlikely to happen.				
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Greenfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	Greenfield	-
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	It is mineral soil with no peat content and it does not have any prime agricultural land.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	0	n/a	0
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	Yes	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	The site does have a south facing aspect, and there is some shelter from prevailing winds	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	+	Design and layout to maximise opportunities for solar gain.	+
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?	No issues envisaged	Check CFS form, aerial map and site visit	0	Access arrangements need to be in accordance with the Roads Authority	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	Lies within 400 m of an existing bus stop, but the primary school and services in Crook of Devon are beyond easy active travel distance.	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities	-	n/a	-
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	No but there is an overhead line 33 kv which runs roughly east-west through the site.	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised) Check for pylons on OS map and on	0	n/a	0


	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				site visit			
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and it's tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas.	Check NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	--	There is no wider benefit to justify further consideration of this proposal.	--
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	No designated sites will be affected	GIS layers for NSA, and SLA	0	n/a	0
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	This site was considered by the David Tyldesley and Associates Landscape Capacity Study which identified this area of land as a sensitive edge to the settlement with important landscape features or views beyond. The conclusion of this report states that 'Development of the open field in the village north of the nursing home would (be) inappropriate' identifying both landscape constraints and development not	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available	--	There are sufficient infill opportunities identified within Rumbling Bridge and this sites development would have a negative impact on the rural character of the village.	--

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			being consistent with the settlement pattern.'	Site visit			
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	No	GIS layer greenbelt	0	n/a	0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	N/a	GIS layer for waste management sites	n/a	n/a	n/a
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	n/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	n/a	n/a	n/a
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	No	GIS layers Listed building, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Gardens and	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Designed Landscape, Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit			
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	N/a		n/a	n/a	n/a
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	It is compatible with residential areas nearby.	OS map and site visit	0	0	0
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	No	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0

Site Name: E24 Rumbling Bridge	Source of site suggestion: All landowners/interested parties identified/aware? Richstream Ltd		Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals: 06/02120/FUL application for 13 holiday chalets refused. This decision was appealed and was considered by the DPEA and dismissed at appeal. Whilst a reserved matters application 08/01412/REM for a nursery and 5 chalets has lapsed.
Settlement: Rumbling Bridge	GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref: Proposed Plan Ref: E24	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? Inside	The site lies within the settlement boundary as an employment land allocation in the current Local Development Plan. It was not SEA assessed for the current LDP so a full assessment is required.
OS Grid Ref: 301934 699327	Site Size (ha): 1.2 ha	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? No	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc). The A977 lies at a much higher level to the south east of the site. It lies at the south eastern end of Rumbling Bridge adjacent to the A977/A823 junction. The site is steeply sloping down from the A977 and has some woodland within it. It is an existing disused commercial site, part of former railway land.
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc): Undeveloped land	Proposed Use: Employment use	Officer Comments The site is a good and suitable location for employment uses. The site would require an access from the A977 which lies at a much higher level to the south east of the site. It has some landscape and visual sensitivity and Rumbling Bridge is an unsewered settlement. Employment uses will need to be restricted to ensure compatibility with nearby residential area. As with all railway land there is potential for contamination.	

--	--	--	--



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	Possibly The groundwater status is good	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer	-	Apply Water Environment policy to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – re foul drainage + and requiring appropriate SUDS.	0
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	No there is no mains drainage in Rumbling Bridge	GIS Layer for existing network	-	Policy Foul Drainage	0
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human	No SEPA mapping flood risk identified within or adjacent but existing LDP requirement for FRA.	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	0	FRA required.	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
		Health					
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	Possible but it is not within the Loch Leven catchment and there are no designated sites	GIS layers SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment	0	Policy Biodiversity. Policy Foul Drainage	+
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		No	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI, and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0	n/a	0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	There are trees within the site and some would be affected by the access into the site	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	-	Planting to mitigate	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	no	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	Employment uses so not significant impacts on this.	GIS Layers for school catchments	0	n/a	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	The site has no open space function.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	n/a	0
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	It is proposed that the site would accommodate employment uses class 4, 5 and 6.	Check CFS form	++	n/a	++

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Former railway land (brownfield)	GIS aerial map/site visit	+	n/a	+
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	It forms part of former railway land and there is potential for contamination from a number of different processes. There is no peat content in the soils here and it is class 3.2 - not prime agricultural land.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	+	Development should not begin until a scheme to deal with the contamination on site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority.	+
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	It is an existing allocated site which is considered to be effective for development.	Check submission	0	n/a	0
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	It lies on a north facing slope but it does have some shelter from prevailing winds.	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	-	Siting and design of buildings to take account of solar orientation.	0
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of	Material assets and climatic		Check CFS form, aerial map and site	0	Access would need to be delivered to the satisfaction of the Council as Roads Authority.	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	accommodating traffic generated?	factors?		visit			
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	Partially lies within 400 m of an existing bus stop but there are no facilities within the village	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities	-	n/a	-
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	No	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised)	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Check for pylons on OS map and on site visit			
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or is it consistent with the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	No	Check NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	0	n/a	0
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	No it will not affect any designated site.	GIS layers for NSA, and SLA	0	.n/a	0
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	The site was not considered through the David Tyldesley landscape capacity study. It was considered beyond a sensitive edge with important landscape features or views beyond	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available	-	Appropriate design and layout and meeting placemaking policy. Requirement for landscape framework including enhancement of riparian strip	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Site visit			
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	No	GIS layer greenbelt	0	n/a	0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	No	GIS layer for waste management sites	0	n/a	0
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	No	Check Zero Waste Plan	0	n/a	0
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	No	GIS layers Listed building, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Gardens and	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Designed Landscape, Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit			
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	N/a		0	n/a	0
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	Yes the type of employment uses will be restricted to ensure compatibility with nearby residential.	OS map and site visit	0	Sensitive layout, landscaping and design (placemaking policy).	0
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	There are no known constraints	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0

Site Name: Scotlandwell 1	Source of site suggestion: All landowners/interested parties identified/aware? Bidwells on behalf of the landowner Kinneston.		Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals: The site lies outwith but adjacent to the settlement boundary.
Settlement: Scotlandwell 1	GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref: Scotlandwell 1 Proposed Plan Ref: H161	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? Outwith	
OS Grid Ref: 319069 701516	Site Size (ha): 1.1 hectares	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? No	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc). The site is bounded by Leslie road to the south and will be bound on its eastern side by a new road required for the extraction of forestry timber, surrounding land uses comprise residential, agricultural and equestrian.
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc): Agricultural land - arable	Proposed Use: Residential	Officer Comments LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and its tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas. There are already sufficient housing opportunities within Scotlandwell. This means that the justification for any additional site in a non-tiered settlement site has to be about delivering benefits and it is considered	

		<p>that there are no significant wider benefits to this proposal.</p> <p>Also this sites development would have a negative impact on the character of the village, and its conservation area and promote ribbon development</p>	
--	--	---	--



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
--	---	---------------------------------	---------	---	--------------------------	--	---------------------------

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	Possibly. The groundwater status is good.	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer	-	Apply Water Environment policy to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – and require appropriate SUDS.	0
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes but with regard to current capacity in the public drainage network (Scottish Water will advise further).	GIS Layer for existing network	-	Policy Foul Drainage	0
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human	No there is only a small amount of surface water flood risk to along the northern boundary where there would be no built development.	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
		Health					
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	Possible but it is not within the Loch Leven catchment and there are no designated sites.	GIS layers SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment	0	Policy Biodiversity. Policy Foul Drainage	+
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		No	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI, and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0	n/a	0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	The current landuse is agricultural. It would not result in habitat fragmentation.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	Framework planting would be required to the east and north of this site for landscape reasons.	+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	No Portmoak Primary School is nearing capacity	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Proportional developer contributions will be sought towards primary education provision.	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	There are no core paths within the site and there is no maintained open space within the site.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	Application of Policy Open Space ensures appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development proposals.	+
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	Suggested that this proposal could help cross fund the equestrian business and improvements to it	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0
Soils							

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Greenfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	Greenfield	-
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	It is mineral soil with no peat content and it does not have any prime agricultural land.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	0	n/a	0
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	Yes	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	The site does have a south facing aspect, and there is some shelter from prevailing winds from residential areas to the west	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	+	Design and layout to maximise opportunities for solar gain.	+
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?	No issues envisaged.	Check CFS form, aerial map and site visit	0	In accordance with the Roads Authority	0
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed	Climatic factors and	Lies within 400 m of an existing bus stop, but the primary school in Kinnesswood and a lot of other	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer	-	n/a	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	by public transport?	human health	services are outwith the community and beyond easy active travel distance.	so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities			
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	No	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised) Check for pylons on OS map and on site visit	0	n/a	0
	Does the proposal support a	Material	LDP requires to be compatible with	Check NPF3	--	There is no significant wider	--

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Assets	TAYplan and it's tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas.	and TAYplan SDP		benefit to justify further consideration of this proposal.	
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	This site lies within the Loch Leven and Lomond Hills SLA. There are sufficient opportunities identified within Scotlandwell and this sites development would have a negative impact on the character of the village, and promote ribbon development	GIS layers for NSA, and SLA	--	Framework planting to the north and east.	--
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	There are sufficient opportunities identified within Scotlandwell and this sites development would have a negative impact on the character of the village, and promote ribbon development	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available	--	Framework planting to the north and east.	--


	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				Site visit			
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	No	GIS layer greenbelt	0		0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	N/a	GIS layer for waste management sites	n/a	n/a	n/a
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	N/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	n/a	n/a	n/a
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	Yes it lies adjacent to the conservation area. There are sufficient opportunities identified within Scotlandwell and this sites development would have a negative impact on the character of the village, and promote ribbon	GIS layers Listed building, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Gardens and	--		--

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			development.	Designed Landscape, Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit			
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	N/a		n/a		n/a
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	It is compatible with residential areas nearby.	OS map and site visit	0		0
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	No	Check CFS form	0		0

<p>Site Name: Scotlandwell 2</p>	<p>Source of site suggestion: All landowners/interested parties identified/aware?</p> <p>TMS Planning on behalf of the landowners Mr and Mrs Esparon</p>		<p>Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals:</p> <p>The site lies outwith but adjacent to the settlement boundary and site H54.</p>
<p>Settlement: Scotlandwell 2</p>	<p>GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref: Scotlandwell 2 Proposed Plan Ref: H162</p>	<p>Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary?</p> <p>Outwith</p>	
<p>OS Grid Ref: 319069 701516</p>	<p>Site Size (ha): 2.5 hectares</p>	<p>Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier?</p> <p>No</p>	<p>Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc).</p> <p>South facing aspect which is open to the south leaving it exposed to prevailing winds until any framework planning is established. It lies immediately south of the allocated H54 and east of allotment gardens.</p>
<p>Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc):</p> <p>Agricultural land – arable but it is currently unused.</p>	<p>Proposed Use:</p> <p>Residential use in the western section of the site (circa 1.5 ha) and a community woodland on land to the east (1 ha)</p>	<p>Officer Comments</p> <p>LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and its tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas.</p> <p>There are already sufficient housing opportunities within Scotlandwell. This means that the justification for any additional site in a non-tiered settlement site has to be about delivering benefits and it is considered that there are no significant wider</p>	

benefits to this proposal.

Whilst there could be some benefit from the provision of community woodland there are sufficient housing opportunities within Scotlandwell and almost the entire site lies within the SEPA medium river flood risk for the River Leven making it an unsuitable site for development. The scale of development proposed (alongside H54) is also out of keeping with the character of the village.



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	Possibly. The groundwater status is good.	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer	-	Apply Water Environment policy to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – and require appropriate SUDS	0
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes but with regard to current capacity in the public drainage network (Scottish Water will advise further).	GIS Layer for existing network	-	Policy Foul Drainage	0
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human	Yes it lies almost entirely within SEPA medium river flood risk and there is also surface water flood risk on the eastern third of the site	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	--		--

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
		Health					
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	Possible but it is not within the Loch Leven catchment and there are no designated sites.	GIS layers SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment	0	Policy Biodiversity. Policy Foul Drainage	+
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		No	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI, and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0		0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	The current landuse is agricultural. It would not result in habitat fragmentation. Community woodland is proposed for an eastern 1 ha area and framework planting would be required to the south.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	++		++

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	No	GIS Layers	0		0
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	No Portmoak Primary School is nearing capacity	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Proportional developer contributions will be sought towards primary education provision.	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	There are no core paths within the site and there is no maintained open space within the site.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	Application of Policy Open Space ensures appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development proposals.	+
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	No	Check CFS form	0		0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Greenfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	Greenfield	-
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	It is class 5 soil in terms of carbon rich soils.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	--	Requirement for an appropriate peat survey and management plan; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Any disturbance or excavation be minimised; and</u> • <u>Suitable mitigation measures implemented to abate carbon emissions</u> 	-
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	Yes	Check CFS form	0		0
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	The site does have a south facing aspect, but is a pretty open site.	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	0	Design and layout to maximise opportunities for solar gain. Potentially some planting to the south and east.	+
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic	Material assets and climatic factors?	No issues envisaged.	Check CFS form, aerial map and site visit	0	In accordance with the Roads Authority	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	generated?						
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport?	Climatic factors and human health	Lies within 400 m of an existing bus stop, but the primary school in Kinnesswood and a lot of other services are outwith the community and beyond easy active travel distance.	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities	-	n/a	-
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	No	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised) Check for	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
				pylons on OS map and on site visit			
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and it's tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas. It should be noted that the Reporter when considering LDP1 took a very strict interpretation of this approach and removed or reduced the size of a number of sites in the smaller settlements with limited services. One example of this being the reduction of a site in Powmill from 120 units to 30 units. This means that the justification for any site has to be about delivering benefits.	Check NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	-	The proposal includes community woodland to the east of the site on 1 hectare site which could mitigate the impact on the spatial strategy although it is still contrary to it.	-
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	This site lies within the Loch Leven and Lomond Hills SLA There are sufficient opportunities identified within Scotlandwell and this sites development would have a	GIS layers for NSA, and SLA	--		--

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
			<p>negative impact on the character of the village, due to its scale alongside H54.</p> <p>Framework planting to the south and community woodland proposed for 1 hectare of the site.</p>				
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	<p>There are sufficient opportunities identified within Scotlandwell and this sites development would have a negative impact on the character of the village, due to its scale alongside H54.</p> <p>Framework planting to the south and community woodland proposed for 1 hectare of the site.</p>	<p>Check existing LDP</p> <p>GIS layer wild land</p> <p>Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available</p> <p>Site visit</p>	--		--
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	No	GIS layer greenbelt	0	n/a	0
Material assets							


	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	N/a	GIS layer for waste management sites	n/a	n/a	n/a
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?	Material Assets	N/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	n/a	n/a	n/a
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	Yes it lies close to the conservation area. There are sufficient opportunities identified within Scotlandwell and this sites development would have a negative impact on the character of the village.	GIS layers Listed building, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape, Battlefields, Archaeology Site visit	-	n/a	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	N/a		n/a	n/a	n/a
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	It is compatible with the allotments and the LDP housing allocation H54.	OS map and site visit	0	n/a	0
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	No	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0

Site Name: Scotlandwell 3	Source of site suggestion: All landowners/interested parties identified/aware? Montague Evans on behalf of the landowner John Beales		Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals: The site lies outwith but adjacent to the settlement boundary and site H54. Previously rejected through LDP and reporter supported the Council's position.
Settlement: Scotlandwell 3	GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref: Scotlandwell 3 Proposed Plan Ref: H163	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? Outwith	
OS Grid Ref: 318678 701406	Site Size (ha): 1.2 hectares	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? No	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc). The land located south of the open space at Friar Place allocated within the current Local Development Plan. The burial ground lies to the north and there is a grassed area to the south of this. The area currently provides open views south to the countryside. The allocated H54 housing site lies to the immediate west of the site.
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc): Agricultural land.	Proposed Use: Residential and extended open space (extended onto existing provision to the north of the site).	Officer Comments LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and its tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas. There are already sufficient housing opportunities within Scotlandwell. This means that the justification for any additional site in a non-tiered	

settlement site has to be about delivering benefits and it is considered that there are no significant wider benefits to this proposal.

The scale of development proposed (alongside H54) is out of keeping with the character of the village. This proposal would also interrupt views out from village over important greenspace and would affect the connection between the conservation area and the countryside beyond.



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	Possibly. The groundwater status is good	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer	-	Apply Water Environment policy to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – and require appropriate SUDS	0
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes but with regard to current capacity in the public drainage network (Scottish Water will advise further).	GIS Layer for existing network	-	Policy Foul Drainage	0
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human	No	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
		Health					
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	Possible but it is not within the Loch Leven catchment and there are no designated sites.	GIS layers SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment	0	Policy Biodiversity. Policy Foul Drainage	+
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		No	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI, and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0	n/a	0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	The current landuse is agricultural. It would not result in habitat fragmentation.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	0	Framework planting to the east and south	+
Air Quality							

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	No Portmoak Primary School is nearing capacity	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Proportional developer contributions will be sought towards primary education provision.	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	There are no core paths within the site and there is no maintained open space within the site.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	Application of Open Space Policy ensures appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development proposals.	+
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	No	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0
Soils							
	Is the option on greenfield or	Material	Greenfield	GIS aerial	-	Greenfield	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	brownfield land?	Assets and Soils		map/site visit			
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	It lies within class 5 which has carbon rich soils. It is not prime agricultural land.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An appropriate peat survey and management plan; • Any disturbance or excavation be minimised; and • Suitable mitigation measures implemented to abate carbon emissions 	-
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	Yes	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	The site does have a south facing aspect, but is a pretty open site.	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	0	Design and layout to maximise opportunities for solar gain. Shelter planting to the south and east.	+
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?		Check CFS form, aerial map and site visit	0	In accordance with the Roads Authority	0
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed	Climatic factors and	Lies within 400 m of an existing bus stop, but the primary school in	GIS layer for bus stops has	-	n/a	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	by public transport?	human health	Kinnesswood and a lot of other services are outwith the community and beyond easy active travel distance.	a 400m buffer so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities			
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	No	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised) Check for pylons on OS map and on site visit	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Does the proposal support a designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Material Assets	LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and it's tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas.	Check NPF3 and TAYplan SDP	--	n/a	--
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	0		0
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	<p>This site lies within the Loch Leven and Lomond Hills SLA</p> <p>There are sufficient opportunities identified within Scotlandwell and this sites development would have a negative impact on the character of the village, due to its scale alongside H54.</p> <p>Some open space provision adjacent to the existing is proposed however it would still interrupt views out from village over important greenspace and would affect the connection between the conservation area and the countryside beyond.</p>	GIS layers for NSA, and SLA	--	n/a	--
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	There are sufficient opportunities identified within Scotlandwell and this sites development would have a negative impact on the character of the village, due to its scale alongside H54. Some open space provision adjacent to the existing is proposed however it would still interrupt views out from village over important greenspace and would affect the connection between the conservation area and the countryside beyond.	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available Site visit	--	n/a	--
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	No	GIS layer greenbelt	0	n/a	0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	N/a	GIS layer for waste management sites	n/a	n/a	n/a
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in	Material Assets	N/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	n/a	n/a	n/a

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?						
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	<p>Yes it lies adjacent to the conservation area.</p> <p>There are sufficient opportunities identified within Scotlandwell and this sites development would have a negative impact on the character of the village.</p> <p>Some open space provision adjacent to the existing is proposed however it would still interrupt views out from village over important greenspace and would affect the connection between the conservation area and the countryside beyond.</p>	<p>GIS layers</p> <p>Listed building, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape, Battlefields, Archaeology</p> <p>Site visit</p>	-	n/a	-
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with	N/a		n/a	n/a	n/a

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
		landscape					
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	It is compatible with the allotments and the LDP housing allocation H54.	OS map and site visit	0	n/a	0
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	No	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0

Site Name: Scotlandwell 4	Source of site suggestion: All landowners/interested parties identified/aware? Landowner Angela Morrison		Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals: The site lies mainly the settlement boundary although the land directly adjacent to Leslie Road lies within.
Settlement: Scotlandwell 4	GIS Site Ref: MIR Site Ref: Pre-MIR Site Ref: Scotlandwell 4 Proposed Plan Ref: H164	Outside or adjacent to a settlement boundary? Outwith	
OS Grid Ref: 318657 701724	Site Size (ha): 0.9 hectares	Within a TAYplan preferred Settlement, if so which settlement tier? No	Summary Description (topography, features, boundaries, neighbouring issues, access, exposure, aspect etc). The site lies close to the centre of the village, is south facing and there are mature trees to the north, west and partially along the eastern boundary which provides some shelter. It is bounded by a track to the north, Leslie Road to the south and residential properties Arkle Cottage to the west and Applerigg to the east. Most of the site is backland with no road frontage.
Current Use e.g. is the site developed, sparsely developed or undeveloped (e.g. agriculture, brownfield etc): Vacant land.	Proposed Use: Residential	Officer Comments LDP requires to be compatible with TAYplan and its tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas. There are already sufficient housing opportunities within Scotlandwell. This means that the justification for any additional site in a non-tiered	

		<p>settlement site has to be about delivering benefits and it is considered that there are no significant wider benefits to this proposal.</p> <p>In any case the proposal would have a significant negative impact on the conservation area and on the settlement pattern/form being backland development with no frontage.</p>	
--	--	--	--



	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
--	---	---------------------------------	---------	---	--------------------------	--	---------------------------

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Water							
	Could the option result in a negative impact on the water environment? (see notes)	Water	Possibly. The groundwater status is good.	Check on OS map GIS Landuse layer Waste water drainage hotspots Private water supplies (risk assessed) layer	-	Apply Water Environment policy to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any possible impacts on the water environment – and require appropriate SUDS	0
	Can the option connect to the public foul sewer?	Water	Yes but with regard to current capacity in the public drainage network (Scottish Water will advise further).	GIS Layer for existing network	-	Policy Foul Drainage	0
	Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	Water, Climatic Factors and Human	No	Check all the GIS Layers for flood risk	0	n/a	0

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
		Health					
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna							
	To what extent will the proposal affect biodiversity, flora and fauna interests?	Bio flora and fauna	Possible but it is not within the Loch Leven catchment and there are no designated sites.	GIS layers SAC/SPA/SSSI/ NNR/ TPO/protected species Loch Leven Catchment Lunan Valley catchment River Tay Catchment	0	Policy Biodiversity. Policy Foul Drainage	+
	Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal?		No	GIS Layers for Geological Conservation Review sites, SSSI, and Tayside Geodiversity Sites	0	n/a	0
	How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?	Bio flora and fauna	The current landuse is vacant grassland. It would not result in habitat fragmentation. Framework planting to the north, and it is proposed that the gardens (riggs) of the properties could be used for local food production.	GIS aerial map/OS map/site visit	+		+

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Air Quality							
	Could the option lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached within the Perth and Crieff Air Quality Management Areas or lead to the designation of a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? (see notes)	Air	No	GIS Layers	0	n/a	0
Service Infrastructure							
	What will be the impact on local/community facilities and infrastructure (see notes)	Popl and human health or material assets	No Portmoak Primary School is nearing capacity.	GIS Layers for school catchments	-	Proportional developer contributions will be sought towards primary education provision.	0
	To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?	Popl and human health or material assets	There are no core paths within the site and there is no maintained open space within the site.	GIS layers for core paths and rights of way and maintained open space and existing LDP for open space allocations	0	Application of Open Space Policy ensures appropriate provision of informal and formal open space alongside any development proposals.	+
	Will the proposal create/reduce employment land/opportunities?	Population	No	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0
Soils							

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Is the option on greenfield or brownfield land?	Material Assets and Soils	Greenfield	GIS aerial map/site visit	-	Greenfield	-
	Are there any contaminated land/ soils issues on the site? (see notes)	Material Assets and Soils	It is mineral soil with no peat content and it is not prime agricultural land.	GIS Layers for carbon richness (which shows whether there is peatland), and prime agricultural land (LCA 50K)	0	n/a	0
Deliverability/sustainability constraints							
	Will the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?	Material assets	Yes	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0
	Site aspect – does the site make best use of solar gain? Is the site protected from prevailing winds?	Climatic factors	The site does have a south facing aspect, and there are mature trees to the west north and partially along the western boundaries of the site.	Check CFS form, aerial map and possibly site visit	+	Design and layout to maximise opportunities for solar gain.	+
	Vehicular Access constraints or opportunities - Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?	Material assets and climatic factors?		Check CFS form, aerial map and site visit	0	In accordance with the Roads Authority	0
	Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed	Climatic factors and	Lies within 400 m of an existing bus stop, but the primary school in Kinnesswood and a lot of other	GIS layer for bus stops has a 400m buffer	-	n/a	-

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	by public transport?	human health	services are outwith the community and beyond easy active travel distance.	so you can see if it is within easy active travel distance Check distance to local services and amenities			
	Is the site within a Health and Safety Consultation Zone or any other site servicing constraints, e.g. electricity pylons, underground gas pipelines etc.	Material Assets and Population and Human Health	No	GIS layers for pylons, gas pipelines, scottish gas networks network rail buffer Check the health and safety consultations at the back of the LDP (they are not digitised) Check for pylons on OS map and on site visit	0	n/a	0
	Does the proposal support a	Material	LDP requires to be compatible with	Check NPF3	--	n/a	--

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	designated National Planning Framework national priority or a site identified in the Strategic Development Plan?	Assets	TAYplan and it's tiered approach to concentrating development on the principal settlements, and directing the majority of allocations to the main settlements whilst allowing limited development in other areas.	and TAYplan SDP			
	Will the site make use of existing buildings?	Material Assets	No	GIS aerial map/site visit	0	n/a	0
Landscape Designated sites							
	To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations?	Landscape	This site lies within the Loch Leven and Lomond Hills SLA There are sufficient opportunities identified within Scotlandwell and this sites development would have a negative impact on the character of the village, as the majority of the proposal is for backland development which is not in keeping with the historic settlement pattern.	GIS layers for NSA, and SLA	--	n/a	--
Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests							

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? (see notes)	Landscape	There are sufficient opportunities identified within Scotlandwell and this sites development would have a negative impact on the character of the village, as the majority of the proposal is for backland development which is not in keeping with the historic settlement pattern.	Check existing LDP GIS layer wild land Check the landscape impact using capacity study if one is available Site visit	--	n/a	--
	Will the proposal have an adverse impact on the integrity of the greenbelt?	Popl and human health or material assets	No	GIS layer greenbelt	0	n/a	0
Material assets							
	Is the option in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation?	Material Assets and Human Health	N/a	GIS layer for waste management sites	n/a	n/a	n/a
	For potential waste management activity sites (includes allocation for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) - does the proposal comply with the locational criteria set out in	Material Assets	N/a	Check Zero Waste Plan	n/a	n/a	n/a

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
	annex B of the Zero Waste Plan?						
Cultural Heritage							
	Will the option affect any cultural heritage asset or their setting?	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage (and links with landscape)	<p>Yes it lies within the conservation area.</p> <p>There are sufficient opportunities identified within Scotlandwell and this sites development would have a negative impact on the character of the village, as the majority of the proposal is for backland development which is not in keeping with the historic settlement pattern.</p>	<p>GIS layers</p> <p>Listed building, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscape, Battlefields, Archaeology</p> <p>Site visit</p>	--	n/a	--
	To what extent will the proposal result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? (see notes)	Cultural heritage, incl architectural and archaeological heritage and links with landscape	N/a		n/a	n/a	n/a

	Site assessment question (click on links embedded in the text for further guidance)	Related SEA topic if applicable	Comment	Information available – GIS/site visit?	Scoring – pre mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement if appropriate?	Scoring – post mitigation
Constraints							
	Is the site impacted by/compatible with neighbouring uses?	Could relate to all SEA topics depending on neighboring uses	It is compatible with the residential properties.	OS map and site visit	0	n/a	0
	Are there any known constraints to development e.g. ownership, marketability etc.	Material Assets	No	Check CFS form	0	n/a	0