



Flood Risk Management Plans 2021-2027: Strategic Environmental Assessment

Post Adoption Statement

For information on accessing this document in an alternative format or language please either contact SEPA by telephone on 03000 99 66 99 or by email to equalities@sepa.org.uk

If you are a user of British Sign Language (BSL) the Contact Scotland BSL service gives you access to an online interpreter enabling you to communicate with us using sign language.

<http://contactscotland-bsl.org/>

www.sepa.org.uk

Strathallan House,
Castle Business Park,
Stirling, FK9 4TZ

Contents

SEA post adoption statement cover note	4
1. Introduction.....	7
2. The environmental effects of the flood risk management plans	12
3. Mitigating and monitoring of significant environmental effects.....	26
Appendix 1: Responses to the consultation on the Environmental report.....	31
Appendix 2: Update to assessment of environmental effects.....	47
Appendix 3: Revision of figures of designated sites	52

SEA post adoption statement cover note

PART 1

To: SEA.gateway@gov.scot

PART 2

A post adoption SEA Statement is attached for the plan, programme or strategy (PPS) entitled:

Flood risk management plans 2021-2027

The Responsible Authority is:

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)

PART 3

Please tick the appropriate box

- The PPS falls under the scope of Section 5(3) of the Act and requires an SEA under the Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005. **or**
- The PPS falls under the scope of Section 5(4) of the Act and requires an SEA under the Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005. **or**
- The PPS does not require an SEA under the Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005. However, we wish to carry out an SEA on a voluntary basis. We accept that, as this SEA is voluntary, the statutory 5 week timescale for views from the Consultation Authorities cannot be guaranteed.

PART 4	
Contact name	Helen Panter
Job Title	Senior Policy Officer, Flood Risk Management
Contact details	<p>Please contact us by email to FRMplanning@sepa.org.uk.</p> <p>For current information about other ways to contact us, please view the FAQs document: https://www2.sepa.org.uk/frmplans/documents/frequently-asked-questions.pdf</p>
PART 5	
Signature (electronic signature is acceptable)	H. Panter
Date	22 December 2021

Abbreviations

EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
LPD	Local Plan District
PVA	Potentially Vulnerable Area
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
SEPA	Scottish Environment Protection Agency
SFM	Sustainable Flood Management
SPA	Special Protection Area
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
SUDS	Sustainable Drainage Systems

1. Introduction

1.1 The flood risk management plans

The Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 introduced a plan-led approach to flood risk management in Scotland. The legislation aims to reduce overall flood risk in the most sustainable manner.

Flood risk management plans set the direction and priorities for flood risk management in Scotland. They are being produced by SEPA, in collaboration with local authorities, Scottish Water and other partners. Key facts about the flood risk management plans are stated in **Table 1.1**.

The plans will be supplemented by the local flood risk management plans which are produced by lead local authorities and describe the delivery and funding arrangements for the agreed priorities. The flood risk management plans and the local flood risk management plans are at the heart of coordinated efforts to tackle flooding in Scotland in the most sustainable way.

1.2 Strategic Environmental Assessment

As part of the preparation of the flood risk management plans, SEPA has undertaken a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). The SEA is required by the Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005 and is a systematic method for considering the likely environmental effects of certain plans, programmes and strategies.

The SEA aims to:

- Integrate environmental factors into the preparation of and decision-making for plans, programmes and strategies.
- Improve plans, programmes and strategies and enhance environmental protection.
- Increase public participation in decision making.
- Facilitate openness and transparency of decision-making.

Note that this SEA only considers the environmental effects of the flood risk management plans and not the local flood risk management plans. Lead local authorities are responsible for determining whether the local flood risk management plans require SEAs.

Further environmental assessment (SEA or Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)) will take place where required as part of more detailed plans and projects.

Table 1.1: Key facts about the flood risk management plans 2021-2027

Responsible Authority	Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
Title	Flood risk management plans 2021-2027
Purpose	To set the overarching direction and priorities for the sustainable management of flood risk in Scotland. To help deliver the vision for sustainable flood risk management, as set out in the Scottish Government guidance on Delivering Sustainable Flood Risk Management¹
What prompted the flood risk management plans	The Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009, which transposes the EU Directive (2007/60/EC) on the assessment and management of flood risks
Date adopted	22 December 2021
Period covered	December 2021 - December 2027 (Cycle 2)
Frequency of updates	Every 6 years (Cycle 1: 2015 – 2021; Cycle 2: 2021 – 2027; Cycle 3: 2027 – 2033)
Area covered	Scotland, via 14 flood risk management plans, one for each Local Plan District
SEA publication	The SEA environmental report and post adoption statement are available on SEPA's website: www.sepa.org.uk/frmplanssea

¹ Scottish Government 2019. Delivering sustainable flood risk management: guidance. Link: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/flood-risk-management-scotland-act-2009-delivering-sustainable-flood-risk-management/>

<p>Flood risk management plan publication</p>	<p>The flood risk management plans 2021-27 are available on SEPA’s website: www.sepa.org.uk/frmplans</p> <p>The findings from the flood risk management plan consultation are also available, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ministerial summary (published December 2021): Summarising outcomes of the public consultation and describing adjustment made to the flood risk management plans as a result of the consultation. • Public consultation digest (due Spring 2022): Detailed analysis of responses to the consultation and description of how SEPA has taken the views into consideration when finalising the flood risk management plans.
<p>Objective of the flood risk management plans</p>	<p>The objective is to reduce overall flood risk in the most sustainable way.</p>
<p>Contact</p>	<p>Please contact us by email at: FRMplanning@sepa.org.uk. For current information about other ways to contact us, please view the FAQs document: https://www.sepa.org.uk/frmplans/documents/frequently-asked-questions.pdf</p>

1.3 SEA activities to date

1.3.1 Screening and scoping

SEPA undertook screening and scoping of the flood risk management plans 2021- 2027 during 2019. SEPA determined that the plans fall within the scope of the Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005, and SEPA included the screening determination within our scoping report.

The scoping report was issued for consultation from 2nd October to 6th November 2019. SEPA received 5 responses to the consultation. The responses were analysed in 2019 and took the views into account as we prepared our environmental report. Due to the cyberattack on SEPA systems in December 2020, SEPA was unable to publish the analysis of the responses in the environmental report as originally planned.

1.3.2 Environmental report and consultation

SEPA prepared an environmental report, which identified, described and evaluated the likely significant effects of the flood risk management plans 2021-2027 and their reasonable alternatives. SEPA consulted on the environmental report from 30 July – 31 October 2021, alongside the consultation on draft flood risk management plans.

The consultation provided an early and effective opportunity for all interested parties - including individuals, community groups, businesses, statutory consultees and other organisations - to offer views on any aspect of the draft flood risk management plans and the environmental report.

SEPA received 11 responses to the consultation on the environmental report of the Strategic Environmental Assessment and over 650 responses to the consultation on the draft flood risk management plans.

The targeted responses received on the environmental report are discussed in **Section 2.2** of this post adoption statement. Additionally, NatureScot's consultation response to the draft plans also contained comments relevant to the environmental report: these comments have been addressed in **Section 2.2** and **Appendix 2** of this post adoption statement.

1.3.3 Post adoption statement (this document)

The purpose of this post adoption SEA statement is to:

- State how environmental considerations have been integrated into the flood risk management plans;
- State how the environmental report has been taken into account;
- State how the responses to the consultation on the draft flood risk management plans and environmental report have been taken into account;
- State the reasons for choosing the flood risk management plans was adopted, in light of the other reasonable alternatives considered;
- Identify the measures to be taken for preventing, reducing and offsetting any significant negative effects;
- Identify the measures that are to be taken to monitor any significant environmental effects of the implementation of the flood risk management plans.

2. The environmental effects of the flood risk management plans

2.1 How environmental considerations have been integrated into the flood risk management plans

The flood risk management plans set out the plan for the management of flood risk in Scotland in a sustainable manner. Environmental considerations have been integrated into the assessment of flood risk, development of national principles, setting objectives and selecting actions, as described below.

2.1.1 Assessment of flood risk

In 2018, SEPA carried out a second national flood risk assessment that identified flood risk to the environment and cultural heritage, as well as to human health and economic activity. SEPA assessed the flood risk to designated environmental and cultural heritage sites by considering the exposure and vulnerability of Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), Special Protection Areas (SPAs), Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), UNESCO World Heritage Sites, Battlefields, Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes, Scheduled Monuments and A-Listed buildings, as agreed with NatureScot and Historic Environment Scotland.

From this assessment, we identified priority areas where the risks of flooding were agreed to be nationally significant: these areas are known as potentially vulnerable areas (PVAs). Within each potentially vulnerable area, target areas have been identified that are the focus of further assessment.

2.1.2 National principles for flood risk management

The flood risk management plans set out three high-level national principles for sustainable flood management as follows:

- Take a long term, risk-based approach to flood risk management decisions and one that considers the impacts of and adaptability to climate change;
- Deliver coordinated and integrated flood risk management by engaging with communities and working in partnership, sharing data, expertise, services and resources; and
- Consider whole catchments and coastlines and work with natural processes and the environment to deliver multiple outcomes.

These overarching principles for sustainable flood risk management underpin the identification of flood risk objectives and actions within the flood risk management plans.

2.1.3 Setting flood risk management objectives

The primary aim of the flood risk management objectives is to reduce overall flood risk and avoid a future increase in flood risk. In the environmental report, SEPA undertook a compatibility assessment to consider the likely significant environmental effects arising from the flood risk management plans objectives. Overall, it was determined that the flood risk management objectives were either compatible or had no/limited relationship with the SEA objectives. No flood risk management objective was found to be incompatible.

2.1.4 Selecting flood risk management actions

The flood risk management plans identify the most sustainable combination of actions to meet the objectives. Building on understanding of flood risk and any previous studies undertaken during the first flood risk management plans (2015 – 2021), environmental constraints and opportunities were reviewed and considered for all target areas at risk and their associated wider catchments and coastal areas.

The environmental impacts of the actions were formally considered through the SEA process. Any significant effects were identified, and activities have been planned to mitigate and monitor these. The review of environmental constraints and opportunities undertaken as part of this SEA assessment will be used to inform and influence the way the future actions will be carried out and the key factors to be considered. Environmental considerations will therefore continue to influence the implementation of the plans.

2.1.5 Habitats Regulations Appraisal

SEPA carried out a Habitats Regulations Appraisal to ensure that the flood risk management plans will not adversely affect the integrity of SACs and SPAs. Mitigation statements have been included in the flood risk management plans where required.

2.1.6 Working in partnership

Throughout the development of the flood risk management plans, SEPA has worked in close partnership with responsible authorities. NatureScot, Historic Environment Scotland and other stakeholders have been involved in the preparation of the draft plans through national and local advisory groups, forums, and have provided detailed input and advice for specific aspects of the plans.

Cross border coordination and input from the responsible authorities in England was facilitated by the Cross Border Advisory Group. This group has a statutory responsibility to advise the relevant authorities in the Solway and Tweed Local Plan Districts on the preparation of their flood risk management plans, including assessment of the potential actions implemented on one side of the border to affect the other side of the border.

2.2. How responses to the SEA consultation have been considered

The responses from the SEA consultation were analysed, and the issues raised were assigned to one of two groups:

1. Issues relevant to the flood risk management plans, rather than the SEA.
2. Issues relevant to the SEA.

How these issues have been considered and addressed is described below.

2.2.1 Responses relevant to the flood risk management plans

Several responses were identified that raised issues relevant to the flood risk management plans consultation rather than the SEA. These issues include:

- “Concerns over exclusion of communities as target areas and lack of information on how potentially vulnerable areas/target areas were determined”
- “Concerns raised over the management of roads drainage and sewer flooding”
- “Concerns about sewerage flooding not being included in the flood risk management plans”
- “Concerns that dredging of waterways and river management is not regularly being carried out and therefore flood risk is potentially increasing.”
- “Concerns about consultation responses not being taken into consideration”
- “Concerns were raised over increased flooding from new development and increase in hard surfacing.”
- “Concerns about the format of the consultation and lack of detail in the proposed actions.”

SEPA’s responses to these issues will be provided within the flood risk management plan ministerial summary and the public consultation digest of responses (see **Table 1.1**), rather than within the SEA.

2.2.2 Responses relevant to the SEA

The responses relevant to the SEA are summarised below along with a description of how the responses have been taken into account. A complete list of responses and a full account of how they have been reflected in the final plans is provided in **Appendix 1**. Please note, for a more integrated and comprehensive analysis, some general aspects of NatureScot's response to the draft plans have been included in the SEA consultation analysis.

The responses relevant to the SEA expressed overall support for SEPA's approach and assessment. (Disagreement tended to be related to the issues about the consultation of the flood risk management plans; see above.) Only a small number of comments have resulted in a change in the environmental report; those changes have been collated in this post adoption document in **Section 2.3** including an updated summary of environmental effects and at **Appendix 2**.

Two key themes have been identified from the SEA consultation responses:

a) Support collaboration and joint working

Historic Environment Scotland and NatureScot both expressed support for continuation of joint working. Opportunities for early consideration of environmental issues were also identified, for example:

- Use of Dynamic Coast project outputs.
- Peatland and river restoration projects.
- Urban environment and blue-green infrastructure initiatives.
- Locations of protected species and invasive non-native species.

Working together is key to delivering flood risk management in Scotland and it has been highlighted as one of the high-level national principles for sustainable flood risk management (**Section 2.1.2**). SEPA will continue to collaborate with partners to tackle flooding in Scotland. In the summary of environmental effects (**Appendix 3**) and mitigation proposals (**Table 3.1**), SEPA has included further recommendations for the involvement of NatureScot and Historic Environment Scotland. Information on how authorities will work

together to deliver actions to manage flood risk will be included in the local flood risk management plans due to be published in 2022.

b) Designated nature conservation sites

NatureScot raised concerns over the accuracy of counts of designated nature conservation sites in the Shetland Local Plan District and provided SEPA with information on recently designated sites that were missing from the assessment. SEPA acknowledges that there were some inaccuracies in the Shetland figures (and also notably for the SSSIs for Highland and Argyll). Revised figures for all Local Plan Districts can be found in **Appendix 3** of this post adoption statement.

The changes to the data do not alter the assessment of significant environmental effects, although there are some potential minor implications. The primary implication is the potential inaccuracy of biodiversity constraints identified for each target area (Tables E-R.3 of the Local Plan District appendices of the environmental report). These constraints are provided to highlight issues for consideration during the development of flood studies, data collection and monitoring, and planning and resilience actions. To avoid any inaccuracies, SEPA has recommended that site-specific environmental assessments be undertaken during the development of flood risk management actions, see **Table 3.1** for details.

SEPA reviewed the assessment, considering whether the revised data would alter the assessment of the impacts of flood schemes and works. SEPA also took into account NatureScot's detailed consultation comments for the relevant target areas. In response, SEPA has:

- Made minor amendments to the assessment for the SEA biodiversity objective for five potential flood protection schemes and works. See **Appendix 2** for full details.
- Reviewed the Habitats Regulations Appraisal to take account of these comments. More information in **Section 2.1.5** in this document.

2.3. Review of environmental assessment, key findings and recommendations

2.3.1 Update to assessment of environmental effects

SEPA has reviewed the environmental assessment and made a small number of updates:

1. Post-consultation changes to the contents of the flood risk management plans:
Changes relevant to the SEA were identified as (i) new national-scale actions; (ii) new actions to design flood schemes /works; and (iii) addition or removal of flood study actions and planning and resilience actions.
2. Consultation responses to the SEA and the flood risk management plans:
Changes to the biodiversity assessment for flood schemes/works, based on consultation feedback.

The detailed update can be found in **Appendix 2**. Given the strategic nature of the assessment, the update does not alter the conclusions about the significant environmental effects of the plans.

2.3.2 Duration and permanency of effects

SEPA has reviewed the assessment to consider whether the effects are short, medium or long-term, and whether the effects are permanent or temporary. These effects are defined as follows:

- Duration: Short duration (up to 1 year), moderate duration (1 – 6 years), long duration (>6 years).
- Permanency: The extent to which effects could be reversed: reversible (reversible with no, little or moderate remediation or small – moderate scale works), permanent (not reversible or only reversible with significant remediation or large scale works).

The assessment is summarised in **Table 2.1**. At this strategic scale of assessment, the majority of the effects identified are anticipated to be of long duration. Effects of short and medium duration are difficult to assess at a strategic scale as these typically require more

detailed information on the location and type and timing of proposals. These are more appropriate to consider as part of project-level assessment.

Table 2.1 Assessment of the duration and permanency of environmental effects

Action type	Likely duration of effects	Likely permanency
Data collection and mapping	Not applicable (neutral effects)	Not applicable (neutral effects)
Planning and resilience	Long term (> 6 years), as long as action is continued	Reversible, for example, if flood warning services are stopped or if people stop using or maintaining property level protection
Flood studies	Not applicable (assessment identified key environmental sensitivities)	Not applicable (assessment identified key environmental sensitivities)
Flood schemes and works at design / implementation stage in Cycle 2 (2021 – 2027)	Majority of effects are long term. Short and medium term effects may arise from construction and maintenance, for example temporary loss of access to green space and recreation, or minor disturbance to habitats and species or sediment.	Effects may be reversible, for example, if flood defences are removed, woodlands are felled, or embankments are reinstated. This is dependent on the size, location and construction method, as removal may be difficult in some situations. Severe adverse effects on rare species or habitats may be difficult to reverse. Frequent or lengthy storage of flood waters may lead to very long duration changes to soil composition that are difficult to reverse.

2.3.3 Potential effects of the flood risk management plans and key recommendations

In response to consultation feedback, we have updated our key recommendations from the environmental report. Specifically, we have included (i) recommendations related to SSSIs; and (ii) recommendations for early engagement and consultation with NatureScot and Historic Environment Scotland. A copy of our summary and updated recommendations can be found in **Table 2.2** below.

Table 2.2 Summary of potential effects of the flood risk management plans and key recommendations by SEA topic.

SEA topic	Summary of potential effects	Key recommendations
Population and human health	Overall, the plans could have a significant positive effect on population and human health. The proposed actions seek to reduce flood risk to a significant number of homes and communities, targeting the most vulnerable communities. In improving the resilience of these communities, this would protect human health and support wellbeing.	Opportunities should be sought to provide and enhance the quality of public open space and improve access to the natural environment, to improve health and wellbeing. Actions should also seek to support local regeneration proposals and to target opportunities towards the most disadvantaged communities.
Biodiversity	Overall, the flood risk management plans could have mixed effects on biodiversity, with effects dependent on the type and location of actions. Where actions provide opportunities for habitat	Potential negative effects can be mitigated through the identification of impacts, sympathetic design and timing of works to avoid or minimise the effects on habitats and wildlife, along with consultation with relevant organisations.

SEA topic	Summary of potential effects	Key recommendations
	<p>protection, restoration and creation, there could be benefits for biodiversity. There is the potential for negative effects where actions may impact on designated sites or disrupt natural processes.</p>	<p>Opportunities for habitat creation or improvement should be sought as actions are progressed. Early consultation with NatureScot is recommended to identify opportunities to deliver improvements to biodiversity and to avoid adverse effects.</p> <p>Potential negative effects on European protected sites are assessed by SEPA as part of the Habitats Regulations Appraisal for the flood risk management plans and mitigation applied where required. Habitats Regulations Appraisal will be applied at more detailed levels of flood risk management planning. Negative effects to nationally important sites such as SSSIs must also be avoided.</p> <p>NatureScot (and where relevant, Natural England) should be consulted where impacting on designated sites.</p>
Water	<p>Overall, the plans could have mixed effects on water, depending on the type and location of actions.</p> <p>There is potential for negative effects on water quality where engineered actions impact on sensitive water environments and the potential for degradation of beds and banks of rivers and</p>	<p>Potential negative effects on the water environment can be mitigated by understanding the effects on physical processes, including flows and erosion, within rivers and coastal waters; minimising potential habitat loss; and including habitat creation in flood risk management actions.</p> <p>Negative effects should be addressed during flood studies and design of flood</p>

SEA topic	Summary of potential effects	Key recommendations
	<p>coastlines. This is balanced with the opportunity to support river basin management plan objectives to prevent deterioration and improve water quality status, with overall positive effects on the water environment.</p>	<p>schemes and works. Early consultation with NatureScot, SEPA and other relevant organisations is recommended to identify opportunities to deliver improvements to water and avoid adverse effects.</p> <p>Actions that can affect the freshwater environment (such as flood storage actions) are regulated under the Controlled Activities Regulations, which aim to protect the water environment. Mitigation is considered as part of the authorisation process.</p> <p>Some actions, particularly those deemed as development, will be regulated under the land use planning system; and environmental effects will be addressed through project-level Environmental Impact Assessments.</p>
<p>Soil</p>	<p>Overall, the plans could have a neutral effect on soil, depending on the quality of the land and extent and location of the action.</p> <p>Potential benefits if high value land and associated soils is protected from flooding, and where carbon-rich soils are restored or improved.</p> <p>Alterations to natural processes, however, could result in the loss</p>	<p>Modelling of natural processes can help to better predict and mitigate potential negative effects on soil. This should be considered during flood studies and design of flood schemes and works.</p> <p>Early consultation with NatureScot is recommended to identify opportunities to deliver improvements to soil (e.g., peatland restoration opportunities) and to avoid adverse effects.</p>

SEA topic	Summary of potential effects	Key recommendations
	or erosion of areas of high value agricultural land or carbon rich soils (e.g., peatland).	
Climatic factors	Overall, the plans could have a positive effect on climatic factors as the actions provide resilience in terms of future climate change whether through structural actions or planning and resilience measures. Actions should be developed in line with the plans' national principles to 'Take a long term, risk-based approach to flood risk management decisions and one that considers the impacts of and adaptability to climate change'.	Flood studies (including adaptation plans) should seek to develop actions and management plans that can be adapted to a changing climate. Flood schemes and works should be designed to include consideration of the long-term impacts of climate change. Opportunities should be sought during flood studies and design of flood schemes and works to avoid highly engineered solutions which could negatively affect greenhouse gas emissions and to minimise the use of non-renewable or high energy resources in maintenance and construction.
Material assets	Overall, the plans could have a significant positive effect on material assets and key infrastructure, where present, by reducing flood risk. This protection of material assets would provide resilience and adaption for future climate change predictions and reduce the resource required to replace assets.	Opportunities to minimise waste and resource use should be examined during flood studies and design of flood schemes and works.

SEA topic	Summary of potential effects	Key recommendations
<p>Cultural heritage</p>	<p>Overall, the plans could have mixed effects on cultural heritage.</p> <p>The actions are likely to benefit the historic environment by helping to improve understanding of flood risk (thereby enabling better adaptation planning) and through reducing the level of flood risk. There is potential for negative effects where the construction of new defences are in areas of high cultural or archaeological sensitivity, although this would be dependent on the type and design and location of actions.</p>	<p>Potentially negative effects on cultural heritage can be mitigated through the identification of any heritage assets (including archaeology) and the early engagement of heritage interests (including Historic Environment Scotland) during flood studies and design of flood schemes and works.</p>
<p>Landscape</p>	<p>Overall, the plans could have neutral effects on landscape. Positive effects on landscape could result from actions that restore or create natural habitats. There is, however, potential for actions that include the construction of new engineered features to interrupt the views of rivers or coasts, or negatively affect the local landscape. These effects depend on the type, design and</p>	<p>Potential negative effects to landscape should be addressed during flood studies and design of flood schemes and works.</p> <p>Opportunities for enhancement of the local landscape and public realm should be considered including expansion of green network infrastructure where appropriate. Catchment-based approaches to flood risk management should seek to identify landscape scale opportunities.</p>

SEA topic	Summary of potential effects	Key recommendations
	location of actions and would likely be localised.	Consultation with NatureScot, National Park Authorities (where appropriate) and affected communities is recommended.

2.4. The reasons for choosing the content of the flood risk management plans in light of reasonable alternatives

SEPA is required to produce the flood risk management plans under the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009. The most sustainable approach for managing flood risk have been chosen in light of reasonable alternatives.

SEPA has developed the plans in collaboration and agreement with local authorities, Scottish Water and other partner organisations.

The plans build on the work undertaken in the first planning cycle (2015 – 2021). Objectives and actions have been developed in an iterative way with consideration of:

- The nature and level of flood risk
- Current flood risk management activities in the target area and wider catchment / coastal area
- Environmental opportunities and constraints in the catchment / coastal area
- Delivery of an integrated and sustainable approach to flood risk management

The consideration of alternatives (and their environmental effects) will continue to be a factor during the implementation of the plans. For example, flood studies will consider a wide range of alternative actions for managing flooding to a community before selecting a preferred combination for further development.

3. Mitigating and monitoring of significant environmental effects

3.1 Mitigation and recommendations

Under the Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005, SEPA is required to identify measures to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant negative environmental effects that might occur as a result of the flood risk management plans.

SEPA did not identify any significant negative effects of the plans. Instead, SEPA has focussed on recommendations to prevent or reduce any non-significant negative effects (see **Table 3.1**). These recommendations will need to be taken forward as part of more detailed stages of flood risk management planning, particularly during the development of flood studies and the design of flood schemes and works. Other organisations including local authorities and Scottish Water, will deliver many of these actions.

Table 3.1: Key recommendations, including measures envisaged for the prevention, reduction and offsetting of any negative effects

Action type	Potential negative effects	Key recommendations
Data collection and mapping	No significant negative environmental effects	While no significant environmental effects were predicted, SEPA recommends that (where relevant) environmental constraints are identified and considered and inform any future flood studies that may arise. SEPA recommends carrying out a site-specific environmental assessment using current data, although the constraints presented in Appendices E to R of the environmental report may be

Action type	Potential negative effects	Key recommendations
		used as an initial guide (noting potential inaccuracies; see Section 2.2.2). This will help to identify potential issues that may need to be addressed through sensitive design and mitigation and consultation with the relevant bodies.
Planning and resilience	No significant negative environmental effects	<p>While no significant negative environmental effects were predicted, SEPA recommends that environmental constraints for each target community and associated wider catchment and coastal areas are considered during implementation.</p> <p>Where relevant, SEPA recommends carrying out a site-specific environmental assessment using current data, although the constraints presented in Appendices E to R of the environmental report may be used as an initial guide (noting potential inaccuracies; see Section 2.2.2). This will help to identify potential issues that may need to be addressed through sensitive design and mitigation and consultation with the relevant bodies.</p>
Flood studies	No significant negative environmental effects	While no significant negative environmental effects were identified, flood studies should be developed with consideration of the environmental sensitivities of the target community and

Action type	Potential negative effects	Key recommendations
		<p>associated wider catchment and coastal areas. Relevant organisations should be consulted early in the study.</p> <p>SEPA recommends flood studies undertake a project-specific environmental assessment, although those environmental constraints presented in Appendices E to R of the environmental report may be used as an initial guide (noting potential inaccuracies; see Section 2.2.2). This will help to identify potential issues that may need to be addressed through sensitive design and mitigation.</p>
<p>Flood schemes and works at design / implementation stage in Cycle 2 (2021 – 2027)</p>	<p>The potential for negative, but not significant, environmental effects, were identified for the following SEA topics: biodiversity, water, cultural heritage and landscape; depending on the location and types of actions. These were primarily from the implementation of actions such as river and coastal defences and storage, conveyance and control. The potential for negative effects were identified in</p>	<p>Project-specific environmental assessment is required to mitigate potential negative effects. The assessment should consider the type, design and timing of works to avoid or minimise the effects on habitats and species, and river and coastal processes. Opportunities for habitat creation and improvement and other environmental enhancements should be sought as design is progressed.</p> <p>Potentially negative effects on cultural heritage can be mitigated through the identification of any heritage assets (including archaeology) and the early</p>

Action type	Potential negative effects	Key recommendations
	specific target areas where these structural actions are proposed in areas with an identified high number of constraints and where the actions could lead to the potential degradation of the coastline and river beds and banks and impact on designated sites and landscape character.	engagement of heritage interests during the design of flood schemes and works. Potential negative effects on landscape should be addressed early during the design of flood schemes and works. NatureScot, Historic Environment Scotland, SEPA and other relevant organisations should be consulted early in the design.

3.2 Monitoring

The Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005 requires SEPA to monitor significant environmental effects of implementing the flood risk management plans. This must be done in such a way as to also identify unforeseen negative effects and to take appropriate remedial action. Monitoring must tell us about the effects of the flood risk management plans themselves rather than wider trends.

SEPA proposes to monitor three aspects of the environment: flood risk, the water environment, and the condition of designated nature conservation sites.

Where possible, SEPA intends to make use of the extensive data collection on the state of the environment undertaken by SEPA and other organisations.

These datasets will be used alongside specific monitoring plans to measure the success of flood risk management.

a. Flood risk

The flood risk management plans are anticipated to have a significant positive effect on population and human health and material assets, as a result of reducing flood risk. SEPA will monitor the effects on flood risk as follows:

- SEPA's overarching ambition for managing flood risk will be set out in our flooding services strategy and implementation plan, due for publication 2022. (This strategy is part of the new national-scale action - future flood risk management planning - in the flood risk management plans). The implementation plan will describe how SEPA will measure success in reducing flood risk: as such, this will also be SEPA's primary monitoring mechanism for the SEA.
- SEPA undertakes a 6-yearly update to the national flood risk assessment (NFRA). If methods and data allow, we will use the NFRA to examine how flood risk has changed.

Note that the effects of individual projects will be monitored according to plans devised as part of the project-level Environmental Impact Assessment. Lead local authorities will also provide an interim report on the progress of delivering the flood risk management actions.

b. The water environment

The plans are anticipated to have a mixed effect on the water environment. SEPA will explore the use of river basin management planning data to better understand the effects of flood risk management actions on the water environment.

c. Condition of designated nature conservation sites

The plans are anticipated to have a mixed effect on biodiversity. In their consultation response, NatureScot suggested SEPA may be able use data on condition of designated nature conservation sites to help monitor the effects of the flood risk management plans. SEPA will work with NatureScot to explore the use of this opportunity.

Appendix 1: Responses to the consultation on the Environmental report

Please note SEA consultation responses relevant to the flood risk management plans consultation, rather than the SEA, are not included in this appendix, as noted in section 2.2 in this document.

Responses from public bodies are reported verbatim; responses from non-public bodies and individuals have been summarised.

A1: Who responded?

SEPA received 11 responses to the consultation via Citizen Space:

- 4 responses from members of community council /community groups.
- 3 responses from other public bodies including consultation authorities (Nature England, NatureScot and Historic Environment Scotland).
- 3 responses from the public.
- 1 blank.

A2. Environmental baseline: Do you think that we have accurately described the relevant aspects of the current state of the environment?

Respondent	Comment	SEPA response	SEPA action
Natural England	Yes	Noted.	No action required
Historic Environment Scotland	Yes, we welcome the summary of the historic environment resource presented in Section 3.8 of the report.	Noted.	No action required
NatureScot	Yes, broadly speaking the report has identified the main relevant aspects of the current state of the environment.	Noted.	No action required
Individual	The baseline should include small communities at flood risk	The flood risk described in the environmental report at a scale appropriate for a strategic level assessment. It is based on the information published in the flood risk management plans. Concerns over exclusion of communities as target areas will be	No action required

		addressed as part of SEPA's response to the flood risk management plan consultation (see Section 2.2.1)	
Individual	The baseline should include activities (such as recycling) that impact on climate change and future flood risk	The environmental baseline describes, at a strategic level, the anticipated effects of climate change on flood risk. It also notes where flood risk management activities can impact, both positively and negatively, on climate change.	No action required
Interest / community group	The baseline should include location of developer's landholdings	We do not have this information.	No action required
Community council	The baseline should include more detail on natural processes and current management for individual catchments	Describing natural processes for individual catchments would be too detailed for a strategic level assessment. Concerns over the lack of information on catchments in the consultation document will be addressed as part of SEPA's response to the flood risk management plan consultation (see Section 2.2.1)	No action required
Community council	The baseline should include future flood damages, risk to life, impacts on wellbeing and the environment:	Future flood damages, risk to life and impacts on wellbeing are identified in the environmental report (section 3), along with a description of the current state of the environment.	No action required

A3. SEA objectives and assessment: Do you think that our objectives and assessment method have enabled us to adequately assess the potential significant environmental effects of the proposed actions?

Respondent	Comment	SEPA response	SEPA action
Natural England	Not sure, Natural England has not made a thorough assessment of this. However, the objectives and assessment method used seem comprehensive and reasonable.	Noted.	No change to SEA
Historic Environment Scotland	Yes, we understand that the scale of the work and detail level of information available (particularly in relation to flood scheme design and implementation) has informed the methodological approach to the assessment. The assessment is therefore generic and high-level in nature. In terms of the assessment objectives for the historic environment we agree that these are appropriate for testing the plan objectives and actions.	Noted.	No change to SEA.
NatureScot	Not sure, in the summary of the potential impacts on protected sites you refer to Habitats Regulations	SEPA notes the advice from NatureScot. In the environmental	Change to SEA post adoption

	<p>Assessment, which is only applicable to European designated sites. We recommend that SSSIs, which are afforded protection through policies protecting nationally important conservation sites, should also be considered as part of the SEA process. In Table 4.2 [of the environmental report], impacts on SSSIs are however correctly acknowledged.</p> <p>We are pleased to note reference to opportunities for habitat creation or improvement and the ambition to work with natural processes. We will be happy to work with SEPA to realise these ambitions and our detailed response to the district plans highlight a number of opportunities.</p>	<p>report, summary of potential effects of the draft flood risk management plans key recommendations, reference is made to Habitats Regulation Appraisal in the biodiversity section. However, SEPA can confirm SSSIs have been considered through all the assessment.</p> <p>SEPA welcomes those references that point opportunities to specific Local Plan Districts. SEPA welcomes the joint working initiative and further considerations have been included at Section 2.2.2 in this document.</p>	<p>statement: further reference of SSSIs at Table 2.2. in this document.</p>
<p>Interest/ community group</p>	<p>Forestry operations might have an impact on flood risk.</p>	<p>Scottish Forestry regularly liaises with SEPA's planning service. The UK Forestry Standard Guidelines for Forests and Water also include guidelines regarding clear felling in areas of high flood risk.</p>	<p>No change to SEA.</p>

A4. Do you think that we have accurately assessed the potential significant environmental effects of the proposed actions?

Respondent	Comment	SEPA response	SEPA action
Natural England	Yes, based on the types of actions detailed in this assessment, Natural England agrees that the potential significant environmental effects have been accurately identified.	Noted.	No action required.
Historic Environment Scotland	Yes. The assessment recognises the compatibility between the objectives of the plan objectives and the protection of the historic environment at the national scale. Furthermore, the assessment of the planning and resilience action notes that there will be a positive impact for the historic environment while recognising that impacts on individual sites may need assessed and mitigated as part of any detailed design stage.	Noted. Mitigation is proposed in Table 3.1.	No action required.

<p>NatureScot</p>	<p>No, we note the blended approach of local and national scale assessments and consider this to be suitably pragmatic for a plan of such scale. We are grateful that you have shared your working for the overall Habitats Regulations Assessment. For completeness we have, under separate cover, provided a current full list of designated SPAs and SACs, which includes the suite of marine SPAs sites established in December 2020. For the most part, these new sites will have a limited impact on the overall assessment, but are worth including to screen for any Likely Significant Effects at specific locations early on in the process; for example, the proposed road improvement at Cullivoe, Yell is close to part of the Bluemull and Colgrave Sounds SPA, designated as a foraging area for breeding red throat diver.</p>	<p>Approach: The environmental assessment is strategic and high level. It considers the potential effects of the types of actions identified for each of the 14 Flood risk management plans and, on a combined basis, across Scotland. Designated sites: SEPA can confirm the current full list of designated SPAs and SACs is now included in the Habitat Regulation Assessment and our counts of protected sites by Local Plan District.</p>	<p>Change to SEA: Amendments included in our environmental assessment (see Appendix 2) and Habitats Regulation Appraisal for Cullivoe to take account of the recently designated SPA.</p>
-------------------	--	--	--

A5. Do you think that we have proposed appropriate mitigation of the significant negative environmental effects?

Respondent	Comment	SEPA response	SEPA action
Natural England	Not sure, Natural England broadly agrees with the proposed mitigation. However, we expect that Nature Scot will be consulted on any proposals as they come forward and will carry out Habitat Regulations Assessments for any potential impacts on European Sites. Similarly, Nature Scot should be consulted regarding the potential for impacts on National Sites. Any opportunities for habitat creation should be perused.	In the development of the flood risk management plans, SEPA consulted with NatureScot on the Habitats Regulations Appraisal. No cross-border impacts were identified. Wider opportunities for habitat creation and other catchment-based actions will be identified in the flood studies carried out by the responsible authorities.	Changes to the SEA post adoption statement: amended the mitigation recommendations (Table 3.1) to include consultation with NatureScot and other relevant organisations.
Historic Environment Scotland	Yes, while no significant negative environmental effects have been identified for the historic environment, we welcome the recognition that nature of effects will be	Noted.	No change to SEA

	dependent on the location and design of actions.		
NatureScot	<p>Yes, the overall impacts in this necessarily high-level environmental report are correctly identified. We note that site specific effects will be addressed during flood studies and the design of flood schemes and works. We are happy to work with SEPA as the details become available.</p> <p>In Table 5.3 [of the environmental report] for Landscape you recommend consultation with NatureScot in developing mitigation options. We would encourage this course of action for Biodiversity, Soil and Water too.</p> <p>In Table 6.1 [of the environmental report], although perhaps implied under potential negative effects on habitats and wildlife, the potential for negative impacts of coastal defence works on coastal processes should be explicitly mentioned.</p>	SEPA welcomes further opportunities for partnership working and collaboration.	<p>Changes to SEA post adoption statement added at Table 3.1, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) amended the mitigation recommendations to include consultation with NatureScot and other organisations; (ii) amended the recommendations in the summary table to include consultation with NatureScot under a range of SEA topics; (iii) added further reference to potential negative impacts from coastal defence works.

A6. Are there any other ways in which we could monitor the significant environmental effects of the flood risk management plans?

Respondent	Comment	SEPA response	SEPA action
Natural England	Natural England does not have any additional suggestions regarding monitoring the effects of these plans.	Noted.	No action required.
NatureScot	In addition to national flood risk assessment and river basin management planning, data from our site condition monitoring could be utilised.	SEPA welcomes opportunities to use site condition data for monitoring purposes and will look for opportunities to liaise with NatureScot.	Change in the SEA post adoption statement: Our monitoring proposals (Section 3.2) have been amended to consider the use of NatureScot site condition databases.
Community Council	Provide a two ways mechanism of communication for communities and responsible authorities. Ideally, to provide a dedicated interface for communities to record adverse and beneficial impacts/actions for feedback	SEPA recognises the potential value of establishing two ways of communication with communities to understand the impacts of flood risk management actions locally. SEPA will pass this suggestion to local authorities.	No change to the SEA.

	and iteration that allows communities a voice/ means of action.		
Individual	Include and consider flood local data records collected by community volunteering groups that could inform monitoring of actions and decision making for further improvements.	To assess the effects of the flood risk management plans at a strategic level, SEPA needs to make use of consistent nation-wide data. However, SEPA recognises the potential value for working with communities to help monitor the impacts of flood risk management actions locally. SEPA will pass this suggestion to local authorities to consider as part of monitoring for flood schemes and works.	No change to SEA

A7. Please provide any comments on the Environmental Assessment for the individual Local Plan Districts (appendices E-R)

Respondent	Comment	SEPA response	SEPA action
Natural England	Natural England (Northumbria Area Team) agrees with the assessment of Appendix Q, Assessment for Local Plan District 13: Tweed and requests that we are made	Possible physical interventions will be confirmed by the local authority (Scottish Borders Council) once	No action required.

	<p>aware when the physical interventions at Peebles, Lindean and Hawick are brought forward.</p>	<p>the Scottish Government has concluded the flood risk management funding review process. These will be made public in the local flood risk management plan (Local Plan District 13: Tweed) due to be published in 2022.</p>	
<p>Historic Environment Scotland</p>	<p>We welcome the objectives and actions put forward in the 14 Local Plan District flood risk management plans and agree with the findings presented in the environmental assessment accompanying the plan as they relate to the historic environment. We look forward to continuing to work with all stakeholders as detail on the location and design of actions and proposals for flood management protection schemes are brought forward</p> <p>We note that no significant effects relating to the historic environment have been identified as part of assessment of flood schemes and works design and implementation.</p>	<p>SEPA welcomes and supports further partnership working during the implementation of the plans.</p>	<p>Change in the SEA post adoption statement: a recommendation for project-specific has been added to the mitigation proposals (Table 3.1)</p>

	<p>Mixed effects have been identified in relation to proposed schemes at Blairninich, Dingwall (Highland Local Plan District), Aberfeldy and Pitlochry (Tay Local Plan District) and Peebles (Tweed Local Plan District). On the basis of the information available at this level we are content to agree with this assessment.</p> <p>As discussed earlier, the high level nature of the assessment focuses on identified sensitivity to different actions based on the prevalence of historic environment assets in the target areas. This approach reflects the nature of the strategies at this stage of development and does not offer an assessment of individual impacts on historic environment assets.</p>		
NatureScot	<p>We have provided detailed comments, where appropriate, for individual target areas in our online response to the 14 Local Plan Districts (LPDs). In each of the plans, marine areas have been omitted from the summary maps, although reference is made to them in the text. The rationale for this is not given, but it is an omission. We have not undertaken an analysis of</p>	<p>Marine Protected Areas: Marine Protected Areas have been included in the assessment, although they were not shown on the maps. SEPA recognises that it would have been helpful to show the marine areas on the summary</p>	<p>Changes to SEA post adoption statement: (i) Appendix 2 reports minor changes to Biodiversity</p>

	<p>the tally of designated sites in each of the LPDs; however we recommend this is checked as there are errors, for example in Shetland you state: 1 marine protection areas (MPA) (2 – these are mixed, not exclusively marine sites); 12 Ramsar Sites (1); 11 SACs (12, plus Pobie Bank Reef offshore); 47 SPAs (15, including the three new marine SPAs which, together with the marine extensions to several seabird SPAs, which are not shown on the map); 1 SSSI (78). However, for the Outer Hebrides LPD the figures appear accurate. The designated sites in each LPD should be checked and, where necessary, rectified as such inaccuracies undermine confidence in the document.</p> <p>The assessments made at this stage are necessarily high level and reflect the nature of the plans. We anticipate that EIA undertaken during the development of individual schemes will provide a more specific analysis.</p>	<p>maps to support the information presented in the table. SEPA will review mapping for future environmental reports.</p> <p>Designated sites: Checks on numbers of designated sites have been carried forward as suggested. Some errors were found:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSSIs figures. • Shetland and Highland designated sites totals. <p>The implications are discussed in Section 2.2.2.</p> <p>SEPA welcomes comments on protected sites and species. As noted in Table 1.1, responses will be passed to local authorities to be consider during production and</p>	<p>assessments; (ii) Appendix 3 contains a correction of figures of designated sites by Local Plan District; (iii) Section 2.2.2 discusses the implications of updates to information on designated sites.</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>Although reference is made to otters as features within protected sites in Tay, Tweed and North East LPDs, they are widespread out with protected sites and in other LPDs such as Shetland and Highland and Argyll. We have made reference to this in our detailed response to the plans, along with observations in relation to other protected species such as fossorial water voles, whose distribution overlaps with several target areas in the Clyde part of the Clyde and Lomond District. Although these will be identified in ecological surveys, prior knowledge is likely to prove useful.</p>	<p>implementation of the local flood risk management plans.</p>	
<p>Community Council</p>	<p>The environmental reports do not cover loss of property, landscape, natural environment for wildlife and the aquatic environment or the threat to the environment in the past.</p>	<p>Noted. The current state of the environment is described in environmental report at a national scale. Flood damages to property, landscape, flora and fauna and water environment are included as part of the assessment.</p>	<p>No change to the SEA.</p>

<p>Interest /community group</p>	<p>Provide full support to the flood management proposals currently being developed by the East Dunbartonshire council. In addition, Milngavie is an historic village and historic assets were affected by flowing waters. This is a part of Scotland which urgently needs to be cared for by an effective flood management plan.</p>	<p>Information on flood risk and support for flood risk management actions will be considered with the flood risk management plan consultation responses. SEPA notes the information on the historic environment, which agrees with the assessment of cultural heritage constraints for Milngavie in the environmental report (Appendix O of the environmental report).</p>	<p>No change to the SEA.</p>
----------------------------------	---	---	------------------------------

Appendix 2: Update to assessment of environmental effects

The table below lists the updates to the assessment of the environmental effects, in response to:

1. Post-consultation changes to the contents of the flood risk management plans
2. Consultation responses to the SEA and the flood risk management plans

The updates do not alter our assessment of significant environmental effects.

Table A2.1: Update to assessment of environmental effects

Local Plan District/ Target area	Reason	Updated assessment	Change to assessment of significant environmental effects
1. Updates following relevant changes to the contents of the flood risk management plans			
ALL	New national-scale data collection and mapping actions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Data to support climate resilience 2. Scottish Flood Defence Asset Database 3. Guidance development 	These actions are anticipated to have neutral effects across all SEA topics. They will, however, play an important role in enabling SEPA and the responsible authorities to help protect people and	No change to overall assessment of significant effects.

	<p>These actions are related to monitoring and data collection, and to producing guidance to support the development of flood risk management actions. They are most aligned with the data collection and mapping actions assessed in the environmental report.</p>	<p>properties from current and future flooding, and help to adapt to climate change.</p>	
ALL	<p>New national-scale planning and resilience action:</p> <p>1. Future flood risk management planning</p> <p>This action focusses on improving how we plan for, and manage, future flood risk. It is aligned with the planning and resilience actions assessed in the environmental report.</p>	<p>This action is anticipated to have significant positive effects on the SEA objectives of population and human health and material assets. Positive (possibly significantly positive) effects on the SEA objective for climatic factors.</p>	<p>No change to overall assessment of significant effects.</p>

Tay Estuary and Montrose Basin / Dundee (270)	Change of action from flood study to design of scheme/works to manage surface water flooding. Detail of schemes/works unspecified.	Potential for positive effects on human health and wellbeing, material assets and climatic factors. Potential negative or neutral impacts on biodiversity due to high value designated nature conservation sites within the target area.	No change to overall assessment of significant effects.
Forth Estuary / Cardenden (209)	Change of action from flood study to design and implementation of scheme/works to manage river flooding. Proposals include defences and flood storage/conveyance/control type actions.	Potential for positive effects on human health and wellbeing, material assets and climatic factors. Potential for negative impacts on the water environment, as 1 or more waterbodies within the catchment is failing to meet their 2027 Water Framework Directive objectives as a result of their physical condition.	No change to overall assessment of significant effects.
Forth Estuary / Linlithgow (246)	Change of action from flood study to design and implementation of scheme/works to manage river and surface water flooding. Proposals include	Potential for positive effects on human health and wellbeing, material assets and climatic factors. This target area has large environmental constraints for biodiversity, water, landscape and cultural heritage -	No change to overall assessment of significant effects.

	defences (bund) and property flood resilience.	flood management activities have potential for negative effects on these receptors, although effects depend on location and design of actions.	
Solway / Moffat (136)	Change of action from flood study options appraisal to design and implementation of scheme/works to manage river and surface water flooding. Detail of scheme/works unspecified.	Potential for positive effects on human health and wellbeing, material assets and climatic factors. There are large cultural heritage constraints in this target area, but the effects are dependent on type, location and design of actions.	No change to overall assessment of significant effects.
ALL	A small number of flood studies and planning/resilience actions have been added, removed or amended.	No change to assessment. Note that where a flood study will be carried out before progressing to design of schemes/works (e.g., Cairneyhill target area in the Forth Estuary Local Plan District) the assessment focusses on the opportunities and constraints for the flood	No change to overall assessment of significant effects.

		study (see Section 2.3.2 of the environmental report).	
2. Update of environmental assessment following relevant SEA and flood risk management plan consultation comments			
Highland and Argyll/ Golspie (333)	<p>NatureScot identified potential negative impacts on protected sites. SEPA has reviewed these comments and identified changes to the assessments for selected flood schemes/works.</p> <p>NatureScot also identified other opportunities and constraints. Whilst the additional information does not alter the SEA conclusions, it is relevant for local authorities as they progress the development of actions.</p>	<p>SEPA has amended the assessment for the design and implementation of flood schemes/works for the selected target areas. SEPA recognises the potential for actions to have negative effects on the SEA objective for biodiversity. The SEA significance scores for biodiversity are thus revised to negative/neutral for the relevant target areas.</p> <p>Note the Habitat Regulations Appraisal conclusions have also been reviewed and amended, if required.</p>	<p>No change to overall assessment of significant effects.</p>
Shetland/ Cullivoe (388)			
Findhorn, Nairn and Speyside/ Rothes (397)			
Tay/ Kirriemuir (241)			
Clyde and Loch Lomond/ Bearsden (103)			

Appendix 3: Revision of figures of designated sites

Table A3.1: Key environmental constraints - Biodiversity: Correction of figures of designated sites by Local Plan District.

LPD 1 Highland and Argyll	Count
Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)	12
Ramsar Sites	1
Special Areas of Conservation (SACs)	106
Special Protection Areas (SPAs)	57
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs)	417
LPD 2 Outer Hebrides	Count
Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)	2
Ramsar Sites	4
Special Areas of Conservation (SACs)	15
Special Protection Areas (SPAs)	14
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs)	48
LPD 3 Orkney	Count
Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)	2
Ramsar Sites	1
Special Areas of Conservation (SACs)	6
Special Protection Areas (SPAs)	9
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs)	27
LPD 4 Shetland	Count
Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)	2
Ramsar Sites	1
Special Areas of Conservation (SACs)	12
Special Protection Areas (SPAs)	13
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs)	77

LPD 5 Findhorn, Nairn and Speyside	Count
Ramsar Sites	4
Special Areas of Conservation (SACs)	17
Special Protection Areas (SPAs)	15
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs)	63
LPD 6 North East	Count
Ramsar Sites	5
Special Areas of Conservation (SACs)	21
Special Protection Areas (SPAs)	15
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs)	86
LPD 7 Tay Estuary and Montrose Basin	Count
Ramsar Sites	3
Special Areas of Conservation (SACs)	5
Special Protection Areas (SPAs)	7
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs)	69
LPD 8 Tay	Count
Ramsar Sites	5
Special Areas of Conservation (SAC)	23
Special Protection Areas (SPA)	11
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	126
LPD 9 Forth	Count
Ramsar Sites	2
Special Areas of Conservation (SACs)	5
Special Protection Areas (SPAs)	2
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs)	54
LPD 10 Forth Estuary	Count
Ramsar Sites	4
Special Areas of Conservation (SACs)	8
Special Protection Areas (SPAs)	9
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs)	103

LPD 11 Clyde and Loch Lomond	Count
Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)	1
Ramsar site	2
Special Areas of Conservation (SACs)	13
Special Protection Areas (SPAs)	7
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs)	137
LPD 12 Ayrshire	Count
Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)	1
Special Areas of Conservation (SACs)	6
Special Protection Areas (SPAs)	5
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs)	77
LPD 13 Tweed	Count
Ramsar Sites	4
Special Areas of Conservation (SACs)	7
Special Protection Areas (SPAs)	4
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs)	82
LPD 14 Solway	Count
Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)	1
Ramsar Sites	5
Special Areas of Conservation (SACs)	18
Special Protection Areas (SPAs)	7
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs)	101