

EIA Screening decision proforma

Business details			
Business reference number	[REDACTED TEXT]	Name	[REDACTED TEXT]
Main location code	[REDACTED TEXT]	EIA ID	2026-013

Proposed works details				
Location CPH	[REDACTED TEXT]	Type	Non improved / Semi natural / sensitive land	x
Location name	[REDACTED TEXT]		Restructuring above thresholds	
Grid reference	NN902182 & NN918185		Drainage	
Nearest Town	Crieff		Irrigation	
Description of proposed works	The applicant proposes ploughing to sow a soil conditioning crop, followed by an EFA grass mix in 2 land parcels that were under species rich grassland from 2018-2022.			

Initial check (LPIS, PastMap etc)	comments
Are any significant earthworks proposed within 25m of a railway or classified road? (If yes refer customer to LA planning department, and reject screening application)	No
Does the project involve creating new tracks, or any other action that would require planning permission or approval from LA planning, or fall under Forestry EIA regulations? (if yes refer customer to LA planning or FS, and reject screening application)	No
Does the proposed work involve removing earth/rock from farm unit? (If yes refer customer to LA planning and SEPA, and reject screening application)	No
Does the proposed work involve infilling depressions or hollows with material not from the immediate area? (If yes consult with SEPA)	No
Check designations and cross compliance layers, and PastMap. Are there monuments close to the proposed works? (If yes consult with HES for scheduled monuments, and LA archaeologist for non-scheduled monuments)	Yes, south-east corner of field A is part of the Innerpeffray woods Roman camp SM3775 and temporary camp Innerpeffray West MPK1367. Field B is adjacent to Parkneuk Roman signal station, Roman road & camp, rampart & ditch (SM2102) and to the Roman camp (SM3775).
Does the project involve any Semi-natural / uncultivated / sensitive areas, or potentially effect any habitat, landscape, or wildlife species (If yes, consult with NatureScot)	After a field survey it was concluded the areas cannot be described as semi-natural/uncultivated/sensitive
Does the project potentially effect the water environment, pose a pollution risk, or potentially have any other effects under SEPAs remit? (if yes consult with SEPA)	No

Check if proposals breach thresholds
No thresholds breached

Check EIA tracker for previous projects at location

No previous projects at location found

Schedule 2 selection criteria

The characteristics of projects must be considered with particular regard to	
characteristic of project:	Brief description and identification of any potential impacts
the size and design of the whole project;	The project involves 2 fields of 1.22 and 2.3 ha each.
cumulation with other existing and/or approved projects;	There are no other known projects
the use of natural resources, in particular land, soil, water and biodiversity;	Land will be managed similarly to how it has been managed within the last 10 years (i.e. ploughing and reseeded with grass). Potential impacts were highlighted in our consultation with NatureScot and Historic Environment Scotland. They include potential spreading of injurious weeds and non-native species and ground disturbance affecting the schedule monument.
the production of waste;	No production of waste has been identified in relation to the project
pollution and nuisances;	Not anticipated
the risk of major accidents and/or disasters which are relevant to the project concerned, including those caused by climate change, in accordance with scientific knowledge;	Not anticipated if Good Agricultural and Environmental Conditions (GAECs) and Statutory Management Requirements (SMRs) are followed, as well as SEPA's General Binding Rule 23(g) in relation to the application of pesticides near a watercourse.
the risks to human health (for example due to water contamination or air pollution).	The use of pesticides is not part of the application, but if herbicides were to be used for the control of weeds and non-native invasive species, following the requirements stated as above would reduce the risk to humans, animals and the environment. Additionally, the Water Environment (Controlled Activities Scotland) Regulations 2011 (CAR) place the necessary controls to protect the environment if used in the proximity of the water.

Location of projects; The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by projects must be considered with particular regard to	
	Brief description and identification of any potential impacts
the existing and approved land use	The fields were managed as Species-rich grasslands (SRG) under an AECS contract until 2022. Since this management ceased, agricultural weeds have become more widespread. In addition, the soil nutrient status is considered too high to support a diverse SRG sward. Field A is currently affected by a significant level of agricultural weeds. The proposal for topping and reseeded with a EFA compatible mix is likely to have a positive impact on the existing agricultural land use, especially if it's combined with appropriate weed control measures.
the relative abundance, availability, quality and regenerative capacity of natural resources(including soil, land, water and biodiversity) in the area and its underground;	no significant adverse impacts on the abundance, availability, quality, or regenerative capacity of natural resources are anticipated. Moreover, reseeded with an EFA-compatible mix has the potential of increasing plant biodiversity and improving the habitat for pollinating and other insects.
the absorption capacity of the natural environment, paying particular attention to the following areas—	Brief description and identification of any potential impacts
(i) wetlands, riparian areas, river mouths;	N/A
(ii) coastal zones and the marine environment;	N/A
(iii) mountain and forest areas;	N/A
(iv) nature reserves and parks;	N/A
(v) european sites and other areas classified or protected under national legislation;	N/A
(vi) areas in which there has already been a failure to meet the environmental quality standards, laid down in Union legislation and relevant to the project, or in which it is	N/A

considered that there is such a failure;	
(vii) densely populated areas;	N/A
(viii) landscapes and sites of historical, cultural or archaeological significance.	Field A (LPID NN/90248/18255) is partially within the scheduled monument Innerpeffray Wood Roman camp SM3775. There is potential for ground disturbance from cultivation associated with reseedling. On the other hand, the proposed topping together with weed control measures may help reduce the risk of damage from deep-rooted weeds and scrub encroachment, which can adversely affect buried archaeological remains. With appropriate management, significant adverse effects on the monument are not anticipated.

The likely significant effects of projects on the environment must be considered in relation to criteria set out in the sections above, with regard to the impact of the projects on the factors specified in regulation 4(3) (environmental impact assessment), taking into account Score High, Low, Unknown impact with comments explaining reasoning for:				
Types and characteristics of the potential impact in relation to 1-4 (right), taking into account:	1. Population and human health	2. Biodiversity*	3. Land, soil, water, air and climate	4. Material assets, cultural heritage, and landscape
the magnitude and spatial extent of the impact (for example geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected);	Low	Low	Low	Low
the nature of the impact;	Low	Low	Low	Low
the transboundary nature of the impact;	Low	Low	Low	Low
the intensity and complexity of the impact;	Low	Low	Low	Low
the probability of the impact;	Low	Low	Low	Low
the expected onset, duration, frequency and reversibility of the impact;	Low	Low	Low	Low
the cumulation of the impact with the impact of other existing and/or approved projects;	Low	Low	Low	Low
the possibility of effectively reducing the impact.	No anticipated impact on human health	no protected species known to be affected. Plant and invertebrate biodiversity has the potential to increase with an EFA compatible seed mix.	The spread of injurious weeds and non-native invasive species, particularly Himalayan balsam, can be reduced by implementing control measures before ploughing or by leaving the affected area unploughed.	Ground disturbance could be minimised by topping, harrowing the surface and reseeded, or by clearing the current vegetation using herbicide before surface seeding.

- Biodiversity and in particular species and habitats protected under the Habitats Directive and Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the conservation of wild birds(12);

If all impacts identified score low, no EIA report is required, and the project can proceed. If there are any unknowns or high scores, a full EIA report may be required.

Local Authority Planning consultation	
Our questions	NA
Reply	NA

Historic Environment Scotland / Local Authority Archaeologist consultation	
Our questions	Is the proposed project likely to have a significant negative impact on the listed scheduled monuments?
Reply	Field A (LPID NN/90248/18255) is partially within the scheduled monument. A scheduled monument qualifies as a sensitive area in terms of the Agriculture, Land Drainage and Irrigation Projects (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017. It appears from our records that the land in this field has not been ploughed since 2018, eight years ago. Normally any works to a scheduled monument would require written Scheduled Monument Consent (SMC), which is administered by Historic Environment Scotland on behalf of Scottish Ministers. However, if the fields have been under the plough in the last 10 years, they are covered by The Ancient Monuments (Class Consents) (Scotland) Order 1996, and SMC is not required. The current proposals for reseeded require ploughing, but we would welcome the opportunity to advise on ways to minimise ground disturbance and therefore protect the archaeological remains below the ground surface. This could be done by topping, harrowing the surface and reseeded, or by clearing the current vegetation using herbicide before surface seeding, if either of these options were acceptable under the terms of the scheme. We would also recommend ensuring that the reseeded sward is regularly grazed, to reduce deep-rooted weeds and brush regeneration.

NatureScot consultation	
Our questions	1. Can you comment on whether you agree that the fields are not species rich? 2. Do you consider that the proposed project (plough and sowing with a greening compatible mixture) will have significant negative environmental impacts or not?
Reply	1.As an Operations Officer for NatureScot we would be looking for a minimum of 4 of the indicator species listed for Species Rich Grassland in the AECS supporting guidance. From the data you have provided on the surveys there is only one quadrat showing the presence of 4 indicator species in Field B, but has a very high percentage of grasses and a maximum of 3 indicator species in Field A which has an extremely high cover of dock and thistle at the time of survey. From the photographs provided, it is obvious that the soil is too rich on both fields and the Species Rich Grassland creation wildflower mix was unlikely, and has not been successful.
	2. In the current condition of Fields A and B I would agree that they should be classed as semi- Improved and as such we do not feel that there will be a significant negative environmental impact. However we would advise caution regarding ploughing in the area that contains Himalayan Balsam to avoid the spread this and other of invasive weeds.

SEPA consultation	
Our questions	NA

Reply	NA
-------	----

Scottish Forestry consultation	
Our questions	NA
Reply	NA

Outcome			
Reasons for decision following consideration of Schedule 2 selection criteria	The proposed work falls under the Agriculture, Land Drainage and Irrigation Projects (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017 but is unlikely to have a significant effect on the environment considering the criteria in Schedule 2.		
Full EIA report required?	NO		
If EIA report not required, state the measures envisioned to avoid or prevent adverse effects on the environment (regulation 12(2)(b))	Measures should be taken to prevent the spread of injurious and non-native invasive species, with advice on suitable control methods obtained from NatureScot.		
Deciding officer	[REDACTED TEXT]	Countersigning officer	[REDACTED TEXT]
Date	19/08/2026	Date	20/08/2026

Acronyms:

EIA Environmental Impact Assessment
 FS Forestry Scotland
 HES Historic Environment Scotland
 LA Local Authority
 LPIS Land Parcel Identification System
 SEPA Scottish Environmental Protection Agency