

PLANNING

**Cairngorms National Park**  
**Proposed Local Development Plan (as modified)**  
Habitats Regulations Appraisal

## Contents

	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
1	Introduction	3
2	Methodology	4
3	Screening Process	5
4	Mitigation Measures	23
5	Rescreening following mitigation	26
6	Appropriate Assessment and Amending Plan	36
7	HRA Conclusion	66
8	Consultation on the Draft, amendments to the LPD and HRA record	66
9	Note of remaining MREs	67
	Bibliography	67
	<u>Appendices</u>	
1	Details of Natural 2000 sites	68
2	Screening Matrix	109
3	In-combination screening matrices	110
4	Glossary	117
5	Record of consultation responses	118

## I. Introduction

- I.1 The Local Development Plan (LDP) is a document that sets out how places should change and what they could be like in the future. It says what type of development should take place where, and which areas should not be developed. It comprises a vision, spatial strategy, policies, settlement proposals and supplementary guidance. The supplementary guidance includes the Core Paths Plan.
- I.2 European Directive 92/43/EEC, transposed into law in Scotland by The Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 1994 (as amended), requires that the plans and projects of competent authorities that could have a likely significant effect on a Natura site, should be subject to an assessment of their potential impacts upon the site. There are two categories of such sites, both of which are found within the Cairngorms National Park. In addition, under Scottish Planning Policy (2014), Ramsar sites in Scotland are either SPAs or SSSIs and are protected under the statutory regimes accordingly. Sites put forward for designation under Natura (provisional sites) are also fully protected until the time when the designation is either confirmed or refused. The types of site considered for this appraisal are therefore:
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC and pSAC) – a European designation which protects natural habitats and wild flora and fauna other than birds
  - Special Protection Area (SPA and pSPA) – a European designation which protects wild birds
  - Ramsar Site – an international designation which protects wetlands
- I.3 The Cairngorms National Park Local Development Plan (LDP) and its Supplementary Guidance (including the Cairngorms National Park Core Paths Plan (CPP)) fall within the regulations and must be assessed. The Cairngorms National Park Authority cannot approve or adopt these plans unless it can be concluded that there will be no adverse effect upon the integrity of any of these sites arising from the measures within the plans. This process of assessment is known formally as a Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA), or informally as a Natura Appraisal. This is not to be confused with an Appropriate Assessment (AA), which is a component of the process of appraisal.
- I.4 This HRA considers all parts of the LDP, the supplementary guidance and the CPP within the same HRA. Appraising them together ensures consistency of approach and allows consideration of the integration of effects and consequent mitigation across both plans and guidance. The elements of the CPP are still identifiable through the stages of the appraisal and so this can be read in its own right if required.

## 2. Methodology

- 2.1 There is no prescribed method for a HRA. CNPA are therefore following the guidelines prepared by David Tyldesley and Associates for Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) 'Habitats Regulations Appraisals of Plans' and have consulted SNH during the preparation of the appraisal.
- 2.2 There are 13 stages to the methodology followed, set out in the table below. This report records all stages.

<b>Stages of Methodology</b>	
<i>(Source: SNH Guidance: Habitats Regulations Appraisal of Plans, D Tyldesley)</i>	
<b>Stage 1</b>	Decide whether plan is subject to HRA
<b>Stage 2</b>	Identify Natura Sites that should be considered
<b>Stage 3</b>	Gather information about the Natura Sites
<b>Stage 4</b>	Discretionary consultation on the method and scope of the appraisal
<b>Stage 5</b>	Screening the plan for potential likely significant effects on Natura sites
<b>Stage 6</b>	Apply mitigation measures
<b>Stage 7</b>	Re-screen the plan after mitigation measures have been applied
<b>Stage 8</b>	If significant effects still likely, undertake an appropriate assessment in view of conservation objectives
<b>Stage 9</b>	Apply mitigation measures until there is no adverse effect on site integrity
<b>Stage 10</b>	Prepare a draft record of the HRA
<b>Stage 11</b>	Consult on the draft record of the HRA
<b>Stage 12</b>	If amending the plan in light of consultation, screen amendments for likely significant effects and if required, carry out appropriate assessment and consult SNH again
<b>Stage 13</b>	Modify HRA record in light of any amendments, complete and publish the final HRA record with clear conclusions

Further details of the methodology applied during screening and appropriate assessment are given in the relevant sections.

### 3. Screening Process

#### 3.1 Stage 1: The Local Development Plan (LDP) and Core Paths Plan (CPP) and the decision to screen

3.1.1 The LDP for the Cairngorms National Park is a land use plan. The CPP is a strategy plan for safeguarding access. Neither plan is wholly concerned with the necessary management of a European site for nature conservation (Natura Site). As such the plans must be subject to an HRA under the terms of regulation 69A.

#### 3.2 Stages 2 and 3: Identification of Natura Sites and gathering their details

3.2.1 The following sites have been identified with the assistance of SNH. In total there are 43 sites within the Cairngorms National Park. Approximately 49 per cent of the Park's 4,500 km<sup>2</sup> area is covered by at least one Natura designation. See Appendix I for details on each site and its qualifying features.

#### Special Area of Conservation (SAC)

Ballochbuie	Kinveachy Forest
Beinn a' Ghlo	Ladder Hills
Caenlochan	Monadhliath
Cairngorms	Morrone Birkwood
Coyles of Muick	Morven and Mullachdubh
Creag Meagaidh	Muir of Dinnet
Creag nan Gamhainn	River Dee
Dinnet Oakwood	River South Esk
Drumochter Hills	River Spey
Glen Tanar	River Tay
Greenhill of Strathdon	The Maim
Insh Marshes	Tulach Hill and Glen Fender Meadows

#### Special Protection Area (SPA)

Abernethy Forest	Drumochter Hills
Anagach Woods	Forest of Clunie
Ballochbuie	Glen Tanar
Caenlochan	Kinveachy Forest
Cairngorms	Loch Vaa
Cairngorms Massif	Lochnagar
Craigmore Wood	Muir of Dinnet
Creag Meagaidh	River Spey – Insh Marshes

#### Ramsar sites

Cairngorm Lochs  
Muir of Dinnet  
River Spey – Insh Marshes

### **3.3 Stage 4: Discussions on the method and scope of the appraisal**

3.3.1 Advice from SNH was sought at key stages in preparing the HRA including:

- Scoping approach and methodology for assessment
- Review and discussion of first draft
- Consultation on final draft

3.3.2 In addition, advice has also been sought from SEPA, Scottish Water and SNH on matters specifically relating to the River Spey, River Dee and River Tay SACs in relation to water quality, abstraction, and wastewater treatment.

### **3.4 Stage 5: Screening the plan for potential likely significant effects**

3.4.1 Screening for likely significant effects (LSE) involved four steps:

- Step 1: Screening out general policy statements
- Step 2: Screening out projects referred to, but not proposed by, the LDP
- Step 3: Screening out aspects of the LDP that could have no likely significant effect on a site, alone or in combination with other aspects of the same plan, or with other plans
- Step 4: Assessing if any combination of minor residual effects amounts to a likely significant effect

#### **Stage 5 Step 1: Screening out general policy statements**

3.4.2 The vision and spatial strategy of the LDP are general policy statements that set out the overall direction for the plan. Table I sets out the screening for these statements.

**Table 1: Screening of General Policy Statements**

Aspect of Plan, policy, project or strategy		Screened in or out	General policy statement
<b>Vision</b>	An outstanding National Park enjoyed and valued by everyone, where nature and people thrive together.	Out	General policy statement from NPPP setting out overall vision for the National Park.
<b>Spatial Strategy</b>	We will focus future activity and growth on these corridors, and within the settled valleys and straths of the Park.	Out	General CNPA aspiration for future development within the National Park.
	New housing will be focussed on existing settlements, and, within Badenoch and Strathspey, in the new settlement of An Camas Mòr.	Out	General CNPA aspiration for future development within the National Park. Though locations are listed these are dealt with individually in settlement screening in step 3 below.
	The remaining areas of the Park are identified as having important land management, recreation, landscape, wildness and nature conservation benefits. Within these areas, development should be to support the delivery of those multiple benefits.	Out	General CNPA aspiration for future development within the National Park.

3.4.3 *Stage 5 Step 1 Conclusion - No Likely Significant Effects or Minor Residual Effects were identified.*

**Stage 5 Step 2: Screening out projects referred to, but not proposed by, the LDP**

3.4.4 Eight of the settlements identified in the LDP have sites with extant permission for housing development: Aviemore; Carr-Bridge; Cromdale; Dalwhinnie; Dulnain Bridge; Kingussie; Newtonmore and Tomintoul. These will be screened in Stage 5 Step 3 alongside the allocations as it is possible they add to the potential effects on their respective settlements. There are no other projects referred to in the LDP.

3.4.5 *Stage 5 Step 2 Conclusion - Extant permissions referred to but not proposed by the LDP to be screened at Stage 5 Step 3.*

**Stage 5 Step 3: Screening out other aspects of the LDP that could have no likely significant effect**

3.4.6 Beyond the vision and spatial strategy, the LDP has three sections: policies; supplementary guidance; and community information which includes information on how development within that settlement should be undertaken and specific allocations of land for housing, economic, tourism, open space and community development. A number of housing allocations are accompanied by additional information in the form of Development Briefs which are supplementary guidance. All parts of the Plan have been screened.

**Policies and Supplementary Guidance(SG)**

3.4.7 Policies and Supplementary Guidance have been screened together (Table 2). Screening has determined that none of the general policies within the LDP has any likely significant effects on any specific Natura site. Consequently they have all been screened out for individual effects. No minor residual effects have been identified for any of these policies.

3.4.8 All Supplementary Guidance, with the exception of the Core Paths Plan and Development Briefs, has been screened out as it provides additional information to the criteria set out in the corresponding policy and does not in itself propose any specific measures, nor is it site specific. No Likely Significant Effects (LSE) or Minor Residual Effects (MRE) have been identified. The development briefs have been screened alongside the relevant settlements in the main screening.

**Table 2: Screening policies for likely significant effects**

Nature of policy or guidance	Screened in or out	Title of policy or guidance
Policies and guidance which are too general so that it is not known where, when or how development may be implemented, or where potential effects may occur, or which European sites, if any, may be affected.	Out	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing Development</li> <li>• Supporting Economic Growth</li> <li>• Digital infrastructure</li> <li>• Resources</li> <li>• Renewable Energy</li> <li>• Sport and Recreation</li> </ul>
Policies and guidance that have been screened out because they do not of	Out	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustainable Design</li> </ul>

<p>themselves promote development, but are qualitative in nature or relate to process, and are based upon general criteria</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing SG</li> <li>• Resources SG</li> <li>• Supporting Economic Growth SG</li> <li>• Renewable Energy SG</li> <li>• Sustainable Design SG</li> <li>• Developer Contribution</li> <li>• Developers Contribution SG</li> <li>• Sport and Recreation SG</li> </ul>
<p>Policies and guidance that are excluded because they are protective in nature and so have no potential negative effects upon designated sites.</p>	<p>Out</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural Heritage</li> <li>• Natural Heritage SG</li> <li>• Landscape</li> <li>• Landscape SG</li> <li>• Cultural Heritage</li> <li>• Cultural Heritage SG</li> </ul>

### Core Paths Plan Supplementary Guidance

3.4.9 The Core Paths Plan (CPP) is Supplementary Guidance to the LDP. It contains the paths from the existing CPP as well as a number of new paths. All paths have been screened for LSEs and this process is set out in the matrix in Appendix 2. Where LSEs have been found they are taken forward to the Appropriate Assessment (AA) unless mitigation can be applied that cancels or avoids effects. Where MREs have been found, either directly from screening or as a result of the application of mitigation, these have been considered in combination with other MREs.

The purpose of the core path designation is to safeguard a route for public access. It is a policy aim of the CNPA to ensure that all core paths are fit for purpose. What this means will change from location to location and may result in some improvements to paths. It is not intended that additional promotion will follow from designation, though some additional signage may follow.

3.4.10 Existing and proposed paths are screened in if designation as a core path will result in:

- increased promotion and therefore use; or

- significant improvements to the physical state of the path that will encourage significantly greater use
- 3.4.11 Only where a path is significantly improved and/or given additional promotion is it likely that there could be an increase in users. Paths which may have effects on capercaillie are those which cross, or are within 100m, of SPAs or other supporting habitat and are unfit for purpose. These were screened as these are the ones most likely to be improved and may have unintended effects on capercaillie due to an increasing number of users.
- 3.4.12 Since the existing paths were first designated and assessed there has not, in general, been any change which has led to any likely significant effect. However, people using paths, especially with dogs, may disturb capercaillie. This may happen at a number of critical times over the year, for example during the breeding season. Disturbance at such a time may lead to a reduction in productivity of the birds, resulting ultimately in a reduced population. In addition, dogs may kill birds thus being a direct threat. However, there has been no clear relationship established between the volume of users and the significance of disturbance as habituation, or other factors, may mitigate the effects.
- 3.4.13 All existing core paths were screened and, with the exception of the Highburnside path and the Thieves road, found to have no LSEs on Natura sites. The Highburnside core path links the new housing development at Highburnside to the path network of Craigellachie NNR. It requires upgrading which will improve connectivity between Aviemore and Kinveachy Forest SPA. There is an LSE from recreational disturbance that cannot be ruled out.
- 3.4.14 The same conditions have been applied to proposed core paths. Again where the path is already in existence, in suitable condition (fit for purpose), well promoted, and signed, the designation will add nothing that would encourage more users to the path and there will be no LSE or any MRE. This is again shown in Appendix 2.

### **Settlements**

- 3.4.15 Each settlement with a defined boundary has been screened against each Natura site for possible LSEs, options where mitigation is possible, occasions with MREs or where it has been possible to screen them out completely. Criteria have been used to assess direct and indirect effects (see Appendix 2). It is important to note that if a site or qualifying interest is not included within Appendix 2, then it has been concluded that there will be no adverse impact on it. Table 4 summarises those settlements that may have LSEs and the Natura sites that might be affected.
- 3.4.16 The sensitivity to recreational disturbance of capercaillie, a qualifying feature for several SPAs, meant that the potential impacts of settlements had to be given special consideration. Screening for LSEs on capercaillie considered the relationship between the size of housing developments and their distance from the Natura site. A matrix sets out the significance of effect in relation to the size of development and proximity to the site (Table 3). Dog walking is considered to be the most significant potential source of recreational disturbance to capercaillie.

For the purposes of screening, thresholds based on evidence of recreational behaviour were used to determine LSEs:

- 2 km threshold reflects the distance around settlements where most dog-walking is likely to take place.
- Thresholds of 5 and 10 km were also used to assess the impact of increasing distance between a settlement and a site.
- Beyond the distance of 10 km from a settlement, it is considered that the volume of people would be so low as to be negligible.

It should be explained however that these thresholds are used as a general guide for direct effects and that professional judgement from access specialists and ecologists have been applied to the outcome. These thresholds do not, for example, take into account favourite dog walking spots but a judgement on these is applied in the overall analysis. In addition it should be noted that secondary effects on SPAs from disruption to dispersal between woodlands in the meta population area are considered separately and are within the AA.

**Table 3: Screening guide for capercaillie SPAs and housing development**

No. units /distance from site	Less than 2 km	2-5 km	5-10 km	More than 10 km
Less than 100 houses	LSE	MRE	MRE	No effect
100-300 houses	LSE	LSE	MRE	No effect
More than 300 houses	LSE	LSE	LSE	No effect

3.4.17 Where no housing or economic development allocations are identified within a settlement's boundary, the settlement is screened out as the Plan does not propose any significant growth. Any applications for development would be considered on a windfall basis. Tourism allocations identify and safeguard important facilities so these are screened out as they do not support alternative uses and are not considered to have identifiable effects upon any Natura designations. It is important to note that if development proposals come forward they would be subject to appraisal to assess any likely significant effect upon a Natura site.

*Table 4 sets out the conclusions of Stage 5 Step 3.*

**Table 4: Summary of LSE for Settlements and Core Paths**

Abbreviations:

- QI – Qualifying Interest
- WW – Waste Water

Aspect of LDP or CPP	SPA/Ramsar	Likely Significant Effect	SAC	Likely Significant Effect
An Camas Mòr	Abernethy Forest SPA	Disturbance to QI	River Spey SAC	Disturbance to QI Pollution and siltation Pollution from WW Water abstraction Run-off Disturbance to Lamprey from lighting
	Cairngorms SPA	Disturbance to QI	Cairngorms SAC	Distribution of qualifying habitats
	Kinveachy Forest SPA	Disturbance to QI		
	Anagach Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		

CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AS MODIFIED  
Habitats Regulations Appraisal Record

	Craigmore Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
Aviemore and vicinity	Abernethy Forest SPA	Disturbance to QI	River Spey SAC	Disturbance to QI Pollution and siltation Pollution from WW Water abstraction Run-off
	Cairngorms SPA	Disturbance to QI		
	Anagach Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Craigmore Wood	Disturbance to QI		
	Kinveachy Forest SPA	Disturbance to QI		
Ballater	Glen Tanar SPA	Disturbance to QI	River Dee SAC	Disturbance to QI Pollution and siltation Pollution from WW Water abstraction

CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AS MODIFIED  
Habitats Regulations Appraisal Record

				Run-off
	Ballochbuie SPA	Disturbance to QI		
	Cairngorms SPA	Disturbance to QI		
Blair Atholl			River Tay SAC	Disturbance to QI Pollution and siltation Pollution from WW Water abstraction Run-off
Boat of Garten	Abernethy SPA	Disturbance to QI	River Spey SAC	Disturbance to QI Pollution and siltation Pollution from WW Water abstraction Run-off
	Cairngorms SPA	Disturbance to QI		
	Craigmore Wood SPA	Disturbance to QI		
	Kinveachy Forest SPA	Disturbance to QI		

CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AS MODIFIED  
Habitats Regulations Appraisal Record

	Anagach Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
Braemar	Ballochbuie SPA	Disturbance to QI	River Dee SAC	Disturbance to QI Pollution and siltation Pollution from WW Water abstraction Run-off
	Cairngorms SPA	Disturbance to QI		
	Glen Tanar SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
Carr-Bridge	Abernethy Forest SPA	Disturbance to QI	River Spey SAC	Disturbance to QI Pollution and siltation Pollution from WW Water abstraction Run-off
	Cairngorms SPA	Disturbance to QI		

	Kinveachy Forest SPA	Disturbance to QI		
	Anagach Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Craigmore Wood SPA	Disturbance to QI		
Inverdrue and Coylumbridge	Anagach Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal	River Spey SAC	Disturbance to QI Pollution and siltation Pollution from WW Water abstraction Run-off
	Craigmore Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal	Cairngorms SAC	Disturbance to QI
	Abernethy Forest SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Cairngorms SPA	Disturbance to QI		
	Cairngorms SAC	Loss of qualifying Habitat		
	Kinveachy Forest SPA	Secondary effect:		

CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AS MODIFIED  
Habitats Regulations Appraisal Record

		reduction in dispersal		
Cromdale and Advie	Anagach Wood SPA	Disturbance to QI	River Spey SAC	Disturbance to QI Pollution and siltation Pollution from WW Water abstraction Run-off
	Craigmore Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Abernethy Forest SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Cairngorms SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Kinveachy Forest SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
Dalwhinnie			River Spey SAC	Disturbance to QI Pollution and siltation

CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AS MODIFIED  
Habitats Regulations Appraisal Record

				Pollution from WW Water abstraction Run-off
Dinnet			River Dee SAC	Disturbance to QI Pollution and siltation Pollution from WW Water abstraction Run-off
Dulnain Bridge	Craigmore Wood SPA	In-combination disturbance to QI	River Spey SAC	Disturbance to QI Pollution and siltation Pollution from WW Water abstraction Run-off
	Abernethy Forest SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		

	Cairngorms SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Kinveachy Forest SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Anagach Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
Glenmore	Anagach Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal	River Spey SAC	Disturbance to QI Pollution and siltation Pollution from WW Water abstraction Run-off
	Craigmore Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Abernethy Forest SPA	Disturbance to QI		
	Cairngorms SPA	Disturbance to QI		
	Kinveachy Forest SPA	Secondary effect:		

		reduction in dispersal		
Grantown-on-Spey	Anagach Wood SPA	Disturbance to QI	River Spey SAC	Disturbance to QI Pollution and siltation Pollution from WW Water abstraction Run-off
	Craigmore Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Abernethy Forest SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Cairngorms SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Kinveachy Forest SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
Killiecrankie			River Tay SAC	Disturbance to QI Pollution and siltation

CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AS MODIFIED  
Habitats Regulations Appraisal Record

				Pollution from WW Water abstraction Run-off
Kincraig and Vicinity	River Spey – Insh Marshes SPA Ramsar site	Disturbance to QI Pollution and siltation Pollution from WW Water abstraction Run-off	Insh Marshes SAC	Disturbance to QI Pollution and siltation Pollution from WW Water abstraction Run-off
	Anagach Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal	River Spey SAC	Disturbance to QI Pollution and siltation Pollution from WW Water abstraction Run-off
	Abernethy Forest SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Cairngorms SPA	Disturbance to QI		

	Kinveachy Forest SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Craigmore Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
Kingussie	River Spey – Insh Marshes SPA Ramsar site	Disturbance to QI Pollution and siltation Pollution from WW Water abstraction Run-off	River Spey SAC	Disturbance to QI Pollution and siltation Pollution from WW Water abstraction Run-off
			Insh Marshes SAC	Disturbance to QI Pollution and siltation Pollution from WW Water abstraction Run-off
Nethy Bridge	Abernethy Forest SPA	Disturbance to QI	River Spey SAC	Disturbance to QI Pollution and siltation

				Pollution from WW Water abstraction Run-off
	Craigmore Wood SPA	Disturbance to QI		
	Cairngorms SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Kinveachy Forest SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Anagach Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
Newtonmore	River Spey – Insh Marshes SPA Ramsar site	Disturbance to QI Pollution and siltation Pollution from WW Water abstraction Run-off	Insh Marshes SAC	Disturbance to QI Pollution and siltation Pollution from WW Water abstraction Run-off
			River Spey SAC	Disturbance to QI

				Pollution and siltation Pollution from WW Water abstraction Run-off
Tomintoul			River Spey SAC	Disturbance to QI Pollution and siltation Pollution from WW Water abstraction Run-off
Highburnside candidate CP	Kinveachy Forest SPA	Disturbance to QI		
	Cairngorms SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Abernethy Forest SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Craigmore Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		

CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AS MODIFIED  
Habitats Regulations Appraisal Record

	Anagach Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
Ballochbuie proposed core path	Ballochbuie SPA	Disturbance to QI	Ballochbuie SPA	Disturbance to QI and loss of QI (habitats)
Thieves Road Rothiemurchus	Cairngorms SPA	Disturbance to QI		
	Kinveachy Forest SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Abernethy Forest SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Craigmore Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Anagach Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		

- 3.4.19 The following settlements in the LDP have been screened out because no housing or economic development allocations are proposed (and therefore any effect is too general to identify), or because no effect is predicted because they are sufficiently remote from any Natura site:

Angus Glens	Glenshee
Bruar and Pitagowan	Insh
Calvine	Laggan
Glenlivet	Strathdon and vicinity

#### **Stage 5 Step 4: In-combination effects**

- 3.4.20 Some policies or proposals may have effects that are negative but that are not likely to be significant effects in their own right. These are known as minor residual effects (MRE). The last step of Stage 5 is to assess whether any combination of MREs may result in an LSE. This includes any combination of policies and projects with MREs within the LDP itself and also the combination of the MREs of other plans, policies or projects covering the area of the National Park with the MREs within the LDP. These are called 'in-combination effects' but are sometimes referred to as cumulative effects.
- 3.4.21 The matrices in Appendix 3 show for each Natura site where there are combinations of MREs and where these become significant. If they do, mitigation will be applied where possible and if this does not avoid or cancel the likely significant effect, they will be subject to an appropriate assessment.

#### **In-combination effects within the Plan**

- 3.4.22 The general policy statements and Supplementary Guidance have been screened out for a variety of reasons and no LSEs or MREs have been identified. Therefore there are no in-combination effects resulting from them.
- 3.4.23 Screening has identified a number of MREs from other aspects of the LDP. These are set out in the matrices in Appendix 3 for each Natura site. The combination of these has been considered to see if they result in an LSE. Where effects are likely to be significant they are taken forward into an appropriate assessment.

#### **In-combination effects with other plans or projects**

- 3.4.24 The policies, plans and strategies in Table 5 have been searched for any MREs that may combine with those identified from aspects of the LDP. Two plans and policies were found to have MREs on Natura sites: the National Transport Strategy; and the Strategic Transport Projects Review. In both cases the potential effects are from the dualling of the A9 on the Drumochter Hills SAC and River Spey SAC. These effects have been included in the in-combination effects matrices and considered alongside the in-plan MREs.

**Table 5: Other Plans, Policies and Strategies**

<b>Policy Plan or Project</b>	<b>Aspect</b>	<b>MRE</b>
National Planning Framework for Scotland 3 (2014)	Speyside Way Long Distance Route	Cairngorms SPA
Scotland River Basin Management Plan		
Land Use Strategy for Scotland		
Scottish Forestry Strategy		
Scotland Rural Development Programme		
Climate Change Adaptation Framework (2009)		
Scottish Biodiversity Strategy		
Scotland's Zero Waste Plan (2010)		
Scotland's National Transport Strategy 2006	A9 widening	Drumochter Hills SAC River Spey SAC
Transport Scotland Strategic Transport Projects Review	A9 widening	Drumochter Hills SAC River Spey SAC
Scottish Tourism: The Next Decade – a Tourism Framework for Change (2006)		
Local Housing Strategies (prepared by local authorities as housing authorities for each council area)		
Regional Economic Development Strategies		
Catchment Management Plans for Rivers Dee, South Esk and Spey		
Aberdeen City & Shire Structure Plan 2014		
Aberdeenshire LDP 2012	Considered abstraction from River Dee	

Angus Local Plan Review 2009		
Highland Structure Plan		
Highland wide Local Development Plan		
Moray Structure Plan		
Moray proposed Local Development Plan (at examination)	Considered abstraction from River Spey	
TayPlan		
Perth and Kinross Local Development Plan		
Perth & Kinross Highland Area LP		
Strategy and Action Plan for Sustainable Tourism in the Cairngorms		
Cairngorms National Park Partnership Plan 2012-2017		
Cairngorms Nature Action Plan 2013-2017		
Cairngorms National Park Outdoor Access Strategy		
Cairngorms National Park Deer Framework		
Cairngorms Forest and Woodland Framework		

#### 4. Stage 6: Mitigation measures

- 4.1 Where LSEs have **not** be screened out during Stage 5 it may be possible to incorporate measures into the Plan that will mitigate these effects. Such mitigation must reduce the effects identified to a level where they are not likely to be significant and will have no adverse effect on the integrity of any Natura site.

Stage 6 immediately follows screening. At this point mitigation may be applied by deleting an aspect of the Plan or modifying it in some way; for example by relocating it, changing the time of delivery, or by making changes that avoid effects or reduce scale. Where this is done the mitigated aspect is then re-screened to see if LSEs remain.

Once mitigation measures have been applied in Stage 6, Stage 7 re-screens the Plan to determine whether significant effects are still likely. If they are, an appropriate assessment is undertaken (stage 8), through which further mitigation measures are identified.

4.1 Having considered the LSEs identified in Stage 5 and summarised above, Stage 6 identifies five mitigation measures that are straightforward and can be applied to the Plan immediately after screening to address specific LSEs. These are:

4.1.1 **Mitigation measure 1: Removal from the Plan**

**Effect:** Ballochbuie footpath has not been screened out because there is no current path and the proposed route would run through Ballochbuie SAC and SPA. It may result in disturbance to qualifying species (otter and capercaillie) and loss of qualifying habitat. This is an LSE and it cannot be ascertained at this point that it will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Natura sites.

**Mitigation required:** Ballochbuie footpath should be removed from the CPP.

4.1.2 **Mitigation measure 2: Water abstraction**

**Effect:** Water for developments will be supplied from public or private systems. The increase in water abstraction associated with increased development may reduce water levels in protected water courses thus affecting site integrity.

**Mitigation required:** The water supply must be available for the development from known sources and these must have a demonstrable capacity to supply the required water without adverse effects upon the integrity of Natura sites. If the capacity has not been demonstrated then development should be prohibited until it is in place. Demand for water should be reduced within all developments by using the best methods for efficient water use. Compliance with sustainable design guidance is required to ensure minimum use of water.

**Required provision within LDP:** The LDP must ensure that developments brought forward through the Plan will comply with current best practice to achieve the required mitigation. The first draft of the HRA required the following wording:

*Developments which would have a likely significant effect on (named European designated sites) through the additional abstraction of water must supply as part of the planning application the necessary information to allow the Planning Authority to carry out an Appropriate Assessment which will inform the decision on the application. It must be demonstrated that water usage has been minimised through the design of the development. It must be demonstrated to the planning authority that the capacity for water supply is in place and that this will not adversely affect the integrity of the site, either alone or in combination. Development may be prohibited until capacity for supply is in place.*

The recommendations of the reporter reworded this section as follows:

*“In addition, development on land allocated in the plan has the potential to have a significant effect either directly or indirectly on a number of European designated sites, alone or in combination.*

- *[Relevant European Site(s) stated]*

*You must supply as part of your planning application, all necessary information to allow the planning authority to carry out Appropriate Assessment in order that they can be confident that your development will not have an adverse effect on the site integrity in view of the conservation objectives, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. If the planning authority is unable to reach this conclusion, your proposal will be judged not to be in accordance with this plan. Specifically your proposal must address the mitigation measures (as set out in Natural Heritage Supplementary Guidance) required to address potential impacts on:*

- *Water abstraction.”*

This new wording leads to the same effect as the original and so provides the same level of certainty about any effect on the conservation objectives. This wording is included within the LDP for each settlement listed above as having a LSE upon this Natura site.

#### 4.1.3 **Mitigation measure 3: Disturbance to otter**

**Effect:** Otters may be disturbed by construction activity, noise, lighting and other features of the development’s design or by post-construction activity.

**Mitigation required:** A full survey is undertaken in accordance with standard methodologies to determine if there are otters in the vicinity of the development. An appraisal will be required of the construction activity, design and use of the development to see if there would be any effect upon otters. Any identified effects must be eliminated through modifications to proposals and detailed within a species protection plan (SPP). Survey, appraisal and SPP must be submitted with planning application.

**Required provision within LDP:** The LDP must ensure that developments brought forward through the Plan will comply with current best practice to achieve the required mitigation. The first draft of the HRA required the following wording:

*Developments which would have a likely significant effect on (named European designated sites) must supply as part of the planning application a survey for otters and assessment of impacts upon this qualifying feature in accordance to accepted standards. This will allow the Planning Authority to carry out an Appropriate Assessment which will inform the decision on the application. To be in accordance with this Plan and for planning permission to be granted, such developments must not adversely affect the integrity of the site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.*

The recommendations of the reporter reworded this section as follows:

*“In addition, development on land allocated in the plan has the potential to have a significant effect either directly or indirectly on a number of European designated sites, alone or in combination.*

- *[Relevant European Site(s) stated]*

*You must supply as part of your planning application, all necessary information to allow the planning authority to carry out Appropriate Assessment in order that they can be confident that your development will not have an adverse effect on the site integrity in view of the conservation objectives, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. If the planning authority is unable to reach this conclusion, your proposal will be judged not to be in accordance with this plan. Specifically your proposal must address the mitigation measures (as set out in Natural Heritage Supplementary Guidance) required to address potential impacts on:*

- *Disturbance to otters.”*

This new wording leads to the same effect as the original and so provides the same level of certainty about any effect on the conservation objectives. This wording is included within the LDP for each settlement listed above as having a LSE upon this Natura site.

#### 4.1.4 **Mitigation measure 4: Pollution and siltation from construction sites**

**Effect:** Contamination of protected watercourses by chemical pollutants or particles washed into it from construction sites.

**Mitigation required:** That site operations are managed in a way that the likelihood is removed. This can be achieved through safe handling of potential pollutants and provision of interceptor drains, filters and other measures on site. These measures must be set out in a Construction Method Statement (CMS) and this must follow recognised guidelines and best practice. Where required through statute, Controlled Activity Regulations (CAR) must be complied with.

**Required provision within LDP:** The LDP must ensure that developments brought forward through the Plan will comply with current best practice to achieve the required mitigation. The first draft of the HRA required the following wording:

*Developments which would have a likely significant effect on (named European designated sites) must supply as part of the planning application a construction method statement (CMS) to allow the Planning Authority to carry out an Appropriate Assessment which will inform the final decision on the application. The CMS must clearly demonstrate that risks to watercourses and ground water are eliminated through application of good site management in accordance with accepted best practice and guidelines. Development may not commence until it has been demonstrated to the planning authority that the measures in the CMS have been adopted for onsite management. To be in accordance with this Plan and for planning permission to be granted, such developments must not adversely affect the integrity of the site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.*

The recommendations of the reporter reworded this section as follows:

*“In addition, development on land allocated in the plan has the potential to have a significant effect either directly or indirectly on a number of European designated sites, alone or in combination.*

- *[Relevant European Site(s) stated]*

*You must supply as part of your planning application, all necessary information to allow the planning authority to carry out Appropriate Assessment in order that they can be confident that your development will not have an adverse effect on the site integrity in view of the conservation objectives, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. If the planning authority is unable to reach this conclusion, your proposal will be judged not to be in accordance with this plan. Specifically your proposal must address the mitigation measures (as set out in Natural Heritage Supplementary Guidance) required to address potential impacts on:*

- *Pollution and siltation from construction sites.”*

This new wording leads to the same effect as the original and so provides the same level of certainty about any effect on the conservation objectives. This wording is included within the LDP for each settlement listed above as having a LSE upon this Natura site.

#### 4.1.5 **Mitigation measure 5: Requirement for SUDS**

**Effect:** The use of hard impervious surfaces within development is likely to increase the speed with which rainfall enters watercourses. This can increase flood events causing damage to river habitats. This rainfall may also bring particles from these surfaces which may cloud water and reduce its quality.

**Mitigation required:** A Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme (SUDS) must be implemented that will intercept water and either increase infiltration rates by using porous surfaces or slow run-off rates through storage mechanisms.

**Required provision within LDP:** The LDP must ensure that developments brought forward through the plan will comply with current best practice to achieve the required mitigation. The first draft of the HRA required the following wording:

*Developments which would have a likely significant effect on (named European designated sites) must supply as part of the planning application a Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme (SUDS) to allow the Planning Authority to carry out an Appropriate Assessment which will inform the final decision on the application. To be in accordance with this Plan and for planning permission to be granted, such developments must not adversely affect the integrity of the site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.*

The recommendations of the reporter reworded this section as follows:

*“In addition, development on land allocated in the plan has the potential to have a significant effect either directly or indirectly on a number of European designated sites, alone or in combination.*

- *[Relevant European Site(s) stated]*

*You must supply as part of your planning application, all necessary information to allow the planning authority to carry out Appropriate Assessment in order that they can be confident*

*that your development will not have an adverse effect on the site integrity in view of the conservation objectives, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. If the planning authority is unable to reach this conclusion, your proposal will be judged not to be in accordance with this plan. Specifically your proposal must address the mitigation measures (as set out in Natural Heritage Supplementary Guidance) required to address potential impacts on:*

- *Requirement for SUDS.”*

This new wording leads to the same effect as the original and so provides the same level of certainty about any effect on the conservation objectives. This wording is included within the LDP for each settlement listed above as having a LSE upon this Natura site.

## **5. Stage 7: Re-screen the LDP and determine the need for an Appropriate Assessment**

- 5.1 Following application of the mitigation measures in Stage 6, this stage re-screens the plan to identify LSEs that remain. Table 6 summarises all the LSEs initially identified through screening and deletes those that have been removed as a result of applying the mitigation measures in Stage 6. The remaining LSEs are therefore taken forward into an appropriate assessment at Stage 8.

**Table 6: Aspects of LDP and CPP to be taken forward to Appropriate Assessment**

Aspect of LDP or CPP	SPA	Likely Significant Effect	SAC/Ramsar	Likely Significant Effect
An Camas Mòr	Abernethy Forest SPA	Disturbance to QI	River Spey SAC	Disturbance to QI <del>Pollution and siltation</del> Pollution from WW <del>Water abstraction</del> Run-off Disturbance to Lamprey from lighting
	Cairngorms SPA	Disturbance to QI	Cairngorms SAC	Distribution of qualifying habitats
	Kinveachy Forest SPA	Disturbance to QI		
	Anagach Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Craigmore Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
Aviemore and vicinity	Abernethy Forest SPA	Disturbance to QI	River Spey SAC	<del>Disturbance to QI</del>

CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AS MODIFIED  
Habitats Regulations Appraisal Record

				<del>Pollution and siltation</del> Pollution from WW <del>Water abstraction</del> Run-off
	Cairngorms SPA	Disturbance to QI		
	Anagach Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Craigmore Wood	Disturbance to QI		
	Kinveachy Forest SPA	Disturbance to QI		
Ballater	Glen Tanar SPA	Disturbance to QI	River Dee SAC	<del>Disturbance to QI</del> <del>Pollution and siltation</del> Pollution from WW <del>Water abstraction</del> Run-off
	Ballochbuie SPA	Disturbance to QI		
	Cairngorms SPA	Disturbance to QI		

CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AS MODIFIED  
Habitats Regulations Appraisal Record

Blair Atholl			River Tay SAC	<del>Disturbance to QI</del> <del>Pollution and siltation</del> Pollution from WW <del>Water abstraction</del> Run-off
Boat of Garten	Abernethy SPA	Disturbance to QI	River Spey SAC	<del>Disturbance to QI</del> <del>Pollution and siltation</del> Pollution from WW <del>Water abstraction</del> Run-off
	Cairngorms SPA	Disturbance to QI		
	Craigmore Wood SPA	Disturbance to QI		
	Kinveachy Forest SPA	Disturbance to QI		
	Anagach Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Braemar	Ballochbuie SPA	Disturbance to QI	River Dee SAC

				<del>Pollution and siltation</del> Pollution from WW <del>Water abstraction</del> <del>Run-off</del>
	Cairngorms SPA	Disturbance to QI		
	Glen Tanar SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
Carr-Bridge	Abernethy Forest SPA	Disturbance to QI	River Spey SAC	<del>Disturbance to QI</del> <del>Pollution and siltation</del> Pollution from WW <del>Water abstraction</del> <del>Run-off</del>
	Cairngorms SPA	Disturbance to QI		
	Kinveachy Forest SPA	Disturbance to QI		
	Anagach Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		

	Craigmore Wood SPA	Disturbance to QI		
Cromdale and Advie	Anagach Wood SPA	Disturbance to QI	River Spey SAC	<del>Disturbance to QI</del> Pollution and siltation Pollution from WW <del>Water abstraction</del> Run-off
	Craigmore Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Abernethy Forest SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Cairngorms SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Kinveachy Forest SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
Inverdrueie and Coylumbridge	Anagach Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal	River Spey SAC	<del>Disturbance to QI</del> Pollution and siltation

CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AS MODIFIED  
Habitats Regulations Appraisal Record

				Pollution from WW <del>Water abstraction</del> <del>Run-off</del>
	Craigmore Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal	Cairngorms SAC	<del>Disturbance to QI</del>
	Abernethy Forest SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Cairngorms SPA	Disturbance to QI		
	Kinveachy Forest SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
Dalwhinnie			River Spey SAC	<del>Disturbance to QI</del> <del>Pollution and siltation</del> Pollution from WW <del>Water abstraction</del> <del>Run-off</del>
Dinnet			River Dee SAC	<del>Disturbance to QI</del>

				<del>Pollution and siltation</del> Pollution from WW <del>Water abstraction</del> <del>Run-off</del>
Dalnain Bridge	Craigmore Wood SPA	In-combination disturbance to QI	River Spey SAC	<del>Disturbance to QI</del> <del>Pollution and siltation</del> Pollution from WW <del>Water abstraction</del> <del>Run-off</del>
	Abernethy Forest SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Cairngorms SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Kinveachy Forest SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		

CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AS MODIFIED  
Habitats Regulations Appraisal Record

	Anagach Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
Glenmore	Anagach Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal	River Spey SAC	<del>Disturbance to QI</del> <del>Pollution and siltation</del> Pollution from WW <del>Water abstraction</del> Run-off
	Craigmore Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Abernethy Forest SPA	Disturbance to QI		
	Cairngorms SPA	Disturbance to QI		
	Kinveachy Forest SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
Grantown-on-Spey	Anagach Wood SPA	Disturbance to QI	River Spey SAC	<del>Disturbance to QI</del> <del>Pollution and siltation</del> Pollution from WW

CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AS MODIFIED  
Habitats Regulations Appraisal Record

				<del>Water abstraction</del> <del>Run-off</del>
	Craigmore Wood SPA	In-combination disturbance to QI		
	Abernethy Forest SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Cairngorms SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Kinveachy Forest SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
Killiecrankie			River Tay SAC	<del>Disturbance to QI</del> <del>Pollution and siltation</del> Pollution from WW <del>Water abstraction</del> <del>Run-off</del>
Kincraig and vicinity	River Spey – Insh Marshes SPA Ramsar site	<del>Disturbance to QI</del> Pollution and siltation	Insh Marshes SAC/ Ramsar	<del>Disturbance to QI</del> Pollution and siltation

		<p>Pollution from WW</p> <p><del>Water abstraction</del></p> <p><del>Run-off</del></p>		<p>Pollution from WW</p> <p><del>Water abstraction</del></p> <p><del>Run-off</del></p>
	Anagach Wood SPA	<p>Secondary effect:</p> <p>reduction in dispersal</p>	River Spey SAC	<p><del>Disturbance to QI</del></p> <p><del>Pollution and siltation</del></p> <p>Pollution from WW</p> <p><del>Water abstraction</del></p> <p><del>Run-off</del></p>
	Abernethy Forest SPA	<p>Secondary effect:</p> <p>reduction in dispersal</p>		
	Cairngorms SPA	Disturbance to QI		
	Kinveachy Forest SPA	<p>Secondary effect:</p> <p>reduction in dispersal</p>		
	Craigmore Wood SPA	<p>Secondary effect:</p> <p>reduction in dispersal</p>		
Kingussie	River Spey – Insh Marshes SPA Ramsar site	<del>Disturbance to QI</del>	River Spey SAC	<del>Disturbance to QI</del>

CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AS MODIFIED  
Habitats Regulations Appraisal Record

		<del>Pollution and siltation</del> Pollution from WW <del>Water abstraction</del> Run-off		<del>Pollution and siltation</del> Pollution from WW <del>Water abstraction</del> Run-off
			Insh Marshes SAC/ Ramsar	<del>Disturbance to QI</del> <del>Pollution and siltation</del> Pollution from WW <del>Water abstraction</del> Run-off
Nethy Bridge	Abernethy Forest SPA	Disturbance to QI	River Spey SAC	<del>Disturbance to QI</del> <del>Pollution and siltation</del> Pollution from WW <del>Water abstraction</del> Run-off
	Craigmore Wood SPA	Disturbance to QI		
	Cairngorms SPA	Secondary effect:		

		reduction in dispersal		
	Kinveachy Forest SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Anagach Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
Newtonmore	River Spey – Insh Marshes SPA Ramsar site	<del>Disturbance to QI</del> <del>Pollution and siltation</del> Pollution from WW <del>Water abstraction</del> <del>Run-off</del>	Insh Marshes SAC/ Ramsar	<del>Disturbance to QI</del> <del>Pollution and siltation</del> Pollution from WW <del>Water abstraction</del> <del>Run-off</del>
			River Spey SAC	<del>Disturbance to QI</del> <del>Pollution and siltation</del> Pollution from WW <del>Water abstraction</del> <del>Run-off</del>
Tomintoul			River Spey SAC	<del>Disturbance to QI</del>

CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AS MODIFIED  
Habitats Regulations Appraisal Record

				<del>Pollution and siltation</del> Pollution from WW <del>Water abstraction</del> Run-off
Highburnside candidate CP	Kinveachy Forest SPA	Disturbance to QI		
	Cairngorms SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Abernethy Forest SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Craigmore Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Anagach Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
Ballochbuie proposed core path	Ballochbuie SPA	<del>Disturbance to QI</del>	Ballochbuie SPA	<del>Disturbance to QI and loss of QI (habitats)</del>
Thieves Road Rothiemurchus	Cairngorms SPA	Disturbance to QI		

	Kinveachy Forest SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Abernethy Forest SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Craigmore Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		
	Anagach Wood SPA	Secondary effect: reduction in dispersal		

## **6. Stages 8 and 9: Appropriate Assessment and amending the Plan**

- 6.1 The Appropriate Assessment (AA) determines whether the aspects of the Plan for which LSEs remain will not adversely affect the integrity or otherwise of Natura sites. The assessment identifies the potential impacts for each aspect and provides the information to allow the CNPA, as competent authority, to apply mitigation measures to the LDP to avoid any adverse impacts. The assessment applies the precautionary approach in the case of all potential issues identified.
- 6.2 Where MREs are found following mitigations to LSEs they should be reassessed for in-combination effects with other MREs. If these combinations are then assessed to have LSEs these would be reincorporated into the AA for additional mitigation. This iteration process would continue until no further LSEs are found. However MREs were identified for four sites but no in combination LSEs were found.

The appropriate assessment is structured by each Natura site.

### **6.3 Stage 8: Appropriate Assessment**

(See tables overleaf)

### Abernethy Forest SPA

#### Conservation objectives

To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained; and

To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in the long-term:

- Population of the species as a viable component of the site
- Distribution of the species within the site
- Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species
- Structure, function and supporting process of habitats supporting the species
- No significant disturbance of the species

#### Qualifying species

- Capercaillie (*Tetrao urogallus*)
- Osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*)
- Scottish crossbill (*Loxia scotica*)

#### Effect on conservation objectives and necessary mitigation measures

There is no likely significant effect on osprey and Scottish crossbill because of the locations of osprey nests in relation to the proposed developments, while Scottish crossbill is not considered to be sensitive to disturbance by people.

However, there is potential for likely significant effect on capercaillie, an endangered ground-nesting species sensitive to human-related disturbance. The following settlements could not be screened out for likely significant effects:

#### Allocation sites

- **An Camas Mor:** 1500 houses located at 2-5 km means there is a likelihood of a significant effect.
- **Boat of Garten:** 30 houses located within 2 km means there is a likelihood of a significant effect.
- **Carr-bridge:** Housing allocation with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of a LSE.
- **Cromdale:** Housing allocation with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of an indirect effect.
- **Dulnain Bridge:** 30 houses may lead to increase in disturbance in this SPA
- **Glenmore:** Tourism allocation allows for expansion of provision which may lead to increased disturbance to capercaillie in this and other SPAs and so direct and indirect effects on this SPA
- **Grantown-on-Spey:** Housing allocation with a LSE on another SPA means there is a

likelihood of a indirect effect

- **Inverdrue and Coylumbridge:** Tourism allocation allows for expansion of provision which may lead to increased disturbance to capercaillie in other SPAs and to indirect effects on this SPA
- **Kincraig:** Housing allocation with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of a indirect effect
- **Nethy Bridge** Housing allocation located within 2 km means there is a likelihood of a significant effect

#### **Consented Sites**

- **Aviemore:** Housing consents may have a LSE on other SPAs and so lead to indirect effect on this site.
- **Carr-bridge:** Housing consents may have a LSE on other SPAs and so lead to indirect effect on this site..
- **Cromdale:** Housing consents may have a LSE on other SPAs and so lead to indirect effect on this site.

#### **Core Paths**

- Highburnside core path will have improvements which may mean an increase in users to another SPA thereby leading to indirect effects

**In combination effect:**

There are no potential minor residual effects identified from any settlements, therefore there are no in-combination effects.

**Mitigation**

The original wording for the mitigation required of the LDP was:

*“Developments which would have a likely significant effect on Abernethy Forest SPA must supply, as part of the planning application, all necessary information to allow the planning authority to carry out an Appropriate Assessment. Required mitigation will include a Recreational Management Plan (RMP), to comply with the criteria set out in this Plan. To be in accordance with this Plan, and for planning permission to be granted, such developments must not adversely affect the integrity of the site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.”*

The recommendations of the reporter reworded this section as follows:

*“You must supply as part of your planning application, all necessary information to allow the planning authority to carry out Appropriate Assessment in order that they can be confident that your development will not have an adverse effect on the site integrity in view of the conservation objectives, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. If the planning authority is unable to reach this conclusion, your proposal will be judged not to be in accordance with this plan. Specifically your proposal must address the mitigation measures (as set out in Natural Heritage Supplementary Guidance) required to address potential impacts on:*

- *Disturbance to Capercaillie.”*

This new wording leads to the same effect as the original and so provides the same level of certainty about any effect on the conservation objectives. This wording is included within the LDP for each settlement listed above as having a LSE upon this Natura site.

**Minor residual effects**

Following mitigation (individual RMPs and the Capercaillie Action Plan) there are no minor residual effects from any of the settlements within the LDP.

**Conclusion on site integrity**

Implementing these proposals will not have an adverse effect upon the integrity of this European Site, either alone or in combination.

### Anagach Woods SPA

#### Conservation objectives

To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained; and

To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in the long-term:

- Population of the species as a viable component of the site
- Distribution of the species within the site
- Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species
- Structure, function and supporting process of habitats supporting the species
- No significant disturbance of the species

#### Qualifying species

- Capercaillie (*Tetrao urogallus*)

#### Effect on conservation objectives

There is potential for increased impact on the qualifying species, an endangered ground-nesting species sensitive to human-related disturbance. The following could not be screened out for likely significant effects:

#### Allocation sites

- **An Camas Mor:** Housing allocation with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of an indirect effect
- **Boat of Garten:** Housing allocation with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of an indirect effect
- **Carr-bridge:** Housing allocation with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of an indirect effect.
- **Cromdale:** 30 houses located within 2 km (travel distance) means there is likelihood, with consented sites, of a significant effect.
- **Dalnain Bridge:** 30 houses may lead to an indirect effect on this SPA
- **Glenmore:** Tourism allocation allows for expansion of provision which may lead to increased disturbance to capercaillie in other SPAs and so an indirect effect on this SPA
- **Grantown-on-Spey:** 78 houses located within 2 km means there is a likelihood of a significant effect.
- **Inverdrue and Coylumbridge:** Tourism allocation allows for expansion of provision which may lead to increased disturbance to capercaillie in other SPAs and to indirect effects on this SPA
- **Kincraig:** Housing allocation with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of an indirect effect

- **Nethy Bridge:** Housing allocation with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of a indirect effect

#### **Consented Sites**

- **Aviemore:** Housing consents may have a LSE on other SPAs and so lead to indirect effect on this site.
- **Carr-bridge:** Housing consents may have a LSE on other SPAs and so lead to indirect effect on this site..
- **Cromdale:** 12 houses located within 2 km (travel distance) means there is a likelihood, with allocated sites, of a significant effect

#### **Core Paths**

- Highburnside core path will have improvements which may mean an increase in users to another SPA which may lead to indirect effects on this site

**In combination effect**

There are no potential minor residual effects identified from any settlements, therefore there are no in-combination effects.

**Mitigation**

The original wording for the mitigation required of the LDP was:

*“Developments which would have a likely significant effect on Anagach Woods SPA must supply, as part of the planning application, all necessary information to allow the planning authority to carry out an Appropriate Assessment. Required mitigation will include a Recreational Management Plan (RMP), to comply with the criteria set out in this Plan. To be in accordance with this Plan, and for planning permission to be granted, such developments must not adversely affect the integrity of the site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.”*

The recommendations of the reporter reworded this section as follows:

*“You must supply as part of your planning application, all necessary information to allow the planning authority to carry out Appropriate Assessment in order that they can be confident that your development will not have an adverse effect on the site integrity in view of the conservation objectives, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. If the planning authority is unable to reach this conclusion, your proposal will be judged not to be in accordance with this plan. Specifically your proposal must address the mitigation measures (as set out in Natural Heritage Supplementary Guidance) required to address potential impacts on:*

- *Disturbance to Capercaillie.”*

This new wording leads to the same effect as the original and so provides the same level of certainty about any effect on the conservation objectives. This wording is included within the LDP for each settlement listed above as having a LSE upon this Natura site.

**Minor residual effects**

Following mitigation (individual RMPs and the Capercaillie Action Plan) there are no minor residual effects from any of the settlements within the LDP.

**Conclusion on site integrity**

Implementing these proposals will not have an adverse effect upon the integrity of this European Site, alone or in combination.

<b>Ballochbuie SPA</b>
<p><b>Conservation objectives</b></p> <p>To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population of the species as a viable component of the site</li> <li>• Distribution of the species within the site</li> <li>• Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting process of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of the species</li> </ul>
<p><b>Qualifying species</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capercaillie (Tetrao urogallus)</li> <li>• Scottish crossbill (Loxia scotica)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Effect on conservation objectives</b></p> <p>There is no likely significant effect on Scottish crossbill because it is not considered to be sensitive to disturbance by people.</p> <p>However, there is potential for increased impact on capercaillie, an endangered ground-nesting species sensitive to human-related disturbance. The following settlements could not be screened out for likely significant effects:</p> <p><b>Allocated sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Braemar:</b> 4 houses located within 2 km means there is likelihood, with consented sites, of a significant effect.</li> <li>• <b>Ballater:</b> 258 houses allocated and or in future supply means there is a likelihood of a significant effect</li> </ul> <p><b>Consented Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Braemar:</b> 58 houses located within 2 km means there is likelihood, with allocated sites, of a significant effect.</li> </ul>
<p><b>In combination effect</b></p> <p>No residual effects have been identified from general polices within the LDP. There are no potential minor residual effects identified from any settlements, therefore there are no in-combination effects.</p>
<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>The original wording for the mitigation required of the LDP was:</p> <p><i>“Developments which would have a likely significant effect on Ballochbuie SPA must supply, as part of the planning application, all necessary information to allow the planning authority to carry out an Appropriate Assessment. Required mitigation will include a Recreational Management Plan (RMP), to comply with the criteria set out in this Plan. To be in accordance with this Plan, and for planning permission to be granted, such developments must not adversely affect the integrity of the site, either alone or in combination with</i></p>

*other plans or projects.”*

The recommendations of the reporter reworded this section as follows:

*“You must supply as part of your planning application, all necessary information to allow the planning authority to carry out Appropriate Assessment in order that they can be confident that your development will not have an adverse effect on the site integrity in view of the conservation objectives, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. If the planning authority is unable to reach this conclusion, your proposal will be judged not to be in accordance with this plan. Specifically your proposal must address the mitigation measures (as set out in Natural Heritage Supplementary Guidance) required to address potential impacts on:*

- *Disturbance to Capercaillie.”*

This new wording leads to the same effect as the original and so provides the same level of certainty about any effect on the conservation objectives. This wording is included within the LDP for each settlement listed above as having a LSE upon this Natura site.

<p><b>Minor residual effects</b> Following mitigation, there are no minor residual effects from Braemar or Ballater</p>
<p><b>Conclusion on site integrity</b> Implementing these proposals will not have an adverse effect upon the integrity of this European Site, alone or in combination.</p>
<p><b>Cairngorms SPA</b></p>
<p><b>Conservation objectives</b> To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained; and  To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population of the species as a viable component of the site</li> <li>• Distribution of the species within the site</li> <li>• Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting process of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of the species</li> </ul>
<p><b>Qualifying species</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capercaillie (<i>Tetrao urogallus</i>)</li> <li>• Dotterel (<i>Charadrius moninellus</i>)</li> <li>• Golden eagle (<i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>)</li> <li>• Merlin (<i>Falco columbarius</i>)</li> <li>• Osprey (<i>Pandion haliaetus</i>)</li> <li>• Peregrine (<i>Falco peregrinus</i>)</li> <li>• Scottish crossbill (<i>Loxia scotica</i>)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Effect on conservation objectives</b> There is no likely significant effect on ospreys because their nests are well monitored and any recreational impacts are managed. Likewise there is no likely significant effect on dotterel as they nest a considerable distance away and are not considered particularly susceptible to recreational disturbance. Merlin and peregrine settle in areas of their choice each year and are not considered to be subject to significant casual disturbance within the SPA. The Scottish crossbill is not considered to be sensitive to disturbance by people. For golden eagle, disturbance is unlikely because of distance and nature of the upland terrain. Furthermore, nesting sites on the western side of the SPA already have a line of sight to footpaths so that birds are used to recreational usage.  However, there is potential for increased impact on capercaillie, an endangered ground-nesting species sensitive to human-related disturbance. Settlements and core paths that could not be screened out for likely significant effects:</p>

#### Allocation sites

- **An Camas Mor:** 1500 houses located at 2-5 km means there is a likelihood of a significant effect.
- **Boat of Garten:** Housing allocation with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of a LSE
- **Braemar:** Housing allocation with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of an indirect effect.
- **Ballater:** Housing allocation with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of an indirect effect
- **Carr-bridge:** Housing allocation with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of a LSE
- **Cromdale:** Housing allocation with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of an indirect effect
- **Dulnain Bridge:** 30 houses may lead to an indirect effect on this SPA
- **Glenmore:** Tourism allocation allows for expansion of provision which may lead to increased disturbance to capercaillie in this and other SPAs and so direct and indirect effects on this SPA
- **Grantown-on-Spey:** Housing allocation with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of an indirect effect
- **Inverdrue and Coylumbridge:** Tourism allocation allows for expansion of provision which may lead to increased disturbance to capercaillie in this SPA and lead to direct effects on this SPA
- **Kincraig:** 50 houses there is a likelihood of a significant effect
- **Nethy Bridge:** Housing allocation with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of an indirect effect

#### Consented Sites

- **Aviemore:** 336 houses located at 5-10 km (travel distance) means there is a likelihood of a significant effect.
- **Braemar:** Housing consents with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of an indirect effect
- **Carr-bridge:** Housing consents with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of an indirect effect.
- **Cromdale:** Housing consents with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of an indirect effect

#### Core Paths

- Highburnside core path will have improvements which may mean an increase in users to the

another SPA which may have an indirect effect on this site

- Thieves Road core path will have a likely significant effect because fo the potential recreational disturbance to capercaillie. Following advice from SNH , it is concluded that the conservation objectives of the cairngorms SPA will be maintained , and that the proposal will not adversely affect the integrity of the site for Qualifying interestes

**In combination effect**

There are no potential minor residual effects identified from any settlements, therefore there are no in-combination effects.

**Mitigation**

The original wording for the mitigation required of the LDP was:

*“Developments which would have a likely significant effect on Cairngorms SPA must supply, as part of the planning application, all necessary information to allow the planning authority to carry out an Appropriate Assessment. Required mitigation will include a Recreational Management Plan (RMP), to comply with the criteria set out in this Plan. To be in accordance with this Plan, and for planning permission to be granted, such developments must not adversely affect the integrity of the site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.”*

The recommendations of the reporter reworded this section as follows:

*“You must supply as part of your planning application, all necessary information to allow the planning authority to carry out Appropriate Assessment in order that they can be confident that your development will not have an adverse effect on the site integrity in view of the conservation objectives, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. If the planning authority is unable to reach this conclusion, your proposal will be judged not to be in accordance with this plan. Specifically your proposal must address the mitigation measures (as set out in Natural Heritage Supplementary Guidance) required to address potential impacts on:*

- *Disturbance to Capercaillie.”*

This new wording leads to the same effect as the original and so provides the same level of certainty about any effect on the conservation objectives. This wording is included within the LDP for each settlement listed above as having a LSE upon this Natura site.

Also for tourism allocations at Glenmore and Inverdrurie/Coylumbridge policy caveats have been added as follows “ where appropriate, enhancement opportunities will be supported, subject to a satisfactory outcome of the habitats Regulations Appraisal”

**Minor residual effects**

Following mitigation (individual RMPs and the Capercaillie Action Plan) there are no minor residual effects from any of the settlements within the LDP.

**Conclusion on site integrity**

Implementing these proposals will not have an adverse effect upon the integrity of this European Site, alone or in combination.

## Cairngorms SAC

### Conservation objectives

To avoid deterioration of the qualifying habitats (listed below) thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and

To ensure for the qualifying habitats that the following are maintained in the long-term:

- Extent of the habitat on site
- Distribution of the habitat within the site
- Structure and function of the habitat
- Process supporting the site
- Distribution of typical species of the habitat
- Viability of typical species as components of the habitat
- No significant disturbance of typical species of the habitat

To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and

To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in the long-term:

- Population of the species as a viable component of the site
- Distribution of the species within the site
- Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species
- Structure, function and supporting process of habitats supporting the species
- No significant disturbance of the species

### **Qualifying habitats**

- Acid peat-strained lakes and ponds
- Acidic scree
- Alpine and subalpine heaths
- Blanket bog\*
- Bog woodland\*
- Caledonian forest\*
- Clear-water lakes or lochs with aquatic vegetation and poor to moderate nutrient levels
- Dry grasslands and scrublands on chalk or limestone
- Dry heaths
- Hard-water springs depositing lime\*
- High-altitude plant communities associated with areas of water seepage\*
- Juniper on heaths or calcareous grasslands
- Montane acid grasslands
- Mountain willow scrub
- Plants in crevices on acid rocks
- Plants in crevices on base-rich rocks
- Species-rich grassland with mat-grass in upland areas\*
- Tall herb communities
- Very wet mires often identified by an unstable 'quaking' surface
- Wet heathland with cross-leaved heath

(\*indicates priority habitat)

### **Qualifying species**

- Green shield-moss (*Buxbaumia viridis*)
- Otter (*Lutra lutra*)

### **Effect on conservation objectives**

There is potential for an effect by the reduction in the area of some qualifying habitats through compensatory habitat measures to replace habitats on the site in lieu of the allocation, eg reforestation of open hill ground. An identified 78ha compensation area represents 0.1 per cent of the area of the Cairngorms SAC. Native tree and shrub planting will increase the coverage of some of the other qualifying features eg mountain willow scrub. The green shield-moss as a woodland species would not be affected by this habitat modification. The following could not be screened out for likely significant effects:

#### **Allocated Sites**

- **An Camas Mor:** Identified compensatory habitat creation measures arising from the allocation will occur in the SAC.
- **Inverdrue and Coylumbridge:** Tourism allocation allows for expansion of facilities which may impact upon qualifying habitats

### **In combination effect**

No residual effects have been identified from general policies within the LDP. There are no potential minor residual effects identified from any settlements, therefore there are no in-combination effects.

### **Mitigation**

The original wording for the mitigation required of the LDP was

The planting proposals for this site that will compensate for the loss of (non designated) habitat can be undertaken within the SAC provided that it does not take place on qualifying habitat. LDP should include the wording:

*Detailed habitat mapping of compensation areas is required to inform where planting could occur without adversely impacting upon qualifying habitats. Proposals will not be in accord with the Local development Plan unless it can be concluded that there will be no adverse effects upon the integrity of the Cairngorms SAC*

The recommendations of the reporter reworded this section as follows:

*“You must supply as part of your planning application, all necessary information to allow the planning authority to carry out Appropriate Assessment in order that they can be confident that your development will not have an adverse effect on the site integrity in view of the conservation objectives, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. If the planning authority is unable to reach this conclusion, your proposal will be judged not to be in accordance with this plan.*

*In addition for the Cairngorms SAC, a compensatory woodland Planting Plan (CWPP) should be submitted as part of the information for the Appropriate Assessment. This should indicate the habitat(s) where it is proposed that compensatory woodland planting will occur and the new habitats(s) to be established. The CWPP should demonstrate that there will be no adverse effect on the integrity of the Cairngorms SAC through habitat loss. Scarcer qualifying habitats should be avoided within the planting plan, including blanket bog, dwarf shrub heaths and wet heath.”*

Also for tourism allocations at Glenmore, policy caveats have been added as follows – “where appropriate, enhancement opportunities will be supported subject to a satisfactory outcome of the habitats Regulations Appraisal.”

This new wording leads to the same effect as the original and so provides the same level of certainty

about any effect on the conservation objectives. This wording is included within the LDP for each settlement listed above as having a LSE upon this Natura site.

**Minor residual effects**

Following mitigation, there are no minor residual effects.

**Conclusion on site integrity**

Implementing these proposals will not have an adverse effect upon the integrity of this European Site, alone or in combination.

### Craigmore Wood SPA

#### Conservation objectives

To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained; and

To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in the long-term:

- Population of the species as a viable component of the site
- Distribution of the species within the site
- Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species
- Structure, function and supporting process of habitats supporting the species
- No significant disturbance of the species

#### Qualifying species

- Capercaillie (*Tetrao urogallus*)

#### Effect on conservation objectives and necessary mitigation measures

There is potential for increased impact on capercaillie, an endangered ground-nesting species sensitive to human-related disturbance.

#### Allocation sites

- **An Camas Mor:** Housing allocation with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of an indirect effect
- **Boat of Garten:** Housing allocation with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of a LSE
- **Carr-bridge:** Housing allocation with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of a LSE
- **Cromdale:** Housing allocation with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of an indirect effect
- **Dalnain Bridge:** Housing allocation with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of an indirect effect
- **Glenmore:** Tourism allocation allows for expansion of provision which may lead to increased disturbance to capercaillie in other SPAs and so an indirect effect on this SPA
- **Grantown-on-Spey:** Housing allocation with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of an indirect effect.
- **Inverdrue and Coylumbridge:** Tourism allocation allows for expansion of provision which may lead to increased disturbance to capercaillie in other SPAs and so indirect effects on this SPA
- **Kincraig:** Housing allocation with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of an

indirect effect

- **Nethy Bridge:** Housing allocation is within 2 km means there is a likelihood of a significant effect

#### **Consented Sites**

- **Aviemore:** Housing consents may have a LSE on other SPAs and so lead to indirect effect on this site.
- **Carr-bridge:** Housing consents may have a LSE on other SPAs and so lead to indirect effect on this site.
- **Cromdale:** Housing consents may have a LSE on other SPAs and so lead to indirect effect on this site.

#### **Core Paths**

- Highburnside core path will have improvements which may mean an increase in users to another SPA which may have an indirect effect on this site

**In combination effect:**

There are no potential minor residual effects identified from any settlements, therefore there are no in-combination effects.

**Mitigation**

The original wording for the mitigation required of the LDP was:

*“Developments which would have a likely significant effect on Craigmore wood SPA must supply, as part of the planning application, all necessary information to allow the planning authority to carry out an Appropriate Assessment. Required mitigation will include a Recreational Management Plan (RMP), to comply with the criteria set out in this Plan. To be in accordance with this Plan, and for planning permission to be granted, such developments must not adversely affect the integrity of the site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.”*

The recommendations of the reporter reworded this section as follows:

*“You must supply as part of your planning application, all necessary information to allow the planning authority to carry out Appropriate Assessment in order that they can be confident that your development will not have an adverse effect on the site integrity in view of the conservation objectives, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. If the planning authority is unable to reach this conclusion, your proposal will be judged not to be in accordance with this plan. Specifically your proposal must address the mitigation measures (as set out in Natural Heritage Supplementary Guidance) required to address potential impacts on:*

- *Disturbance to Capercaillie.”*

This new wording leads to the same effect as the original and so provides the same level of certainty about any effect on the conservation objectives. This wording is included within the LDP for each settlement listed above as having a LSE upon this Natura site.

**Minor residual effects**

Following mitigation (individual RMPs and the Capercaillie Action Plan) there are no minor residual effects from any of the settlements within the LDP.

**Conclusion on site integrity**

Implementing these proposals will not have an adverse effect upon the integrity of this European Site, either alone or in combination.

**Insh Marshes SAC**

**Conservation objectives**

To avoid deterioration of the qualifying habitat (listed below) thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and

To ensure for the qualifying habitats that the following are maintained in the long-term:

- Extent of the habitat on site
- Distribution of the habitat within the site
- Structure and function of the habitat
- Process supporting the site

- Distribution of typical species of the habitat
- Viability of typical species as components of the habitat
- No significant disturbance of typical species of the habitat

To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and

To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in the long-term:

- Population of the species as a viable component of the site
- Distribution of the species within the site
- Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species
- Structure, function and supporting process of habitats supporting the species
- No significant disturbance of the species

### Qualifying habitats

- Alder woodland on floodplains\*
- Clear-water lakes or lochs with aquatic vegetation and poor to moderate nutrient levels
- Very wet mires often identified by an unstable 'quaking' surface

(\* indicates priority habitat)

### Qualifying species

- Otter (*Lutra lutra*)

### Effect on conservation objectives

There is potential for an effect on the qualifying clear-water lochs habitat through increased nutrients brought about by increased volumes of wastewater effluent. Three settlements could not be screened out for likely significant effects:

#### Allocated sites

- **Kincraig:** 50 houses located within 2 km means there is a likelihood of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater
- **Newtonmore:** 120 houses located within 2 km means there is a likelihood of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater.

#### Consented sites

- **Kingussie:** 300 houses located within 2 km means there is a likelihood of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater.
- **Newtonmore:** 101 houses located within 2 km means there is a likelihood of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater.

### In combination effect

There are no potential minor residual effects identified from any settlements, therefore there are no in-combination effects.

### Mitigation

The LDP should include the wording: The original wording for the mitigation required of the LDP was:

*Developments which would have a likely significant effect on Insh Marshes SAC must supply as part of the planning application the necessary information to allow the Planning Authority to carry out an Appropriate Assessment which will inform the final decision on the application. To be in accordance with this Plan and for planning permission to be granted, such developments must not adversely affect the integrity of the site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.*

*Development may not commence until it has been demonstrated to the planning authority that there is sufficient capacity in local waste water treatment works in terms of capacity and ability to remove pollutants to recommended standards at the time of approval.*

The recommendations of the reporter reworded this section as follows:

*“You must supply as part of your planning application, all necessary information to allow the planning authority to carry out Appropriate Assessment in order that they can be confident that your development will not have an adverse effect on the site integrity in view of the conservation objectives, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. If the planning authority is unable to reach this conclusion, your proposal will be judged not to be in accordance with this plan. Specifically your proposal must address the mitigation measures (as set out in Natural Heritage Supplementary Guidance) required to address potential impacts on:*

- *Pollution from wastewater .”*

This new wording leads to the same effect as the original and so provides the same level of certainty about any effect on the conservation objectives. This wording is included within the LDP for each settlement listed above as having a LSE upon this Natura site.

**Minor residual effects**

Following mitigation, there are no minor residual effects.

**Conclusion on site integrity**

Implementing these proposals will not have an adverse effect upon the integrity of this European Site, alone or in combination.

### Glen Tanar SPA

#### Conservation objectives

To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained; and

To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in the long-term:

- Population of the species as a viable component of the site
- Distribution of the species within the site
- Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species
- Structure, function and supporting process of habitats supporting the species
- No significant disturbance of the species

#### Qualifying species

- Capercaillie (*Tetrao urogallus*)
- Hen Harrier (*Circus cyaneus*)
- Osprey (*Pandion halietus*)
- Scottish crossbill (*Loxia scotica*)

#### Effect on conservation objectives

There is no likely significant effect on ospreys because their nests are well monitored and recreational impacts are managed. The Scottish crossbill is not considered to be sensitive to disturbance by people. For hen harrier disturbance is unlikely because of distance and nature of the upland terrain. However, there is potential for increased impact on capercaillie, an endangered ground-nesting species sensitive to human-related disturbance. Two settlements could not be screened out for likely significant effects:

#### Allocated sites

- **Braemar:** Housing allocation with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of an indirect effect .
- **Ballater:** 258 houses located within 5 km means there is a likelihood of a significant effect

#### Consented Sites

- **Braemar:** Housing consents with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of an indirect effect

**In combination effect**

There are no potential minor residual effects identified from any settlements, therefore there are no in-combination effects.

**Mitigation**

The original wording for the mitigation required of the LDP was:

*“Developments which would have a likely significant effect on Glen Tanar SPA must supply, as part of the planning application, all necessary information to allow the planning authority to carry out an Appropriate Assessment. Required mitigation will include a Recreational Management Plan (RMP), to comply with the criteria set out in this Plan. To be in accordance with this Plan, and for planning permission to be granted, such developments must not adversely affect the integrity of the site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.”*

The recommendations of the reporter reworded this section as follows:

*“You must supply as part of your planning application, all necessary information to allow the planning authority to carry out Appropriate Assessment in order that they can be confident that your development will not have an adverse effect on the site integrity in view of the conservation objectives, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. If the planning authority is unable to reach this conclusion, your proposal will be judged not to be in accordance with this plan. Specifically your proposal must address the mitigation measures (as set out in Natural Heritage Supplementary Guidance) required to address potential impacts on:*

- *Disturbance to Capercaillie.”*

This new wording leads to the same effect as the original and so provides the same level of certainty about any effect on the conservation objectives. This wording is included within the LDP for each settlement listed above as having a LSE upon this Natura site.

**Minor residual effects**

With mitigation there will be no minor residual effects from Braemar or Ballater

**Conclusion on site integrity**

Implementing these proposals will not have an adverse effect upon the integrity of this European Site, alone or in combination.

### **Kinveachy Forest SPA**

#### **Conservation objectives**

To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained; and

To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in the long-term:

- Population of the species as a viable component of the site
- Distribution of the species within the site
- Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species
- Structure, function and supporting process of habitats supporting the species
- No significant disturbance of the species

#### **Qualifying species**

- Capercaillie (*Tetrao urogallus*)
- Scottish crossbill (*Loxia scotica*)

#### **Effect on conservation objectives and necessary mitigation measures**

There is no likely significant effect on Scottish crossbill because it is not considered to be sensitive to disturbance by people.

However, there is potential for increased impact on capercaillie, an endangered ground-nesting species sensitive to human-related disturbance. The following settlements could not be screened out for likely significant effects:

#### **Allocation sites**

- **An Camas Mor:** 1500 houses located at 2-5 km means there is a likelihood of a significant effect.
- **Boat of Garten:** Housing allocation with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of a LSE
- **Carr-bridge:** Housing allocation with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of a LSE.
- **Cromdale:** Housing allocation with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of an indirect effect .
- **Dalnain Bridge:** Housing allocation with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of an indirect effect
- **Glenmore:** Tourism allocation allows for expansion of provision which may lead to increased disturbance to capercaillie in other SPAs and so an indirect effect on this SPA
- **Grantown-on-Spey:** Housing allocation with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of an indirect effect
- **Inverdrue and Coylumbridge:** Tourism allocation allows for expansion of provision

which may lead to increased disturbance to capercaillie in other SPAs and so indirect effects on this SPA

- **Kincraig:** Housing allocation with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of an indirect effect
- **Nethy Bridge:** Housing allocation with a LSE on another SPA means there is a likelihood of an indirect effect

#### **Consented Sites**

- **Aviemore:** 336 houses located at 5-10 km (travel distance) means there is a likelihood of a significant effect.
- **Carr-bridge:** Housing consents may have a LSE on other SPAs and so lead to indirect effect on this site..
- **Cromdale:** Housing consents may have a LSE on other SPAs and so lead to indirect effect on this site.

#### **Core Paths**

- Highburnside core path will have improvements which may mean an increase in users to the SPA. However on advice from CNPA Access Team it has concluded that in fact more people will be diverted away from Kinveachy SPA because the new route provides a better alternative. We therefore conclude that in fact there is no effect.

**In-combination effect**

There are no potential minor residual effects identified from any settlements, therefore there are no in-combination effects.

**Mitigation**

The original wording for the mitigation required of the LDP was:

*“Developments which would have a likely significant effect on Kinveachy Forest SPA must supply, as part of the planning application, all necessary information to allow the planning authority to carry out an Appropriate Assessment. Required mitigation will include a Recreational Management Plan (RMP), to comply with the criteria set out in this Plan. To be in accordance with this Plan, and for planning permission to be granted, such developments must not adversely affect the integrity of the site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.”*

The recommendations of the reporter reworded this section as follows:

*“You must supply as part of your planning application, all necessary information to allow the planning authority to carry out Appropriate Assessment in order that they can be confident that your development will not have an adverse effect on the site integrity in view of the conservation objectives, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. If the planning authority is unable to reach this conclusion, your proposal will be judged not to be in accordance with this plan. Specifically your proposal must address the mitigation measures (as set out in Natural Heritage Supplementary Guidance) required to address potential impacts on:*

- *Disturbance to Capercaillie.”*

This new wording leads to the same effect as the original and so provides the same level of certainty about any effect on the conservation objectives. This wording is included within the LDP for each settlement listed above as having a LSE upon this Natura site.

**Minor residual effects**

Following mitigation (individual RMPs and the Capercaillie Action Plan) there are no minor residual effects from any of the settlements within the LDP.

**Conclusion on site integrity**

Implementing these proposals will not have an adverse effect upon the integrity of this European Site, either alone or in combination.

## River Dee SAC

### Conservation objectives

To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and

To ensure for the qualifying habitats that the following are maintained in the long-term:

- Population of the species, including range of genetic types for salmon, as a viable component of the site
- Distribution of the species within site
- Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species
- Structure, function and supporting processes of habitats supporting the species
- No significant disturbance to the species
- Distribution and viability of freshwater pearl mussel host species
- Structure, function and supporting processes of habitats supporting freshwater pearl mussel host species

### Qualifying species

- Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*)
- Freshwater pearl mussel (*Margaritifera margaritifera*)
- Otter (*Lutra lutra*)

### Effect on conservation objectives

There is also potential for an effect on Atlantic salmon and freshwater pearl mussel through increased nutrients brought about by increased volumes of wastewater effluent. Water abstraction for domestic and commercial use could create an effect on qualifying features by reducing water levels in the river. Three settlements could not be screened out for likely significant effects:

#### Allocated Sites

- **Ballater:** 258 houses located within 2 km means there is a likelihood of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater.
- **Braemar:** 4 houses located within 2 km means there is a likelihood, with consented sites, of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater.
- **Dinnet:** 19 houses located within 2 km means there is a likelihood of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater.

#### Consented Sites

- **Braemar:** 58 houses located within 2 km means there is a likelihood, with allocated sites, of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater.

**In combination effect**

No residual effects have been identified from general policies within the LDP. There are no potential minor residual effects identified from any settlements, therefore there are no in-combination effects.

**Mitigation**

The original wording for the mitigation required of the LDP was:

*Developments which would have a likely significant effect on the River Dee SAC must supply as part of the planning application the necessary information to allow the Planning Authority to carry out an Appropriate Assessment which will inform the final decision on the application. To be in accordance with this Plan and for planning permission to be granted, such developments must not adversely affect the integrity of the site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.*

*Development may not commence until it has been demonstrated to the planning authority that there is sufficient capacity in local waste water treatment works in terms of volume and ability to remove pollutants to recommended standards at the time of approval.*

The recommendations of the reporter reworded this section as follows:

*“You must supply as part of your planning application, all necessary information to allow the planning authority to carry out Appropriate Assessment in order that they can be confident that your development will not have an adverse effect on the site integrity in view of the conservation objectives, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. If the planning authority is unable to reach this conclusion, your proposal will be judged not to be in accordance with this plan. Specifically your proposal must address the mitigation measures (as set out in Natural Heritage Supplementary Guidance) required to address potential impacts on:*

- *Pollution from wastewater.”*

This new wording leads to the same effect as the original and so provides the same level of certainty about any effect on the conservation objectives. This wording is included within the LDP for each settlement listed above as having a LSE upon this Natura site.

**Minor residual effects**

Following mitigation, there are no minor residual effects from Ballater, Braemar, and Dinnet.

**Conclusion on site integrity**

Implementing these proposals will not have an adverse effect upon the integrity of this European Site, alone or in combination.

**River Spey – Insh Marshes SPA and Ramsar site**

**Conservation objectives**

To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained; and

To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in the long-term:

- Population of the species as a viable component of the site
- Distribution of the species within the site
- Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species
- Structure, function and supporting process of habitats supporting the species
- No significant disturbance of the species

**Qualifying features (SPA)**

- Hen harrier (*Circus cyaneus*)
- Osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*)
- Spotted crake (*Porzana porzana*)
- Whooper swan (*Cygnus cygnus*)
- Wigeon (*Anas penelope*)
- Wood sandpiper (*Tringa galeola*)

**Qualifying features (Ramsar)**

- Breeding bird assemblage
- Flood-plain fen
- Mesotrophic loch
- Trophic range river/stream
- Whooper swan (*Cygnus cygnus*)

**Effect on conservation objectives**

There is potential for an effect on qualifying habitat features of the Ramsar site through increased nutrients brought about by increased volumes of wastewater effluent. Three settlements could not be screened out for likely significant effects:

**Allocated sites**

- **Kincraig:** 50 houses located close to and upstream of the site means there is a likelihood of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater.
- **Newtonmore:** 120 houses located close to and upstream of the site means there is a

likelihood, with consented sites, of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater.

**Consented sites**

- **Kingussie:** 300 houses located close to and upstream of the site means there is a likelihood of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater.
- **Newtonmore:** 101 houses located close to and upstream of the site means there is a likelihood, with allocated sites, of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater.

**In combination effect**

There are no likely significant effects arising from the combination of MREs, though these remain as MREs.

**Mitigation**

The original wording for the mitigation required of the LDP was:

*Developments which would have a likely significant effect on the River Spey – Insh Marshes SPA and Ramsar site must supply as part of the planning application the necessary information to allow the Planning Authority to carry out an Appropriate Assessment which will inform the final decision on the application. To be in accordance with this Plan and for planning permission to be granted, such developments must not adversely affect the integrity of the site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.*

*Development may not commence until it has been demonstrated to the planning authority that there is sufficient capacity in local waste water treatment works in terms of volume and ability to remove pollutants to recommended standards at the time of approval.*

The recommendations of the reporter reworded this section as follows:

*“You must supply as part of your planning application, all necessary information to allow the planning authority to carry out Appropriate Assessment in order that they can be confident that your development will not have an adverse effect on the site integrity in view of the conservation objectives, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. If the planning authority is unable to reach this conclusion, your proposal will be judged not to be in accordance with this plan. Specifically your proposal must address the mitigation measures (as set out in Natural Heritage Supplementary Guidance) required to address potential impacts on:*

- *Pollution from wastewater.”*

This new wording leads to the same effect as the original and so provides the same level of certainty about any effect on the conservation objectives. This wording is included within the LDP for each settlement listed above as having a LSE upon this Natura site.

**Minor residual effects**

Minor residual effects from Kincaig, Kingussie and Newtonmore remain with regard to possible disturbance to qualifying species.

**Conclusion on site integrity**

Implementing these proposals will not have an adverse effect upon the integrity of this European Site, alone or in combination.

## River Spey SAC

### Conservation objectives

To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and

To ensure for the qualifying habitats that the following are maintained in the long-term:

- Population of the species, including range of genetic types for salmon, as a viable component of the site
- Distribution of the species within the site
- Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species
- Structure, function and supporting processes of habitats supporting the species
- No significant disturbance to the species
- Distribution and viability of freshwater pearl mussel host species
- Structure, function and supporting processes of habitats supporting freshwater pearl mussel host species

### Qualifying species

- Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*)
- Freshwater pearl mussel (*Margaritifera margaritifera*)
- Otter (*Lutra lutra*)
- Sea lamprey (*Petromyzon marinus*)

### Effect on conservation objectives

There is potential for likely significant effects on Atlantic salmon and freshwater pearl mussel through increased nutrients brought about by increased volumes of wastewater effluent. Sea Lamprey migration can be disturbed by lighting on the river. Otter can be disturbed by an increase in residents recreation near the river. Thirteen settlements could not be screened out for likely significant effects:

#### Allocated Sites

- **An Camas Mor:** 1500 houses located close to and upstream of the site means there is a likelihood of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater. Bridge crossings mean there is a risk of disturbance to Sea Lamprey from lighting.
- **Boat of Garten:** houses located close to and upstream of the site means there is a likelihood of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater.
- **Carr-Bridge:** houses located close to and upstream of the site means there is a likelihood, with consented sites, of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater.

- **Cromdale:** 30 houses located close to and upstream of the site means there is a likelihood, with consented sites, of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater.
- **Dalwhinnie:** 11 houses located close to and upstream of the site means there is a likelihood, with consented sites, of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater.
- **Dalnain Bridge:** 30 houses located close to and upstream of the site means there is a likelihood, with consented sites, of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater.
- **Grantown-on-Spey:** 78 houses located close to and upstream of the site means there is a likelihood of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater.
- **Kincraig:** 50 houses located close to and upstream of the site means there is a likelihood of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater.
- **Nethy Bridge:** Housing allocation located close to and upstream of the site means there is a likelihood of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater.
- **Newtonmore:** 120 houses located close to and upstream of the site means there is a likelihood, with consented sites, of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater.
- **Tomintoul:** 23 houses located close to and upstream of the site means there is a likelihood, with consented sites, of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater.

#### Consented Sites

- **Aviemore:** 336 houses located close to and upstream of the site means there is a likelihood of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater.
- **Carr-Bridge:** 23 houses located close to and upstream of the site means there is a likelihood, with allocated sites, of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater.
- **Cromdale:** 12 houses located close to and upstream of the site means there is a likelihood, with allocated sites, of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater.
- **Dalwhinnie:** 5 houses located close to and upstream of the site means there is a likelihood, with allocated sites, of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater.
- **Dalnain Bridge:** 12 houses located close to and upstream of the site means there is a likelihood, with allocated sites, of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater.
- **Kingussie:** 300 houses located close to and upstream of the site means there is a likelihood of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater.
- **Newtonmore:** 101 houses located close to and upstream of the site means there is a likelihood, with allocated sites, of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater.
- **Tomintoul:** 3 houses located close to and upstream of the site means there is a likelihood, with allocated sites, of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater.

**In combination effect**

There are no likely significant effects arising from in combination of MREs

**Mitigation**

The original wording for the mitigation required of the LDP was:

*Developments which would have a likely significant effect on the River Spey SAC must supply as part of the planning application the necessary information to allow the Planning Authority to carry out an Appropriate Assessment which will inform the final decision on the application. To be in accordance with this Plan and for planning permission to be granted, such developments must not adversely affect the integrity of the site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.*

*Development may not commence until it has been demonstrated to the planning authority that there is sufficient capacity in local waste water treatment works in terms of volume and ability to remove pollutants to recommended standards at the time of approval.*

The recommendations of the reporter reworded this section as follows:

*“You must supply as part of your planning application, all necessary information to allow the planning authority to carry out Appropriate Assessment in order that they can be confident that your development will not have an adverse effect on the site integrity in view of the conservation objectives, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. If the planning authority is unable to reach this conclusion, your proposal will be judged not to be in accordance with this plan. Specifically your proposal must address the mitigation measures (as set out in Natural Heritage Supplementary Guidance) required to address potential impacts on:*

- *Pollution from wastewater.”*

Also for An Camas Mor in terms of the relationship with Aviemore, a policy caveat has been added as follows:

*“development of recreational and leisure facilities on land either side of the river, and of a link bridge across the river to Aviemore, has potential to have a significant effect on the River Spey SAC through disturbance to otters, disturbance to freshwater species movements and impact on water quality. To accord with this plan, detailed proposals for these development must demonstrate that there would be no adverse effect on the integrity of the River Spey SAC, alone or in combination with other plans or projects.”*

This new wording leads to the same effect as the original and so provides the same level of certainty about any effect on the conservation objectives. This wording is included within the LDP for each settlement listed above as having a LSE upon this Natura site.

**Minor residual effects**

Following mitigation, there are no minor residual effects from An Camas Mor, Aviemore, Boat of Garten, Carr-bridge, Cromdale, Dalwhinnie, Dulnain Bridge, Grantown-on-Spey, Kinraig, Kingussie, Nethy Bridge, Newtonmore, and Tomintoul.

**Conclusion on site integrity**

Implementing these proposals will not have an adverse effect upon the integrity of this European Site, alone or in combination.

<b>River Tay SAC</b>
<p><b>Conservation objectives</b></p> <p>To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying habitats that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population of the species, including range of genetic types for salmon, as a viable component of the site</li> <li>• Distribution of the species within site</li> <li>• Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting processes of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• No significant disturbance to the species</li> <li>• Distribution and viability of freshwater pearl mussel host species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting processes of habitats supporting freshwater pearl mussel host species</li> </ul>
<p><b>Qualifying features</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Atlantic salmon (<i>Salmo salar</i>)</li> <li>• Brook lamprey (<i>Lampetra planeri</i>)</li> <li>• River lamprey (<i>Lampetra fluviatilis</i>)</li> <li>• Sea lamprey (<i>Petromyzon marinus</i>)</li> <li>• Clear-water lakes or lochs with aquatic vegetation and poor to moderate nutrient levels.</li> <li>• Otter (<i>Lutra lutra</i>)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Effect on conservation objectives</b></p> <p>There is potential for an effect on Atlantic salmon and freshwater pearl mussel through increased nutrients brought about by increased volumes of wastewater effluent. Two settlements could not be screened out for likely significant effects:</p> <p><b>Allocated Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Blair Atholl:</b> an economic development allocation close to, and upstream of, part of the site means there is a likelihood of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater.</li> <li>• <b>(Killiecrankie:</b> 12 houses located close to and upstream of the site means there is a likelihood of a significant effect from pollution from wastewater.)</li> </ul>
<p><b>In combination effect</b></p> <p>No residual effects have been identified from general policies within the LDP. There are no potential</p>

minor residual effects identified from any settlements, therefore there are no in-combination effects.

**Mitigation**

The original wording for the mitigation required of the LDP was:

*Developments which would have a likely significant effect on the River Tay SAC must supply as part of the planning application the necessary information to allow the Planning Authority to carry out an Appropriate Assessment which will inform the final decision on the application. To be in accordance with this Plan and for planning permission to be granted, such developments must not adversely affect the integrity of the site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.*

*Development may not commence until it has been demonstrated to the planning authority that there is sufficient capacity in local waste water treatment works in terms of volume and ability to remove pollutants to recommended standards at the time of approval.*

The recommendations of the reporter reworded this section as follows:

*“You must supply as part of your planning application, all necessary information to allow the planning authority to carry out Appropriate Assessment in order that they can be confident that your development will not have an adverse effect on the site integrity in view of the conservation objectives, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. If the planning authority is unable to reach this conclusion, your proposal will be judged not to be in accordance with this plan. Specifically your proposal must address the mitigation measures (as set out in Natural Heritage Supplementary Guidance) required to address potential impacts on:*

- *Pollution from wastewater.”*

This new wording leads to the same effect as the original and so provides the same level of certainty about any effect on the conservation objectives. This wording is included within the LDP for each settlement listed above as having a LSE upon this Natura site. The allocation of land for housing at Killiecrankie was removed via the Examination of the proposed Plan so will have no effect.

**Minor residual effects**

Following mitigation, there are no minor residual effects from Blair Atholl and Killiecrankie.

**Conclusion on site integrity**

Implementing these proposals will not have an adverse effect upon the integrity of this European Site, alone or in combination.

## **6.4 Stage 9: Amending the Plan - Mitigation at Appropriate Assessment Stage**

- 6.4.1 The appropriate assessment identifies a range of mitigations which, if implemented, will result in the CNPA being able to ascertain that there will be no adverse effect on the integrity of the relevant designated sites. The appropriate assessment sets out how the mitigation should be incorporated into the LDP, and through Stage 9, those changes have been made to the LDP so that the necessary mitigation is included in the Local Development Plan which the CNPA intends to adopt.

The Community Information section of the plan identifies, where relevant, the Natura sites that are likely to be significantly affected by the allocations, either alone or in combination, and specifies the mitigation that must be included in proposals. Guidance on the mitigation is provided in the Natural Heritage Supplementary Guidance.

As a result of the HRA, the Local Development Plan requires mitigation to address the following effects where relevant:

- Water abstraction
- Pollution and siltation from construction sites
- Run-off/Requirement for SUDS
- Pollution from wastewater
- Disturbance to otters
- Disturbance to capercaillie
- Distribution of qualifying habitats

The appropriate assessment identifies two requirements for mitigation that are common to several Natura sites: disturbance to capercaillie and pollution from wastewater. The detailed approach to implementing mitigation for these effects has therefore been considered in order to apply it to a number of sites where relevant. Further explanation of the required mitigation is given below.

### **Disturbance to capercaillie**

- 6.4.2 The screening process identified a number of aspects that have LSEs on the SPAs for which capercaillie is a qualifying feature. The AA puts forward mitigation to address the issues raised by possible increased recreational disturbance. The mitigation sets a number of 'tests' as criteria which must be used for all developments where an HRA identifies LSEs. They must be incorporated into the LDP to ensure that the provisions are applied to planning applications. The first draft of the HRA sought compliance through the following wording:

*Developments which would have a likely significant effect on (named European designated sites) must supply, as part of the planning application, all necessary information to allow the planning authority to carry out an Appropriate Assessment. Required mitigation will include a Recreational Management Plan (RMP) to comply with the criteria set out in this Plan. To be in accordance with this Plan, and for planning permission to be granted, such developments must not adversely affect the integrity of the site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.*

The recommendations of the reporter reworded this section as follows:

*“In addition, development on land allocated in the plan has the potential to have a significant effect either directly or indirectly on a number of European designated sites, alone or in combination.*

- *[Relevant SPA(s) with capercaillie as a qualifying feature stated]*

*You must supply as part of your planning application, all necessary information to allow the planning authority to carry out Appropriate Assessment in order that they can be confident that your development will not have an adverse effect on the site integrity in view of the conservation objectives, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. If the planning authority is unable to reach this conclusion, your proposal will be judged not to be in accordance with this plan. Specifically your proposal must address the mitigation measures (as set out in Natural Heritage Supplementary Guidance) required to address potential impacts on:*

- *Disturbance to capercaillie”*

This new wording leads to the same effect as the original and so provides the same level of certainty about any effect on the conservation objectives. This wording is included within the LDP for each settlement listed above as having a LSE upon this Natura site.

- 6.4.3 In addition, the policy on Natural Heritage should include wording to ensure that development complies with these criteria and that tension within the Plan is not created. For example ‘Development would not accord with the policy if the criteria cannot be met’.

### **Criteria for mitigation to capercaillie disturbance**

**Criterion 1** - Current and estimated recreational use and provision. The mitigation proposals must be based on a detailed and evidence-based understanding of current recreational use of the area, (both spatially and over time) in terms of type, numbers, distribution, and behaviour and take account of the predicted future recreation demand arising from the proposed development.

**Criterion 2** - Capercaillie population and site issues. The mitigation proposals must be based on a detailed and evidence-based understanding of current capercaillie population within the affected SPAs and connected non-designated woodlands. It

must also have detailed information on site condition and any specific issues that may affect the way the species uses the sites.

**Criterion 3 - Best practice.** The mitigation proposals must be built on best practice as agreed with the planning authority and Scottish Natural Heritage.

**Criterion 4 – Location and Time Specific –** the mitigation proposals should be designed to avoid an increase in disturbance though out different times of the day and year, alongside adequate consideration of current and likely future levels and patterns of use

**Criterion 5 - Deliver targeted site-specific mitigation.** Development proposals must put forward a detailed package of mitigation that addresses the issues raised in these criteria. They must clearly demonstrate that the combination of mitigation measures will ensure that there is no adverse effect upon the integrity of a Natura site, and no in-combination MREs which make LSEs will remain. The measures for mitigation are likely to include:

- Awareness-raising through ranger activity, leaflets, signage and media communications
- Provision of alternative footpaths, other routes, or green space
- Path removal to increase core capercaillie refuge areas
- Habitat improvement
- Habitat expansion
- Screening within woodland areas
- Specific measures for increased dog control

**Criterion 6 - Community engagement and support.** The proposals must demonstrate effective engagement with the community (existing and future) and recreational users and a sufficient degree of support to ensure the proposals will be effective.

**Criterion 7 - Practical enforcement.** The mitigation proposals must demonstrate that the measures will be legally and practically enforceable and maintained for the lifetime of the development.

**Criterion 8 - Phasing.** For developments of more than 50 units a phased approach must be adopted. The approval of phases will be conditional upon the successful delivery of mitigation proposals for the previous phases. The measures for success will be part of the Appropriate Assessment and attached to any approval.

**Criterion 9 - Monitoring, review and adaptive management.** The mitigation and management measures must be monitored and reviewed in a manner agreed with the planning authority and Scottish Natural Heritage to ensure effectiveness for the lifetime of the development. A mechanism must be put in place to take further management measures to reduce disturbance if necessary.

**Criterion 10 - Co-ordinated action.** Mitigation measures must demonstrate awareness of other developments and projects that could affect the same designated

sites and to ensure that in-combination effects are considered. These must include developments that have been proposed, submitted for permission, or approved but not yet built. Any conflicts in effectiveness or delivery must be managed within the mitigation measures to ensure no adverse effect upon any site's integrity.

**Criterion II - Proportionality.** The evidence base and subsequent mitigation measures must be proportionate to the level of potential effect and the size of the development whilst still ensuring no adverse effect upon the integrity of sites.

- 6.4.4 The package of measures referred to in Criterion 4, and all the information required to meet all ten criteria, are called the Recreational Management Plan. It is not necessary at this level to prescribe which mitigations will be applied because these will have to be determined prior to an application when the full detail of the site and development can be known. This will be assessed through a further AA. The RMP may require off site mitigation to be undertaken and delivery mechanisms for this will have to be identified such as direct provision with land owner consent and /or appropriate financial contribution made to the delivery of aspects of the Capercaillie Action Plan.

### **Pollution from wastewater**

- 6.4.5 Effect:** Wastewater from development can contain chemicals that could pollute water courses. Soluble phosphorous is harmful to freshwater pearl mussel at levels above 0.03mg/l.

**Mitigation required:** All wastewater from developments must be treated at wastewater treatment works to remove harmful levels of pollutants to recommended standards at the time of commencement.. There must be capacity within water treatment works for the volume of material generated by developments and the facilities needed to reduce pollutants to a level where there will be no adverse effects upon the integrity of Natura sites. SNH advise that current work is underway to assess tolerance levels of juvenile fresh water pearl mussels and mitigation will be required to comply with any resulting standards.

**Required provision within LDP:** The LDP must ensure that developments brought forward through it will comply with current best practice to achieve the required mitigation. It must ensure mandatory compliance through the following wording:

*Developments which would have a likely significant effect on (named European designated sites) must supply as part of the planning application the necessary information to allow the Planning Authority to carry out an Appropriate Assessment which will inform the final decision on the application. To be in accordance with this Plan and for planning permission to be granted, such developments must not adversely affect the integrity of the site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.*

*Development may not commence until it has been demonstrated to the planning authority that there is sufficient capacity in local wastewater treatment works in terms of capacity and ability to remove pollutants to recommended standards at the time of commencement.*

The recommendations of the reporter reworded this section as follows:

*“In addition, development on land allocated in the plan has the potential to have a significant effect either directly or indirectly on a number of European designated sites, alone or in combination.*

- *[Relevant SPA(s) and SAC(s) screened in as a result of potential pollution from wastewater}*

*You must supply as part of your planning application, all necessary information to allow the planning authority to carry out Appropriate Assessment in order that they can be confident that your development will not have an adverse effect on the site integrity in view of the conservation objectives, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. If the planning authority is unable to reach this conclusion, your proposal will be judged not to be in accordance with this plan. Specifically your proposal must address the mitigation measures (as set out in Natural Heritage Supplementary Guidance) required to address potential impacts on:*

- *Pollution from wastewater”*

This new wording leads to the same effect as the original and so provides the same level of certainty about any effect on the conservation objectives. This wording is included within the LDP for each settlement listed above as having a LSE upon this Natura site.

## **7. Stage 10: Conclusions of the HRA record**

- 7.1 This HRA has identified a wide range of Likely Significant Effects and Minor Residual Effects on the Natura sites within the Cairngorms National Park arising from the LDP. It has also identified a range of mitigation measures that must be included within the LDP and implemented through its delivery. At this stage of the planning process, without the fine detail of specific projects, the proper resolution of the effects has been put forward at an appropriate level, together with clear indications of how and when mitigation will be implemented at future stages. This approach follows the opinion of the Advocate General in the ECJ case C-6/04.
- 7.2 Following stages 1 to 9 of the appraisal we conclude that there will be no adverse effect on the integrity of any Natura site within the Cairngorms National Park through the provisions of the Proposed LDP, implemented in accordance with the identified mitigation.
- 7.3 This report forms a record of the HRA process. The report will be published alongside the Local Development Plan after adoption.

## **8. Stages 11-13: Consultation on the Draft amendments to the LPD and HRA record**

The draft report was first consulted upon alongside the proposed Local development Plan in April-July 2013. A number of comments were received and some significant changes have been undertaken as a result. A summary of the main points raised by consultees has been

included in appendix 5. This table also set out the response of the CNPA to these comments and highlights what changes have been made (see below).

This report underwent a final consultation with the statutory conservation body in Scotland, SNH in October 2014 prior to adoption in line with the Habitats regulations. SEPA and the RSPB were also re-consulted at this time. Final representations are summarised in appendix 5.

### **Stage 12: Amend the Local Development Plan**

The LDP has been modified in a number of ways to ensure it complies with the HRA, these have been undertaken directly in response to the original draft HRA and then the report on the plan by the appointed reporter. These have been included in appendix 5.

### **Stage 13 Modify the Record of the HRA**

This report is the record of the HRA. It has been updated to include the final consultation responses on the draft record and subsequent modification from the final report of on the LDP by the appointed reporter.

## **9. Record of Minor Residual Effects**

It has become common practice to summarise the MREs assessed through this process. This is not a part for the formal assessment process but assists in the preparation of HRAs for other projects and plans. There are quite a number of MREs identified on five sites. These have been listed in Appendix 3 and therefore this has not been repeated here.

## **References**

Habitat Regulations Appraisal of Plans – Guidance for Plan Making Bodies in Scotland.  
SNH/DTA August 2012 (Version 2.0)

## Appendix I - Details of Natura 2000 sites within, or adjacent to, the Cairngorms National Park

The following tables include Site Condition information. These are correct at the time of publication but are subject to change. For up-to-date information please refer to SNH's web site\_ <http://gateway.snh.gov.uk/sitelink/index/jsp>

Name of European Site	Abernethy Forest
Site Type	Special Protection Area
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population of the species as a viable component of the site</li> <li>• Distribution of the species within the site</li> <li>• Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting process of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of the species</li> </ul>
Qualifying Species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capercaillie (Tetrao urogallus)</li> <li>• Osprey (Pandion haliaetus)</li> <li>• Scottish crossbill (Loxia scotica)</li> </ul>
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capercaillie, breeding, 2009. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Osprey, breeding, 2007. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Scottish crossbill, not monitored to date.</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	In terms of development, no factors currently influencing site
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disturbance from construction and recreation arising from neighbouring development</li> <li>• Relevant settlements: Grantown on Spey, Dulnain Bridge, Boat of Garten, Nethy Bridge, Cromdale, Carr-bridge, Aviemore, Kincaig, An Camas Mor</li> </ul>

Name of European Site	Anagach Woods
Site Type	Special Protection Area
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population of the species as a viable component of the site</li> <li>• Distribution of the species within the site</li> <li>• Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting process of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of the species</li> </ul>
Qualifying Species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capercaillie (Tetrao urogallus)</li> </ul>
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Breeding capercaillie, favourable maintained (2010).</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	Impact from disturbance from adjacent village and footpaths within the wood
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disturbance from construction and recreation arising from neighbouring development</li> <li>• Relevant settlements: Grantown on Spey, Dulnain Bridge, Boat of Garten, Nethy Bridge, Cromdale, Carr-bridge, Aviemore, Kincaig, An Camas Mor</li> </ul>

Name of European Site	Ballochbuie
Site Type	Special Area of Conservation
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the qualifying habitats (listed below) thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying habitats that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent of the habitat on site</li> <li>• Distribution of the habitat within the site</li> <li>• Structure and function of the habitat</li> <li>• Process supporting the site</li> <li>• Distribution of typical species of the habitat</li> <li>• Viability of typical species as components of the habitat</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of typical species of the habitat</li> </ul>
Qualifying Habitats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Blanket bog* 2006 unfavourable no change</li> <li>• Bog woodland* 2011 unfavourable no change</li> <li>• Caledonian forest* 2011 unfavourable no change</li> <li>• Dry heaths 2006 unfavourable no change</li> <li>• Plants in crevices on acid rocks 2006 favourable no change</li> <li>• Plants in crevices on base-rich rocks 2004 favourable no change</li> <li>• Wet heathland with cross-leaved heath 2006 unfavourable no change</li> </ul> <p>(* indicates priority habitat)</p>
Site Type	Special Area of Conservation
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population of the species as a viable component of the site</li> <li>• Distribution of the species within the site</li> <li>• Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting process of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of the species</li> </ul>

Qualifying Species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Otter (<i>Lutra lutra</i>)</li> </ul>
Site Type	<b>Special Protection Area</b>
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population of the species as a viable component of the site</li> <li>• Distribution of the species within the site</li> <li>• Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting process of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of the species</li> </ul>
Qualifying Species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capercaillie (<i>Tetrao urogallus</i>) 2011 unfavourable declining</li> <li>• Scottish crossbill (<i>Loxia scotica</i>)</li> </ul>
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bog woodland, 2002. Unfavourable declining.</li> <li>• Caledonian forest, 2002. Unfavourable declining.</li> <li>• Otter, 2004. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Plants in crevices in acid rocks, 2008. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Other features not yet monitored.</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	In terms of development, none at present
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	Relevant settlements: Ballater, Braemar

Name of European Site	Beinn a Ghlo
Site Type	Special Area of Conservation
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the qualifying habitats (listed below) thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying habitats that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent of the habitat on site</li> <li>• Distribution of the habitat within the site</li> <li>• Structure and function of the habitat</li> <li>• Process supporting the site</li> <li>• Distribution of typical species of the habitat</li> <li>• Viability of typical species as components of the habitat</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of typical species of the habitat</li> </ul>
Qualifying habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acidic scree</li> <li>• Apline and subalpine heaths</li> <li>• Base-rich fens</li> <li>• Blanket bog</li> <li>• Dry grasslands and scrublands on chalk or limestone</li> <li>• Dry heaths</li> <li>• Geyer's whorl snail (<i>Vertego geyeri</i>)</li> <li>• Hard-water springs depositing lime</li> <li>• High-altitude plant communities associated with areas of water seepage</li> <li>• Montane acid grasslands</li> <li>• Plants in crevices on acid rocks</li> <li>• Plants in crevices on base-rich rocks</li> <li>• Round-mouthed whorl snail (<i>Vertego genesii</i>)</li> <li>• Species-rich grassland with mat-grass in upland areas</li> </ul>
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Species-rich grassland with mat-grass, 2010, Favourable, Recovered</li> <li>• Dry heaths, 2005. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Plants in crevices on base-rich rocks, 2004, Favourable, Maintained.</li> <li>• Plants in crevices on acid rocks, 2010, Favourable, Recovered.</li> <li>• Acidic scree, 2005. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Alpine and subalpine heaths, 2010 Favourable, Recovered.</li> <li>• Montane acid grasslands, 2005. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Base-rich fens, 2005. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• High-altitude plant communities associated with areas of</li> </ul>

	<p>water seepage, 2010, Favourable, Recovered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hard-water springs depositing lime, 2005. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Blanket bog, 2010 Favourable, Recovered.</li> <li>• Dry grasslands and scrublands on chalk or limestone, 2010, Unfavourable, Recovering.</li> <li>• Round-mouthed whorl snail (<i>Vertigo genesii</i>), 2010. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Geyer's whorl snail (<i>Vertigo geyeri</i>), 2010. Favourable maintained.</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	In terms of development, none at present.
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	Recreational pressures from hillwalking may impact upon features although most popular routes are historical and were in place before classification of the site. Renewables development would be difficult to accommodate in the habitat mosaics present.

Name of European Site	Caenlochan
Site Type	<b>Special Area of Conservation</b>
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the qualifying habitats (listed below) thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying habitats that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent of the habitat on site</li> <li>• Distribution of the habitat within the site</li> <li>• Structure and function of the habitat</li> <li>• Process supporting the site</li> <li>• Distribution of typical species of the habitat</li> <li>• Viability of typical species as components of the habitat</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of typical species of the habitat</li> </ul>
Qualifying Habitats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acidic scree</li> <li>• Alpine and subalpine heaths</li> <li>• Base-rich fens</li> <li>• Base-rich scree</li> <li>• Blanket bog*</li> <li>• Dry heaths</li> <li>• Grasslands on soils in heavy metals</li> <li>• High-altitude plant communities associated with areas of water seepage*</li> <li>• Montane acid grasslands</li> <li>• Mountain willow scrub</li> <li>• Plants in crevices on acid rocks</li> <li>• Plants in crevices on base-rich rocks</li> <li>• Species-rich grassland with mat-grass in upland areas*</li> <li>• Tall herb communities</li> </ul> <p>(*indicates priority habitat)</p>
Site Type	<b>Special Protection Area</b>
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population of the species as a viable component of the site</li> <li>• Distribution of the species within the site</li> <li>• Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting process of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of the species</li> </ul>

Qualifying Species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dotterel (<i>Charadrius moninellus</i>)</li> <li>• Golden eagle (<i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>)</li> </ul>
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acidic scree, 2006. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Alpine and sub-alpine heaths, 2006. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Base rich fens, 2006. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Base-rich scree, 2006. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Blanket bog, 2006. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Dry heath, 2006. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Grassland on soils rich in heavy metals, 2006. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• High-altitude plant communities associated with areas of water seepage, 2006. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Montane acid grasslands, 2006. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Mountain willow scrub, 2006. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Plants in crevices in acid rocks, 2006. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Plants in crevices in base-rich rocks, 2006. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Species-rich grassland with mat-grass in upland areas, 2006. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Tall herb communities, 2006. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Dotterel, 1999. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Golden eagle, 2009. Favourable maintained.</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	In terms of development, none at present
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wind farms could impact on young golden eagles, given their mobility</li> <li>• Recreational pressure may affect the notified features</li> </ul>

Name of European Site	Cairngorms
Site Type	Special Area of Conservation
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the qualifying habitats (listed below) thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying habitats that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent of the habitat on site</li> <li>• Distribution of the habitat within the site</li> <li>• Structure and function of the habitat</li> <li>• Process supporting the site</li> <li>• Distribution of typical species of the habitat</li> <li>• Viability of typical species as components of the habitat</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of typical species of the habitat</li> </ul> <p>Recently it has been agreed to favour woodland expansion in the Cairngorms over a 20 year period while retaining the SAC's ranking as the foremost site the Britain for dwarf shrub heath. To prevent adverse effects on certain dwarf shrub heaths, in particular lower altitude heath with bearberry, grasslands, active positive management may need to be included in forthcoming woodland expansion plans</p>
Qualifying Habitats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acid peat-strained lakes and ponds</li> <li>• Acidic scree</li> <li>• Alpine and subalpine heaths</li> <li>• Blanket bog*</li> <li>• Bog woodland*</li> <li>• Caledonian forest*</li> <li>• Clear-water lakes or lochs with aquatic vegetation and poor to moderate nutrient levels</li> <li>• Dry grasslands and scrublands on chalk or limestone</li> <li>• Dry heaths</li> <li>• Hard-water springs depositing lime*</li> <li>• High-altitude plant communities associated with areas of water seepage*</li> <li>• Juniper on heaths or calcareous grasslands</li> <li>• Montane acid grasslands</li> <li>• Mountain willow scrub</li> <li>• Plants in crevices on acid rocks</li> <li>• Plants in crevices on base-rich rocks</li> <li>• Species-rich grassland with mat-grass in upland areas*</li> <li>• Tall herb communities</li> <li>• Very wet mires often identified by an unstable 'quaking' surface</li> <li>• Wet heathland with cross-leaved heath</li> </ul> <p>(*indicates priority habitat)</p>
Site Type	Special Area of Conservation

<p>Conservation Objectives</p>	<p>To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population of the species as a viable component of the site</li> <li>• Distribution of the species within the site</li> <li>• Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting process of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of the species</li> </ul>
<p>Qualifying Species</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green shield-moss (<i>Buxbaumia viridis</i>)</li> <li>• Otter (<i>Lutra lutra</i>)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Site Type</b></p>	<p><b>Special Protection Area</b></p>
<p>Conservation Objectives</p>	<p>To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population of the species as a viable component of the site</li> <li>• Distribution of the species within the site</li> <li>• Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting process of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of the species</li> </ul>
<p>Qualifying Species</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capercaillie (<i>Tetrao urogallus</i>)</li> <li>• Dotterel (<i>Charadrius moninellus</i>)</li> <li>• Golden eagle (<i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>)</li> <li>• Merlin (<i>Falco columbarius</i>)</li> <li>• Osprey (<i>Panion haliaetus</i>)</li> <li>• Peregrine (<i>Falco peregrinus</i>)</li> <li>• Scottish crossbill (<i>Loxia scotica</i>)</li> </ul>
<p>Site Condition</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acid peat-stained lakes and ponds, 2010. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Acidic scree, 2007. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Alpien and subalpine heaths, 2007. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Blanket bog, 2007. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Bog woodland, 2002. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Caledonian forest, 2009. Unfavourable declining.</li> <li>• Clear water lakes or lochs with aquatic vegetation and poor to moderate nutrient levels, 2010. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Dry heaths, 2007. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Dry grasslands and scrublands on chalk or limestone, 2007, Unfavourable, No change</li> <li>• Green-shield moss (<i>Bauxbaumia viridis</i>), 2006. Favourable maintained.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hard water springs depositing lime, 2007, Favourable, Maintained</li> <li>• High-altitude plant communities associated with areas of water seepage, 2006. Unfavourable, No change.</li> <li>• Juniper on heaths or calcareous grasslands, 2007. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Montane acid grasslands, 2006. Unfavourable recovering.</li> <li>• Mountain willow scrub, 2007. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Otter, 2004. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Plants in crevices on acid rocks, 2007. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Plants in crevices on base-rich rocks, 2007. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Species rich grassland with mat-grass in upland areas, 2007, Unfavourable, No Change</li> <li>• Tall herb communities, 2007. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Very wet mires often identified by an unstable 'quaking' surface, 2007. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Wet heathland with cross-leaved heath, 2007. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Breeding capercaillie, 2011 Favourable maintained</li> <li>• Breeding dotterel, 1999. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Breeding golden eagle, 2009. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Breeding osprey, 2006. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Breeding peregrine, 2002. Favourable maintained.</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	In terms of development, none at present
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recreational disturbance to species from neighbouring development</li> <li>• Relevant settlements: An Camus Mòr, Granttown on Spey, Dulnain Bridge, Boat of Garten, Nethy Bridge, Cromdale, Carr-bridge, Aviemore, Kincaig – also developing of, or extension of existing, recreational facilities</li> <li>• Wind farms could impact on young golden eagles, given their mobility</li> <li>• Improvements to Thieves' Road</li> </ul>

Name of European Site	Cairngorm Lochs
<b>Site Type</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
Conservation Objectives	To avoid deterioration of the qualifying habitats thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for the site.
Qualifying Habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oligotrophic loch</li> </ul>
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oligotrophic loch, 2010, favourable maintained</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	In terms of development, none at present

Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	No specific vulnerabilities identified
---	--

Name of European Site	Cairngorms Massif
<b>Site Type</b>	<b>Special Protection Area</b>
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population of the species as a viable component of the site</li> <li>• Distribution of the species within the site</li> <li>• Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting process of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of the species</li> </ul>
Qualifying Species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Golden eagle (<i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>)</li> </ul>
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Golden eagle, 2003, Favourable maintained</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	In terms of development, none at present
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	Relevant settlements: all settlements have potential to contribute to an increase in disturbance to qualifying species.

Name of European Site	Coyles of Muick
<b>Site Type</b>	<b>Special Area of Conservation</b>
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the qualifying habitats (listed below) thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying habitats that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent of the habitat on site</li> <li>• Distribution of the habitat within the site</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Structure and function of the habitat</li> <li>• Process supporting the site</li> <li>• Distribution of typical species of the habitat</li> <li>• Viability of typical species as components of the habitat</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of typical species of the habitat</li> </ul>
Qualifying Habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grasslands on soils rich in heavy metals</li> </ul>
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grasslands on soils rich in heavy metals, 2006. Favourable maintained.</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	In terms of development, none at present
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	No specific vulnerabilities identified

Name of European Site	Craigmore Wood
Site Type	Special Protection Area
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population of the species as a viable component of the site</li> <li>• Distribution of the species within the site</li> <li>• Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting process of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of the species</li> </ul>
Qualifying Species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capercaillie (Tetrao urogallus)</li> </ul>
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capercaillie, 2009. Unfavourable no change.</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	In terms of development, none at present
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recreational disturbance from development in neighbouring areas</li> <li>• Relevant settlements: Grantown on Spey, Dulnain Bridge, Boat of Garten, Nethy Bridge, Cromdale, Carr-bridge, Aviemore, Kincaig, An Camas Mor</li> </ul>

Name of European Site	Creag Meagaidh
Site Type	<b>Special Area of Conservation</b>
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the qualifying habitat (listed below) thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying habitats that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent of the habitat on site</li> <li>• Distribution of the habitat within the site</li> <li>• Structure and function of the habitat</li> <li>• Process supporting the site</li> <li>• Distribution of typical species of the habitat</li> <li>• Viability of typical species as components of the habitat</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of typical species of the habitat</li> </ul>
Qualifying Habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acidic scree</li> <li>• Alpine and subalpine heaths</li> <li>• Blanket bog*</li> <li>• Clear-water lakes or lochs with aquatic vegetation and poor to moderate nutrient levels</li> <li>• Dry heaths</li> <li>• Montane acid grasslands</li> <li>• Mountain willow scrub</li> <li>• Plants in crevices on acid rocks</li> <li>• Plants in crevices on base-rich rocks</li> <li>• Tall herb communities</li> <li>• Wet heathland with cross-leaved heath</li> </ul> <p>(*indicates priority habitat)</p>
Site Type	<b>Special Protection Area</b>
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population of the species as a viable component of the site</li> <li>• Distribution of the species within the site</li> <li>• Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting process of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of the species</li> </ul>
Qualifying Species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dotterel (<i>Charadrius morinellus</i>)</li> </ul>
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acidic scree, 2005. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Alpine and subalpine heaths, 2005. Unfavourable no change.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Blanket bog, 2005. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Clear-water lakes or lochs with aquatic vegetation and poor to moderate nutrient levels, 2010. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Dry heaths, 2005. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Montane acid grasslands, 2005. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Mountain willow scrub, 2005. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Plants in crevices on acid rocks, 2005. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Plants in crevices on base-rich rocks, 2010. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Tall herb communities, 2005. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Wet heathland with cross-leaved heath, 2005. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Dotterel, 2001. Favourable maintained.</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	In terms of development, none at present
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	No specific vulnerabilities identified

Name of European Site	Creag nan Gamhainn
Site Type	Special Area of Conservation
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the qualifying habitat (listed below) thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying habitats that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent of the habitat on site</li> <li>• Distribution of the habitat within the site</li> <li>• Structure and function of the habitat</li> <li>• Process supporting the site</li> <li>• Distribution of typical species of the habitat</li> <li>• Viability of typical species as components of the habitat</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of typical species of the habitat</li> </ul>
Qualifying Habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hard-water springs depositing lime* (*indicates priority habitat)</li> </ul>
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hard-water springs depositing lime, 2011. Favourable maintained.</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	In terms of development, none at present
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	No specific vulnerabilities identified

Name of European Site	Dinnet Oakwood
Site Type	Special Area of Conservation
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the qualifying habitat (listed below) thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying habitats that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent of the habitat on site</li> <li>• Distribution of the habitat within the site</li> <li>• Structure and function of the habitat</li> <li>• Process supporting the site</li> <li>• Distribution of typical species of the habitat</li> <li>• Viability of typical species as components of the habitat</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of typical species of the habitat</li> </ul>
Qualifying Habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Western acidic oak woodland</li> </ul>
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Western acidic oak woodland, 2002. Favourable maintained.</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	In terms of development, none at present
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	No specific vulnerabilities identified

Name of European Site	<b>Drumochter Hills</b>
<b>Site Type</b>	<b>Special Area of Conservation</b>
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the qualifying habitat (listed below) thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying habitats that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent of the habitat on site</li> <li>• Distribution of the habitat within the site</li> <li>• Structure and function of the habitat</li> <li>• Process supporting the site</li> <li>• Distribution of typical species of the habitat</li> <li>• Viability of typical species as components of the habitat</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of typical species of the habitat</li> </ul>
Qualifying Habitats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acidic scree</li> <li>• Alpine and subalpine heaths</li> <li>• Blanket bog*</li> <li>• Dry heaths</li> <li>• Montane acid grasslands</li> <li>• Mountain willow scrub</li> <li>• Plants in crevices on acid rocks</li> <li>• Species-rich grassland with mat-grass in upland areas*</li> <li>• Tall herb communities</li> <li>• Wet heathland with cross-leaved heath</li> </ul> <p>(*indicates priority habitat)</p>
<b>Site Type</b>	<b>Special Protection Area</b>
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population of the species as a viable component of the site</li> <li>• Distribution of the species within the site</li> <li>• Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting process of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of the species</li> </ul>
Qualifying Species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dotterel (<i>Charadrius moninellus</i>)</li> <li>• Merlin (<i>Falco columbarius</i>)</li> </ul>
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acidic scree, 2006. Favourable maintained.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alpine and subalpine heaths, 2006. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Blanket bog, 2006. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Dry heaths, 2006. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Montane acid grasslands, 2006. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Mountain willow scrub, 2006. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Plants in crevices on acid rocks, 2006. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Species-rich grasslands with mat-grass in upland areas, 2006. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Tall herb communities, 2006. Unfavourable recovering.</li> <li>• Wet heathland with cross-leaved heath, 2006. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Dotterel, 2004. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Merlin, 2004. Unfavourable no change.</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	<p>ATVs and tracks Beaully-Denny transmission line project Proposals for the Dually of the A9</p>
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	<p>No specific vulnerabilities identified</p>

Name of European Site	Forest of Clunie
Site Type	Special Protection Area
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population of the species as a viable component of the site</li> <li>• Distribution of the species within the site</li> <li>• Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting process of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of the species</li> </ul>
Qualifying Species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hen harrier (<i>Circus cyaneus</i>), breeding</li> <li>• Merlin (<i>Falco columbarius</i>), breeding</li> <li>• Osprey (<i>Pandion haliaetus</i>), breeding</li> <li>• Short-eared owl (<i>Asio flammeus</i>), breeding</li> </ul>
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hen harrier (<i>Circus cyaneus</i>), breeding, 2010. Unfavourable declining.</li> <li>• Merlin (<i>Falco columbarius</i>), breeding, 2009. Unfavourable declining.</li> <li>• Osprey (<i>Pandion haliaetus</i>), breeding, 2011. Favourable declining.</li> <li>• Short-eared owl (<i>Asio flammeus</i>), breeding, 2009. Unfavourable declining.</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	In terms of development, none at present
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	Development of wind renewables within connectivity distance of the site has the potential to damage the features

Name of European Site	Glen Tanar
Site Type	<b>Special Area of Conservation</b>
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the qualifying habitat (listed below) thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying habitats that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent of the habitat on site</li> <li>• Distribution of the habitat within the site</li> <li>• Structure and function of the habitat</li> <li>• Process supporting the site</li> <li>• Distribution of typical species of the habitat</li> <li>• Viability of typical species as components of the habitat</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of typical species of the habitat</li> </ul>
Qualifying Habitats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Blanket bog*</li> <li>• Caledonian forest*</li> <li>• Dry heaths</li> <li>• Wet heathland with cross-leaved heath</li> </ul> <p>(*indicates priority habitat)</p>
Site Type	<b>Special Area of Conservation</b>
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population of the species as a viable component of the site</li> <li>• Distribution of the species within the site</li> <li>• Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting process of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of the species</li> </ul>
Qualifying Species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Otter (<i>Lutra lutra</i>)</li> </ul>
Site Type	<b>Special Protection Area</b>
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained; and</p>

	<p>To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population of the species as a viable component of the site</li> <li>• Distribution of the species within the site</li> <li>• Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting process of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of the species</li> </ul>
Qualifying Species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capercaillie (<i>Tetrao urogallus</i>)</li> <li>• Hen Harrier (<i>Circus cyaneus</i>)</li> <li>• Osprey (<i>Pandion halietus</i>)</li> <li>• Scottish crossbill (<i>Loxia scotica</i>)</li> </ul>
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Blanket bog* 2007. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Caledonian forest* 2010. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Dry heaths 2005. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Wet heathland with cross-leaved heath 2009. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Otter (<i>Lutra lutra</i>) 2007. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Capercaillie (<i>Tetrao urogallus</i>) 2011. Unfavourable declining.</li> <li>• Hen Harrier (<i>Circus cyaneus</i>) 2010. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Osprey (<i>Pandion halietus</i>). 2010 Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Scottish crossbill (<i>Loxia scotica</i>), not monitored to date.</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	In terms of development, none at present
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	Relevant settlements: Ballater, Braemar

Name of European Site	Greenhill of Strathdon
Site Type	Special Area of Conservation
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the qualifying habitat (listed below) thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying habitats that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent of the habitat on site</li> <li>• Distribution of the habitat within the site</li> <li>• Structure and function of the habitat</li> <li>• Process supporting the site</li> <li>• Distribution of typical species of the habitat</li> <li>• Viability of typical species as components of the habitat</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of typical species of the habitat</li> </ul>
Qualifying Habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dry heaths</li> <li>• Grasslands on soils rich in heavy metals</li> <li>• Juniper on heaths or calcareous grasslands</li> </ul>
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dry heaths, 2009. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Grasslands on soils rich in heavy metals, 2009. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Juniper on heaths or calcareous grasslands, 2005. Favourable maintained.</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	In terms of development, none at present
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	No specific vulnerabilities identified

Name of European Site	Insh Marshes
Site Type	Special Area of Conservation
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the qualifying habitat (listed below) thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying habitats that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent of the habitat on site</li> <li>• Distribution of the habitat within the site</li> <li>• Structure and function of the habitat</li> <li>• Process supporting the site</li> <li>• Distribution of typical species of the habitat</li> <li>• Viability of typical species as components of the habitat</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of typical species of the habitat</li> </ul>
Qualifying Habitats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alder woodland on floodplains*</li> <li>• Clear-water lakes or lochs with aquatic vegetation and poor to moderate nutrient levels</li> <li>• Very wet mires often identified by an unstable 'quaking' surface (* indicates priority habitat)</li> </ul>
Site Type	Special Area of Conservation
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population of the species as a viable component of the site</li> <li>• Distribution of the species within the site</li> <li>• Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting process of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of the species</li> </ul>
Qualifying Species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Otter (<i>Lutra lutra</i>)</li> </ul>
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alder woodland on floodplains*, 2009. Unfavourable recovering.</li> <li>• Clear-water lakes or lochs with aquatic vegetation and poor to moderate nutrient levels, 2010. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Very wet mires often identified by an unstable 'quaking' surface, 2005. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Otter (<i>Lutra lutra</i>), 2007. Favourable maintained.</li> </ul>

Factors currently influencing site	Potential impacts from new development due to additional nutrient loading.
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Effects on water quality including sewerage treatment, release of minerals, contamination or other waste</li><li>• Relevant settlements: Kingussie, , Kinbraig, Newtonmore, Insh</li></ul>

Name of European Site	Kinveachy Forest
Site Type	<b>Special Area of Conservation</b>
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the qualifying habitat (listed below) thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying habitats that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent of the habitat on site</li> <li>• Distribution of the habitat within the site</li> <li>• Structure and function of the habitat</li> <li>• Process supporting the site</li> <li>• Distribution of typical species of the habitat</li> <li>• Viability of typical species as components of the habitat</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of typical species of the habitat</li> </ul>
Qualifying Habitats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bog woodland*</li> <li>• Caledonian forest*</li> </ul> <p>(* indicates priority habitat)</p>
Site Type	<b>Special Protection Area</b>
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population of the species as a viable component of the site</li> <li>• Distribution of the species within the site</li> <li>• Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting process of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of the species</li> </ul>
Qualifying Species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capercaillie (<i>Tetrao urogallus</i>)</li> <li>• Scottish crossbill (<i>Loxia scotica</i>)</li> </ul>
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bog woodland*, 2009. Unfavourable recovering.</li> <li>• Caledonian forest*, 2009. Unfavourable recovering.</li> <li>• Capercaillie (<i>Tetrao urogallus</i>), 2009. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Scottish crossbill (<i>Loxia scotica</i>), not monitored to date.</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	In terms of development, none at present.
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recreational disturbance from development in neighbouring areas</li> <li>• Relevant settlements: Grantown on Spey, Dulnain Bridge, Boat of Garten, Nethy Bridge, Cromdale, Carr-bridge, Aviemore, Kincaig, An Camas Mor</li> </ul>

Name of European Site	Ladder Hills
Site Type	Special Area of Conservation
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the qualifying habitat (listed below) thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying habitats that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent of the habitat on site</li> <li>• Distribution of the habitat within the site</li> <li>• Structure and function of the habitat</li> <li>• Process supporting the site</li> <li>• Distribution of typical species of the habitat</li> <li>• Viability of typical species as components of the habitat</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of typical species of the habitat</li> </ul>
Qualifying Habitats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alpine and subalpine heaths</li> <li>• Blanket bog*</li> <li>• Dry heaths</li> </ul> <p>(*indicates priority habitat)</p>
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alpine and sub-alpine heaths, 1999. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Blanket bog, 1999. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Dry heaths, 2007. Unfavourable declining.</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	In terms of development, none at present
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential effects from development in the neighbouring Lecht Ski Centre</li> <li>• No specific vulnerabilities identified</li> </ul>

Name of European Site	Loch Vaa
Site Type	Special Protection Area
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population of the species as a viable component of the site</li> <li>• Distribution of the species within the site</li> <li>• Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting process of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of the species</li> </ul>
Qualifying species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Slavonian grebe (<i>Podiceps auritus</i>)</li> </ul>
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Slavonian grebe (<i>Podiceps auritus</i>), 2010. Unfavourable no change.</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	In terms of development, none at present
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effects on water quality including sewerage treatment, release of minerals, contamination or other waste</li> </ul>

Name of European Site	Lochnagar
Site Type	Special Protection Area
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population of the species as a viable component of the site</li> <li>• Distribution of the species within the site</li> <li>• Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting process of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of the species</li> </ul>
Qualifying Species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dotterel (<i>Charadrius morinellus</i>)</li> </ul>
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dotterel (<i>Charadrius morinellus</i>), 2005. Favourable maintained.</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	In terms of development, none at present
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	No specific vulnerabilities identified

Name of European Site	Monadhliath
Site Type	Special Area of Conservation
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the qualifying habitat (listed below) thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying habitats that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent of the habitat on site</li> <li>• Distribution of the habitat within the site</li> <li>• Structure and function of the habitat</li> <li>• Process supporting the site</li> <li>• Distribution of typical species of the habitat</li> <li>• Viability of typical species as components of the habitat</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of typical species of the habitat</li> </ul>
Qualifying Habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Blanket bog* (* indicates priority habitat)</li> </ul>
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Blanket bog*, 2005. Unfavourable no change.</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	In terms of development, none at present
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	No specific vulnerabilities identified

Name of European Site	Morrone Birkwood
Site Type	Special Area of Conservation
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the qualifying habitat (listed below) thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying habitats that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent of the habitat on site</li> <li>• Distribution of the habitat within the site</li> <li>• Structure and function of the habitat</li> <li>• Process supporting the site</li> <li>• Distribution of typical species of the habitat</li> <li>• Viability of typical species as components of the habitat</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of typical species of the habitat</li> </ul>
Qualifying Species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Geyer's whorl snail (<i>Vertigo geyeri</i>)</li> </ul>
Qualifying Habitats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alpine and subalpine heaths</li> <li>• Base-rich fens</li> <li>• Dry grasslands and scrublands on chalk or limestone</li> <li>• Hard-water springs depositing lime*</li> <li>• High-altitude plant communities associated with areas of water seepage*</li> <li>• Juniper on heaths or calcareous grasslands</li> </ul> <p>(*indicates priority habitat)</p>
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alpine and subalpine heaths, 2009. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Base-rich fens, 2010. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Dry grasslands and scrublands on chalk or limestone, 2005. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Hard-water springs depositing lime*, 2005. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• High-altitude plant communities associated with areas of water seepage*, 2005. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Juniper on heaths or calcareous grasslands, 2009. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Geyer's whorl snail, 1998, Favourable maintained</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	In terms of development, none at present
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	Possibly access to water supply for housing

Name of European Site	Morven and Mullachdubh
-----------------------	------------------------

<b>Site Type</b>	<b>Special Area of Conservation</b>
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the qualifying habitat (listed below) thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying habitats that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent of the habitat on site</li> <li>• Distribution of the habitat within the site</li> <li>• Structure and function of the habitat</li> <li>• Process supporting the site</li> <li>• Distribution of typical species of the habitat</li> <li>• Viability of typical species as components of the habitat</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of typical species of the habitat</li> </ul>
Qualifying Habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Juniper on heaths or calcareous grasslands</li> </ul>
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Juniper on heaths or calcareous grasslands, 2011. Favourable maintained.</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	In terms of development, none at present
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	No specific vulnerabilities identified

Name of European Site	Muir of Dinnet
<b>Site Type</b>	<b>Special Area of Conservation</b>
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the qualifying habitat (listed below) thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying habitats that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent of the habitat on site</li> <li>• Distribution of the habitat within the site</li> <li>• Structure and function of the habitat</li> <li>• Process supporting the site</li> <li>• Distribution of typical species of the habitat</li> <li>• Viability of typical species as components of the habitat</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of typical species of the habitat</li> </ul>
Qualifying Habitats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear water lakes or lochs with aquatic vegetation and poor to moderate nutrient levels</li> <li>• Degraded raised bogs</li> <li>• Dry heaths</li> <li>• Very wet mires often identified by an unstable 'quaking' surface</li> </ul>
<b>Site Type</b>	<b>Special Area of Conservation</b>
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population of the species as a viable component of the site</li> <li>• Distribution of the species within the site</li> <li>• Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting process of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of the species</li> </ul>
Qualifying Species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Otter (<i>Lutra lutra</i>)</li> </ul>
<b>Site Type</b>	<b>Special Protection Area</b>
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in</p>

	<p>the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population of the species as a viable component of the site</li> <li>• Distribution of the species within the site</li> <li>• Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting process of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of the species</li> </ul>
Qualifying Species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greylag goose (<i>Anser anser</i>)</li> <li>• Waterfowl assemblage</li> </ul>
Site Type	<b>Ramsar Site</b>
Feature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greylag goose (<i>Anser anser</i>)</li> </ul>
Site Description	The Muir of Dinnet Ramsar Site comprises two neighbouring freshwater lochs (Davan and Kinord) in the Deeside area of Aberdeenshire, Scotland. The entire area of the SPA falls within Muir of Dinnet SSSI and NNR.
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear water lakes or lochs with aquatic vegetation and poor to moderate nutrient levels, 2005. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Degraded raised bogs, 2005. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Dry heaths, 2005. Unfavourable declining.</li> <li>• Very wet mires often identified by an unstable 'quaking' surface, 2008. Unfavourable declining.</li> <li>• Otter (<i>Lutra lutra</i>), 2010. Favourable declining.</li> <li>• Greylag goose (<i>Anser anser</i>), 2012. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Waterfowl assemblage, 2010. Unfavourable declining.</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	In terms of development, none at present
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential effects on water quality from neighbouring developments</li> <li>• Potential for recreational disturbance from neighbouring areas.</li> <li>• Relevant settlement: Dinnet</li> </ul>

Name of European Site	River Dee
Site Type	Special Area of Conservation
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying habitats that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population of the species, including range of genetic types for salmon, as a viable component of the site</li> <li>• Distribution of the species within site</li> <li>• Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting processes of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• No significant disturbance to the species</li> <li>• Distribution and viability of freshwater pearl mussel host species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting processes of habitats supporting freshwater pearl mussel host species</li> </ul>
Qualifying Interest(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Atlantic salmon</li> <li>• Freshwater pearl mussel</li> <li>• Otter</li> </ul>
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Atlantic salmon, 2007. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Freshwater pearl mussel, 2005. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Otter, 2007. Favourable maintained.</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	In terms of development, none at present but possible future water abstraction for Aberdeen and Aberdeenshire development proposals.
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effects on water quality including sewerage treatment, release of minerals, contamination or other waste</li> <li>• Functioning of flood plains and the river system</li> <li>• Water abstraction</li> <li>• Micro-hydro schemes</li> <li>• Disturbance to otter</li> <li>• River engineering</li> <li>• Rainbow trout fisheries</li> <li>• Relevant settlements: Braemar, Ballater, Dinnet</li> </ul>

Name of European Site	River South Esk
Site Type	Special Area of Conservation
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying habitats that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population of the species, including range of genetic types for salmon, as a viable component of the site</li> <li>• Distribution of the species within site</li> <li>• Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting processes of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• No significant disturbance to the species</li> <li>• Distribution and viability of freshwater pearl mussel host species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting processes of habitats supporting freshwater pearl mussel host species</li> </ul>
Qualifying Species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Atlantic salmon</li> <li>• Freshwater pearl mussel</li> </ul>
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Atlantic salmon, 2007. Unfavourable recovering.</li> <li>• Freshwater pearl mussel, 2009. Unfavourable no change.</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	Diffuse pollution from agricultural operations, illegal collection of freshwater pearl mussels, morphological alterations to river channel
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effects on water quality including sewerage treatment, release of minerals, sedimentation, contamination or other waste</li> <li>• Functioning of flood plains and the river system</li> <li>• Changes to natural river morphology</li> <li>• Relevant Settlement: Angus Glens</li> </ul>

Name of European Site	River Spey – Insh Marshes
Site Type	Special Protection Area
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population of the species as a viable component of the site</li> <li>• Distribution of the species within the site</li> <li>• Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting process of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of the species</li> </ul>
Qualifying Interest(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hen harrier (<i>Circus cyaneus</i>)</li> <li>• Osprey (<i>Pandion haliaetus</i>)</li> <li>• Spotted crake (<i>Porzana porzana</i>)</li> <li>• Whooper swan (<i>Cygnus Cygnus</i>)</li> <li>• Wigeon (<i>Anus Penelope</i>)</li> <li>• Woodsandpiper (<i>Tringa galeola</i>)</li> </ul>
Site Type	Ramsar Site
Feature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Breeding bird assemblage</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood-plain fen</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mesotrophic loch</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tropic range river/stream</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whooper swan (<i>Cygnus Cygnus</i>)</li> </ul>
Site description	<p>The River Spey-Insh Marshes site is a mosaic of freshwater wetland habitats. The River Spey is considered to be a unique example in Britain of a large, high altitude, but slow flowing river. Loch Insh is, however, noted for its exceptionally rapid water turnover and is an excellent example of a mesotrophic loch, an uncommon type in Britain. The Insh Marshes form the largest, most northerly, single-unit flood-plain mire of the poor fen type in Great Britain.</p> <p>The boundaries of the Ramsar site are coincident with those of the River Spey-Insh Marshes SSSI.</p>
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hen harrier (<i>Circus cyaneus</i>), 2010. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Osprey (<i>Pandion haliaetus</i>), 2009. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Spotted crake (<i>Porzana porzana</i>), 2005. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Whooper swan (<i>Cygnus Cygnus</i>), 2010. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Wigeon (<i>Anus Penelope</i>), 2010. Unfavourable no change.</li> <li>• Woodsandpiper (<i>Tringa galeola</i>), 2005. Unfavourable declining.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Breeding bird assemblage, 2005. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Floodplain fen, 2005. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Mesotrophic loch, 2010. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Trophic range river/stream, 2005. Favourable maintained.</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	Potential impacts from new development due to additional nutrient loading
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recreational disturbance from development in neighbouring areas</li> <li>• Effects on water quality including sewerage treatment, release of minerals, contamination or other waste</li> <li>• Functioning of flood plains and the river system</li> <li>• Relevant settlements: Kingussie, Kinncraig, Newtonmore, Insh</li> </ul>

Name of European Site	River Spey
Site Type	Special Area of Conservation
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying habitats that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population of the species, including range of genetic types for salmon, as a viable component of the site</li> <li>• Distribution of the species within site</li> <li>• Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting processes of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• No significant disturbance to the species</li> <li>• Distribution and viability of freshwater pearl mussel host species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting processes of habitats supporting freshwater pearl mussel host species</li> </ul>
Qualifying Interest(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Atlantic salmon</li> <li>• Freshwater pearl mussel</li> <li>• Otter</li> <li>• Sea lamprey</li> </ul>
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Atlantic salmon, 2005. Unfavourable recovering.</li> <li>• Freshwater pearl mussel, 2005. Unfavourable recovering.</li> <li>• Otter, 2007. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Sea lamprey, 2011. Favourable maintained.</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	In terms of development, increased loadings on wastewater treatment works and new septic tanks
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effects on water quality including sewerage treatment, release of minerals, contamination or other pollution and waste</li> <li>• Functioning of flood plains and the river system</li> <li>• Abstraction of water</li> <li>• Disturbance to otter</li> <li>• Relevant settlements: Dalwhinnie, Newtonmore, Kingussie, An Camus Mòr, Aviemore, Inverdrue, Kincaig, Insh, Boat of Garten, Carr-Bridge, Dulnain Bridge, Nethy Bridge, Grantown-on-Spey, Cromdale, Tomintoul, Laggan, Glenmore, Glenlivet</li> <li>• Construction of link bridge between An Camas Mor and Aviemore</li> </ul>

Name of European Site	River Tay
Site Type	Special Area of Conservation

Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species (listed below) or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying habitats that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population of the species, including range of genetic types for salmon, as a viable component of the site</li> <li>• Distribution of the species within site</li> <li>• Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting processes of habitats supporting the species</li> <li>• No significant disturbance to the species</li> <li>• Distribution and viability of freshwater pearl mussel host species</li> <li>• Structure, function and supporting processes of habitats supporting freshwater pearl mussel host species</li> </ul>
Qualifying interests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Atlantic salmon (<i>Salmo salar</i>)</li> <li>• Brook lamprey (<i>Lampetra planeri</i>)</li> <li>• Clear-water lakes or lochs with aquatic vegetation and poor to moderate nutrient levels</li> <li>• Otter (<i>Lutra lutra</i>)</li> <li>• River lamprey (<i>Lampetra fluviatilis</i>)</li> <li>• Sea lamprey (<i>Petromyzon marinus</i>)</li> </ul>
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Atlantic salmon (<i>Salmo salar</i>), 2007. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Brook lamprey (<i>Lampetra planeri</i>), 2010. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Clear-water lakes or lochs with aquatic vegetation and poor to moderate nutrient levels, 2009. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Otter (<i>Lutra lutra</i>), 2007. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• River lamprey (<i>Lampetra fluviatilis</i>), 2010. Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Sea lamprey (<i>Petromyzon marinus</i>), 2010. Favourable maintained.</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	In terms of development, none at present
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effects on water quality including sewerage treatment, release of minerals, contamination or other waste</li> <li>• Functioning of flood plains and the river system</li> <li>• Disturbance to otter</li> <li>• Relevant settlements: Blair Atholl, Killiecrankie, Bruar/Pitagowan, Glenshee</li> </ul>

Name of European Site	The Maim
Site Type	Special Area of Conservation
Conservation	To avoid deterioration of the qualifying habitat (listed below) thus

Objectives	<p>ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying habitat that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent of the habitat on site</li> <li>• Distribution of the habitat within site</li> <li>• Structure and function of the habitat</li> <li>• Processes supporting the habitat</li> <li>• Distribution of typical species of the habitat</li> <li>• Viability of typical species of the habitat</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of typical species of the habitat</li> </ul>
Qualifying Interest(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dry heaths</li> </ul>
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dry heaths, 2010. Unfavourable no change.</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	<p>In terms of development, none at present</p>
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	<p>No specific vulnerabilities identified</p>

Name of European Site	Tulach Hill and Glen Fender Meadows
Site Type	Special Area of Conservation
Conservation Objectives	<p>To avoid deterioration of the qualifying habitat (listed below) thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and</p> <p>To ensure for the qualifying habitat that the following are maintained in the long-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent of the habitat on site</li> <li>• Distribution of the habitat within site</li> <li>• Structure and function of the habitat</li> <li>• Processes supporting the habitat</li> <li>• Distribution of typical species of the habitat</li> <li>• Viability of typical species of the habitat</li> <li>• No significant disturbance of typical species of the habitat</li> </ul>
Qualifying Interest(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Geyer's whorl snail (<i>Vertigo geyeri</i>)</li> <li>• Round-mouthed whorl snail</li> <li>• Dry grasslands and scrublands on chalk or limestone</li> <li>• Limestone pavements</li> <li>• Dry heaths</li> <li>• Base-rich fens</li> </ul>
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Geyer's whorl snail (<i>Vertigo geyeri</i>), 2004, Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Round-mouthed whorl snail 2010, Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Dry grasslands and scrublands on chalk or limestone, 2010, Favourable recovered.</li> <li>• Limestone pavements, 2010, Favourable maintained.</li> <li>• Dry heaths, 2010, Favourable, recovered.</li> <li>• Base-rich fens 2010 Favourable, recovered.</li> </ul>
Factors currently influencing site	In terms of development, none at present
Vulnerabilities to change/potential effects of the Plan	No specific vulnerabilities identified

**Appendix 2**  
**HRA Screening Matrix**

The screening Matrix is a separate spreadsheet for electronic copies of this HRA

**Appendix 3**  
**Matrix for in-combination effects**

The screening exercises have identified a number of minor residual effects from the aspects Local Development Plan (LDP) and other Plans, Projects and Strategies. These are set out in the matrices below for each Natura site where these effects have been identified. The combination of these has been considered to see if they result in an effect that is likely to be significant. Where these likely significant effects (LSE) have been identified an appropriate assessment will be necessary to detail these further and set out what, if any, mitigation is possible.

When determining whether there is a likely significant affect the level and source of the residual effects are considered. The level of effect is a combination of the potential population increase from individual settlements and the distance to the designated site. A scale of low, negligible or none is used and it is a matter of judgement as to what the level is most likely to be. The terms medium or high are not used to avoid confusion with LSE for Appropriate Assessments (AAs). When determining if the combination is likely to be significant, a judgement is made considering the number of 'low' effects, total potential population increase within the catchment and other circumstances which are described in the matrix.

<b>Natura Site: Cairngorms Massif SPA</b>							
Aspect of plan (Source)	Description of source of effect	Qualifying feature potentially effected	Nature of effect: Recreational disturbance	Nature of effect: Pollution of water course	Nature of effect: Siltation of water course	Nature of effect: Loss of habitat	Nature of effect: Loss of supporting habitat
An Camas Mòr	1500 houses  Recreational disturbance on from long distance walkers	Golden Eagle	Though the site is remote there may be some small effect.				
Aviemore and Vicinity	336 houses  Recreational disturbance from long distance walkers	Golden Eagle	Though the site is remote there may be some small effect.				

CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AS MODIFIED  
Habitats Regulations Appraisal Record

Ballater	258 houses Recreational disturbance from long distance walkers	Golden Eagle	Though the site is remote there may be some small effect.				
Braemar	79 Houses Recreational disturbance from long distance walkers	Golden Eagle	Though the site is remote there may be some small effect.				
Killiecrankie	12 Houses Recreational disturbance from long distance walkers	Golden Eagle	Negligible effect from small number of houses and size of SPA.				
Nethy Bridge	Housing allocation Recreational disturbance from long distance walkers	Golden Eagle	Negligible effect from small number of houses and size of SPA.				
Tomintoul	26 houses Recreational disturbance from long distance walkers	Golden Eagle	Negligible effect from small number of houses and size of SPA.				
Is combination likely to be a significant effect? Why?			There is a potential increase in disturbance from an increase in recreational usage of more remote areas. However, volumes are likely to be low given the distance and nature of the terrain. Furthermore, nesting sites on the western side of the SPA already have a line of sight to footpaths so that birds are used to recreational usage. Such small increases in recreational use mean that there is no likelihood from any settlement of a significant effect.				
<b>Conclusion: is an Appropriate Assessment required?</b>			<b>No</b>				



<b>Natura Site: Loch Vaa SPA</b>							
Aspect of plan (Source)	Description of source of effect	Qualifying feature potentially effected	Nature of effect: Recreational disturbance	Nature of effect: Pollution of water course	Nature of effect: Siltation of water course	Nature of effect: Loss of habitat	Nature of effect: Loss of supporting habitat
An Camas Mòr	1500 houses  Recreational disturbance on from long distance walkers	Slavonian Grebe	Site not used by Grebes and no action to improve conservation status. No effect.				
Aviemore and Vicinity	336 houses Recreational disturbance from long distance walkers	Slavonian Grebe	Site not used by Grebes and no action to improve conservation status. No effect.				
Carr-Bridge	Housing allocation houses 3.9 km  Recreational disturbance from long distance walkers or those arriving by car	Slavonian Grebe	Site not used by Grebes and no action to improve conservation status. No effect.				

<p>Boat of Garten Main Issue Report Boat of Garten Appropriate Assessment did not find any MRE</p>	<p>30 houses 2.3km Recreational disturbance from long distance walkers or those arriving by car</p>	<p>Slavonian Grebe</p>	<p>Site not used by Grebes and no action to improve conservation status. No effect.</p>				
<p>Is combination likely to be a significant effect? Why?</p>			<p>There would be no disturbance because birds have not used the site in recent year. Reasons for this are national and not affected by local conditions. In addition nature of possible disturbance is not walkers (with or without dogs) and so no direct effect from housing. Birds breed and raise chicks away from accessible areas and are less prone to disturbance.</p>				
<p><b>Conclusion: is an Appropriate Assessment required?</b></p>			<p><b>No</b></p>				

<b>Natura Site: Muir of Dinnet SPA/Ramsar</b>							
Aspect of plan (Source)	Description of source of effect	Qualifying feature potentially effected	Nature of effect: Recreational disturbance	Nature of effect: Pollution of water course	Nature of effect: Siltation of water course	Nature of effect: Loss of habitat	Nature of effect: Loss of supporting habitat
Dinnet	19 houses 2.1km Disturbance from walkers	Greylag goose waterfowl assemblage	Unlikely due to species –roosting on water over night and loch large enough to provide refuges.				
Is combination likely to be a significant effect? Why?			No combination.				
<b>Conclusion: is an Appropriate Assessment required?</b>			<b>No: there is only a single MRE therefore no in-combination effects</b>				

<b>Natura Site: River Spey Insh Marshes SPA/Rmasar</b>							
Aspect of plan (Source)	Description of source of effect	Qualifying feature potentially effected	Nature of effect: Recreational disturbance	Nature of effect: Pollution of water course	Nature of effect: Siltation of water course	Nature of effect: Loss of habitat	Nature of effect: Loss of supporting habitat
Kincraig and vicinity	46 houses  Recreational disturbance from walkers	Osprey	Osprey have nested in open view and are habituated to high levels of activity. Addition from LDP will be unnoticed				
Kingussie	304 houses 300m away Recreational Disturbance	Hen Harrier, osprey, spotted crane, whooper swan, widgeon, wood sandpiper	Mainly walkers however access to the site is very difficult due to boggy nature. Also controlled viewing is available from hides on reserve				
Newtonmore	220 houses 200m away  Recreational Disturbance	Hen Harrier, osprey, spotted crane, whooper swan, widgeon, wood sandpiper	Birds likely to be only feeding if they are in this part of site, disturbance will not be significant				

Is combination likely to be a significant effect? Why?	No, the nature of the effects is diffuse and on less critical aspects of bird occupation of site				
<b>Conclusion: is an Appropriate Assessment required?</b>	<b>No</b>				

<b>Natura Site: River Spey SAC</b>							
Aspect of plan (Source)	Description of source of effect	Qualifying feature potentially effected	Nature of effect: Recreational disturbance	Nature of effect: Pollution of water course	Nature of effect: Siltation of water course	Nature of effect: Loss of habitat	Nature of effect: Loss of supporting habitat
A9 widening – Project not within LDP	General effect listed in project HRA	Fresh water Pearl Mussel, Atlantic Salmon, Sea Lamprey		From construction activity	From construction activity	From new structures	
Is combination likely to be a significant effect? Why?				Single effect	Single effect	Single effect	
<b>Conclusion: is an Appropriate Assessment required?</b>			<b>No – only source of MRE is from project not within LDP</b>				

## Appendix 4

### Glossary of terms and abbreviations

<b>Appropriate Assessment (AA)</b>	The part of the Habitats Regulations Appraisal which assesses the LSEs on Natura Sites to ensure that they would not have an adverse effect on the site integrity (by applying mitigation) either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.
<b>CNPA</b>	Cairngorms National Park Authority
<b>Competent Authority</b>	The decision making body required under the Habitats Directive to undertake HRA. This includes Scottish Government, National Park Authorities or Local Authorities.
<b>CPP</b>	Core Paths Plan
<b>Habitats Regulation Appraisal (HRA)</b>	The whole appraisal process for determining effects upon Natura Sites. It includes Appropriate Assessments. It is a requirement by the Habitats Directive that competent authorities carry out HRAs where a plan or project affects a Natura site.
<b>LDP</b>	Cairngorms National Park Local Development Plan
<b>LSE</b>	Likely Significant Effect – an effect on a natura site that cannot be ruled out on the basis of objective information.
<b>MRE</b>	Minor Residual Effect – an effect on a natura site that is not significant. MREs must be considered in combination since they may combine to create a LSE
<b>Natura Sites</b>	Collective term for Special Protection Areas and Special Areas of Conservation
<b>Ramsar sites</b>	Ramsar sites are wetlands of international importance designated under the Ramsar Convention 1971. Not technically Natura sites they are however usually also SPAs. They are included within the HRA process by convention.
<b>Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</b>	An area designated for the protection of habitats and species. Authorised under Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora (commonly called the “Habitats Directive”). One of three designation to be considered in a HRA
<b>Special Protection Area (SPA)</b>	An area designation for the protection of birds. Authorised by the Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council (commonly called the “Birds Directive”). One of three designation to be considered in a HRA

## Appendix 5

### Record of changes in response to consultation

In total there have been several hundred individual changes to the HRA, many of these have been corrections and minor clarifications. To ensure the main points remain salient not all have been included here but only those of significance and/or that have changed the outcome of an assessment in either screening or the appropriate assessment. It should be noted that the comments by SNH were made back in summer 2013 and that the evidence base and case work has developed the approach to HRAs for capercaillie since then.

Comment	CNPA response	Action within HRA	Action within LDP
<b>Scottish Natural Heritage - September 2013</b>			
The principle issue for SNH was been to ensure the HRA reflects the dynamics of meta population of capercaillie on Strathspey and Deeside. They advised that all the settlements in Strathspey as far south as Kincaig together with Ballater and Braemar should be screened in for having a LSE and considered in the AA	Greater evidence on this issue arose following the completion of the original draft in February 2013. We accept that this is necessary to undertake an assessment of the effect of not only direct impact from settlements, and some tourist allocations, but also the indirect effect arising from the meta-population dynamics of these two areas.	All of the relevant settlements have been rescreened to consider these indirect effects. In all cases more LSE were identified and these have been included in the screening matrix (appendix 2) the summary tables 4 and 6 as well as within the appropriate assessment. This has ensured that they are included within the scope of mitigation	The LDP has had the wording of settlement statements changed to ensure that these issues are picked up for any future planning application. The list of natura sites has been added to within each relevant settlement section to include all SPAs that could be affected either directly or indirectly.
The Maim SAC should be included making 43 sites to be considered.	agreed	This has been included within the list of Sites in appendix I and implications of the plan have been considered against this site. None were found.	None required
Not clear what mitigation to the	This candidate CP was not taken forward in the	None required. The assessment for the	None required

<p>proposed core path between ACM and Aviemore has been applied to mean no LSE.</p>	<p>final version of the LDP and so this has been removed from the HRA</p>	<p>effects of construction was included within the assessment for ACM.</p>	
<p>The screening for effects on capercaillie in section 3.4.17 appear to rely on set distances and we consider the issues should be based upon professional judgement.</p>	<p>We feel the original text didn't convey the whole assessment process which used these thresholds as guides rather than strict boundaries of effect. In reality advice from ecologists and access specialists was taken into account. The later consideration of meta population dynamics further reinforced the process never the less the distance boundaries did allow for some background relative to research on frequency and distance recreation is likely to take place from resident's homes.</p>	<p>An explanation of this point ha been added to the text to make the relative balance between the matrix as a guide and the assessment by specialists</p>	<p>None required</p>
<p>Table four should reflec the conclusion of the rescreening of settlements for direct and impacts on capercaillie. A number of additions is suggested to this and table 6</p>	<p>Agreed for reason set out above</p>	<p>Tables 4 and 6 have been updated to include the new outcomes of screening. This means more settlements have been identified with LSEs for the seven SPAs for capercaillie.</p>	<p>These additional sites have been included within the settlement statements as appropriate</p>
<p>4.1.2 Thieves road. It is advised that a LSE is identified for this CCP</p>	<p>Since this advice was given SNH has undergone and HRA/AA for this track and has concluded no adverse effect on site integrity</p>	<p>The Thieves road is included within the AA (Cairngorms SPA) where it is concluded that there would be no adverse effect on</p>	<p>None required</p>

		site integrity	
4.1.3, 4.1.4, 4.1.5, 4.1.6, 6.4.2, 6.4.3.: policy caveats required as mitigation have not been carried through to the LDP	This was noted and also picked up by the SG reporter who has required these caveats to be included as per the HRA	None required	Policy caveats will be changed as retired by the Report
As noted above the AA should include consideration of the LSE in respect of the five capercaillie SPAs in Strathspey and the two in Deeside.	agreed	This has been undertaken and these have been included within all seven SPAs. Glen Tanar is a new section in the AA	These additional sites have been included within the settlement statements as appropriate
AA Cairngorms SPA: Thieves' road is not included, tourism allocations in Coylumbridge and Glenmore should be included	The Thieves Road core path, as well as Glenmore and Inverdrue/Coylumbridge, are now included in the AA for Cairngorms SPA	None required	None required
AA Cairngorms SAC: make it clear that the compensatory habitat referred to in the HRA is in reference to compensation for non-designated habitat loss as a result of ACM and not compensation for loss of Natura habitats.	agreed	Text has been changed to make this clear	None required
A number of inconsistencies have occurred where LSE have been identified as a result of reassessment and so MREs no longer exist.	agreed	Several in-combination assessments were made redundant by the reassessment. They have been removed because the effects were	None required

		elevated to LSE.	
We recommend further discussion with access colleagues on the Highburnside CCP to see if a LSE is realistic.	Agreed :discussions were undertaken and the effect was considered to be neutral or even positive in respect to Kinveachy SPA	Outcome of assessment has been changed and changes to the AA made accordingly.	None required
We presume there is a typing error and that the allocation is for 58 not 258 houses in Ballater	The Allocation in this plan is for 50 houses and there are 8 with consent. The figure of 258 is the total possible land supply that goes beyond this plan period. It was considered to be precautionary to consider the larger figure in the assessment. This is consistent with the approach for ACM.	None required	None required
6.6.4 and RMP criterion 4: The proposal to require recreational management plans for developments could be subdivided to identify mitigation both on site and off site, the latter to be delivered through developer contributions	The proposals for RMPs does not distinguish between on and off site mitigation measures and there a several delivery mechanisms for both including S75 agreements. These can be decided upon on a case by case basis.	None required	None required
Criterion 10 while proportionality is important the requirement so of natura are paramount	agreed	Caveat made in criterion 10	None required
Appendix I – a number of changes were suggested to add pressure on site	agreed	Changes made as per suggestions	None required

and other clarifications			
Appendix 2, Screening Matrix: again a number of changes were suggested principally aimed at reconsideration of the outcomes for the effects of settlement on the capercaillie SPAs. LSE were recommended in all cases	agreed	Changes made as per suggestions	Additions to settlement statements have been made to list the extra Natura sites with LSES identified.
Appendix 2, Screening Matrix: Boat of Garten was screened out because of a previous HRA however because it is included as a consented site it should be screened in as per other Strathspey settlements	agreed	Changes made as per suggestions	None required
Glenmore, Inverdrue and Coylumbridge have Tourist allocations and allow for enhancements to the facilities. This may bring in more visitor and create greater pressure on the SPAs	agreed	These have now been screened in for LSE and taken in to the AA as a consequence	The standard policy caveats have been added to the LDP
Water abstraction for all the Strathspey settlements supplied by Kinakyle should be screened in for an effect on the River	agreed	Changes made as per suggestions the screening process had already removed these after initial	None required

Spey		mitigation and so no change to the AA was needed.	
Appendix 3, In combination matrix: inconsistencies had arisen because some MREs were now elevated to LSE when reassessed.	agreed	Several sites were removed from the in combination screening because their effect is now LSE and so will go directly into the AA.	None required
<b>SNH – October 2014</b>			
Thieves Road should be reintroduce into the HRA because a LSE was identified by SNH in its own HRA of this proposal, though it was concluded that there was no effect on site integrity	agreed	The references to the Thieves road have been reinstated throughout the HRA. This does not affect the outcome however because of the conclusion of the integrity test was the same	None required for the LDP but despite the CPP being SPG it is subject tot a separate SG inquiry and the result of this is not known at this time. However this will be considered once it has been examined.
Mitigation quoted in the HRA tally with the changes following the examination report	agreed	The wording of the mitigation has been changed as necessary and confirmation of the effect of the new wording made	Changes have already been made in response to the examination report
Updating the site condition	agreed	This has been made through out without exception	None required
Consistency in how with settlement with no allocations or boundaries are recorded	agreed	Settlements without allocations or boundaries are now listed consistently within the screening matrix as having no effect. These are	None required as it has not affected the outcome of the assessment

		now distinct from those with no allocations but with boundaries	
<b>Report on the LDP</b>			
New policy 7a (digital infrastructure)		This was assessed as not having a LSE due aspect being too general	Changes will be made as per the report
Additional wording to TI at Ballater		This was assessed in the screening and LSE was applied, this was taken into the AA	Changes will be made as per the report
Additional wording to TI Coylumbridge and Glenmore		This was assessed in the screening and LSE was applied, this was taken into the AA	Changes will be made as per the report
Removal of HI at Nethybridge		This was reassessed as a reduction of house numbers however due to the proximity of the development to Craigmore and Abernethy the outcome remained the same	Changes will be made as per the report
Removal of portion of HI at Carr-Bridge		This was reassessed as a reduction of house numbers however due to the proximity of the development to Kinveachy and other supporting woodland the outcome remained the same	Changes will be made as per the report
<b>Rothiemurchus</b>			

Supportive of the HRA and sections relative to ACM: paras 14.42, 14.23, 14.22, 14.2.	Support is noted	None required	None required
Paras 281 and 282 should be updated to reflect latest information on capercaillie	Suggestion for updating is noted	The HRA has been reviewed in light of all current information on capercaillie.	None required
<b>RSPB – October 2014</b>			
3.4.4 - unclear whether list of settlements with extant permissions includes single dwellings	It does not include single dwellings	None required	None required
3.4.11 – meaning of this paragraph is difficult to understand	we agree that it may be misread and could be improved upon	This paragraph has been re worded in line with suggested changes	None required
3.4.17 – arbitrary thresholds do not take into account people driving to favoured spots	Thresholds were based upon evidence of use and professional judgement on distance and recreations. However this has been update as a consequence to SNH comments but the reference to walking areas is appropriate.	This section has been modified to include reference to favourite walking locations as an example of areas requiring extra judgement.	None required
3.4.18 – what consideration has been given to infill developments cumulatively adding to the <100 catagory	Smaller developments will be viewed on a case by case basis and cumulative impacts will be considered for each one. Changes made by examination report clear indicate that all developments will be considered for HRA and this will include cumulative and in-	None required	None required

	combination effects		
Table 5 A9 widening – likely to increase visitor pressure on Strathspey	This aspect was considered within A9 project HRA and no residual effect was found.	None required	None required
4.1.5 does reference to Finalised CMS actually mean a draft tone in practice to allow for changes to be consider in the planning process.	The original wording has been superseded by the examination report and the reference to finalised CMS is no longer present. The CMS submitted will be subject to the HRA and modified through mitigation if required	None required	None required
Table 6 - does disturbance to QI include otter?	Yes	The strike through has been removed and the effect of disturbance to otter have been taken through to the AA	None required
ACM compensatory planting of willow scrub	Willow scrub will be planted only on non qualifying habitats and where it would have no effect upon QH, unless it is to reinforce existing willow scrub habitat	None required	None required
Nethy Bridge – H2 remains and is within 2km of Craigmore wood	Agreed. The HRA for proposed development on H1 and H2 concluded a LSE. However based upon this assessment H2 alone is deemed to be too small to have an LSE by itself.	None required	None required

Cairngorms National Park Authority  
14 The Square  
Grantown-on-Spey  
PH26 3HG

Tel: 01479 873535

Fax: 01479 873527

Email: [localplan@cairngorms.co.uk](mailto:localplan@cairngorms.co.uk)

**[www.cairngorms.co.uk](http://www.cairngorms.co.uk)**