

Post-Adoption SEA Statement – Cover Note

Responsible Authority:	Orkney Islands Council.
Title of the Plan:	Orkney Local Development Plan 2017.
Plan adopted on:	18 April 2017.
Contact name:	Eileen Summers.
Job title:	Environment Officer (Policy).
Contact address:	Council Offices, School Place, Kirkwall, Orkney, KW15 1NY.
Contact telephone number.	01856873535 extension 2828.
Contact email:	eileen.summers@orkney.gov.uk
Signature and date	Eileen Summers, 11 May 2017.

Contents:

Post-Adoption SEA Statement – Cover Note.....1

 Post-adoption Statement Strategic Environmental Assessment process.....4

 How environmental considerations have been integrated into the Orkney Local
Development Plan 2017.....5

 Environmental Issues5

 Aspects of the Plan where there remains potential for significant negative effects23

 Significant positive effects identified in the Environmental Report.....23

How opinions expressed during the consultation have been taken into account25

 Monitoring Programme52

 Reasons for choosing the Orkney Local Development Plan 2017, as adopted58

Post-Adoption Statement – Key Facts

This Post-Adoption document has been prepared in accordance with Section 18 of the Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005.

The full Orkney Local Development Plan 2017 as adopted, along with the Environmental Report and Post-adoption Statement are available on the Orkney Islands Council website at <http://www.orkney.gov.uk>. All three documents may also be inspected free of charge (or a copy obtained for a reasonable charge) from Monday to Friday between the hours of 09:00 and 17:00 at the Council Offices, School Place, Kirkwall KW15 1NY.

Post-adoption Statement: Key Facts	
Purpose of the Orkney Local Development Plan:	The LDP sets a concise spatial plan for the main proposals for a ten-year period, as well as a broad indication of the scale and patterns of growth.
What prompted the plan:	The Council is required by law to prepare and keep under review a Development Plan which sets out the Council's planning policies on the use and development of land in the County. The Development Plan is a statutory document which is directed by European, National and other laws, policies and strategies which the Council is duty bound to respond to. The Development Plan is also a local document which must represent the community and have ownership by the community it exists to serve. It is also a key document enabling the Council to deliver many of its Community Planning and Single Outcome Agreement commitments. The Council is committed to ensuring that the new Development Plan achieves all these requirements.
Subject:	Town and country land use planning.
Period covered:	2017-2022.
Frequency of updates:	The Plan will be monitored and reviewed every five years and will be updated if required.
Area covered by the Plan:	Orkney Islands Council administrative area.
Summary of nature / content of the Plan:	The LDP establishes the land use policy framework for Orkney.
Date adopted:	18 April 2017.
Contact name and job title:	Eileen Summers. Environmental Policy Officer.

Post-adoption Statement Strategic Environmental Assessment process

The Orkney Local Development Plan 2017 has been subject to a process of Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), as required under the Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005. This has included the following activities:

- Taking into account the views of the Scottish Environment Protection Agency, Scottish Natural Heritage and Historic Environment Scotland) regarding the scope and level of detail that was appropriate for the Environmental Report
- Preparing an Environmental Report on the likely significant effects on the environment of the draft PPS which included consideration of:
 - The baseline data relating to the current state of the environment;
 - Links between the Plan and other relevant strategies, policies, plans, programmes and environmental protection objectives;
 - Existing environmental problems affecting the Plan;
 - The plan's likely significant effects on the environment (positive and negative);
 - Measures envisaged for the prevention, reduction and offsetting of any significant adverse effects;
 - An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives chosen;
 - Monitoring measures to ensure that any unforeseen environmental effects will be identified allowing for appropriate remedial action to be taken;
 - Consulting on the Environmental Report;
 - Taking into account the Environmental Report and the results of consultation in making final decisions regarding the Plan; and
 - Committing to monitoring the significant environmental effects of the implementation of the Plan. This will also identify any unforeseen adverse significant environmental effects and to enable taking appropriate remedial action.

Table 1: SEA progress to date

Milestone activity.	Publication date.
Scoping statutory consultation.	17 November – 23 December 2014.
Main Issues Report and Environmental Report consultation.	8 July – 16 September 2015.
Proposed Plan and Environmental Report consultation.	5 May – 16 June 2016.
Final Plan formally adopted.	18 April 2017.
Post-adoption Statement published.	11 May 2018.

How environmental considerations have been integrated into the Orkney Local Development Plan 2017

This section of the Post Adoption Statement sets out how environmental considerations have been taken into account when preparing the Orkney Local Development Plan and how they have broadly influenced its shape. It provides information on how the following have been addressed in the Plan:

- Environmental issues identified by the Environmental Report.
- Assessment and Mitigation.
- Significant negative effects.
- Significant positive effects.

Environmental Issues

Table 2 below outlines the environmental issues which were identified in the Environmental Report and how these have been addressed in preparation of the Orkney Local Development Plan.

Table 2: Environmental Issues identified by the Environmental Report

Environmental issues highlighted by the Environmental Report	Integrated into Plan?	How integrated into the final Plan, or reason for not being taken into account
<p>Orkney has a relatively high carbon footprint which is due a number of contributing factors, some of which are relevant to the Local Development Plan.</p> <p>Although the major centres of population are Kirkwall and Stromness, many people live in rural areas and require transport to get to their work or to access services and facilities in the towns.</p> <p>Orkney is heavily dependent on fossil fuels for transport and there is a high level of car ownership in the county.</p>	Yes.	<p>The Plan seeks to support the growth of Orkney’s communities in a sustainable manner, ensuring that development is directed in the first instance to places with sufficient infrastructure and facilities to support sustainable social and economic development – the towns, villages and rural settlements of the Plan.</p> <p>The Plan identifies generous land allocations for future development in these settlements, with the aim of shaping development patterns in a way that can reduce the need to travel, especially by car.</p>
<p>Orkney’s geographical location means that its climate is cool, damp and windy and space heating is required for much of the year. Fuel poverty is an issue which is anticipated to grow with increased fuel costs.</p>	Yes.	<p>Policy 1 <i>Criteria for all development</i> requires new development to be resource efficient, utilising sustainable construction technologies, techniques and materials and, where practicable, including the installation of low and zero carbon technologies.</p>
<p>Renewable energy development, both on land and in the marine environment, is a growing economic sector in Orkney and makes a significant contribution towards national climate change and carbon reduction targets. However such development has potential to impact upon other environmental receptors.</p>	Yes.	<p>Policy 7C <i>All renewables and low carbon energy developments</i> supports proposals where it has been demonstrated that the development would not result in significant adverse effects on known constraints, either individually or cumulatively.</p> <p>Policy 7D <i>Onshore wind energy development</i> includes the following set of nine development criteria against which wind energy developments of all scales will be assessed:</p> <p>Communities and amenity.</p> <p>Landscape and visual impact.</p>

Environmental issues highlighted by the Environmental Report	Integrated into Plan?	How integrated into the final Plan, or reason for not being taken into account
		<p>Natural heritage. Historic environment. Tourism and recreation. Peat and carbon rich soils. Water environment. Aviation, defence and communications. Construction and decommissioning. It also requires wind farm applications to take account of the Spatial Strategy Framework which identifies the following: Areas where wind farms are not acceptable. Areas of Significant Protection. Areas with potential for wind farm development.</p>
<p>A number of areas in Orkney are at increased risk of flooding.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>Policy 13A <i>Food Risk</i> confirms the situations where development proposals should be supported by a Flood Risk Assessment, in accordance with SEPA’s technical guidance. Where built development in the medium to high risk category is permitted the developer is required to identify measures that would be put in place to protect against or manage flood risk. Any loss of flood storage capacity must be mitigated to achieve a neutral or better outcome.</p> <p>This policy also confirms that development will not be permitted in locations where it would increase the probability of flooding elsewhere, and that the piecemeal reduction of functional floodplains should be avoided. Land with potential to contribute to managing flood risk, e.g. through natural flood management or green infrastructure creation, will be safeguarded.</p>

Environmental issues highlighted by the Environmental Report	Integrated into Plan?	How integrated into the final Plan, or reason for not being taken into account
		Policy 13C <i>Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS)</i> requires development proposals to incorporate SuDS in accordance with national guidance. It also lists the details which should be included in the drainage design for new developments.
A number of locations are at increased risk of coastal erosion. Recently released climate projections indicate the potential for changes to our climate which could in turn influence the rate of coastal erosion.	Yes.	Policy 12B <i>Coastal Change</i> confirms that new development generally will not be supported in areas that are vulnerable to adverse effects of coastal erosion and/or wider coastal change, as identified in the National Coastal Change Assessment. Where new development is adaptive to anticipated coastal change and therefore avoids the need for intervention over its lifetime, the development may be permitted. When there is clear justification for a departure from the above general policy, development proposals will be required to demonstrate that appropriate resilience and adaptation strategies have been incorporated over the lifetime of the development.
Orkney has a rich diversity of wildlife and features, including many sites which are designated at the international, national and local level for their natural heritage value.	Yes.	Protection of designated sites, protected species, the wider biodiversity and ecosystem services is realised primarily through Policy 9 <i>Natural Heritage and Landscape</i> which addresses the following topics:
Increased development may result in loss and fragmentation of natural habitat with further impacts on protected and priority species and habitats.	Yes.	A <i>Natural Heritage designations</i> . B <i>Protected Species</i> . C <i>Wider Biodiversity and Geodiversity</i> .
Orkney Islands Council <i>“has a duty to further the conservation of biodiversity”</i>	Yes.	The following policies also seek to protect certain aspects of biodiversity, as well as ecosystem services:
Certain habitats and landscape features provide society	Yes.	D <i>The Water Environment</i> .

Environmental issues highlighted by the Environmental Report	Integrated into Plan?	How integrated into the final Plan, or reason for not being taken into account
<p>with valuable services, often described as ecosystem services. Their ongoing effectiveness can be threatened by inappropriately designed or sited development.</p>		<p>E <i>Peat and Soils</i>. F <i>Trees and Woodland</i> .</p> <p>The selection of land allocations avoided areas of natural habitat.</p> <p>During SEA of the Plan, all land allocations were screened for the effects of their development on protected species, e.g. otters and bats, and priority habitats, e.g. water courses. Where there is potential for adverse effects, this is highlighted in the relevant settlement statement.</p> <p>Where a waterside location is not essential to the proposal Policy 9D requires an appropriate buffer zone to be established between the development and the water body.</p> <p>A Habitats Regulations Appraisal was undertaken of the LDP, to determine its likely effect on Orkney's international sites. The findings were taken into account within the LDP and its Environmental Report.</p>
<p>Development can lead to negative impact upon water quality.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>Policy 9D <i>The Water Environment</i> requires development proposals to seek to protect and where possible improve the water environment, in line with the River Basin Management Plan for the Scotland River Basin District 2015-2027.</p> <p>Where a waterside location is not essential to the proposal a buffer zone should be established between the development and the water body.</p> <p>There is a presumption against unnecessary culverting and engineering activities in the water environment.</p>
<p>In a number of rural settlements foul water drainage facilities are at, or close to, capacity. In others there is no</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>Policy 13C <i>Waste water drainage</i> requires all new development within or adjacent to settlements to connect to</p>

Environmental issues highlighted by the Environmental Report	Integrated into Plan?	How integrated into the final Plan, or reason for not being taken into account
<p>strategic provision for foul water drainage and properties are reliant on private systems, e.g. septic tanks. Proliferation of septic tank systems can lead to adverse impacts on the water environment.</p>		<p>the public sewer, unless:</p> <p>The proposed development is in a settlement where there is no or a limited collection system, or</p> <p>The proposed development is in a village or town where there are infrastructure constraints that prevent connection and a temporary private system is proposed.</p> <p>In these cases a private system may be permitted where it does not pose a risk of detrimental effect, including cumulative effect, to the natural or built environment, cultural heritage or surrounding uses.</p>
<p>Inappropriately designed or sited aquaculture development can have a negative impact in the marine environment.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>Policy 12 D <i>Aquaculture</i> requires proposals for finfish and shellfish farming to avoid significant effects directly, indirectly or cumulatively on:</p> <p>Habitats and species, including designated sites and protected species.</p> <p>Wider biodiversity interests, including wild salmonids and other priority Marine Features.</p> <p>Biological carrying capacity and seabed interests.</p>
<p>Loss of agricultural land to new housing development.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>Policy 4 <i>Business, Industry and Employment</i> directs new development towards sites within the settlements, unless there is a specific locational requirement for a countryside location.</p> <p>Policy 5 <i>Housing</i> seeks to direct new housing development towards sites within settlements and supports infill development, conversion, the redevelopment of derelict land / existing premises and the subdivision of garden grounds.</p> <p>Outwith the settlements, in the Mainland and Linked South</p>

Environmental issues highlighted by the Environmental Report	Integrated into Plan?	How integrated into the final Plan, or reason for not being taken into account
		Isles development of single houses and housing clusters is only supported where it complies with one of eight defined criteria.
Several areas of vacant and derelict are located in Orkney.	Yes	Policy 5A <i>Housing in Settlements</i> supports the redevelopment of derelict land and allocated redevelopment sites.
Potential effect of identified contaminated land.	Yes.	During SEA of the Plan, all land allocations were screened for risk of contamination. Where there is potential for contamination, this is highlighted in the relevant settlement statement.
Loss of peatland cover.	Yes.	<p>Policy 9E <i>Peat and soils</i> permits development on areas of peat or carbon-rich soils only where:</p> <p>It has been clearly demonstrated that there is no viable alternative;</p> <p>An acceptable assessment of the likely effects of the development on carbon dioxide emissions has been undertaken and submitted.</p> <p>The economic and social benefits of the development clearly outweigh any potential detrimental effects on the environment, including likely carbon dioxide emissions.</p> <p>The Council may ask for a peatland management plan to be submitted.</p> <p>New areas of commercial peat extraction will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that it is an area of degraded peatland which has been damaged by human activity and has low conservation value and, as a result, restoration is not possible.</p>

Environmental issues highlighted by the Environmental Report	Integrated into Plan?	How integrated into the final Plan, or reason for not being taken into account
Inappropriate development and site drainage may lead to increased soil erosion.	Yes.	Policy 9E <i>Peat and soils</i> requires applicants to submit a method statement and, where necessary, a soil management statement in support of any application.
A number of sites throughout Orkney are designated at international, national and local level for their value in illustrating Orkney's geological history and the physical processes which have contributed to its many and varied geomorphological features.	Yes.	Protection of designated sites and the wider geodiversity is realised primarily through Policy 9 <i>Natural Heritage and Landscape</i> which addresses the following topics: A <i>Natural Heritage designations</i> . B <i>Protected Species</i> . C <i>Wider Biodiversity and Geodiversity</i> .
There is a need to protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of Orkney's landscapes and townscapes.	Yes.	Protection of Orkney's landscapes is realised primarily through Policy 9 <i>Natural Heritage and Landscape</i> which includes landscape policy for all development proposals, as well as for development that would affect the National Scenic Area and the Hoy area of wild land. Policy 1 <i>Criteria for all development</i> also requires new development to be sited and designed, taking into consideration the location and the wider townscape, landscape and coastal character. It also requires the proposed density of the development to be appropriate to the location. Policy 2 <i>Design</i> requires proposals to demonstrate that they meet the requirements of six defined design principles through consideration of scale, massing, form, proportions, plot size-density, materials, layout and landscaping. Policy 4 <i>Business, Industry and Employment</i> directs new development towards sites within the settlements, unless there is a specific locational requirement for a countryside
New development and changes to existing structures leads to changes within the landscape; these have potential to be detrimental to landscape character and visual amenity.		

Environmental issues highlighted by the Environmental Report	Integrated into Plan?	How integrated into the final Plan, or reason for not being taken into account
		<p>location.</p> <p>Policy 5 <i>Housing</i> seeks to direct new housing development towards sites within settlements. In the countryside of the Mainland and Linked South Isles development of single houses and housing clusters is only supported where it complies with one of eight defined criteria.</p> <p>Policy 8 <i>Historic Environment and Cultural Heritage</i> provides protection for structures and places, many of which represent important elements in Orkney's landscapes.</p>
<p>Orkney's rich cultural heritage is displayed in its many archaeological sites and historic buildings</p> <p>Development can result in the loss of or damage to, historic environment features or may affect their setting.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>Protection of Orkney's cultural heritage is realised primarily through Policy 8 <i>Historic Environment and Cultural Heritage</i> which addresses the following topics:</p> <p>Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site.</p> <p>Listed Buildings.</p> <p>Demolition.</p> <p>Scheduled Monuments.</p> <p>Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes.</p> <p>Investigation and Recording.</p> <p>Policy 1 <i>Criteria for all development</i> also requires new development to protect and, where possible, enhance Orkney's cultural heritage resources.</p>
<p>Lack of provision of affordable housing.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>Policy 5B <i>Affordable housing</i> requires all housing proposals within Orkney's settlements to demonstrate that they have considered and incorporated housing types and tenures which meet local housing requirements as outlined in the relevant settlement statements, development briefs and masterplans.</p>

Environmental issues highlighted by the Environmental Report	Integrated into Plan?	How integrated into the final Plan, or reason for not being taken into account
Depopulation is a problem in the smaller islands of Orkney and geographical isolation is a major contributory factor.	Yes.	<p>The Spatial Strategy confirms through the ‘Isles Approach’ that developments within the islands which support permanent resident populations and are served by public services, will be supported where it accords with relevant Plan policies and where it shall not place any unacceptable burden on existing infrastructure and services.</p> <p>Policy 5C <i>The Isles approach for housing</i> promotes a presumption in favour of new housing in the non-linked isles which accords with the above ‘Isles Approach’.</p>
Need to protect and, where appropriate, enhance areas of open / green space in urban settings.	Yes.	<p>Policy 10B <i>Open Space in Settlements</i> supports development that will improve, expand or enhance current open space provision. It also protects existing open space areas that are identified in the Plan, the Open Space Audit and Planning for Open Space Planning policy Advice. The loss of open space will only be supported where it fulfils a defined set of three criteria.</p> <p>Policy 1 <i>Criteria for all development</i> also requires new development to protect and, where possible, enhance and promote access to natural heritage, including green infrastructure, landscape and the wider environment.</p>
Low physical activity levels in children and adults can cause or exacerbate a range of illnesses and health conditions.	Yes.	<p>Policy 10A <i>Core Paths and Access</i> encourages active travel and requires development to avoid unacceptable adverse impact on statutory access rights, sore paths, other public footpaths or right of way.</p> <p>Where a proposal will affect any of the above, it will be necessary to:</p> <p>Maintain or enhance the amenity value of the current route; or</p>

Environmental issues highlighted by the Environmental Report	Integrated into Plan?	How integrated into the final Plan, or reason for not being taken into account
		<p>Provide an alternative path or access that is both safe and convenient for the public to use.</p> <p>Policy 10B <i>Open space in settlements</i> supports development which would improve, expand or enhance current open space provision. Open space that is identified in the Plan, the Open Space Audit and Planning for Open Space Planning Policy Advice, including outdoor sports facilities, will generally be protected. The loss of open space will only be supported where it fulfils a defined set of criteria.</p> <p>Policy 11 <i>Outdoor sports, recreation and community facilities</i> supports new facilities where they are to be located within settlement boundaries. Outwith settlement boundaries they will be supported where there are demonstrable functional and/or locational requirements.</p>
Accessibility can be an issue, especially for people with disabilities or mobility issues.	No.	Accessibility within built development is addressed through Building Standards.
There is a need to stabilise or reverse the trend of growth in waste produced in Orkney and to continue to increase rates of re-use and re-cycling of waste	Yes.	<p>Policy 1 <i>Criteria for all development</i> requires new development to facilitate the prevention, reuse, recycling, energy recovery and disposal of waste including, where relevant, the use of Site Waste Management Plans.</p> <p>Policy 4D <i>Waste Management Facilities</i> safeguards areas adjacent to Orkney's main waste handling facilities and supports the expansion of these facilities, subject to appropriate reference to the waste hierarchy, or the incorporation of new methods to manage waste, e.g. energy from waste projects.</p>
Development requires the use of natural resources such	Yes.	Policy 1 <i>Criteria for all development</i> requires new development to be resource efficient, utilising sustainable

Environmental issues highlighted by the Environmental Report	Integrated into Plan?	How integrated into the final Plan, or reason for not being taken into account
as stone, gravel and sand.		<p>construction technologies, techniques and materials.</p> <p>Policy 4E <i>Minerals</i> supports further development within defined Minerals Safeguard Areas or, alternatively, where proposals would meet an identified need or demand for minerals that cannot be provided in one of these Areas.</p>

Assessment and mitigation

At the Main Issues Report stage, assessments were undertaken of a series of alternative options for the direction that land use planning policy and development allocations might take in Orkney, in order to identify their likely environmental effects and enable selection of the most sustainable options as well as rejection of less sustainable alternatives. The findings of these assessments were presented in the Main Issues Report Environmental Report, to be carried forward for further consideration during preparation of the Proposed Plan.

At the Proposed Plan stage, potential issues or constraints relating to the settlement allocations were documented in the Environmental report. **Table 3** lists these issues and constraints and summarises how they have been addressed through mitigation.

Table 3: Potential constraints to development identified through assessment of the Settlement land allocation options

Constraint / issue.	Settlement.	Mitigation.
Land Ownership.		
Land which has been included for development in the draft plan but which has currently not been submitted by the land owner.	Various.	The Housing Land Audit and Land submission exercise opened dialogue with most landowners. Where this was not possible, contact with landowners was achieved through telephone contact, liaison with Elected Members and Community Councillors and written correspondence as required. These allocations have been identified within the 20-year land supply.
Climatic Factors.		
Flood risk– either within the allocation option or to properties downstream.	Various.	Flood risk is noted in the relevant Settlement Statements, along with the requirement to undertake a Flood Risk Assessment where necessary. In some settlements the preparation of Development Briefs will enable new development to avoid areas that are at risk of flooding. In others, the statement requires development-free buffer zones to be established alongside burns and drainage ditches. Site K-17 is now classed as Open Space rather than housing land.
Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora.		
Proximity to designated natural heritage sites.	Stenness.	The Stenness Settlement Statement notes that Loch of Stenness is a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and is vulnerable to the effects of nutrient enrichment. The Settlement Statement also notes that

Constraint / issue.	Settlement.	Mitigation.
		Stenness reedbed will require investment to improve the quality of discharged water, in order to allow further development to connect to the Waste Water Treatment Works.
Possible presence of protected species, e.g. otters.	Multiple settlements.	The potential for otters to be present in areas close to waterbodies and drainage ditches is highlighted in the introduction to the settlement statements. Further mitigation will be achieved through Development Briefs if necessary.
Possible presence of protected species, e.g. bats.	St Margaret's Hope, Finstown, Kirkwall, Stromness.	Bats are less widespread in Orkney; however their potential presence is noted in the relevant Settlement Statements. Further mitigation will be achieved through Development Briefs if necessary.
Water.		
No existing public sewerage infrastructure or upgrade of existing infrastructure not possible.	Various rural settlements.	This issue is highlighted in the relevant Settlement Statements. Private foul water drainage systems will be deemed acceptable for small scale developments, provided that they comply with the current LDP policy on waste water drainage which forms part of Policy 13 <i>Flood Risk, SuDS and Waste Water Drainage</i> .
Existing sewerage infrastructure not adequate for forecast scale of development	Various.	Should demand exceed available capacity, Scottish Water will initiate a Growth Project once one development meets the 5 Growth Criteria. These criteria are set out in paragraph 010 of Supplementary Guidance <i>Settlement Statements</i> .
Private or public water supplies within 250m of the allocation option would be vulnerable to large-scale development.	Stromness, Kirkwall, Burnside Evie School.	Future development in the vicinity of private water supplies in Stromness and Kirkwall will require to connect to the public sewer. At Burnside and Evie School only small scale development is planned.
Cultural heritage.		
Proximity to Scheduled Monuments, unscheduled archaeology or listed buildings	Burnside, Burray Village, Dounby, Evie Village, Hillhead, St Mary's	Cultural heritage sites are noted in the relevant Settlement Statement along with the requirement for development to avoid impact on their setting. Further mitigation will be achieved through Development Briefs if necessary.

Constraint / issue.	Settlement.	Mitigation.
	Stenness.	Site DY-8, adjacent to Esgar, two burnt mounds, has been removed from the Plan.
Potential to affect the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site	Stenness Village. Burnside.	Both Stenness Village and the south end of Burnside settlement lie within the Inner Sensitive Zone of the WHS. Part of allocation STR-10 is on a sensitive ridgeline for the WHS. This information is included in the relevant Settlement Statements. Further mitigation will be achieved through Development Briefs if necessary.

Where assessment of the policies highlighted the potential for negative effects, mitigation was recommended, in the form of changes to the wording. **Table 4** below summarises the findings of the Proposed Plan Environmental Report and how these were addressed in the Plan.

Table 4: Policy assessments – SEA recommendations

Policy	SEA recommendation	How incorporated into policy
1. Criteria for All Development.	Criterion i. - townscape, landscape or seascape character. Add a further criterion: <i>It protects, and where appropriate enhances the natural environment and cultural heritage resources.</i>	In criterion i. <i>character</i> was accepted; <i>coastal</i> was inserted in preference to <i>seascape</i> . A further criterion x. was included: It protects and, where possible, enhances Orkney's cultural heritage resources.
2. Design.	Criterion v. It minimises use of energy and materials at all stages of the development and maximises opportunities for shelter in the landscape <i>or through the use of building forms to create shelter and microclimates.</i>	Criterion v. was amended to: <i>It promotes sustainable design, minimising use of energy and materials at all stages of the development, and maximising opportunities for shelter.</i> This version promotes development which benefits from shelter from either landscape features or other built form.
3. Settlements, Town Centres and Primary Retail Frontages.	No further recommendations.	N/A.

Policy	SEA recommendation	How incorporated into policy
<p>4. Business, Industry and Employment.</p>	<p>Part D Waste management facilities: policy should avoid impact on the environment and public amenity. Policy should also make provision for the development of new landfill facilities. These would be unlikely to be accommodated in areas such as Hatston and Garson industrial estates which are used for handling recycle and municipal waste, and instead would require a rural location.</p> <p>Part E Minerals (i) a) A buffer distance that takes into account the specific circumstances of the proposal that will include the location and surroundings, size, expected duration, method of working, local topography, <i>the characteristics of the environmental effects likely to arise and the mitigation that can be achieved.</i></p> <p>Part (i) b) Details of the secondary materials <i>and wastes arising</i> from the process.</p>	<p>Part D amended: The provision of new waste management facilities, <i>including landfill sites for inert waste</i>, will be supported on business and industrial allocations or other sites where a locational justification has been provided and <i>where there are no unacceptable adverse impacts.</i></p> <p>Part (i) a) has been amended: Information on the location and its surroundings, size, expected duration, methods of working, local topography <i>and environment and a suitable buffer;</i></p> <p>Part (i) b) has been amended: Details of the secondary materials <i>and waste arising</i> from the process (extraction and processing) and how these will be stored and used in the site restoration.</p>
<p>5. Housing.</p>	<p>Part C The Isles Approach for Housing – policy promotes a presumption in favour of new housing on the non-linked isles. Suggested inserting <i>subject to other policies in the Plan.</i></p>	<p>Part C was amended to include reference to “<i>The Isles Approach</i>” which is set out in the Spatial Strategy. Paragraph SS.4 clarifies that “<i>Development within the islands, which supports permanent resident populations and are served by public transport services, will be supported where it accords with relevant Plan</i></p>

Policy	SEA recommendation	How incorporated into policy
		<i>policies.”</i>
6. Advertisements and Signage.	No further recommendations.	N/A.
7. Energy.	Part D (iv) Suggest - Wind farm developments will be supported <i>in principle</i> within Strategic Wind Energy Development Areas.	Part D (iv) was modified to: <i>“Throughout the lifetime of the Plan, OIC will investigate potential ‘Strategic Wind Energy Development Areas’ within which the principle of wind farm developments will be supported. Any such areas will be subject to appropriate assessment and full public consultation before being adopted within Supplementary Guidance: Energy.”</i>
8. Historic Environment and Cultural Heritage.	No further recommendations.	N/A.
9. Natural Heritage and Landscape.	No further recommendations.	N/A.
10. Green Infrastructure.	Allotment land should be safeguarded. The policy should make provision for the temporary use of unused or underused land as green infrastructure.	Declined.
1.1 Sports, Recreation and Community Facilities.	No further recommendations.	N/A.
12. Coastal and Marine Planning.	Part A Criteria for all coastal development: (i) the scale, location, siting and design of the development will not have a significant adverse effect, either individually or cumulatively on the landscape, <i>seascape</i> or townscape....; (iii) the integrity of coastal and marine ecosystems, <i>as well as geomorphological</i>	Part A Criteria for all coastal development: (i) the scale, location, siting and design of the development will not have a significant adverse effect, either individually or cumulatively on the landscape / <i>coastal, seascape</i> or townscape....; (iii) the integrity of coastal and marine ecosystems, <i>as well as geomorphological</i>

Policy	SEA recommendation	How incorporated into policy
	<p><i>features</i>, have been safeguarded.....</p> <p>Part B Coastal change is rather ambiguous and needs to state that new development new development generally will not be supported in areas that are vulnerable to adverse effects of coastal erosion and/or wider coastal change as identified in the National Coastal Change Assessment. However, when there is clear justification for a departure from the general policy.....</p> <p>D Aquaculture</p> <p>Part i a) suggest: landscape / <i>seascape character</i> and visual amenity; <i>wider biodiversity interests, including wild salmonids and other Priority Marine Features.</i></p> <p>Part i b) suggest: tourism, recreational and <i>leisure</i> activities.</p>	<p><i>features</i>, have been safeguarded.....</p> <p>Part B Coastal change</p> <p>i New development will not generally be supported in areas that are vulnerable to ..</p> <p>ii When there is clear justification for a departure from the general policy to avoid new development in areas that are vulnerable to ...</p> <p>D Aquaculture</p> <p>i a) the interests of the natural, built and cultural environment including: landscape / <i>seascape character</i> and visual amenity, taking account .. historic environment resources; habitats and species, including designated sites and protected species; <i>wider biodiversity interests, including wild salmonids and other Priority Marine Features;</i></p> <p>I b) existing users of the marine environment including: existing and consented aquaculture sites; Disease Management Areas; commercial inshore fishing grounds and activities; established ports and harbours, anchorages and defined navigational routes;</p>

Policy	SEA recommendation	How incorporated into policy
		tourism, recreational and <i>leisure</i> activities.
13. Flood Risk, SuDS and Waste Water Drainage.	No further recommendations.	N/A.
14. Transport, Travel and Vehicle Access.	No further recommendations.	N/A.
15. Digital Connectivity.	No further recommendations.	N/A.

Aspects of the Plan where there remains potential for significant negative effects

The Environmental Report identified only one aspect of the Plan where the potential for significant negative effects has not been fully addressed.

The reed bed within the Stenness Waste Water Treatment Works is currently defective, with the result that waste water passing through the Works is not being adequately treated. Effluent from the reedbed flows into the Loch of Stenness where there is potential for it to impact on water quality, for example by altering the nutrient balance of the loch. This in turn has potential to affect plant assemblages which are routinely present in the Loch of Stenness SAC, for example by encouraging the growth of microscopic algae at the expense of larger plant species. Scottish Water has confirmed that the reed bed will require investment, in order to improve water quality.

The Settlement Statement confirms that “*The Stenness reedbed will require investment to improve the quality of discharged water, in order for further development to connect to the Waste Water Treatment Works.*” However further consultation with Scottish Water will be required, regarding timescales for improvements to the reed bed system.

Significant positive effects identified in the Environmental Report

Assessment of the Plan concluded that significant positive effects are likely to result from implementation of the Plan. These are described in the following paragraphs.

Climatic factors

Overall, the effects of the Proposed Plan are likely to be moderately beneficial in terms of climatic factors. The spatial strategy continues to focus major development towards the towns, villages and rural settlements where there is ready access to services and facilities and the option to use public transport is generally available, reducing dependency on the private car. With policies that make provision for renewable energy generation and the incorporation of low and zero carbon energy generating technology, as well as design principles to reduce energy usage, the Plan seeks to reduce energy usage and support the transition to a low carbon economy. A number of its policies make provision for development that can help increase Orkney's resilience to the effects of climate change, in particular its policy on flood risk and Sustainable Drainage Systems. In addition, Policy 10 *Green Infrastructure* makes provision for the creation of green networks in the larger settlements; these have potential to enhance flood risk management. However flood risk continues to be an issue, particularly in parts of Kirkwall and Policy 13 also notes that future Sustainable Drainage Systems will have to ensure that there is a neutral or better risk of flooding from surface water both on and off site.

Biodiversity, flora and fauna

Although the effects on biodiversity, flora and fauna are mainly neutral, policies 9 *Natural Heritage and Landscape*, 10 *Green Infrastructure* and 13 *Flood Risk, SuDS Waste Water* all make provision for biodiversity enhancement, for example through the creation of green networks and natural flood management projects. However there are also risks of localised loss of biodiversity, for example where Policy 4 *Housing* continues to support infill development; in some instances this is achieved through the subdivision of garden ground and can lead to the loss of mature trees as well as flowering shrubs and herbaceous plants which collectively represent important sources of forage and shelter for certain bird and invertebrate species.

Water

Policies which make provision for the creation of green networks and natural flood risk management schemes have potential to improve the water environment and contribute to River Basin Management Planning objectives.

Soils

Moderate benefits are likely for peat and soils where policy 9E seeks to minimise the loss of and disturbance to peat and carbon rich soils. This policy also benefits climatic factors by seeking to minimise development-related release to atmosphere of carbon that is stored in these soils and minerals.

Geology

Effects on geology are broadly neutral as the relevant policies are generally protective rather than making provision for enhancement. However it should be noted that both Policy 9 *Natural Heritage and Landscape* and Policy 12 *Coastal Development* recognise that certain natural features and processes provide services to communities. Examples include geomorphological features such as shingle banks, spits and coastal sand dunes which provide protection from coastal flooding.

Landscape

The effects on landscape are mainly protective and neutral; however there is potential for moderate benefit through improved design in new development as well as the creation of green networks.

Cultural heritage

The effects on cultural heritage are also anticipated to be broadly neutral; however Policy 8 *Historic Environment and Cultural Heritage* also makes provision for enhancement.

Population and human health

Moderate benefit is likely for the population and human health receptors from a number of policy areas, not least increased options for housing provision. Design guidance and the requirement for increased energy efficiency in new housing will also help reduce the cost of heating homes. A continued focus on improving permeability and pedestrian access in new development will enable and encourage active travel and the associated health benefits; the provision of green networks will improve the built environment and offer potential to incorporate shelter, e.g. through woodland planting or new water features which help mitigate flood risk and provide more attractive places in which to live and work. Support for digital connectivity through Policy 15 is important in enabling increased social inclusion, in particular in more remote areas. Better connectivity also has potential to improve access to health, social and recreational facilities.

Material assets

Moderate benefit is possible where Policy 5 *Business, Industry and Employment* makes provision for energy from waste development. This would replace the current waste management arrangement whereby Orkney's waste is shipped to Shetland for incineration in an energy-from-waste plant.

How opinions expressed during the consultation have been taken into account

Responses received during consultation on the Environmental Reports which were prepared alongside the Main Issues Report and the Proposed Plan are set out in **Tables 5 and 6** below, along with an explanation of how these have been taken into account in making the decision to adopt the final Orkney Local Development Plan 2017.

Table 7 lists the changes that were made to the Plan to take account of the recommendations of the Scottish Government Reporter, and how these were taken into account in the Environmental Report.

Table 5: Summary and analysis of responses to the Environmental Report of the Main Issues Report

Consultation Body.	Environmental Report Ref.	Consultation Body Comment.	Response and Action.
Historic Environment Scotland (HS).	General comments.	The interim Environmental Report is well set out, clear and concise. HS comments at scoping stage have been largely taken into account. I am generally content with the assessment approach and its findings.	Noted.
HS.		Throughout the document, it is often assumed that cultural heritage is protected by the policies of the LDP. While we consider that this is appropriate, as this is fundamental to a lot of the assessment, we would welcome the opportunity to comment on the draft policies as early as possible. This will allow us to contribute to the process of ensuring that they are worded to provide the level of protection expected by the assessment.	Noted – HS will be consulted at an early stage in drafting the policies.
HS.		On a minor note, scheduled monuments are often referred to as scheduled ancient monuments, or SAMs, in the document. We would recommend that this is updated to say simply scheduled monuments or SMs, to reflect current legislation and acknowledge the fact that not all such sites can be classed as ‘ancient’.	Noted, the MIR Environmental Report and its appendices have been updated accordingly.
HS.	Issue 1 The Spatial Strategy.	Proposed new settlement hierarchy – there appears to be some confusion over the new proposed Rural Settlements, as Scorradaile is identified in Table 9 and the following summary whereas, later in the report and in Appendix D.4, Linnadale is identified as the fourth proposed Rural Settlement. We note that Linnadale was identified as the proposed settlement in the Main Issues Report itself and we are content with the assessment and its conclusions other than this.	This settlement was originally named Scorradaile and was subsequently re-named Linnadale.
HS.	Issue 4.1 Potential Strategic Areas	We welcome that a detailed assessment has been carried out for the preferred option. We note that the mitigation measures which have been recommended in the Landscape Assessment Study relate only	Noted.

	for Wind Energy Development.	to landscape and visual impacts and that the ER assessment recognises this. We agree with the assessment that there is the potential for significant adverse impacts on cultural heritage and that it may not prove possible to address these through mitigation.	
HS.		<p>We note that the suggested mitigation recommends additional studies to refine further the boundaries of the Strategic Development Areas (SDAs) and gives examples of some of the studies to be undertaken. We welcome the inclusion of an assessment of the likely effects on nationally important cultural heritage resources such as scheduled monuments.</p> <p>We would also suggest that an assessment of the likely effects on the internationally important Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site would be useful to ensure that any SDAs do not impact on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the World Heritage Site.</p> <p>In addition it may be useful to highlight that developers may be required to undertake a cultural heritage assessment at project level or to highlight siting and design options that minimise cultural heritage impacts.</p>	Noted – Appendix E <i>Assessment of Potential SDAs</i> and Appendix F <i>Assessment of the Main Issues Options</i> have been updated accordingly.
HS.	Assessment of the Settlement land allocation options.	We note that Table 11 (Potential constraints to development identified through assessment of the Settlement land allocation options) identifies proximity to scheduled monuments and unscheduled archaeology as a constraint/issue but does not identify proximity to listed buildings although Appendix D assesses a number of allocations as being in close proximity to listed buildings with similar mitigation proposed. You may wish to consider amending this in the revised Environmental Report.	Noted – Table 11 has been updated accordingly.
HS.	Measures for the prevention, reduction and offsetting of significant	We welcome that mitigation will be built into the relevant policies and proposals during the production of the plan and as noted above, we would welcome the opportunity to comment on the draft policies to ensure that the mitigation proposed is robust.	Noted.

	adverse effects.		
HS.		We note that Table 13 (Potential for environmental impact identified through assessment of the Main Issues and Suggested Mitigation) does not specifically identify any potential impacts to the historic environment despite identification of potential impacts in the assessments of the Main Issues. However, we recognise that this would be covered by the ‘other environmental receptors’ in Issue 4.1. It is not clear why public amenity has been specifically mentioned in this section of the table when others have not.	Table 13 has been amended to include a clearer reference to both the natural and historic environments and recommends that further surveys and assessments should be undertaken, with the findings being used to inform and refine the boundaries of the potential Strategic Areas.
HS.	Monitoring.	We note that the suggested monitoring indicators for cultural heritage relate only to buildings and the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site. We would recommend that monitoring indicators should also be provided for other elements of the historic environment such as scheduled monuments, unscheduled archaeology and Inventory gardens and designed landscapes (GDLs).	Noted – a revised set of indicators has been identified and is included in Table 8 below.
		The suggested monitoring indicators for listed buildings and conservation areas relate only to the number of buildings demolished and the number of buildings removed from the Buildings at Risk register. While these statistics can contribute to an understanding of the state of the historic environment, they focus only on one element of the historic environment and can also be affected by factors, such as economic and social, which are outside the influence of the Local Development Plan. Indicators which focus on the baseline only are not likely to be closely enough linked with the predicted effects and objectives of the plan to fully reflect its actual effects.	Noted – a revised set of indicators has been identified and is included in Table 8 below.
HS.		In order to achieve effective monitoring, we recommend the use of indicators linked to the SEA objective to measure change. For example:	Noted – a revised set of indicators has been identified and is included in Table 8

		<p>SEA objective: safeguard cultural heritage features and their settings through responsible design and siting of development.</p> <p>Indicator: to monitor the number and outcome of planning applications where scheduled monuments and/or their settings are affected.</p> <p>Target: 0 planning applications consented where adverse impacts on scheduled monuments and/or their settings are predicted.</p> <p>We suggest that there should be a range of indicators to cover the different types of heritage asset which may be affected by the Plan.</p>	below.
HS.	Appendix D: Assessment of land allocation options.	<p>We welcome the detailed assessments which have been carried out and consider that this provides a thorough environmental assessment of the land allocations assessed, however, we note that not all sites for land allocations included in the Main Issues Report have been included in the assessments in the Environmental Report and that there does not appear to be an explanation for omitting sites from the assessment in the ER.</p> <p>It appears that some sites 'carried forward' from the adopted local plan have not been included in the assessment. We would advise that if this is the case a rationale for omitting carried forward sites from the assessment should be set out clearly in the ER.</p> <p>In reference to advice in Scottish Government's SEA Guidance, this is a matter of clarification for Orkney as Responsible Authority to consider in the context of demonstrating that assessment of allocations is evidence-based and meaningful. As it stands, we are unclear on the reasoning for departing from advice on site assessment in PAN 1/2010 and on how this accords with the overall assessment of the development strategy.</p>	<p>The settlement statements for the mainland and south linked isles have been updated to include allocations assessed in the SEA of the OLDP 2014.</p> <p>The settlement statements for the non-linked isles have not been included as no allocations are proposed in these settlements.</p>
HS.	Appendix D.4: Assessment of the West Mainland land	Dounby – we note that the ER assessment recommends that site 8 should be removed from the allocations due to the adverse impact on the scheduled monument within the site, however this recommendation does not appear to have been carried over to the	Dounby Site 8 has been removed from the allocations.

	allocation options.	Main Issues Report as site 8 is still included as an allocation in the preferred option. No rationale or justification for this has been included in either the ER or the MIR and we would recommend that if this site is to be included as a preferred option against the recommendation of the ER then a robust justification should be provided.	
		We also note that this site has been given a pre-mitigation scoring of adverse effect. Given the presence of the scheduled area within a significant area of the site and the potential, therefore, for direct impacts as well as indirect impacts we would have expected to see this as a significantly adverse effect following the assessment methodology given in Table 7. No explanation of why an adverse rather than a significant adverse effect has been identified is given and we would recommend that consideration is given to amending this in the revised Environmental Report.	Noted - Appendix D <i>West Mainland Settlement Assessments</i> (Dounby) has been updated accordingly.
Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA).	General comments.	We generally found the document easy to follow and it demonstrates a considerable commitment from the council to the process. We welcome that the comments we made on your scoping report have been included in the document. The assessment methodology is simple and clear. We are generally supportive of many of the mitigation measures identified. You may wish to consider colour coding any changes you make to subsequent versions of the ER to allow consultees to easily follow the amendments and additions.	Noted. The settlement statement assessments have been updated to include additional flood risk information provided by SEPA during consultation on the MIR.
SEPA.	Relationship of the Local Development Plan with other Plans, Programmes and Strategies	As per our Scoping response (PCS/137100, 22 December 2014) we generally consider that the PPS listed in Appendix A provides a good background framework to the development of the Plan.	Noted.

	(PPS) and environmental protection objectives.		
SEPA.		We note that the section on Air Quality which was included at the scoping stage is no longer included within Appendix A. We assume this is because you have opted to scope out Local Air Quality 'as this is generally not considered to be an issue in Orkney'	Following consideration of the scoping responses we opted to scope out Local Air Quality as this is generally not considered to be an issue in Orkney. This was explained on page 48 of the Environmental Report.
SEPA.		We welcome the reference to latest version of The Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2011 (as amended), which we referred to within our scoping response.	Noted.
SEPA.		We would also take this opportunity to highlight the following: PAN 69 (Planning and building Standards Advice on Flooding) has been superseded within ' Online planning Advice on Flood Risk '. Reference to our 'Indicative River and Coastal Flood Risk map' has been included. These were updated in last year. Information on the new SEPA Flood Maps can be found at: http://www.sepa.org.uk/environment/water/flooding/flood-maps/ . The Water Environment (Shellfish Water Protected Areas: Environmental Objectives etc.) (Scotland) Regulations 2013 replaces the repealed EC Directive 2006/113/EC and subsidiary Scottish legislation.	Noted - Appendix A has been updated accordingly.
SEPA.	Environmental baseline, local issues and SEA objectives.	We note that the baseline information has been updated since the scoping report was submitted for review and generally covers topics within our remit. In particular, we are pleased to note that reference is made to Groundwater Dependant Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTE) as this is an issue which has moved on since the last plan. GWDTE,	Noted.

		which are types of wetland, are specifically protected under the Water Framework Directive.	
SEPA.		We also welcome the reference to the dataset of 'carbon rich soil, deep peat and priority peatland habitats' which has been produced by Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH). We understand that the final version is due to be published in the near future. We recommend that you discuss the use of these maps with SNH.	Noted.
SEPA.		In addition, we wish to make you aware that updated water body data in relation to River Basin Management Planning is now available on our website via a temporary spotfire tool that has been developed specifically for planning purposes. Please note that this is an interim measure until updated information is published as part of RMBP2. We are also currently reviewing our 'areas of potential cumulative drainage impacts'. We may therefore be able to provide further advice on this issue at a later stage.	Noted.
SEPA.		In respect of the environmental issues set out within Table 5 of the ER, we are pleased to note the inclusion of foul drainage within the water section, as recommended within our scoping response and also the associated question asking whether it is possible for the land allocation to connect into a public sewerage system. It needs to be ensured that the plan directs development to areas which either already have public waste water drainage infrastructure, or to where such infrastructure can easily be added.	Noted. Foul water drainage is addressed in Policy 13.
SEPA.		In terms of the SEA objectives and associated questions set out in Table 5, we note that the question relating to flood risk has been amended to include the need for avoidance of flood risk as requested in our scoping response and that a question has been added relating to the need to ensure that development does not increase flood risk elsewhere. We also note that questions have been included relating to potential impacts on water quantity from abstraction and potential	Noted.

		<p>impact on ecological status or morphology of water bodies, that Groundwater Dependant Terrestrial Ecosystems have also been specifically referred to and that references have been made to enhancing/improving the water environment as well as protecting it and also to peat. These were issues highlighted in our scoping response and we welcome their inclusion.</p>	
SEPA.	<p>Assessment of environmental effects and measures envisaged for prevention, reduction and offset of any significant adverse effects.</p>	<p>We welcome the thorough assessment of MIR options. We understand the policy areas that are not specifically discussed in your MIR will be updated and will follow the approach in national planning policy and from your ER, we understand that the revised policies will also be environmentally assessed. It should also be ensured that the ER supporting the Proposed Plan includes a clear assessment of all aspects of the plan that are likely to result in significant environmental effects. This may include the plans themes, objectives, policies and allocations.</p>	Noted.
SEPA.		<p>We welcome that the ER has highlighted many of the issues within our remit relating to the MIR options, for example potential issues arising from the proliferation of septic tanks, and has suggested mitigation. We particularly welcome the inclusion of potential issues/constraints such as peat and GWDTE relating to the 'potential strategic areas for wind energy development'. However, the mitigation relates to the provision of relevant assessments, for example a peat management plan. We consider that such areas should be <u>avoided</u> in the first instance.</p>	Noted.
SEPA.		<p>In relation to your assessment of site allocations, we note that sites within Kirkwall and Stromness have been individually assessed, whereas sites within the remaining settlements have been included in an overall settlement assessment which appears to discuss constraints relating to specific sites where necessary. The beginning of each settlement assessment confirms which sites have been</p>	Noted.

		assessed. Provided that all constraints are raised where relevant to individual sites, we have no concerns regarding this 'settlement' approach which we note was also taken in the ER supporting the previous plan.	
SEPA.		<p>However, it would appear in relation to your site allocations that <u>many of the sites have not been included in the assessment</u>, including a large number in the towns of Kirkwall and Stromness. It is unclear from the information in your ER why some sites have not been assessed. For some settlements, for example Dounby, it appears that only new sites have been assessed. However for other settlements, for example Evie School, only sites which have been carried forward from the current plan appear to have been assessed. Some settlement assessments (for example Burray and Madras) also indicate that certain allocations have been assessed whilst referring to others in the assessment. In addition, none of the site allocations for the settlements of Orphir, Quoyloo, The Palace, Hillhead, Houton, Lyron, Norseman, Scapa Brae have been included in the ER.</p> <p>In relation to the settlement of Dounby the assessment appears to include a 'site 13' which is not included in the MIR consultation and it also appears that there may be an error in numbering of the remaining sites.</p>	<p>The settlement statements for the mainland and south linked isles have been updated to include allocations assessed in the SEA of the OLDP 2014.</p> <p>The settlement statements for the non-linked isles have not been included as no allocations are proposed in these settlements.</p>
SEPA.		In addition to the above, for the sites that have been assessed, although we welcome that the ER has picked up a lot of the issues within our remit, there are some environmental issues included within our MIR response and site allocation table (see our ref: PCS/141053) that have not been included in your ER. One example would be that we consider flood risk to be an issue for Toab site 6 and St Margaret's Hope site 8 which is not reflected in your ER.	Noted - the assessments for St Margaret's Hope and Toab have been updated accordingly.
SEPA.		In light of the above, although we welcome the considerable amount of work that has been undertaken to date, <u>it has not been possible to conclude that all sites have been assessed or that all constraints have</u>	The settlement statements for the mainland and south linked isles have been updated to

		<u>been included.</u>	include allocations assessed in the SEA of the OLDP 2014.
SEPA.		<u>In addition, it should be ensured that the ER supporting the proposed plan fully reflects the comments/constraints raised by consultees including those set out within our MIR consultation response and associated site allocation table (our ref: PCS/141053). We would particularly highlight the flood risk advice that we have provided.</u>	The settlement statements have been updated to include flood risk advice provided by SEPA.
SEPA.		For ease, we also recommend that the settlements are considered in the same order in both the ER and proposed plan documents to allow easier comparison.	Noted.
SEPA.	Monitoring.	We are pleased to see the monitoring programme as Table 14 of the ER. However, the ER should identify who is responsible for carrying out each monitoring objective and the timescales, intensity and duration of the monitoring. With regards to the indicator for flood risk we suggest that this should include applications received and also applications approved in flood risk areas.	Noted – the monitoring programme has been updated, with details included in Table 8 below.
Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH).	General Comments.	<p>We consider that the ER provides a comprehensive assessment on the Main Issues Report (MIR) and for this you are to be commended. We consider that there are lots of aspects of the ER which are good, and we have highlighted many of them below. There are no specific overarching issue to bring to your attention here, except to highlight the requirement to ensure that the mitigation you propose is firmly embedded in the Plan.</p> <p>We welcome that the Environmental Report includes preliminary assessments of the likely effects of the MIR policies and proposals on Orkney's internationally designated natural heritage sites (Natura 2000 sites), and that you state a full Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) will be undertaken alongside preparation of the Proposed Plan. We are happy to input to the HRA as you progress with it.</p>	Noted.

SNH.	Assessments - general comments.	We welcome that you have gone to significant effort to assess all aspects of the MIR in some detail and we found the main body of text in the ER provided a very useful summary and interpretation of your assessment results. Your tables are clear and easy to follow. It is especially helpful that you have actually included the options themselves at the top of each assessment table. We agree with the comparable assessments of preferred and alternative options.	Noted.
SNH.	Assessment of preferred option in more detail.	We welcome the approach you have taken in providing a more detailed assessment of the preferred option for each main issue, proposing mitigation and then providing an assessment of the likely effects when mitigation is applied. Generally we welcome the proposed mitigation measures and look forward to seeing them clearly included in the Plan. We provide some detailed comments below.	Noted.
SNH.	Assessment of Land Allocations.	We welcome the detailed assessment which has been carried out this provides a very detailed and thorough environmental assessment of all the preferred and alternative land allocation. We are generally in agreement with the assessment presented and look forward to seeing the proposed mitigation included in the Plan.	Noted.
SNH.	Assessment of the Potential Strategic Development Areas (SDA) for Wind Energy Development.	We welcome the detailed assessment which has been carried. We are generally in agreement with the assessment presented and agree that even with mitigation there is likely to still be adverse effects.	Noted.
Royal Society for the Protection of		We welcome the acknowledgement within the SEA (p74) that the majority of the identified PSAs for wind development are likely to lead to significant adverse impacts on biodiversity, flora and fauna amongst other SEA receptors. However, as stated above we disagree	Noted.

Birds (RSPB).		with the approach taken to identifying these areas in the first place and believe that the approach is contrary to the SPP. Therefore, rather than suggesting that ‘further surveys and assessments are required to inform boundaries of these sites’ we suggest that the whole approach to identifying PSAs should be revised as suggested in our response to the Main Issues Report.	
RSPB.		We suggest that the initial table in Appendix E (Table 6.1) is misleading and it needs to be made clearer that this table represents only the Landscape Limits to acceptable development.	This information is included as a footnote to Table 6.1.
Crown Estate (CE).		Page 59, Issue 3.1 sets out the adoption of the PFOWMSP as Planning Policy Advice with no alternative option. However, this plan is non-statutory in nature, therefore a possible alternative would be to consult on Orkney’s Regional Marine Plan as PPA rather than to use the PFOW in a manner in which it has been drafted.	Policy 12 confirms that the PFOWMSP and any subsequent Regional Marine Plan will be adopted as Planning Policy Advice.
CE.		Page 62. It is unclear how the proposed onshore wind Strategic Development Areas (SDAs) will affect marine turtles and cetaceans. Is this perhaps related to inter-island cabling? Clarity should be provided.	A list of the types of European Protected Species found in Orkney was provided for information. Cetaceans and otters could be affected by onshore wind energy proposals if these included development of piers on islands where pier facilities are either absent or are inadequate for the transport of turbine parts. However it is agreed that marine turtles would be unlikely to be affected and they have been removed from the list to avoid confusion.
CE.		Appendix B; Page 6. EMEC has other wave and tidal test facilities	Appendix B has been updated

		within Orkney waters which are not mentioned here. A full and comprehensive list should be provided. We are happy to assist with this should further information be required.	accordingly.
CE.		Appendix B; Page 6. The document is correct in stating that The Crown Estate entered into Agreements for Lease (AfLs) for 1600MW within the PFOW strategic area. However, a certain number of agreements have lapsed and the most up to date map can be found here - http://www.thecrownestate.co.uk/media/5729/ei-pentland-firth-and-orkney-waters_a4.pdf The document should be updated to include this link and not the link that currently exists.	Appendix B has been updated accordingly.
CE.		Appendix F; Page 21; Issue 3. We welcome the desire set out in the document to have a complementary planning system covering both the terrestrial and marine environment.	Noted.

Responses received during consultation on the Environmental Report associated with the Proposed Plan are set out in **Table 6** below, along with an explanation of how these have been taken into account in making the decision to adopt the final Orkney Local Development Plan.

Table 6: Responses to consultation on the Proposed Plan Environmental Report

Consultation Body	Environmental Report Ref.	Consultation Body Comment relating to the Proposed Plan.	Response and Action.
Historic Environment Scotland. (HES).	General comments.	Overall, the Environmental Report provides a clear and comprehensive assessment of the significant effects of the Proposed Plan on the historic environment and we are content with the level of information provided within the document. We are generally content with the assessment approach and its findings.	Noted.
	Environmental baseline, local issues and Appendix B.	It may be useful to use the HES data website at http://portal.historicenvironment.scot/ as a source for all nationally designated historic environment assets as this is updated regularly. Our records indicate that there are currently 372 scheduled	Noted – Appendices B Environmental Baseline and B.5 Scheduled Monuments have been updated

		monuments in Orkney rather than the 363 shown in Appendix B.5 but this is likely to be due to further designation having occurred since the baseline data was gathered.	accordingly.
	Measures envisaged for the prevention, reduction and offsetting of significant adverse effects.	We welcome that Table 11 identifies that the proposed Strategic Wind Energy Development Areas may have significant impacts on cultural heritage and that further assessment will be required.	Noted.
		We welcome that the potential conflict between the sustainable re-use of recycling building materials and the need to preserve historic structures has been recognised. We are pleased to note that Policy 4: Housing and the Settlement Statements have taken this potential conflict into account and provided suitable mitigation.	Noted.
	Monitoring programme.	We would note that Table 12 contains no indicators for Inventory gardens and designed landscapes or unscheduled archaeology and we would recommend that such indicators should be included.	Noted – a revised set of indicators has been identified and is included in Table 8 below.
HES.		We note that the indicators for listed buildings and conservation areas relate solely to demolition and you may wish to consider whether an indicator which takes into account other aspects of the planning system (for example impacts on setting, other impacts on the buildings themselves) would be useful.	Noted – a revised set of indicators has been identified and is included in Table 8 below.
		We would also note that the indicator for the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site relates to the number of WHS management plan actions completed and is to be monitored by the WHS co-ordinator. We would recommend that an indicator is chosen which more closely relates to the activities of the Plan itself, such as the indicator used for scheduled monuments which relates to the number of planning applications which have an impact on the asset and which can be monitored by the Environmental Policy Officer. We would not recommend using an indicator which relies heavily on external parties to complete or monitor.	Noted – a revised set of indicators has been identified and is included in Table 8 below.

Appendix C6: Assessment of policies for compatibility with SEA objectives.	Policy 1: Criteria for all development – as noted above, although we consider that this policy could be improved by the addition of a further criterion regarding cultural heritage we are content that Policy 8 is sufficient.	Noted.
	Policy 4: Housing – we note that the assessment finds that there are no links to cultural heritage despite there being a direct reference in this policy to consolidating or retaining buildings of architectural or historical merit. You may wish to consider whether there is a link to cultural heritage here.	Appendices C6 and C7 have been updated to acknowledge the benefits of requiring the consolidation or retention of buildings of architectural or historic merit.
	Policy 7: Energy – we are content that at present the Strategic Wind Energy Development Areas remain as an uncertain effect on cultural heritage until the further detailed assessments are carried out.	Noted.
	Policy 8: Historic environment and cultural heritage – at present we consider that this policy does not accord with Scottish Planning Policy due to the lack of specific policy considerations for Inventory gardens and designed landscapes in Section C of the policy. We therefore disagree that the policy as it currently stands is fully compatible with the SEA objectives. As noted in Part 1 of this letter we recommend that this should be addressed by inserting specific policy considerations for Inventory gardens and designed landscapes into Section C. Once this is carried out we will be content to agree that the policy is compatible with all the cultural heritage SEA objectives.	<i>Policy 8 Historic Environment and Cultural Heritage</i> has been updated to include specific policy considerations for Inventory gardens and designed landscapes.
Appendices C2, C3, C4 and C5: Assessment of allocations.	<p>We welcome that all of the proposed allocations including those that have been brought forward from the existing 2014 Orkney LDP have been included in the assessments and updated to take account of any changes to baseline environmental data.</p> <p>The inclusion of the MIR reference ID and the existing Orkney LDP reference ID is very useful and allows easy comparison to previous comments made, we welcome that these references were included.</p>	Noted.

		<p>Appendix C2: Stromness allocations – STR 10 notes that the site is on a sensitive ridgeline for the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site and the proposed mitigation for the site indicates that this is identified in the settlement statement. The allocation is therefore given a neutral effect for cultural heritage post mitigation. Simply identifying that the site is on a sensitive ridgeline is not mitigation and we would recommend that the mitigation section should provide further detail such as identifying that development in this area should avoid impacts to the setting and OUV of the World Heritage Site or referring to specific detailed advice in Supplementary Guidance for the historic environment. Given the lack of clarity regarding proposed mitigation the post mitigation scoring should perhaps reflect this by giving an uncertain effect.</p>	<p>The settlement map clearly indicates that the northern boundary of the site is on the sensitive ridgeline. Stromness is also located within the National Scenic Area. The inclusion of this information in the settlement statement alerts stakeholders to the fact that any development within this site would be carefully assessed for its impact on the landscape and the OUV of the WHS.</p>
HES.		<p>Appendix C4: East Mainland and Linked Isles allocations – for a number of allocations the mitigation proposed is simply noting the presence of a historic environment asset in the Settlement Statement. The Settlement Statement in most cases gives further detail of mitigation, such as a requirement to avoid adverse impacts on the setting of assets. We would recommend that this level of detail is provided in the ER assessments for mitigation to help justify the post mitigation scoring.</p>	<p>In Appendix C4 the assessments for Hillhead and St Mary’s have been updated to acknowledge mitigation that has been included to protect historic environment assets.</p>
		<p>Appendix C5: West Mainland allocations – we are pleased to note that following our comments on the interim ER the allocation at Dounby 8 has been removed from the Proposed Plan and the scoring updated to reflect the significant adverse impacts on cultural heritage for development in this site.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Scottish Environment Protection Agency.	General comments.	<p>We consider that the main ER document provides a good summary of the process and we are generally in agreement with the results of the assessments presented. We welcome that the land allocation options taken forward have now been updated to take account of further information that was provided during consultation on the MIR and that</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

SEPA.		<p>the assessments have been updated to include the existing allocations that were carried forward from the existing Orkney Local Development Plan.</p> <p>We also welcome that the ER has been updated to incorporate our other previous advice as detailed in Table 14: Summary and analysis of responses to the Environmental Report of the Main Issues Report.</p>	
	Assessment of the Vision and Spatial Strategy.	We generally agree with the assessment of the vision and spatial strategy.	Noted.
	Cumulative assessment.	We are content with the assessment of the preferred settlement land allocations presented and generally agree that there is benefit from a policy approach which directs larger scale developments towards settlements where they would be close to existing infrastructure.	Noted.
	Assessment of the policies.	We generally agree with the assessment of the policies and welcome the addition of Table 10 which details the recommendations identified as a result of the assessment process.	Noted.
		As a minor point the Proposed Plan Policy titles in column one of the table in Appendix C6 and Table 10 are slightly different from that in the Proposed Plan for 12: Coastal and Marine Planning and Policy 14: transport, travel and Vehicle Access, which are entitled Coastal Development and Transport, Travel and Road Network Infrastructure in the Proposed Plan.	Table 10 of the Environmental Report and Appendix C6 have been updated to include the correct policy titles.
SEPA.	<p>Assessment of sites.</p> <p><u>Soils - Is the proposal on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat?</u></p> <p>At the MIR stage we highlighted, based on a limited desk-based assessment (Scotland soils maps/GIS/SNH draft maps), where peaty soils may be present on site. These were all either categories 2 or 4 on the Scotland soils web carbon richness map where there may be 'occasional peat' or sites where there may be peat on adjacent higher</p>	The Soil Survey of Scotland identifies the soil types in this area of Burray as peaty podzols, some peaty gleys and peat. It also identifies the range of vegetation as Atlantic heather moor and arable and permanent pastures.	

		<p>land.</p> <p>For example for Burray Village sites BV-1 and 2 we highlighted Carbon cat = 4 = organo-mineral with some peat. However we note in the assessment that in response to the question <i>Is the proposal on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat?</i> The answer is no and scoring pre and post mitigation is 0 Minor or neutral effect. While we do not for these allocations disagree with the scoring we would consider that while the site is not peatland there is the potential for peat on site and therefore in response to the part of the question <i>could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat</i> that potentially it could and that appropriate mitigation would be new development should comply with Policy 9 Natural Heritage and Landscape. Please refer to our response to the proposed Plan for other sites where this also applies.</p>	<p>The observed vegetation on sites BV-1 and 2 is grass pasture, indicating that the area is managed for agriculture. It is unlikely therefore that the sites are now underlain by peat.</p>
		<p>As a minor point we highlight under mitigation for some of the assessments reference is made to Policy 9 Natural Environment and Landscape but in the Proposed Plan Policy 9 is entitled Natural Heritage and Landscape.</p>	<p>The correct title is Policy 9 <i>Natural Heritage and Landscape</i>.</p>
		<p><u>Climate change – flooding</u></p> <p>For Houton Pier sites HT-1 – 3 under the ER question <i>Is the proposal thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere?</i> It is noted “A small part of the seaward edge of site 3 is below the 5.0m contour and may be at risk from wave action or the effects of future climate change.” and the mitigation proposed is “The settlement statement highlights the risk of flooding and requires a Flood risk Assessment to be undertaken of Sites HT-2 and HT-3. Flood risk should be addressed through the relevant development briefs.”</p> <p>However, while the settlement statement highlights the risk of flooding the text, in the Proposed Plan the HT-2 text states “A development brief would be required for this allocation. There are surface water</p>	<p>In the settlement statement the requirement to provide a development brief is an acknowledgment that, in this instance, flood risk can be avoided through site design and layout.</p>

		<p>flooding issues on part of this site.” and for HT-3 states “There is an identified flood risk adjacent to this site. A small part of the seaward edge of the site is below the 5 metre contour and may be at risk. This should be considered in the development design for the site.” The specific requirement for a Flood risk Assessment to be undertaken of Sites HT-2 and HT-3 is not included - we would query if this specific mitigation is required, if so the wording in the Proposed Plan should be updated accordingly.</p>	
SEPA.		<p>For Kirkwall sites K-23 and K-24 we welcome the mitigation that “The settlement statement notes that residential development will not be possible on sites K-23 and K-24 until works are in place to reduce flood risk from both coastal and fluvial sources to no greater than 0.5% annual probability of flooding.”</p> <p>However, as noted in our response to the Proposed Plan this requirement does not appear to be fully reflected in the proposed wording for these two sites.</p>	<p>The settlement statements for K-23 and K-24 have been updated and now read: “Any development proposal on this site would require a flood risk assessment to demonstrate that the site is not at risk of flooding or the risk can be managed within increasing risk elsewhere. Depending on the outcomes of this flood risk assessment, it should be noted that the residential element of any mixed use development may be conditioned to only allow occupation after all flood risks have been successfully mitigated against in line with the planned measures for Kirkwall within the Orkney Local Flood Risk Management Plan.”</p>

	Monitoring programme.	Following our MIR advice we welcome that Table 12 has been updated to include a 'monitored by' column but would reiterate this should also detail the timescales, intensity and duration of the monitoring.	Noted – the monitoring programme has been updated and is included in Table 8 below.
Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH).	General comment.	We have assessed the updated Environmental Report and generally agree with the findings of SEA. We welcome the clear way in which the SEA recommendations for further mitigation have been set out, including details of where the mitigation identified in the SEA will be brought forward in the Proposed Plan.	Noted.
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB).	Appendix B1.	The draft Special Protection Areas (dSPAs) for Pentland Firth and North Orkney should be included within the table in Appendix B1.	Appendix B <i>Environmental Baseline</i> and Appendix B1 <i>Internationally and Nationally Designated Sites</i> have been updated to include North Orkney, Scapa Flow and Pentland Firth pSPAs.
Interested person.	Appendix C5 Finstown assessment.	Site 7 is described as being on the east side of Heddle Road, with site 6 on the west; however the proposals map indicates site 7 on the east of Heddle road, with site 6 on the west.	Site numbering underwent changes during the assessment process, hence the confusion. Appendix C5 has been amended appropriately. However neither of these sites is included in the final LDP.

Table 7: Changes that were made to the Plan to take account of the Scottish Government Reporters' recommendations, and how these were taken into account

Issue	Paragraph / Policy number	Reporter's recommendation	Effect of amendment on the conclusions of assessment of the modified Proposed Plan
1.	Policy 1 Criteria for all development.	The plan should be modified by adding the following two criteria to Policy 1, numbered ix and x: ix. it protects and, where possible, enhances and promotes access to natural heritage, including green infrastructure, landscape and the wider environment.	This modification strengthens the Plan's protection of the natural environment by acknowledging this as an issue which should be considered in all development proposals. It also protects public access to the natural environment which, in turn, can lead to health benefits.
		x. it protects and, where possible, enhances Orkney's cultural heritage resources.	This modification strengthens the Plan's protection of Orkney's cultural heritage by acknowledging this as an issue which should be considered in all development proposals. Benefits are also likely in terms of conserving cultural heritage features which are enjoyed and appreciated by both residents and visitors to the islands.
2.	Design (Road Safety).	No modification.	N/A
3.	Affordable Housing.	No modification.	N/A
4.	Housing in the Countryside (Infill).	No modification.	N/A
5.	Housing in the Countryside (Allocation).	No modification.	N/A
6.	Minerals.	No modification.	N/A
7.	Energy and Coast	No modification.	N/A

Issue	Paragraph / Policy number	Reporter's recommendation	Effect of amendment on the conclusions of assessment of the modified Proposed Plan
	(RSPB).		
8.	Energy and Coast (DP Energy).	<p><u>Policy 7 Energy</u> The proposed plan should be modified as follows: Delete policy paragraph 7D v. "The net-economic impacts of a proposal, including local and community socio-economic benefits such as employment, associated business and supply chain opportunities, will be taken into consideration and any demonstrable benefits will be balanced against any identified adverse impacts on known constraints." And insert it as an additional criterion under 7C All Renewables and Low Carbon Energy Developments.</p> <p><u>Policy 12 Coastal Development</u> Delete the word 'only from the first sentence of Policy 12A. This now reads: "Development in the coastal zone (above Mean Low Water Mark of Ordinary Spring tides) will be supported where it can be demonstrated that."</p> <p><u>Policy 12</u> After criteria i-v, add: "Development that would result in significant adverse effects under criteria i to v that cannot be appropriately mitigated, will only be permitted when it can be demonstrated that any such effects are clearly outweighed by significant socio-economic benefits".</p>	<p>No significant environmental effects. This modification acknowledges that paragraph 7D v. should apply to all types of renewable and low-carbon energy developments and not only to onshore wind energy developments.</p> <p>No significant environmental effects. Text has a slightly more positive tone.</p> <p>No significant environmental effects. This modification requires significant adverse effects to be balanced against socio-economic benefit. This brings Policy 12 into alignment with Policy 7.</p>

Issue	Paragraph / Policy number	Reporter's recommendation	Effect of amendment on the conclusions of assessment of the modified Proposed Plan
9.	Energy (Consent Periods).	In Policy 7D vi in the first sentence delete 'will' and substitute 'may'. The first sentence should read: Consents for wind energy development may be granted for a maximum period (usually 25 years) from final commissioning / the date that the device commences energy generation.	This modification maintains a degree of flexibility in the policy, recognising that applications to repower an onshore wind energy site may be submitted within the 25 year period.
10.	Historic Environment and Cultural Heritage.	<p>In Policy 8A in the second sentence remove 'a substantial' and replace with 'an'. The sentence to read: "Development which would have an adverse impact....."</p> <p>In Policy 8B insert a new subsection v. headed "inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes", to read: "Development which preserves or enhances the character and features of inventory gardens and designed landscapes and their setting will be supported. Development that would have a significant negative impact upon the character of these areas will not be permitted. The conservation, maintenance and restoration, including the restoration of layout and features, will be supported where this is appropriate and based on historical research." Consequentially replace the existing sub-head number 'v' with 'vi'.</p>	<p>This modification strengthens the policy.</p> <p>Previously, the protection of Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes was covered under Part A All Development. This modification strengthens the policy by requiring the character and features of Gardens and Designed Landscapes to be preserved or enhanced. It also supports their appropriate conservation, maintenance and restoration by requiring any proposals to be based on historical research.</p>
11.	Natural Heritage.	In Policy 9A1i, in the first line, after designated, insert 'or proposed'. The first sentence to read:	Three proposed marine SPAs have been identified in the seas around Orkney since the

Issue	Paragraph / Policy number	Reporter's recommendation	Effect of amendment on the conclusions of assessment of the modified Proposed Plan
		"Development likely to have a significant effect on a site designated or proposed as a Special...."	Proposed Plan was prepared. This addition acknowledges that pSPAs are afforded a similar level of protection to that of SPAs which have been adopted.
12.	Peat and Soils.	<p>Policy 9E</p> <p>Delete the word 'undisturbed' from the first sentence of sections i and ii. The sentences to read: "Developments on areas of peat or carbon-rich soils".... and "Where development on peat or carbon-rich soil..."</p> <p>In section ii delete the final sentence: "In addition an assessment must be undertaken of the likely effects of the development on CO2 emissions."</p> <p>Replace the above sentence with a new criterion (b) to section i as follows: "an acceptable assessment of the likely effects of the development on carbon dioxide emissions has been undertaken and submitted."</p> <p>In section (iii) delete criteria (b) and (c).</p>	These amendments strengthen the protection of areas that are underlain by peat and carbon-rich soils, as well as any natural and cultural heritage interests that are present in these areas.
13.	Wider Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	No modification.	N/A
14.	National Scenic Area and World Heritage Site.	No modification.	N/A
15.	Kirkwall (Land near to Berstane Farm).	No modification.	N/A
16.	Kirkwall (Land near to	No modification.	N/A

Issue	Paragraph / Policy number	Reporter's recommendation	Effect of amendment on the conclusions of assessment of the modified Proposed Plan
	Inganess Cottage).		
17.	Kirkwall (K-14).	No modification.	N/A
18.	Kirkwall (Land near Castlehame).	No modification.	N/A
19.	Kirkwall (Land at Greenfield).	No modification.	N/A
20.	Kirkwall (Land at Carness).	No modification.	N/A
21.	Kirkwall (K-17).	Site K-17 should be deleted from the proposed plan as a housing site and designated as strategic open space.	This modification will ensure that a site, around a third of which is at significant risk of flooding, will not be developed.
22.	Kirkwall (K-1 and K-2).	No modification.	N/A
23.	Kirkwall (Sutherland Park).	No modification.	N/A
24.	Stromness (STR-22).	No modification.	N/A
25.	Stromness (Land at Garson).	No modification.	N/A
26.	Stromness (STR-19).	No modification.	N/A
27.	Scorradale.	The proposed plan should be modified by deleting the name 'Linnadale' and substituting 'Scorradale'.	No environmental effects.
28.	Dalespot (removal).	No modification.	N/A
29.	Dalespot (density increase).	No modification.	N/A

Issue	Paragraph / Policy number	Reporter's recommendation	Effect of amendment on the conclusions of assessment of the modified Proposed Plan
30.	Tingwall.	No modification.	N/A
31.	Burnside (removal).	No modification.	N/A
32.	Burnside (boundary change).	<p>The plan should be modified as follows:</p> <p>Modify the settlement boundary at the southern end of the village in accordance with the plan attached to representation 506.</p> <p>Modify the settlement boundary at allocated site B-A of the current local development plan in accordance with the plan submitted with representation 520.</p>	<p>In the SW of the settlement an area close to the boundary is at risk of flooding. Modification in accordance with representation 506 will bring the boundary closer to the flood risk area. The settlement statement already notes that standing water is known to collect regularly in fields in the Burnside area. , At the time of the SEA site visit (November 2015), there was an area of standing water adjacent to the proposed extension to the SW boundary of the settlement.</p> <p>Suggested mitigation: The area which is at risk of flooding should be avoided through appropriate siting and design.</p> <p>Modification in accordance with representation 520 is unlikely to lead to significant environmental effects.</p>

Monitoring Programme

The purpose of monitoring is to ensure that any proposed mitigation is effective and that unexpected effects can be detected at an early stage, so that appropriate remedial action can be put in place. Over time it is expected that environmental benefits will become apparent through the trends highlighted by the monitoring programme. Monitoring will be used to provide essential information upon which to base future development policies.

In the Proposed Plan Environmental Report a set of monitoring indicators was identified which related closely to the SEA objectives for the Orkney Local Development Plan. These have since been updated, to take account of responses received during the consultation process and also to ensure that they can feasibly be monitored.

The proposed SEA monitoring activities are set out in **Table 8**.

Table 8: Proposed SEA monitoring programme

SEA receptor	SEA Objective	Indicator	Data source	Monitored by and frequency
Climatic factors.	Support patterns of development which provide safe and convenient opportunities for walking and cycling and facilitate travel by public transport.	Annual passenger numbers on subsidised bus routes.	OIC Transport Section.	Environmental Policy Officer. Annual.
	Reduce Scottish greenhouse gas emissions, in line with Government targets.	Annual CO ₂ estimates for Orkney.	Local and Regional CO ₂ Emissions Estimates (Ricardo-AEA).	Environmental Policy Officer. Annual.
	Promote a precautionary approach to flood risk from all sources.	Number of proposals approved to develop residential accommodation within areas that are at significant risk of flooding.	OIC Development Management Section.	Environmental Policy Officer. Annual.
Biodiversity.	Safeguard valuable habitat from loss and fragmentation through development.	Number of proposals approved where mitigative or compensatory measures have been incorporated to safeguard habitats from loss and fragmentation.	OIC Development and Marine Planning Section	Environmental Policy Officer. Annual.
		Number of proposals approved where it has not been possible	OIC Development and Marine	Environmental Policy Officer.

SEA receptor	SEA Objective	Indicator	Data source	Monitored by and frequency
		to incorporate appropriate mitigative or compensatory measures to safeguard habitats from loss and fragmentation.	Planning Section.	Annual.
	Conserve protected sites and species.	Condition of internationally and nationally designated biological natural heritage sites.	SNH website - sitelink http://gateway.snh.gov.uk/sitelink/index.jsp	Environmental Policy Officer. Annual.
		Number of proposals approved where it has not been possible to incorporate appropriate mitigative or compensatory measures to safeguard protected species.	OIC Development and Marine Planning Section.	Environmental Policy Officer.
Water.	Promote the protection and improvement of the water environment, including burns, lochs, estuaries, wetlands, coastal waters and groundwaters.	Water quality and overall status of monitored watercourses.	Scotland's Environment Web http://www.environment.scotland.gov.uk/get-interactive/data/water-body-classification/	Environmental Policy Officer. Annual.
		Number of approved development briefs requiring	OIC Development and Marine	Environmental Policy Officer.

SEA receptor	SEA Objective	Indicator	Data source	Monitored by and frequency
		the establishment of a development-free buffer zone.	Planning Section.	Annual.
Soil.	Promote the viable use of vacant and derelict land, alleviating pressure on greenfield sites.	Number of sites removed from the Derelict and Urban Vacant Land Register.	Scottish Vacant and Derelict Land Survey http://www.gov.scot/Publications	Environmental Policy Officer. Annual.
Soil and Climatic factors.	Recognise the environmental benefits provided by soils and protect their quality and quantity.	Number of proposals approved to develop on areas of peat identified in the national peatland map.	OIC Development Management Section.	Environmental Policy Officer. Annual.
Geology.	Protect designated and undesignated sites which are recognised and valued for their geological or geomorphological importance.	Condition of nationally designated geological / geomorphological natural heritage sites.	SNH website - sitelink http://gateway.snh.gov.uk/sitelink/index.jsp	Environmental Policy Officer. Annual.
Landscape.	Facilitate positive change while maintaining and enhancing distinctive landscape character.	Development of a suite of Local Landscape Areas, following completion of the SNH commissioned review of the Orkney Landscape Character Assessment (1998).	OIC Development and Marine Planning Section.	Environmental Policy Officer. Annual.
		Number of proposals approved which do not align with the	OIC Development and Marine	Environmental Policy Officer.

SEA receptor	SEA Objective	Indicator	Data source	Monitored by and frequency
		guidance provided in the Orkney Wind Energy Capacity Study.	Planning Section.	Annual.
Cultural heritage.	Safeguard cultural heritage features and their settings through responsible design and siting of development.	Number of demolitions of listed buildings and listed or unlisted buildings within a Conservation Area.	OIC Development Management Section.	Historic Environment Officer. Annual.
		Number of proposals approved affecting an Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape.	OIC Development Management Section.	Historic Environment Officer. Annual.
		Number of proposals approved affecting a scheduled monument and / or its settings.	OIC Development Management Section.	Historic Environment Officer. Annual.
	Enable positive change in the historic environment which is informed by a clear understanding of the importance of Orkney's heritage assets and ensures their future use.	Number of buildings removed from the Buildings at Risk Register due to restoration.	Buildings at Risk Register http://www.buildingsatrisk.org.uk/	Historic Environment Officer. Annual.
	Protect the integrity and Outstanding Universal Value of the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World	Number of proposals approved where the integrity and OUV of the WHS is substantially affected.	OIC Development and Marine Planning Section.	Historic Environment Officer. Annual.

SEA receptor	SEA Objective	Indicator	Data source	Monitored by and frequency
	Heritage Site.			
Population.	Retain and, where appropriate, improve quality and quantity of publicly accessible open space.	Number of Open Space Strategy actions completed.	Open Space Strategy Action Plan.	Environmental Policy Officer. Annual.
Human health.	Promote increased availability of affordable housing.	Numbers of affordable homes built.	OIC Strategic Housing Improvement Programme.	OIC Housing Section. Annual.
Material Assets.	Promote the efficient use of resources and the minimisation of wastes through their re-use or their recovery through recycling, composting or energy recovery, in line with 2020 national targets.	Annual household waste data.	SEPA website https://www.sepa.org.uk/environment/waste/waste-data/waste-data-reporting/household-waste-data/	Environmental Policy Officer. Annual.

Reasons for choosing the Orkney Local Development Plan 2017, as adopted

The OLDP 2017 represents an up to date statement of local planning policy and proposals for Orkney that reflects the current planning position of the Scottish Government. The processes that are set in legislation and regulation for the review and production of a new Local Development Plan have been adhered to. The main stages of, and documents resulting from, these processes are noted below.

The Monitoring Statement (MS) detailed the outcomes of the monitoring and review of the existing Plan and was prepared in conjunction with the Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA) Scoping Report. This stage included a period of open engagement with members of the public and other planning stakeholders, to consider planning matters and the direction of future land allocation, as well as a review of Scottish Planning Policy 2014 and National Planning Framework 3 and consideration of any recent social, economic and environmental changes that had affected Orkney.

The outcomes of this process informed preparation of the Main Issues Report (MIR) which was published for public consultation in 2015. The MIR detailed the main planning issues facing Orkney and set out policy and proposal options that could be included in the new Plan. These options were referred to as 'the preferred option' and 'the alternative option'. The judgement of what was preferred was based on a wide range of planning considerations, including the past performance of planning policy, regional and national planning policy and the findings of site visits.

Each of the options were measured against the SEA objectives and assessed for their potential impact on the environment, with the assessment findings reported in the MIR Environmental Report.

Consultation identified a number of issues which required further consideration. These were addressed during preparation of the policies and proposals of the Proposed Plan. All policies and any changes to land allocation proposals were measured against the SEA objectives and assessed for their potential impact on the environment, with the assessment findings reported in the Proposed Plan Environmental Report. Both documents were published for consultation in May 2016.

Following consultation, minor changes were made to the Proposed Plan before it entered into the examination process in January 2017. During this stage, consultation responses which had not been incorporated into the Plan were considered by the Scottish Government's appointed Reporter. A number of recommendations made by the Reporter were published and these underwent SEA; however none were found likely to result in significant environmental effects.

The main advantages of the policies and proposals of the final Orkney Local Development Plan 2017 are that:

- it promotes a sustainable pattern of development;
- it demonstrates a high level of consistency with national and international policies and programmes; and

- compared with alternatives that were considered, the assessments found that a broadly neutral or positive environmental outcome was likely, with fewer and less significant negative impacts.

Throughout the SEA process the Consultation Authorities have confirmed their agreement with the SEA objectives and the overall assessment approach adopted. Comments received from the Consultation Authorities and others, relating to the environmental impacts and opportunities associated with the Local Development Plan, have been retained on a database by Orkney Islands Council and these continue to contribute to the assessment of development proposals through the Development Management function.

The Orkney Local Development Plan 2017 was approved by Orkney Islands Council on 9 March 2017 and formally adopted on 18 April 2017.