

## LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

<b>Site Ref:</b> GTN.H1	<b>Source of site suggestion:</b> LDP Allocation	<b>Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):</b> 13/P/4/0374 PIP - expired	
<b>Site name:</b> Adjacent to Hazeldene			
<b>Settlement:</b> Gretna Border	<b>Current use:</b> Agricultural Land		
<b>OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing):</b> 332257, 568234		<b>Existing LDP allocations/ designations:</b> <b>Yes</b>	
<b>Site Size (ha):</b> 2.45	<b>Proposed use:</b> Housing	<b>HMA:</b> Annan	<b>Date completed:</b> Oct/Nov 2016

TOPIC	Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora	Population and Human Health	Soils	Water	Air Quality	Material Assets	Climatic Factors	Cultural Heritage	Landscape
SCORE	0	+/x	X	0	X	0	X	0	X

### Scoring Guidance

Impact	Significant positive impact	Positive impact	Neutral impact	Unknown impact	Both Positive and Negative impacts	Negative impact	Significant negative impact
Score Symbol	++	+	0	?	+/x	x	xx

### Legends

<b>Related SEA topic</b> Population and Human Health (PHH) Climatic Factors (CF) Biodiversity (B) Landscape (L) Material Assets (MA)	<b>Information source</b> Geographic Information System (GIS) Site visit (SV) Consultee (C) Other (O)	<b>Consultation required ( only if answer is Yes)</b> Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) Transport Scotland (TS) Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
---	---	---

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

### BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)	SACs	N	LNR	N	SPAs	N	SSSIs	N
	NNR	N	Local wildlife sites	N	Natterjack toads	N	Great Crested Newts	N
	RAMSAR	N	Geodiversity Sites	N	Other protected species	N	Marine Consultation Zones	N
	Ancient/semi-natural woodland		N	Comments: No strategic comments from SNH				
Are there any known invasive species within the site	N			GIS & SV	0		0	
Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity	N			SV	0		0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	No designations affecting this site							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No designations affecting this site						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>	

### POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space	MA	N									
		Distance (km)	1								
Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them	MA or CF	Right of Way	N	Comment: Cycle route on western edge of site providing link to Gretna Station							
		Core path	N								
		Cycle path	Y								
What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)	CF	Community/village hall	1	Sports facilities	1-5	Hospitalities	1	Local shops (convenience)	1-5	Bus stop	0.1
What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km)			Primary				Secondary				
	School name:		Springfield				Annan				
	Capacity:		31				331				
	Distance:		1				10				
Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere	MA and B	N			GIS	0		0			
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Site not within reasonable walking distance of the majority of community facilities and public open space. Close proximity to Gretna Station and could encourage active travel and use of sustainable transport.										
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Site not within reasonable walking distance of the majority of community facilities and public open space. Close proximity to Gretna Station and could encourage active travel and use of sustainable transport.						<b>SEA SCORE: -/+</b>				

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

SOILS									
Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land		Y	Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)	3.2	0	X	Prime quality agricultural land being actively farmed for cereal crops	X	
Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)		N	Generally flat site		SV	0		0	
Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site		N	No known previous use.		C	0		0	
Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat	CF	N			0	0		0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Loss of prime agricultural land currently in production								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Loss of prime agricultural land.						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>		

WATER									
Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site	B and L	N			SV	0		0	
Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere	CF and PHH	N	SEPA – no flood risk apparent No comment with regard to flood risk.		C	0		0	
Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse)		N				0		0	
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer	PHH	Y	Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.		C	0		0	
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply	PHH	N	Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.		C	0	Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the requirements for this phase of the upgrade work. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October	0	

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

						2010) refers.			
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No known flood risk. Gretna – limited water network capacity subject to planned upgrading by Scottish Water which will require developer contributions.						<b>SEA SCORE:0</b>		

AIR QUALITY									
Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA		N	There are no AQMA at present in the region	C	0		0		
What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby	PHH	Y	Housing and M74 motorway, slip roads and B7076 SEPA noted an issue with air quality given the sites location	C	X	M74 motorway and spur roads at height above site approx 5m embankment. Noise assessment required. Given that motorway at height mitigation measures are unlikely to be successful	X		
Does the development of the site introduce a new potentially significant air emission to the area (e.g. combined heat and power, an industrial process, large scale quarry of energy from the waste plant)		N			0		0		
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Significant environmental issues due to proximity of M74 and slip roads at height. Noise assessment required. Mitigation measures considered unlikely to be successful								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Significant environmental issues due to proximity of M74 and slip roads at height. Noise assessment required. Mitigation measures considered unlikely to be successful						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>		

MATERIAL ASSETS									
Is the site.....		Brownfield		Comment					
		Greenfield	G						
Is the site vacant or derelict		N	Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey	N		0	No known previous use.	0	
Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover on-site materials/resources		N				0		0	
Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction		N				0		0	
Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore,	PHH	N				0		0	

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

compromise the waste handling operation								
Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9)		n/a			0		0	
Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site			Pylons N	Bord Gais Eirann pipeline N		Shell oil pipeline N	Transco pipeline N	
		Comment No servicing constraints in relation to this site						
Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies			Air Traffic/NATS N	MoD N	Carlisle Airport N	Coal Authority N	HSE N	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Loss of greenfield site. No servicing constraints in relation to this site							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Loss of greenfield site							<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>

ROADS/ACCESS									
Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated		This site (36 units) is located to the south of the C141a with access also available onto Gretna Loaning U530a. Access onto the C141a will require significant infill to achieve satisfactory access gradients. Consideration should be given to site GTN.H205 (158 units) which incorporates this site and the southern section of land to the M74. A Transport Assessment should be commissioned and a Masterplan should be provided for this site. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and a residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards							
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Access to be provided onto Gretna Loaning U530a. Access onto the C141a will require significant infill to achieve satisfactory access gradients. A Transport Assessment should be commissioned and a Masterplan should be provided for this site. Ability to access the land to the south for potential long term expansion of Springfield should not be compromised.								

CLIMATIC FACTORS								
What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)		South			SV	0		
Can the site make best use of solar gain		Y				SV	0	
Is the site protected from prevailing winds		N	Not sheltered from prevailing wind.			SV	x	May require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Not sheltered from prevailing wind, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Not sheltered from prevailing wind, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions							<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>

CULTURAL HERITAGE								
Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting	L	Listed Building	N	Scheduled Monuments	N	Comment Archaeology - Course of Roman Road thought to run through northern portion of site, evaluation will be required. Historic Built Environment - No Listed Buildings; no conservation area. However, the Smithy on the road junction is Category B Listed and of significant social historical		
		Conservation Area	N	Inventory of Historic Battlefield	N			
		World Heritage Site	N	Inventory & Non-Inventory	N			
		Archaeological site	Y	Garden or Designed Landscape				

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

						interest. The church on the corner and the terrace of cottages on Gretna Loaning near the road junction were all built by the early 19 <sup>th</sup> century and represent the core of the village. Development should reinforce the local character.			
Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment	L	N							
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Archaeological mitigation measures to be implemented due to potential course of Roman road running through northern part of site.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Archaeological site potentially affects part of site and evaluation will be required.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

LANDSCAPE										
Is the site within or adjoining any of the following		NSAs Wild Land	N	RSAs TPOs	N	Comment				
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement	N	M74 and slip roads dominate site and area so visual integration would be difficult to achieve	SV	0	Creating a pleasant place to live would be challenging.	0				
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site	N		SV	0		0				
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Requires significant mitigation through bunding and tree planting to reduce dominance of M74/slip road. Even then creating a pleasant place to live would be challenging.									
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Significant environmental issues due to proximity of M74 and slip roads at height. Mitigation measures considered unlikely to be successful.						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>			

PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES										
Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	Y	Existing housing allocation in adopted LDP. Previous consent has now expired.								
Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site	Y	Land is available for development and the landowner would like to see this land brought forward for housing development.								
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips	N									
Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe	?									
<b>OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT</b>	Although the site is an existing housing allocation in adopted LDP proposed housing use is not considered desirable due to proximity of M74 and associated slip road. Would require significant mitigation through bunding and tree planting to reduce dominance of M74/slip roads. Landscape view is that creating a pleasant place to live would be challenging. Review site as an option for inclusion in LDP2.									
<b>OVERALL SEA COMMENT</b>	Negative SEA impact due to loss of prime agricultural land and greenfield site. Distant from the majority of community facilities. Significant environmental									

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

	issues due to proximity of M74 and slip roads at height. Mitigation measures considered unlikely to be successful.							
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

<b>Site Ref:</b> GTN.H2	<b>Source of site suggestion:</b> LDP allocation	<b>Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):</b> Previous consents June 2016 – Proposal of Application Notice 16/N/4/001	
<b>Site name:</b> land north of Victory Avenue (Phase 1)			
<b>Settlement:</b> Gretna Border	<b>Current use:</b> Agricultural land	<b>Existing LDP allocations/ designations:</b> Yes	
<b>OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing):</b> 331687, 567641			
<b>Site Size (ha):</b> 15.63	<b>Proposed use:</b> Housing	<b>HMA:</b> Annan	<b>Date completed:</b> Oct/Nov 2016

TOPIC	Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora	Population and Human Health	Soils	Water	Air Quality	Material Assets	Climatic Factors	Cultural Heritage	Landscape
SCORE	0	+	X	0	0	X	+	0	0

### Scoring Guidance

Impact	Significant positive impact	Positive impact	Neutral impact	Unknown impact	Both Positive and Negative impacts	Negative impact	Significant negative impact
Score Symbol	++	+	0	?	+/-	x	xx

### Legends

<u>Related SEA topic</u>	<u>Information source</u>	<u>Consultation required ( only if answer is Yes)</u>
Population and Human Health (PHH)	Geographic Information System (GIS)	Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
Climatic Factors (CF)	Site visit (SV)	Transport Scotland (TS)
Biodiversity (B)	Consultee (C)	Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
Landscape (L)	Other (O)	Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
Material Assets (MA)		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA								
Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)	SACs	N	LNR	N	SPAs	N	SSSIs	N
	NNR	N	Local wildlife sites	N	Natterjack toads	N	Great Crested Newts	N
	RAMSAR	N	Geodiversity Sites	N	Other protected species	N	Marine Consultation Zones	N
	Ancient/semi-natural woodland		N					
Comments: No strategic comment from SNH								
Are there any known invasive species within the site					0		0	
Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity	Y				0	Greenfield site on edge of settlement. Careful consideration of design and planting could help create new habitats within this development	0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	No designations affecting this site. No strategic comments from SNH. Careful consideration of design and planting could help create new habitats within this development							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No designations affecting this site						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>	

POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH												
Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space	MA	N										
			Distance (km)	0.2								
Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them	MA or CF		Right of Way	N	Comment: Footpath and cycle route on western edge of site giving direct link to Gretna Station							
			Core path	N								
			Cycle path	Y								
What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)	CF		Community/village hall	1	Sports facilities	1	Hospitalities	1	Local shops (convenience)	1	Bus stop	0.1
What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km)			Primary				Secondary					
	School name:		Gretna				Annan					
	Capacity:		76				331					
	Distance:		0.1				10					
Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere	MA and B	N			GIS	0			0			
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Within close walking distance to existing facilities, school and direct access to Gretna station. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.											
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Within close walking distance to existing facilities, school and direct access to Gretna station. Could encourage walking and									<b>SEA SCORE: +</b>		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

<p>cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.</p>	
--	--

SOILS									
Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land		Y	Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)	3.1	0	X	Prime quality agricultural land being actively farmed for cereal crops	X	
Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)		N	Relatively flat open site bounded by embankment of A75 and slip roads to north		SV	0		0	
Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site		N	No known previous use		C	0		0	
Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat	CF	N			0	0		0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Loss of prime agricultural land currently in production								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Would involve loss of prime agricultural land						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>		

WATER									
Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site	B and L	Y	Evidence of some boggy areas and watercourse.		SV	X		0	
Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere	CF and PHH	Y	Site appears in pluvial SEPA flood maps. Body of water traverses the site. SEPA - Small watercourse flows through allocation and potential flood risk from this source should be taken cognisance of.		C	X	Drainage Impact Assessment required. Depending on content, Flood Risk Assessment is required which will require to be agreed with SEPA	0	
Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse)		N				0		0	
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer	PHH		Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.		C	0	Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.	0	
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water	PHH		Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity		C	0	Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to	0	

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required	
supply						<p>alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the requirements for this phase of the upgrade work. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October 2010) refers.</p> <p>A 12"trunk main is running through site and a 90mm water main. Appropriate stand off distances will have to be established with Scottish Water's Asset Impact team.</p>			
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. A 12"trunk main is running through site and a 90mm water main. Appropriate stand off distances will have to be established with Scottish Water's Asset Impact team.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Potential flood risk. Drainage Impact Assessment required. Depending on content, Flood Risk Assessment will also be required which will require to be agreed with SEPA .Gretna – limited water network capacity subject to planned upgrading by Scottish Water which will require developer contributions.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

AIR QUALITY									
Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA		N	There are no AQMA at present in the region	C	0		0		
What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby	PHH	N	North – A75 and rail line. East – Business and industry South – housing, community facilities and school	SV	x	Noise assessment would be required together with any necessary mitigation will be required to address cumulative noise pollution from A75 and railway. Consideration will need to be given to appropriate landscaping and screening	0		
Does the development of the site introduce a new potentially significant air emission to the area (e.g. combined heat and power, an industrial process, large scale quarry of energy from the waste plant)		N			0		0		
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Noise assessment would be required together with any necessary mitigation will be required to address cumulative noise pollution from A75 and railway. Consideration will need to be given to appropriate landscaping and screening								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Noise assessment would be required together with any necessary mitigation to address cumulative noise pollution from A75 and railway. Consideration would need to be given to appropriate landscaping and screening						<b>SEA SCORE:0</b>		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

MATERIAL ASSETS																
Is the site.....		Brownfield		Comment												
		Greenfield	G													
Is the site vacant or derelict		N	Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey		N			No known previous use								
Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover on-site materials/resources		N	There are no existing structure for reuse on the site			SV	0		0							
Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction		N				0			0							
Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation	PHH	N				0			0							
Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9)		n/a							0							
Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site		Pylons		N	Bord Gais Eirann pipeline		N	Shell oil pipeline		N	Transco pipeline		N			
		Comment There are no servicing constraints in relation to this site														
Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies		Air Traffic/NATS		N	MoD		N	Carlisle Airport		N	Coal Authority		N	HSE		N
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Loss of greenfield site. There are no servicing constraints in relation to this site															
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Loss of greenfield site.											<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>				

ROADS/ACCESS										
Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated		This site (104 units) is situated to the west of the B7076 and Victory Avenue C68a. Sites GTN.H2, H7, H4 and H3 are all linked with multiple connections onto various public roads, this would result in an overall development of over 350 units. It would be appropriate that a development brief be provided for this site, and that any future applicant provide a Transport Assessment and that a cumulative Masterplan be provided for all of these sites. Should this site be developed in isolation, this should not prejudice the future development of adjacent sites. An appropriate junction arrangement for the B7076 and C68a should be designed and agreed in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and a residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards								
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	An appropriate junction arrangement for the B7076 and C68a should be designed and agreed in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. It would be appropriate that a development brief be provided for this site, and that any future applicant provide a Transport Assessment and that a cumulative Masterplan be provided for all of these sites. Should this site be developed in isolation, this should not prejudice the future development of adjacent sites.									

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

### CLIMATIC FACTORS

What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)		South		SV	0		0		
Can the site make best use of solar gain		Y	Open flat site.	SV	0	The layout should ensure solar gain and look to create sustainable buildings in line with policies OP1f and OP2.	+		
Is the site protected from prevailing winds		Y	Open relatively flat site	SV	0		0		
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Housing design could make use of passive solar gain, reducing energy use and carbon emissions. The layout should ensure solar gain and look to create sustainable buildings in line with policies OP1f and OP2								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Site is southerly facing. Housing design could make use of passive solar gain, reducing energy use and carbon emissions.						<b>SEA SCORE: +</b>		

### CULTURAL HERITAGE

Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting	L	Listed Building	N	Scheduled Monuments	N	Comment Archaeology - No historic environment issues identified for this site, as of July 2016 Historic Built Environment - No Listed Buildings; no conservation area. However, development should reinforce the layout of the planned town of Gretna which is of national wartime interest. The church on the corner of Victory Ave and Burnside Road is Category B Listed.			
		Conservation Area	N	Inventory of Historic Battlefield	N				
		World Heritage Site	N	Inventory & Non-Inventory	N				
		Archaeological site	N	Garden or Designed Landscape					
Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment	L	N							
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Development should reinforce the layout of the planned town of Gretna which is of national wartime interest. The design of buildings should integrate street scene along Victory Avenue and take account of nearby listed buildings.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No cultural heritage issues identified.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

### LANDSCAPE

Is the site within or adjoining any of the following		NSAs	N	RSAs	N	Comment Open landscape – no trees or hedgerows.				
		Wild Land	N	TPOs	N					
Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level		N	Comments on masterplanning exercise apply. Screen from slip road/A75 with woodland planting.			C & SV	0	Design in combination with H3, H4, H7 and existing residential developments to ensure permeability and sense of place.	0	
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement		Y				C & SV	0		0	
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		N				C & SV	0		0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Design in combination with sites H3, H4, H7 and existing residential developments to ensure permeability and sense of place.									

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Screen from slip road/A75 with woodland and planting.	<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>
---------------------	---	---------------------

<b>PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES</b>		
Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	Y	Site allocated for housing in adopted LDP and current developer interest - Proposal of Application Notice 16/N/4/001 (June 2016)
Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site	Y	
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips	N	
Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe	Y	
<b>OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT</b>	Site allocated for housing in adopted LDP and current developer interest - Proposal of Application Notice 16/N/4/001 (June 2016). Masterplan should include: an overall road layout including access into the adjoining site GTN.H7 and a roundabout access into the site, phasing of the development, open space and footpath links integrated with the existing pedestrian/cycle path connecting to Gretna Green railway station. Should this site be developed in isolation, this should not prejudice the future development of adjacent sites. The design of buildings should integrate street-scene along Victory Avenue and especially with listed buildings. A noise assessment along with any necessary mitigation will be required to address cumulative noise pollution from the A75 and railway line to the north.	
<b>OVERALL SEA COMMENT</b>	Negative SEA impact as greenfield site and loss of prime agricultural land. Proximity of site to community facilities and railway station. Potential to encourage range of sustainable transport modes	

## LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

<b>Site Ref:</b> GTN.H3	<b>Source of site suggestion:</b> LDP Allocations	<b>Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):</b> PIP granted 2011 Current application 16/P/4/0212 Phase 5 – 46units by Hadrian Homes	
<b>Site name:</b> The Hawthorns	<b>Current use:</b> Former caravan site	<b>Existing LDP allocations/ designations:</b> Yes	
<b>Settlement:</b> Gretna Border			
<b>OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing):</b> 331522, 567473	<b>Proposed use:</b> Housing	<b>HMA:</b> Annan	<b>Date completed:</b> Oct/Nov 2016
<b>Site Size (ha):</b> 2.83			

TOPIC	Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora	Population and Human Health	Soils	Water	Air Quality	Material Assets	Climatic Factors	Cultural Heritage	Landscape
SCORE	0	+	0	0	0	+	+	0	0

### Scoring Guidance

Impact	Significant positive impact	Positive impact	Neutral impact	Unknown impact	Both Positive and Negative impacts	Negative impact	Significant negative impact
Score Symbol	++	+	0	?	+/-x	x	xx

### Legends

<u>Related SEA topic</u>	<u>Information source</u>	<u>Consultation required ( only if answer is Yes)</u>
Population and Human Health (PHH)	Geographic Information System (GIS)	Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
Climatic Factors (CF)	Site visit (SV)	Transport Scotland (TS)
Biodiversity (B)	Consultee (C)	Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
Landscape (L)	Other (O)	Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
Material Assets (MA)		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

### BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)	SACs	N	LNR	N	SPAs	N	SSSIs	N
	NNR	N	Local wildlife sites	N	Natterjack toads	N	Great Crested Newts	N
	RAMSAR	N	Geodiversity Sites	N	Other protected species	N	Marine Consultation Zones	N
	Ancient/semi-natural woodland		N	Comments: No strategic comments from SNH				
Are there any known invasive species within the site	N							
Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity	N				0		0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	No biodiversity designations affect site							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No designations affecting site						<b>SEA SCORE:0</b>	

### POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space	MA	N									
		Distance (km)	1	Comment: Within 1km of pedestrian cycle route to Gretna railway station							
Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them	MA or CF	Right of Way	N								
		Core path	N								
		Cycle path	N								
What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)	CF	Community/village hall	1	Sports facilities	1	Hospitalities	1	Local shops (convenience)	1	Bus stop	0.1
What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km)			Primary				Secondary				
	School name:		Gretna				Annan				
	Capacity:		76				331				
	Distance:		1				10				
Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere	MA and B	N		GIS	0			0			
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Within close walking distance to existing facilities, school and Gretna railway station.										
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Within close walking distance to existing facilities, school and Gretna railway station. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.								<b>SEA SCORE: +</b>		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

SOILS								
Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land		N	Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)		0	0	0	
Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)		N			0		0	
Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site			No known previous use		0	Former caravan park	0	
Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat	CF	N			0		0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	No impact on soils							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No impact						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>	

WATER								
Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site	B and L	Y	Watercourse adjacent to site					
Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere	CF and PHH	Y	Site appears in pluvial SEPA flood maps. Body of water lies adjacent to the site. SEPA - A minor watercourse flows along the site boundary which could represent a potential flood risk and a potentially culverted watercourse flows through the site.	C	X	Drainage Impact Assessment required. Depending on content, Flood Risk Assessment may also be required which will require to be agreed with SEPA	0	
Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse)		N			0		0	
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer	PHH	Y	Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.	C	0	Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.	0	
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply	PHH	Y	Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.	C	0	Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the	0	

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

						requirements for this phase of the upgrade work. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October 2010) refers.			
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Potential flood risk. Drainage Impact Assessment required. Depending on content, Flood Risk Assessment may also be required which will require to be agreed with SEPA..						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

AIR QUALITY									
Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA		N	There are no AQMA at present in the region	C	0		0		
What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby	PHH	N	Housing		0		0		
Does the development of the site introduce a new potentially significant air emission to the area (e.g. combined heat and power, an industrial process, large scale quarry of energy from the waste plant)		N			0		0		
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Unlikely to decrease air quality								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Unlikely to decrease air quality						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

MATERIAL ASSETS									
Is the site.....		Brownfield	B	Comment					
		Greenfield							
Is the site vacant or derelict		N	Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey	N			Former caravan park	+	
Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover on-site materials/resources		N							
Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction		N							
Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore,	PHH	N							

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

compromise the waste handling operation								
Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9)		n/a						
Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site			Pylons   N	Bord Gais Eirann pipeline   N	Shell oil pipeline   N	Transco pipeline   N		
Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies			Air Traffic/NATS   N	MoD   N	Carlisle Airport   N	Coal Authority   N	HSE   N	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Brownfield site and benefits from proximity to existing infrastructure							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Brownfield site and benefits from proximity to existing infrastructure							<b>SEA SCORE: +</b>

ROADS/ACCESS									
Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated			This site can take access from The Hawthorns U188a and an extension of The Hawthorns currently being constructed under Roads Construction Consent. This site is also bordered by GTN.H7 to the north. Sites GTN.H3, H7, H4 and H2 are all linked with multiple connections onto various public roads, this would result in an overall development of over 350 units. It would be appropriate that a development brief be provided for this site, and that any future applicant provide a Transport Assessment and that a cumulative Masterplan be provided for all of these sites. Should this site be developed in isolation, this should not prejudice the future development of adjacent sites. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and a residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards						
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	This site can take access from The Hawthorns U188a and an extension of The Hawthorns currently being constructed under Roads Construction Consent. Should this site be developed in isolation, this should not prejudice the future development of adjacent housing sites. – GTN.H7.								

CLIMATIC FACTORS									
What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)		Southerly aspect and flat.							
Can the site make best use of solar gain		Y			+				
Is the site protected from prevailing winds		Y							
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Southerly aspect: housing design could make best use of passive solar gain.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Southerly aspect: housing design could make best use of passive solar gain, reducing energy use and carbon emissions							<b>SEA SCORE: +</b>	

CULTURAL HERITAGE								
Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting	L	Listed Building	Y	Scheduled Monuments	N	Comment Aracheology - No historic environment issues identified for this site, as of July 2016 Historic Built Environment - No conservation area. Site is within the planned town and design should reflect this and reinforce the character. On southern boundary with		
		Conservation Area	N	Inventory of Historic Battlefield	N			
		World Heritage Site	N	Inventory & Non-Inventory	NN			
		Archaeological site	N	Garden or Designed Landscape				

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required	
						Category B Listed hotel The Gables designed by Raymond Unwin as part of the Gretna new town. Development should respect proximity of the setting. Also in main view from western side of Category B Listed Church.			
Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment	L	Y				Design should reflect planned town of Gretna and reinforce the character and respect setting and proximity of listed building on southern boundary.	+		
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Design should reflect planned town of Gretna and reinforce the character and respect setting and proximity of listed building on southern boundary.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Impact on planned town of Gretna and setting of listed building on southern boundary. Design should reflect and reinforce historic character.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

LANDSCAPE										
Is the site within or adjoining any of the following		NSAs		RSAs		Comment				
		Wild Land	N	TPOs	N					
Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level						Suitable for development: No particularly strong landscape elements or views. Used as caravan park and storage.		+		Design in combination with H2, H4, H7 and existing residential developments to ensure permeability and sense of place.
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement		Y								
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		N								
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Design in combination with H2, H4, H7 and existing residential developments to ensure permeability and sense of place									
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No impact on landscape elements or views. Suitable for development.								<b>SEA SCORE: +</b>	

PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES										
Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	Y	Allocated housing site in adopted LDP and current planning application 16/P/4/0212 for 46units (Phase 5) by Hadrian Homes								
Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site	Y									
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips	Y									
Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe	Y	Current planning application being determined and current developer interest								
<b>OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT</b>	Allocated housing site in adopted LDP and current planning application 16/P/4/0212 for 46units (Phase 5) by Hadrian Homes. Effective housing site with current developer interest.									
<b>OVERALL SEA COMMENT</b>	Positive SEA impact - development of brownfield site and proximity to community facilities, school and Gretna railway station. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.									

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

## LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

<b>Site Ref:</b> GTN.H4	<b>Source of site suggestion:</b> LDP Allocation	<b>Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):</b> 12/P/4/0004 PIP Granted Feb 2014 expires Feb 2017	
<b>Site name:</b> Halcrow Stadium			
<b>Settlement:</b> Gretna Border	<b>Current use:</b> Grey hound stadium and racetrack associated buildings, car park and lorry park.	<b>Existing LDP allocations/ designations:</b> Yes	
<b>OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing):</b> 331247, 567570			
<b>Site Size (ha):</b> 3.72	<b>Proposed use:</b> Housing	<b>HMA:</b> Annan	<b>Date completed:</b> Oct/Nov 2016

TOPIC	Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora	Population and Human Health	Soils	Water	Air Quality	Material Assets	Climatic Factors	Cultural Heritage	Landscape
SCORE	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0

### Scoring Guidance

Impact	Significant positive impact	Positive impact	Neutral impact	Unknown impact	Both Positive and Negative impacts	Negative impact	Significant negative impact
Score Symbol	++	+	0	?	+/-	x	xx

### Legends

<u>Related SEA topic</u>	<u>Information source</u>	<u>Consultation required ( only if answer is Yes)</u>
Population and Human Health (PHH)	Geographic Information System (GIS)	Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
Climatic Factors (CF)	Site visit (SV)	Transport Scotland (TS)
Biodiversity (B)	Consultee (C)	Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
Landscape (L)	Other (O)	Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
Material Assets (MA)		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

### BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)	SACs	N	LNR	N	SPAs	N	SSSIs	N
	NNR	N	Local wildlife sites	N	Natterjack toads	N	Great Crested Newts	N
	RAMSAR	N	Geodiversity Sites	N	Other protected species	N	Marine Consultation Zones	N
	Ancient/semi-natural woodland		N	Comments: No strategic comments from SNH				
Are there any known invasive species within the site					0		0	
Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity	N				0		0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	No designations affecting site							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No designations affecting site						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>	

### POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space	MA	N									
		Distance (km)	1	Comment: Within 1km of pedestrian cycle route to Gretna railway station							
Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them	MA or CF	Right of Way	N								
		Core path	N								
		Cycle path	N								
What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)	CF	Community/village hall	1	Sports facilities	1	Hospitalities	1	Local shops (convenience)	1	Bus stop	0.1
What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km)			Primary				Secondary				
	School name:		Gretna				Annan				
	Capacity:		76				331				
	Distance:		1				10				
Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere	MA and B	N		GIS	0			0			
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Within reasonable walking distance of existing community facilities and Gretna railway station – scope to encourage variety of sustainable transport modes.										
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Within reasonable walking distance of existing community facilities and Gretna railway station – scope to encourage variety of sustainable transport modes.						<b>SEA SCORE: +</b>				

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

SOILS									
Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land		N	Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)		0		0		
Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)		N				Relatively flat site	0		
Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site		Y	The site is currently in use as a dog racing track and lorry park. Some further investigation may be required.	SV/C	X	Contaminated land investigation may be required given previous uses.	0		
Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat	CF	N					0		
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Contaminated land investigation may be required given previous uses as a dog racing track and lorry park								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Contaminated land investigation may be required						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

WATER								
Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site	B and L	N		SV	0		0	
Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere	CF and PHH	N	No comment SEPA – no flood risk apparent	C	0		0	
Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse)		N		SV	0		0	
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer	PHH		Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.	C	0	Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.	0	
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply	PHH		Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.	C	0	Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the requirements for this phase of the upgrade work.	0	

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

						Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October 2010) refers.		
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing waste water network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No known flood risk. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing waste water network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended. Gretna – limited water network capacity subject to planned upgrading by Scottish Water which will require developer contributions.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>	

AIR QUALITY								
Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA		N	There are no AQMA at present in the region	C	0		0	
What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby	PHH		North – A7 and railway line. East and South – housing. West – agricultural land. Noise pollution from elevated A75 and railway line to north. SEPA noted an issue with air quality given the sites location	SV/C	-	Appropriate mitigation and landscaping against noise pollution from the A75	+	
Does the development of the site introduce a new potentially significant air emission to the area (e.g. combined heat and power, an industrial process, large scale quarry of energy from the waste plant)		N		SV	0		0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Appropriate mitigation required against noise pollution and landscaping required to minimise impact from adjoining A75 and trains using railway line due north.							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Potential significant noise impact from A75 and railway line to north. Appropriate mitigation and landscaping to minimise noise pollution. Railway station in settlement: could encourage use of more sustainable transport and reduce carbon emissions from transport.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>	

MATERIAL ASSETS								
Is the site.....		Brownfield	B	Comment Dog racing park and lorry park				
		Greenfield						
Is the site vacant or derelict		N	Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey		N	Some further investigation may be required given previous uses.		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover on-site materials/resources		N	Existing buildings on site associated with racing track		0		0	
Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction		N			0		0	
Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation	PHH	N			0		0	
Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9)		n/a			0		0	
Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site		Pylons N Bord Gais Eirann pipeline N		Shell oil pipeline N		Transco pipeline N		
		Comment No known serving constraints						
Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies		Air Traffic/NATS N		MoD N		Carlisle Airport N		Coal Authority N HSE N
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Brownfield site in proximity to existing infrastructure. Contaminated land investigation may be required given previous uses.							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Brownfield site in proximity to existing infrastructure. Some further investigation may be required given previous uses.						<b>SEA SCORE: +</b>	

ROADS/ACCESS									
Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated		This site (85 units) fronts the B721 with site GTN.H7 along the northern boundary. Sites GTN.H4, H7, H2 and H3 are all linked with multiple connections onto various public roads, this would result in an overall development of over 350 units. It would be appropriate that a development brief be provided for this site, and that any future applicant provide a Transport Assessment and that a cumulative Masterplan be provided for all of these sites. Should this site be developed in isolation, this should not prejudice the future development of adjacent sites. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and a residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards							
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Site fronts the B721 with site GTN.H7 along the northern boundary. Sites GTN.H4, H7, H2 and H3 are all linked with multiple connections onto various public roads. It would be appropriate that a development brief be provided for this site, and that any future applicant provide a Transport Assessment and that a cumulative Masterplan be provided for all of these sites. Should this site be developed in isolation, this should not prejudice the future development of adjacent sites.								

CLIMATIC FACTORS									
What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)		South			SV	0		0	
Can the site make best use of solar gain		Y	Generally flat site			SV	0	0	
Is the site protected from prevailing winds		Y	Exposed to the south and west.			SV	X	Appropriate landscaping and layout should take into account aspect and prevailing winds to the south west	0
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Appropriate landscaping and layout should take into account aspect and prevailing winds to the south west								

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Negative SEA impact in terms of exposure to south west wind. Appropriate landscaping and layout should take into account aspect and prevailing winds to the south west						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>
---------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	---------------------

CULTURAL HERITAGE								
Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting	L	Listed Building	N	Scheduled Monuments	N	Comment No historic environment issues identified for this site, as of July 2016  Historic Built Environment - Not Listed not in conservation area. Note – racetrack part of social history for Gretna.		
		Conservation Area	N	Inventory of Historic Battlefield	N			
		World Heritage Site	N	Inventory & Non-Inventory	N			
		Archaeological site	N	Garden or Designed Landscape	N			
Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment	L	N			0		0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	No known cultural issues identified							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No known cultural issues identified						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>	

LANDSCAPE									
Is the site within or adjoining any of the following		NSAs	N	RSAs	N	Comment			
		Wild Land	N	TPOs	N				
Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level				Development would be consistent with existing village footprint: No particularly strong landscape elements though the site is clearly seen from the A75 and western approach to the village. Formerly developed as football ground.	C	0	Design in combination with H3, H7 and existing residential developments to ensure permeability and sense of place (comments on masterplanning exercise apply).	0	
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement		N		Western boundary is weak.	C	X	Western boundary needs to be strengthened by hedgerow and tree planting. Tree planting here and on northern boundary would help mitigate impacts from the A75.	0	
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		N			SV	O		0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Western boundary needs to be strengthened by hedgerow and tree planting. Tree planting on the western and northern boundary would help mitigate impacts from the A75.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Site is clearly seen from the A75 and west. Western boundary needs to be strengthened by hedgerow and tree planting. Tree planting on the western and northern boundary would help mitigate impacts from the A75.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES		
Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	Y	Allocated housing site within the adopted LDP. Effective housing site with extant planning permission in principle 12/P/4/0004 PIP Granted Feb 2014 expires Feb 2017 and subject to a concluded Section 75 agreement

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site		Y						
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips		N						
Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe		Y						
<b>OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT</b>	Allocated housing site within the adopted LDP. Effective housing site with extant planning permission in principle 12/P/4/0004 PIP Granted Feb 2014 expires Feb 2017 and subject to a concluded Section 75 agreement.							
<b>OVERALL SEA COMMENT</b>	Positive SEA impact. Reuse of brownfield site and within reasonable walking distance of existing community facilities and railway station– scope to encourage variety of sustainable transport modes and reduce carbon emissions from transport.							

## LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

<b>Site Ref:</b> GTN.H5	<b>Source of site suggestion:</b> LDP Allocations	<b>Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):</b> 14/P/4/0502 PIP granted 28 Oct 2015 subject to completion of Planning Obligation. Not yet agreed as at Oct 16.	
<b>Site name:</b> Land north of Old Graitney Road			
<b>Settlement:</b> Greta Border	<b>Current use:</b> Agricultural land	<b>Existing LDP allocations/ designations:</b> <b>Yes</b>	
<b>OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing):</b> 331386, 566834			
<b>Site Size (ha):</b> 2.49	<b>Proposed use:</b> Housing	<b>HMA:</b> Annan	<b>Date completed:</b> Oct/Nov 2016

TOPIC	Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora	Population and Human Health	Soils	Water	Air Quality	Material Assets	Climatic Factors	Cultural Heritage	Landscape
<b>SCORE</b>	0	+	x	0	0	x	0	0	0

### Scoring Guidance

Impact	Significant positive impact	Positive impact	Neutral impact	Unknown impact	Both Positive and Negative impacts	Negative impact	Significant negative impact
<b>Score Symbol</b>	++	+	0	?	+/x	x	xx

### Legends

<u>Related SEA topic</u>	<u>Information source</u>	<u>Consultation required ( only if answer is Yes)</u>
Population and Human Health (PHH)	Geographic Information System (GIS)	Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
Climatic Factors (CF)	Site visit (SV)	Transport Scotland (TS)
Biodiversity (B)	Consultee (C)	Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
Landscape (L)	Other (O)	Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
Material Assets (MA)		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA								
Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)	SACs	N	LNR	N	SPAs	N	SSSIs	N
	NNR	N	Local wildlife sites	N	Natterjack toads	N	Great Crested Newts	N
	RAMSAR	N	Geodiversity Sites	N	Other protected species	N	Marine Consultation Zones	N
	Ancient/semi-natural woodland		N		Comments: No strategic comments from SNH			
Are there any known invasive species within the site	N							
Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity	Y	Potential habitat fragmentation due to the loss of a greenfield site.			x	Where appropriate, measures to enhance biodiversity should be implemented, such as the use of locally native tree species in landscape schemes, habitat creation, and the creation of greenways and wildlife corridors along transport corridors, footpaths and cycleways, to encourage the movement of species.		O
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Measures to enhance biodiversity should be implemented, such as the use of locally native tree species in landscape schemes, habitat creation, and the creation of greenways and wildlife corridors along transport corridors, footpaths and cycleways, to encourage the movement of species.							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No designations affecting site						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>	

POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH											
Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space.	MA	N									
Distance to nearest area of open space		Distance (km)	1								
Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them	MA or CF	Right of Way	N	Comment: On road national cycle route 7 on southern boundary of site on Old Graitney Road to Eastriggs and Annan							
		Core path	N								
		Cycle path	Y								
What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)	CF	Community/village hall	1	Sports facilities	1	Hospitalities	1	Local shops (convenience)	1	Bus stop	0.2
What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km)	Primary		Secondary								
	School name:	Gretna		Annan							
	Capacity:	76		331							
	Distance:	1		10							
Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere	MA and B	N	GIS		0	0					
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Within reasonable walking distance to community facilities and school, scope to encourage active travel										

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Positive Sea impact as within reasonable walking distance to community facilities and school, scope to encourage active travel. Gretna served by railway station – could encourage use of more sustainable transport and reduce carbon emissions from transport.						<b>SEA SCORE: +</b>
---------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	---------------------

SOILS								
Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land		Y	Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)	3.1		X		X
Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)		N	Relatively flat open site		SV	O		O
Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site		N	No known previous use.		C	O		O
Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat	CF	N			O	O		O
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Potential loss of prime agricultural land							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Negative SEA impact as potential loss of prime agricultural land						<b>SEA SCORE:X</b>	

WATER								
Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site	B and L	Y	Body of water lies on western boundary of site		SV	0		0
Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere	CF and PHH	Y	Site appears in pluvial SEPA flood maps. Body of water lies adjacent to the site. Historical pluvial issues at this site.		C	X	Flood Risk Assessment required which would require to agreed with SEPA	0
Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse)		N			0	0		0
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer	PHH	Y	Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.		C	0		0
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply	PHH	Y	Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.		C	0	Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network	0

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required	
						issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the requirements for this phase of the upgrade work. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October 2010) refers.			
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. Flood risk assessment required								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Potential flood risk. Flood Risk Assessment required which would require to be agreed with SEPA						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

AIR QUALITY									
Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA		N	There are no AQMA at present in the region	C	0		0		
What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby	PHH	N	North, east and south – existing housing. West – agricultural land. Site bounded by Old Graitney Road on southern boundary		0		0		
Does the development of the site introduce a new potentially significant air emission to the area (e.g. combined heat and power, an industrial process, large scale quarry of energy from the waste plant)		N			0		0		
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Unlikely to decrease air quality.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Unlikely to decrease air quality.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

MATERIAL ASSETS								
Is the site.....		Brownfield		Comment				
		Greenfield	Y					
Is the site vacant or derelict		N	Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey		0	No known previous use	0	
Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover on-site materials/resources		N						
Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction		N						
Is the site in the vicinity of a waste	PHH							

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation								
Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9)		n/a						
Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site			Pylons   N   Bord Gais Eirann pipeline   N   Shell oil pipeline   N   Transco pipeline   N					
Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies			Air Traffic/NATS   N   MoD   N   Carlisle Airport   N   Coal Authority   N   HSE   N					
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	No known service constraints. Loss of greenfield land							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Negative SEA impact as loss of greenfield site						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>	

ROADS/ACCESS									
Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated			This site is situated to the north of Old Graitney Road U171a with site GTN.H207 (110 units) located along the western boundary and site GTN.H6 (20 units) located to the south of the U171a. Old Graitney Road is restrictive in nature and any development would require the widening and improvement of the carriageway to an appropriate standard. Any development on this site would trigger the relocation of the 30mph speed limit and extension of street lighting to a point west of any proposed access to the site. It would also therefore be appropriate that any development of this site include the provision of a footway along the site frontage eastwards to link with the existing footway provisions on Empire Way/Dominion Road. Any development of this site should not prejudice the adjacent sites. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and a residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards						
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	This site is situated to the north of Old Graitney Road U171a which is restrictive in nature. Any development would require the widening and improvement of the carriageway to an appropriate standard and require the relocation of the 30mph speed limit and extension of street lighting to a point west of any proposed access to the site. It would also be appropriate that any development of this site include the provision of a footway along the site frontage eastwards to link with the existing footway provisions on Empire Way/Dominion Road. The ability to access land to the west of this site should not be compromised.								

CLIMATIC FACTORS								
What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)		South and West aspect			SV			0
Can the site make best use of solar gain		Y				SV		0
Is the site protected from prevailing winds		N	Exposed to prevailing winds			SV	X	0
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Appropriate landscaping and layout should take into account aspect and prevailing winds to the south west							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Due to south west aspect the use of solar gain could be used to great effect. Exposed to prevailing winds, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>	

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

CULTURAL HERITAGE									
Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting	L		Listed Building	N	Scheduled Monuments	N	Comment Archaeology - No historic environment issues identified for this site, as of July 2016, but borders the Inventory Battlefield for the Battle of Sark to the south Historic Built Environment - No Listed Buildings. No conservation area.		
			Conservation Area	N	Inventory of Historic Battlefield	N			
			World Heritage Site	N	Inventory & Non-Inventory	N			
			Archaeological site	N	Garden or Designed Landscape				
Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment	L	N				0		0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	No known cultural heritage issues directly affecting site. It should be noted that the site borders the Inventory Battlefield for the Battle of Sark to the south								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No known cultural heritage issues directly affecting site. It should be noted that the site borders the Inventory Battlefield for the Battle of Sark to the south						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

LANDSCAPE									
Is the site within or adjoining any of the following			NSAs	N	RSAs	N	Comment Site is relatively flat with hedge boundary along the road side.		
			Wild Land	N	TPOs	N			
Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level						C	0	Trees and hedgerows should be reinforced with additional planting.	0
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement						SV	0	The site forms a logical extension and is well contained	0
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		N				SV	0		0
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	The site forms a logical extension and is well contained								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Minimal detrimental effect on landscape quality						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES		
Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	Y	Allocated housing site in adopted LDP. Effective housing site as planning in principle granted 28 Oct 2015 (14/P/4/0502) subject to completion of Planning Obligation. Not yet agreed as at Oct 16.
Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site	Y	Landowner willing to release land for development, but site not been formally marketed
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips	N	
Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe	Y	

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

<b>OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT</b>	Allocated housing site in adopted LDP. Effective housing site as planning in principle granted 28 Oct 2015 (14/P/4/0502) subject to completion of Planning Obligation.							
<b>OVERALL SEA COMMENT</b>	Negative SEA impact as greenfield site and potential loss of prime agricultural land. Within reasonable walking distance to community facilities and school, scope to encourage active travel. Gretna served by railway station – could encourage use of more sustainable transport and reduce carbon emissions from transport.							

## LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

<b>Site Ref:</b> GTN.H6	<b>Source of site suggestion:</b> LDP Allocations	<b>Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):</b>	
<b>Site name:</b> Land south of Old Graitney Road			
<b>Settlement:</b> Gretna Border	<b>Current use:</b> Agricultural land	<b>Existing LDP allocations/ designations:</b> <b>Yes</b>	
<b>OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing):</b> 331450, 566681			
<b>Site Size (ha):</b> 1.02	<b>Proposed use:</b> Housing	<b>HMA:</b> Annan	<b>Date completed:</b> Oct/Nov 2016

TOPIC	Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora	Population and Human Health	Soils	Water	Air Quality	Material Assets	Climatic Factors	Cultural Heritage	Landscape
SCORE	0	+	X	0	0	X	0	0	0

Impact	Significant positive impact	Positive impact	Neutral impact	Unknown impact	Both Positive and Negative impacts	Negative impact	Significant negative impact
Score Symbol	++	+	0	?	+/x	x	xx

Legends

<b>Related SEA topic</b>	<b>Information source</b>	<b>Consultation required ( only if answer is Yes)</b>
Population and Human Health (PHH)	Geographic Information System (GIS)	Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
Climatic Factors (CF)	Site visit (SV)	Transport Scotland (TS)
Biodiversity (B)	Consultee (C)	Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
Landscape (L)	Other (O)	Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
Material Assets (MA)		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA								
Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)	SACs	N	LNR	N	SPAs	N	SSSIs	N
	NNR	N	Local wildlife sites	N	Natterjack toads	N	Great Crested Newts	N
	RAMSAR	N	Geodiversity Sites	N	Other protected species	N	Marine Consultation Zones	N
	Ancient/semi-natural woodland		N		Comments: No strategic comments from SNH			
Are there any known invasive species within the site	N							
Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity	Y	Potential habitat fragmentation due to the loss of a greenfield site.			x	Where appropriate, measures to enhance biodiversity should be implemented, such as the use of locally native tree species in landscape schemes, habitat creation, and the creation of greenways and wildlife corridors along transport corridors, footpaths and cycleways, to encourage the movement of species.		+
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Measures to enhance biodiversity should be implemented, such as the use of locally native tree species in landscape schemes, habitat creation, and the creation of greenways and wildlife corridors along transport corridors, footpaths and cycleways, to encourage the movement of species.							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No designations affecting site						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>	

POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH											
Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space	MA	N									
		Distance (km)	1								
Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them	MA or CF	Right of Way	N	Comment: On road national cycle route 7 on northern boundary of site on Old Graitney Road to Easttriggs and Annan							
		Core path	N								
		Cycle path	Y								
What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)	CF	Community/village hall	1	Sports facilities	1	Hospitalities	1	Local shops (convenience)	1	Bus stop	0.2
What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km)	Primary		Secondary								
	School name:	Gretna				Annan					
	Capacity:	76				331					
	Distance:	1				10					
Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere	MA and B	N	GIS			0		0			
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Within reasonable walking distance to community facilities and school, scope to encourage active travel										

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Within reasonable walking distance to community facilities and school, scope to encourage active travel. Gretna served by railway station – could encourage use of more sustainable transport and reduce carbon emissions from transport.						<b>SEA SCORE: +</b>
---------------------	---	--	--	--	--	--	---------------------

SOILS									
Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land		Y	Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)	3.1		0	Loss of prime quality agricultural land currently in agricultural use	0	
Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)		N	Relatively flat open site		SV	0		0	
Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site			No known previous use.		C	0		0	
Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat	CF	N			O	0		0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Loss of prime quality agricultural land currently in agricultural use								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Loss of prime quality agricultural land currently in agricultural use						<b>SEA SCORE:X</b>		

WATER									
Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site	B and L	Y	Body of water lies on western boundary of site		SV			0	
Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere	CF and PHH		Site appears in pluvial SEPA flood maps. Body of water lies adjacent to the site. Historical pluvial issues at this site.		C	X	Flood Risk Assessment required which would require to be agreed with SEPA	0	
Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse)		N							
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer	PHH		Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.		C	0		0	
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply	PHH		Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.		C	0	Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the	0	

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

						requirements for this phase of the upgrade work. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October 2010) refers. 6" water main running along North of site boundary			
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. Water main running along north boundary of site will require to be protected. Flood risk assessment required which would require to be agreed with SEPA.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Potential flood risk. Flood Risk Assessment required which would require to be agreed with SEPA . Gretna – limited water network capacity subject to planned upgrading by Scottish Water which will require developer contributions.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

AIR QUALITY									
Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA		N	There are no AQMA at present in the region	C	0		0		
What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby	PHH	N	East – existing housing. West – agricultural land. Site bounded by Old Graitney Road on northern boundary		0		0		
Does the development of the site introduce a new potentially significant air emission to the area (e.g. combined heat and power, an industrial process, large scale quarry of energy from the waste plant)		N			0		0		
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Unlikely to decrease air quality.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Unlikely to decrease air quality.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

MATERIAL ASSETS								
Is the site.....		Brownfield		Comment currently in agricultural use				
		Greenfield	Y					
Is the site vacant or derelict		N	Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey		0	No known previous use	0	
Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover on-site materials/resources		N						
Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction		N						

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation	PHH							
Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9)		n/a						
Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site			Pylons   N   Bord Gais Eirann pipeline   N   Shell oil pipeline   N   Transco pipeline   N					
Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies			Air Traffic/NATS   N   MoD   NN   Carlisle Airport   N   Coal Authority   N   HSE   N					
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	No known servicing constraints. Loss of greenfield land							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Negative SEA impact as loss of greenfield site						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>	

ROADS/ACCESS									
Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated			This site (20 units) is situated to the south of Old Graitney Road U171a with site GTN.H207 (110 units) and site GTN.H5 (20 units) located to the north of the U171a. Old Graitney Road is restrictive in nature and any development would require the widening and improvement of the carriageway to an appropriate standard. Any development on this site would trigger the relocation of the 30mph speed limit and extension of street lighting to a point west of any proposed access to the site. It would also therefore be appropriate that any development of this site include the provision of a footway along the site frontage eastwards to link with the existing footway provisions on Empire Way/Dominion Road. Any development of this site should not prejudice the adjacent sites. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and a residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards						
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	This site is situated to the south of Old Graitney Road U171a which is restrictive in nature. Any development would require the widening and improvement of the carriageway to an appropriate standard and require the relocation of the 30mph speed limit and extension of street lighting to a point west of any proposed access to the site. It would also be appropriate that any development of this site include the provision of a footway along the site frontage eastwards to link with the existing footway provisions on Empire Way/Dominion Road.								

CLIMATIC FACTORS									
What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)		South and West aspect			SV			0	
Can the site make best use of solar gain		Y			SV			0	
Is the site protected from prevailing winds		N	Exposed to prevailing winds		SV	X	Appropriate landscaping and layout should take into account aspect and prevailing winds to the south west	0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Appropriate landscaping and layout should take into account aspect and prevailing winds to the south west								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Due to south west aspect the use of solar gain could be used to great effect. Exposed to prevailing winds, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

CULTURAL HERITAGE									
Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting	L		Listed Building	N	Scheduled Monuments	N	Comment Archaeology - Lies within the Inventory Battlefield for the Battle of Sark. Historic Built Environment - No Listed Buildings. No conservation area. HES – The site is located within the Battle of Sark (Inventory Battlefield, BTL40. Sensitive development is possible on this site, subject to an assessment of potential impacts on the historic battlefield. The Council's comments on a requirement for a historic assessment to identify mitigation measures are noted and this approach is supported.		
			Conservation Area	N	Inventory of Historic Battlefield	Y			
			World Heritage Site	N	Inventory & Non-Inventory	N			
			Archaeological site	N	Garden or Designed Landscape				
Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment	L	N				0		0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Site lies within the area of the Inventory Battlefield for the Battle of Sark. Appropriate archaeological investigation would be required and appropriate mitigation measures identified where development would not have a significant adverse impact on the character, appearance, setting or key features of the battlefield.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Site lies within the area of the Inventory Battlefield for the Battle of Sark. Appropriate archaeological investigation would be required and appropriate mitigation measures identified where development would not have a significant adverse impact on the character, appearance, setting or key features of the battlefield.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

LANDSCAPE									
Is the site within or adjoining any of the following			NSAs	N	RSAs	N	Comment Site is relatively flat with hedge boundary along the road side.		
			Wild Land	N	TPOs	N			
Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level			No significant issues and contained				C	0	0
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement								0	The site forms a logical extension and is well contained
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		N						0	0
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	No impact on landscape quality								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No impact on landscape quality						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES		
Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	Y	Allocated housing site within the adopted LDP. Query over effectiveness as existing landowner not confirmed development interest and site not submitted through the LDP2 Call for Sites.
Have all landowners been identified and have they	Y	No known interest from existing landowner and site not submitted through the LDP2 Call for Sites.

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

agreed to disposal/development of the site								
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips		N						
Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe		?						
<b>OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT</b>	Allocated housing site within the adopted LDP. Query over effectiveness as existing landowner not confirmed development interest and site not submitted through the LDP2 Call for Sites. Site lies within the area identified in the Inventory of Historic of Battlefields (Battle of Sark) and appropriate mitigation factors would require to be investigated. Review site as an option for inclusion in LDP2.							
<b>OVERALL SEA COMMENT</b>	Negative SEA impact as prime quality agricultural land and loss of greenfield land. Positive SEA impact in terms of population and health - within reasonable walking distance to community facilities and school, scope to encourage active travel. Gretna served by railway station – could encourage use of more sustainable transport and reduce carbon emissions from transport.							

## LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

<b>Site Ref:</b> GTN.H7	<b>Source of site suggestion:</b> LDP allocation	<b>Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):</b>	
<b>Site name:</b> land north of Victory Avenue (Phase 1 and Phase 2)			
<b>Settlement:</b> Gretna Border	<b>Current use:</b> Agricultural land	<b>Existing LDP allocations/ designations:</b> Yes	
<b>OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing):</b> 331599, 567652			
<b>Site Size (ha):</b> 11.25	<b>Proposed use:</b> Housing	<b>HMA:</b> Annan	<b>Date completed:</b> Oct/Nov 2016

TOPIC	Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora	Population and Human Health	Soils	Water	Air Quality	Material Assets	Climatic Factors	Cultural Heritage	Landscape
SCORE	0	+	X	0	0	X	+	0	0

### Scoring Guidance

Impact	Significant positive impact	Positive impact	Neutral impact	Unknown impact	Both Positive and Negative impacts	Negative impact	Significant negative impact
Score Symbol	++	+	0	?	+/-	x	xx

### Legends

<b>Related SEA topic</b>	<b>Information source</b>	<b>Consultation required ( only if answer is Yes)</b>
Population and Human Health (PHH)	Geographic Information System (GIS)	Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
Climatic Factors (CF)	Site visit (SV)	Transport Scotland (TS)
Biodiversity (B)	Consultee (C)	Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
Landscape (L)	Other (O)	Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
Material Assets (MA)		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

### BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)	SACs	N	LNR	N	SPAs	N	SSSIs	N
	NNR	N	Local wildlife sites	N	Natterjack toads	N	Great Crested Newts	N
	RAMSAR	N	Geodiversity Sites	N	Other protected species	N	Marine Consultation Zones	N
	Ancient/semi-natural woodland		N	Comments: No strategic comments from SNH				
Are there any known invasive species within the site	N				0		0	
Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity					0	Greenfield site on edge of settlement. Careful consideration of design and planting could help create new habitats within this development	0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Greenfield site on edge of settlement. Careful consideration of design and planting could help create new habitats within this development							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No biodiversity designations affecting site						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>	

### POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space	MA	N									
		Distance (km)	0.2	Comment: Footpath and cycle route traverses site giving direct link to Gretna Station							
Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them	MA or CF	Right of Way		Comment: Footpath and cycle route traverses site giving direct link to Gretna Station							
		Core path									
		Cycle path	Y								
What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)	CF	Community/village hall	1	Sports facilities	1	Hospitalities	1	Local shops (convenience)	1	Bus stop	0.1
What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km)	Primary		Secondary								
	School name:	Gretna				Annan					
	Capacity:	76				331					
	Distance:	0.1				10					
Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere	MA and B	N		GIS	0			0			
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Within close walking distance to existing facilities, school and direct access to Gretna station. Footpath and cycle route traverses site giving direct link to Gretna Station										
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Within close walking distance to existing facilities, school and direct access to Gretna station. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.									<b>SEA SCORE: +</b>	

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

SOILS								
Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land		Y	Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)	3.1	0	Currently in agricultural use	X	
Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)		N	Site gently slopes with land rising towards A75 trunk road	SV			0	
Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site		N	No known previous use	C			0	
Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat	CF	N			0		0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Would involve loss of prime agricultural land							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Would involve loss of prime agricultural land						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>	

WATER								
Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site	B and L	Y	Evidence of boggy areas and watercourse runs north south through site		X	Appropriate SUDs drainage to be provided		
Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere	CF and PHH	Y	Site appears in pluvial SEPA flood maps. Body of water traverses the site. SEPA - A minor partly culverted watercourse flows along the site boundary which could represent a potential flood risk. A Flood Risk Assessment is required.		x	Drainage Impact Assessment required. Depending on content, Flood Risk Assessment may also be required to be agreed with SEPA	0	
Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse)		N						
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer	PHH		Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.	C	0	There is an existing sewer infrastructure within site. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.	0	
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply	PHH		Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.	C	0	Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been	0	

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

						completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the requirements for this phase of the upgrade work. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October 2010) refers. A 90mm water main. There also is a 12"trunk main near by and appropriate stand off distances will have to be established with Scottish Water's Asset Impact team.			
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. A 90mm water main and a 12"trunk main is nearby and appropriate stand off distances will have to be established with Scottish Water's Asset Impact team. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Depending on content, Flood Risk Assessment may also be required to be agreed with SEPA. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended. There is an existing sewer infrastructure within site. Appropriate SUDs drainage to be provided.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Potential flood risk. Drainage Impact Assessment required. Depending on content, Flood Risk Assessment may also be required to be agreed with SEPA. Gretna – limited water network capacity subject to planned upgrading by Scottish Water which will require developer contributions.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

AIR QUALITY									
Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA		N	There are no AQMA at present in the region	C	0		0		
What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby	PHH	N	North – A75 and rail line. East – site allocated for housing GTN.H2 South – housing, community facilities and school. West – existing greyhound stadium (Halcrow Stadium) allocated for housing development (GTN: H4) SEPA noted an issue with air quality given the sites location	SV/C	X	Noise assessment would be required together with any necessary mitigation will be required to address cumulative noise pollution from A75 and railway. Consideration will need to be given to appropriate landscaping and screening	0		
Does the development of the site introduce a new potentially significant air emission to the area (e.g. combined heat and power, an industrial process, large scale quarry of energy from the waste plant)		N							
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Noise assessment would be required together with any necessary mitigation will be required to address cumulative noise pollution from A75 and railway. Consideration will need to be given to appropriate landscaping and screening								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Noise assessment would be required together with any necessary mitigation will be required to address cumulative noise pollution from A75 and railway. Consideration will need to be given to appropriate landscaping and screening						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

MATERIAL ASSETS											
Is the site.....		Brownfield		Comment Greenfield site currently in agricultural use.							
		Greenfield	G								
Is the site vacant or derelict		N	Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey	N			No known previous use				
Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover on-site materials/resources		N									
Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction		N									
Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation	PHH	N									
Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9)		n/a									
Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site		Pylons	N	Bord Gais Eirann pipeline	N	Shell oil pipeline	N	Transco pipeline	N		
		Comment No known servicing constraints									
Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies		Air Traffic/NATS	N	MoD	N	Carlisle Airport	N	Coal Authority	N	HSE	N
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Loss of greenfield land currently in agricultural use.										
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Negative SEA impact as involves loss of greenfield land.						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>				

ROADS/ACCESS									
Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated		This site (160 units) can potentially take access from Mackies Drive U569a, Burnside Road U173a and The Hawthorns U188a. This site is also bordered by GTN.H2,3 and 4. Sites GTN.H3, H7, H4 and H2 are all linked with multiple connections onto various public roads, this would result in an overall development of over 350 units. It would be appropriate that a development brief be provided for this site, and that any future applicant provide a Transport Assessment and that a cumulative Masterplan be provided for all of these sites. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and a residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards							
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Can potentially take access from Mackies Drive U569a, Burnside Road U173a and The Hawthorns U188a. Sites GTN.H3, H7, H4 and H2 are all linked with multiple connections onto various public roads, this would result in an overall development of over 350 units. It would be appropriate that a development brief be provided for this site, and that any future applicant provide a Transport Assessment and that a cumulative Masterplan be provided for all of these sites.								

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

### CLIMATIC FACTORS

What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)		South							
Can the site make best use of solar gain		Y	Open slightly sloping site with land rising towards north and A75 trunk road.			The layout should ensure solar gain and look to create sustainable buildings in line with policies OP1f and OP2.			
Is the site protected from prevailing winds		Y							
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Housing design could make use of passive solar gain, reducing energy use and carbon emissions.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Site is southerly facing. Housing design could make use of passive solar gain, reducing energy use and carbon emissions.						<b>SEA SCORE: +</b>		

### CULTURAL HERITAGE

Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting	L	Listed Building	N	Scheduled Monuments	N	Comment Archaeology - No historic environment issues identified for this site, as of July 2016 Historic Built Environment - No Listed Buildings; no conservation area. However this wraps around the planned town with GTN H2 and should be developed using the same successful design principles in a modern interpretation.			
		Conservation Area	N	Inventory of Historic Battlefield	N				
		World Heritage Site	N	Inventory & Non-Inventory	N				
		Archaeological site	N	Garden or Designed Landscape					
Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment	L	N							
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Development should reinforce the layout of the planned town of Gretna which is of national wartime interest. The design of buildings should integrate street scene along Victory Avenue and take account of nearby listed buildings.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No cultural heritage issues identified.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

### LANDSCAPE

Is the site within or adjoining any of the following		NSAs	N	RSAs	N	Comment Site gently slopes with land rising towards north and A75 trunk road. Hedgerows and trees along field boundaries.			
		Wild Land	N	TPOs	N				
Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level		N	Comments on masterplanning exercise apply. Screen from slip road/A75 with woodland planting.			C	Design in combination with H2, H3, H4 and existing residential developments to ensure permeability and sense of place.	0	
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement		Y					Site provides northern extension to Gretna located between existing housing and A75 trunk road to north.		
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		N				0		0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Consideration will need to be given to appropriate landscaping and screening along northern boundary								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Design in combination with H2, H3, H4, and existing residential developments to ensure permeability and sense of place. Screen from slip road/A75 with woodland and planting.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

### PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES

Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	Y	Allocated long term housing site (beyond 2024) in adopted LDP. Further information is required on its relative effectiveness.
Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site	Y	Land in multiple ownership. One landowner has indicated that the land is available for development and there are current negotiations with various regional housebuilders. F
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips	N	
Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe	?	Allocated long term housing site (beyond 2024)
<b>OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT</b>		Allocated long term housing site (beyond 2024) in adopted LDP. Further information is required on its relative effectiveness given that the site is in multiple ownerships. Review site as an option for inclusion in LDP2.
<b>OVERALL SEA COMMENT</b>		Negative SEA impact as greenfield site and loss of prime agricultural land. Positive SEA impact as proximity of site to community facilities and railway station. Potential to encourage range of sustainable transport modes.

## LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

<b>Site Ref:</b> GTN.MU1	<b>Source of site suggestion:</b> LDP Allocation	<b>Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):</b> 15/P/4/0277 (PIP) 24/05/2016 for residential and business development approved subject to successful completion of S75 Planning Obligation and conditions within 6 month period of 05/16.	
<b>Site name:</b> former Golf Course			
<b>Settlement:</b> Gretna Border	<b>Current use:</b> Agricultural land	<b>Existing LDP allocations/ designations:</b> Yes	
<b>OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing):</b> 331068, 567232			
<b>Site Size (ha):</b> 11.34	<b>Proposed use:</b> Mixed Use – Housing and Business	<b>HMA:</b> Annan	<b>Date completed:</b> Oct/Nov 2016

<b>TOPIC</b>	Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora	Population and Human Health	Soils	Water	Air Quality	Material Assets	Climatic Factors	Cultural Heritage	Landscape
<b>SCORE</b>	0	+	X	0	0	X	0	0	0

### Scoring Guidance

<b>Impact</b>	Significant positive impact	Positive impact	Neutral impact	Unknown impact	Both Positive and Negative impacts	Negative impact	Significant negative impact
<b>Score Symbol</b>	++	+	0	?	+/-	-	--

### Legends

<u>Related SEA topic</u>	<u>Information source</u>	<u>Consultation required ( only if answer is Yes)</u>
Population and Human Health (PHH)	Geographic Information System (GIS)	Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
Climatic Factors (CF)	Site visit (SV)	Transport Scotland (TS)
Biodiversity (B)	Consultee (C)	Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
Landscape (L)	Other (O)	Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
Material Assets (MA)		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

### BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)	SACs	N	LNR	N	SPAs	N	SSSIs	N
	NNR	N	Local wildlife sites	N	Natterjack toads	N	Great Crested Newts	N
	RAMSAR	N	Geodiversity Sites	N	Other protected species	N	Marine Consultation Zones	N
	Ancient/semi-natural woodland		N	Comments: No strategic comments from SNH				
Are there any known invasive species within the site	N				0		0	
Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity	N				0	Mature trees and the network of hedgerows should be retained and enhanced for biodiversity value.	0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Mature trees and the network of hedgerows should be retained and enhanced for biodiversity value.							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No designations affecting site. Mature trees and the network of hedgerows should be retained and enhanced for biodiversity value.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>	

### POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space	MA	N									
		Distance (km)	1	Comment:							
Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them	MA or CF	Right of Way	N								
		Core path	N								
		Cycle path	N								
What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)	CF	Community/village hall	1	Sports facilities	1	Hospitalities	1	Local shops (convenience)	1	Bus stop	0.1
What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km)	Primary		Secondary								
	School name:	Gretna	Annan								
	Capacity:	76	331								
	Distance:	1	10								
Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere	MA and B	N		GIS	0			0			
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Within reasonable walking distance to existing facilities, school and Gretna station. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.										
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Within reasonable walking distance to existing facilities, school and Gretna station. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.						<b>SEA SCORE: +</b>				

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

SOILS								
Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land		Y	Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)	3.1	0	Currently in agricultural use for cattle grazing. Former use golf course.	X	
Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)		N	Site gently undulates		SV		0	
Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site		N	Two areas of the site are noted to contain some made up ground and waste material and a sewage odour was reported to the east of the site.		C	Consideration should be given to removing this waste material in those areas with a garden end use and to tracing and remedying the source of sewage odour during development.	0	
Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat	CF	N						
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Would involve loss of prime agricultural land. There is evidence of waste material and consideration should be given to removing this waste material in those areas with a garden end use and to tracing and remedying the source of sewage odour during development.							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Would involve loss of prime agricultural land						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>	

WATER								
Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site	B and L	Y	Small drains and watercourses within site					
Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere	CF and PHH		Potential sources of flooding including from two drains within the site and a burn which runs to the eastern corner and from surface water,		X	A Flood Risk Assessment was submitted following a SEPA objection. The FRA concludes that only a small part of the south-eastern corner of the site is predicted to lie within the 1 in 200 year floodplain of the Mill Burn. No significant risk of surface water flooding from adjacent land was predicted. SEPA objection removed following submission of additional information.	0	
Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse)								
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer	PHH	Y	Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.	C	0	Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended. There is an existing sewer infrastructure		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

						within the site.			
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply	PHH	Y	Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.	C	0	Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the requirements for this phase of the upgrade work. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October 2010) refers.			
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended. Appropriate SUDs drainage to be provided. There is an existing sewer infrastructure within the site.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Potential flood risk identified and objection from SEPA. SEPA objection subsequently removed following submission of additional information.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

AIR QUALITY									
Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA		N	There are no AQMA at present in the region	C	0		0		
What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby	PHH	N	North – housing at Malor Park. East – woodland that surrounds Raydale House (Masonic Lodge) and Raydale Park football ground and car park. South – land is mainly in use for small holdings/agriculture. West/southwest – Loanworth Rd. Beyond Loanworth Rd to the west, the land is predominantly open agricultural land.	SV	0		0		
Does the development of the site introduce a new potentially significant air emission to the area (e.g. combined heat and power, an industrial process, large scale quarry of energy from the waste plant)		N		O	0		0		
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Unlikely to decrease air quality.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Unlikely to decrease air quality.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

MATERIAL ASSETS								
Is the site.....		Brownfield		Comment Former golf course and now agricultural land in grazing				

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

		Greenfield	G								
Is the site vacant or derelict		N	Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey	N			Two areas of the site are noted to contain some made up ground and waste material and a sewage odour was reported to the east of the site. Consideration should be given to removing this waste material in those areas with a garden end use and to tracing and remedying the source of sewage odour during development.				
Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover on-site materials/resources		N									
Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction		N									
Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation	PHH	N									
Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9)		n/a									
Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site		Pylons	N	Bord Gais Eirann pipeline	N	Shell oil pipeline	N	Transco pipeline	N		
		Comment No known service constraints									
Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies		Air Traffic/NATS	N	MoD	N	Carlisle Airport	N	Coal Authority	N	HSE	N
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Greenfield site but benefits from proximity to existing infrastructure. No known service constraints										
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Negative SEA impact as greenfield site but benefits from proximity to existing infrastructure							<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>			

<b>ROADS/ACCESS</b>										
Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated		<p>Transport Scotland – no objections subject to the requirement for a travel plan to be submitted and agreed with respect to the employment land which shall set out proposals for reducing dependency on the private car. (Committee report 24/5/16)</p> <p>Council Roads Authority - No objections subject to conditions</p> <p>a) Access – The site frontage on the B721 Annan road has potential for two fully complaint residential points of access. There is potential and it would be desirable for commercial and residential access to be separated with two distinct points of access from Loanworth Road. There is potential for a significant number of vehicle movements which could come into conflict with the residential properties and pedestrian movements should access be shared. Revised indicative site layout drawing no. 14071 (PL) 001A now shows a pedestrian link between the residential and commercial areas within the site.</p> <p>b) As the proposed access is outwith the existing Greta 30mph speed limit; this along with street lighting should be extended westwards on the B721 to a point west of the proposed access to the site and on the C67a Loanworth Road to the junction of the B721. This will require a Traffic Regulation Order to be promoted and implemented at the developer's expense.</p> <p>c) The C67a Loanworth Road is nominally 2-3.5m in width between a point north of the property "Timaru" to the 30mph speed limit east of</p>								

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

			the site frontage with informal passing opportunities along its length. Given the increase in traffic movements associated with both residential and commercial development, it would be appropriate that a scheme of widening and footway provision be submitted and agreed with the Roads Authority, from the B721 junction to an agreed point east of the proposed accesses to facilitate the free and safe movement of pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles. (Committee report 24/5/16)					
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Ref No 15/P/4/0277 Transport Scotland – no objections subject to the requirement for a travel plan to be submitted and agreed with respect to the employment land which shall set out proposals for reducing dependency on the private car. Council Roads Authority - No objections subject to conditions (Committee report 24/5/16)							

CLIMATIC FACTORS								
What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)		South and west			O		O	
Can the site make best use of solar gain		Y			O	Housing design could make best use of passive solar gain, reducing energy use and carbon emissions.	O	
Is the site protected from prevailing winds		N	Potentially exposed to the west		O	PIP indicates a reinforced woodland strip to the west and north west with further woodland planting through the site.	O	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Potentially exposed to the west however this will be partially mitigated by a reinforced woodland strip to the west and north west.							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Potentially exposed to the west however this will be partially mitigated by a reinforced woodland strip to the west and north west.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>	

CULTURAL HERITAGE								
Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting	L	Listed Building	N	Scheduled Monuments	N	Comment Archaeology - The site landscape situation lends itself to the potential for the presence of unknown archaeological material. No objections subject to a condition requiring the submission of a scheme of archaeological investigation.		
		Conservation Area	N	Inventory of Historic Battlefield	N			
		World Heritage Site	N	Inventory & Non-Inventory	N			
		Archaeological site	N	Garden or Designed Landscape	N			
Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment	L							
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Scheme of archaeological investigation required. Refer condition in committee report 25/4/16							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No designations affecting site. Scheme of archaeological investigation required.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>	

LANDSCAPE								
Is the site within or adjoining any of the following		NSAs	N	RSAs	N	Comment		
		Wild Land	N	TPOs	N			
Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant		The site undulates, but there is a general drop in levels between the B721 (Annan Road) and Loanworth Road. Hedgerows and trees bound the site being associated with its former golf course use.				Mature trees and the network of hedgerows should be retained and enhanced for biodiversity value.		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required	
slopes/changes in level									
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement		Y							
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		N							
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Mature trees and the network of hedgerows should be retained and enhanced for biodiversity value.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Mature trees and the network of hedgerows should be retained and enhanced for biodiversity value.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

<b>PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES</b>								
Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	Y	Allocated mixed use site in adopted LDP. Planning in Principle (15/P/4/0277) for residential and business development approved subject to successful completion of S75 Planning Obligation and conditions within 6 month period of 05/16. Refer committee decision of 24/05/2016						
Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site	Y							
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips	N							
Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe	Y							
<b>OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT</b>	Allocated mixed use site in adopted LDP with the benefit of Planning in Principle subject to successful completion of S75 Planning Obligation and conditions within 6 month period of 05/16.							
<b>OVERALL SEA COMMENT</b>	Negative SEA impact as would involve loss of prime agricultural land and greenfield site. Positive in terms of population and human health as within reasonable walking distance to existing community facilities. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.							

## LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

<b>Site Ref:</b> GTN.H201	<b>Source of site suggestion:</b> Call for Sites	<b>Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):</b>	
<b>Site name:</b> land adjacent to Rhona Villa			
<b>Settlement:</b> Gretna Border	<b>Current use:</b> Agricultural land	<b>Existing LDP allocations/ designations:</b> None – Outwith settlement boundary for Gretna Border	
<b>OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing):</b>			
<b>Site Size (ha):</b> 2.4ha	<b>Proposed use:</b> Housing	<b>HMA:</b> Annan	<b>Date completed:</b> Oct/Nov 2016

TOPIC	Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora	Population and Human Health	Soils	Water	Air Quality	Material Assets	Climatic Factors	Cultural Heritage	Landscape
SCORE	0	X/+	X	0	X	X	0	O	XX

### Scoring Guidance

Impact	Significant positive impact	Positive impact	Neutral impact	Unknown impact	Both Positive and Negative impacts	Negative impact	Significant negative impact
Score Symbol	++	+	0	?	+/-	x	xx

### Legends

<b>Related SEA topic</b>	<b>Information source</b>	<b>Consultation required ( only if answer is Yes)</b>
Population and Human Health (PHH)	Geographic Information System (GIS)	Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
Climatic Factors (CF)	Site visit (SV)	Transport Scotland (TS)
Biodiversity (B)	Consultee (C)	Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
Landscape (L)	Other (O)	Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
Material Assets (MA)		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA								
Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)	SACs	N	LNR	N	SPAs	N	SSSIs	N
	NNR	N	Local wildlife sites	N	Natterjack toads	N	Great Crested Newts	N
	RAMSAR	N	Geodiversity Sites	N	Other protected species	N	Marine Consultation Zones	N
	Ancient/semi-natural woodland		N					
Comments: No comments								
Are there any known invasive species within the site	N				O		O	
Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity	N				O		O	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	No impact on biodiversity designations							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No impact on biodiversity designations							<b>SEA SCORE: O</b>

POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH											
Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space	MA	N									
		Distance (km)	1								
Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them	MA or CF	Right of Way	N	Comment: Cycle route on western edge of site providing link to Gretna Station							
		Core path	N								
		Cycle path	Y								
What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)	CF	Community/village hall	1	Sports facilities	1	Hospitalities	1	Local shops (convenience)	1	Bus stop	0.1
What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km)			Primary				Secondary				
	School name:	Springfield				Annan					
	Capacity:	31				331					
	Distance:	1				10					
Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere	MA and B	N			GIS	0				0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Site not within reasonable walking distance of the majority of community facilities and public open space. Close proximity to Gretna Station and could encourage active travel and use of sustainable transport.										
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Site not within reasonable walking distance of the majority of community facilities and public open space. Close proximity to Gretna Station and could encourage active travel and use of sustainable transport.								<b>SEA SCORE: +/X</b>		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

SOILS									
Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land		Y	Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)	3.2	O	Loss of prime quality agricultural land being actively farmed for cereal crops	X		
Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)		N	Generally flat site with M74 embankment to north west		O		O		
Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site		N	No known previous use		C		O		
Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat	CF	N			0		0		
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Loss of prime agricultural land currently in production								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Negative SEA impact as loss of prime agricultural land.						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>		

WATER								
Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site	B and L	N			0		0	
Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere	CF and PHH	N	SEPA - No flood risk apparent.		0		0	
Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse)		N			0		0	
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer	PHH	Y	Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.		0	Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.	0	
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply	PHH	Y	Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity		0	Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the	0	

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

						requirements for this phase of the upgrade work. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October 2010) refers.		
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing waste water network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No known flood risk. Gretna – limited water network capacity subject to planned upgrading by Scottish Water which will require developer contributions.					<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

AIR QUALITY								
Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA		N	There are no AQMA at present in the region	C	0		0	
What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby	PHH	Y	SEPA question the air quality? Site is surrounded by the M74 motorway and the railway line to the south	X		M74 motorway at height above site approx 5m embankment. Noise assessment required. Given that motorway at height mitigation measures are unlikely to be successful	X	
Does the development of the site introduce a new potentially significant air emission to the area (e.g. combined heat and power, an industrial process, large scale quarry of energy from the waste plant)								
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Significant environmental issues due to proximity of M74 at height and railway line. Noise assessment required. Mitigation measures considered unlikely to be successful.							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Significant environmental issues due to proximity of M74 and slip roads at height. Noise assessment required. Mitigation measures considered unlikely to be successful					<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>		

MATERIAL ASSETS								
Is the site.....		Brownfield		Comment				
		Greenfield	Y					
Is the site vacant or derelict		N	Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey	N		O		O
Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover on-site		N				O		O

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
materials/resources								
Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction		N			O		O	
Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation	PHH	N			O		O	
Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9)		n/a			O		O	
Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site			Pylons   N   Bord Gais Eirann pipeline   N   Shell oil pipeline   N   Transco pipeline   N					
Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies			Air Traffic/NATS   N   MoD   N   Carlisle Airport   N   Coal Authority   N   HSE   N					
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	No servicing constraints in relation to this site							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Negative SEA impact as loss of greenfield site						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>	

ROADS/ACCESS									
Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated			This site (69 units) can take access from the B7076 with potential links onto Sarkside U545a via a section of private road. Vehicular access cannot be taken from the private road on the U545a given the restrictive layout, therefore the site should take access from the B7076 only. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and a residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards						
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	The site should take access from the B7076 only with potential links onto Sarkside U545a via a section of private road								

CLIMATIC FACTORS										
What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)		Southerly aspect							O	
Can the site make best use of solar gain		Y								O
Is the site protected from prevailing winds		Y								O
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	No impact on climatic factors.									
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No impact on climatic factors.						<b>SEA SCORE: O</b>			

CULTURAL HERITAGE								
Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting	L	Listed Building   N   Scheduled Monuments   N	Conservation Area   N   Inventory of Historic Battlefield   N	Comment Archaeology - No historic environment issues identified for this site, as of July 2016. Opposite non-inventory designed landscape for Gretna Hall				

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

			World Heritage Site Archaeological site	N N	Inventory & Non-Inventory Garden or Designed Landscape	N	Historic Built Environment - Nearest Listed Buildings are Gretna Hall Hotel, Blacksmith's Shop and Gretna Old Church and churchyard features. No conservation area. The landscape around Gretna Hall is a 19th century designed landscape. The dwellings along the front of the site are large detached and care will be needed not to jar with this character.	
Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment	L					O		O
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	The landscape around Gretna Hall is a 19th century designed landscape (non inventory designed landscape). The dwellings along the front of the site are large detached and care will be needed that development does not impact on its character..							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Appropriate mitigation measures will require to ensure that development does not impact on the non Inventory Designed landscape around Gretna Hall.						<b>SEA SCORE: O</b>	

LANDSCAPE									
Is the site within or adjoining any of the following			NSAs Wild Land	N N	RSAs TPOs	N N	Comment Not suitable for housing: Dominated by M74, A75 and railway line which about the site. Impacts from the M74 which is overlooking the site are particularly significant. Very little scope to mitigate.		
Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level		Y	Dominated by M74, A75 and railway line which about the site. Impacts from the M74 which is overlooking the site are particularly significant..				XX	Very little scope to mitigate impact	XX
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement		N	See above						
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		N							
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Not suitable for housing development due to significant adverse landscape reasons.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Significant negative impact as site dominated by M74, A75 and railway line which about the site. Impacts from the M74 which is overlooking the site are particularly significant and very little scope to mitigate impact						<b>SEA SCORE:XX</b>		

PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES		
Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	Y	Outwith Gretna Border settlement boundary but immediately adjacent to it.
Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site	Y	
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips	N	
Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe	Y	
<b>OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT</b>	The site has not been included in the MIR for development as development of the site would have significant adverse environmental and landscape impacts.	

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

	A number of other sites have been included for development in the settlement that are considered to meet the identified housing strategy.							
<b>OVERALL SEA COMMENT</b>	Site not within reasonable walking distance of the majority of community facilities and public open space. Close proximity to Gretna Station and could encourage active travel and use of sustainable transport. Negative SEA impact as loss of prime agricultural land. Significant environmental issues due to proximity of M74 and slip roads at height. Mitigation measures considered unlikely to be successful. Negative SEA impact as loss of greenfield site. Significant negative impact in terms of landscape as poor environment as site dominated by M74, A75 and railway line. Impacts from the M74 which is overlooking the site are particularly significant and very little scope to mitigate impact							

## LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

<b>Site Ref:</b> GTN.H202	<b>Source of site suggestion:</b> Call for Sites	<b>Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):</b> n/a	
<b>Site name:</b> Raydale, Annan Road			
<b>Settlement:</b> Gretna Border	<b>Current use:</b> Housing	<b>Existing LDP allocations/ designations:</b> No White land	
<b>OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing):</b> 331460, 567242			
<b>Site Size (ha):</b> 1.10	<b>Proposed use:</b> Housing	<b>HMA:</b> Annan	<b>Date completed:</b> Oct/Nov 2016

TOPIC	Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora	Population and Human Health	Soils	Water	Air Quality	Material Assets	Climatic Factors	Cultural Heritage	Landscape
SCORE	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0

### Scoring Guidance

Impact	Significant positive impact	Positive impact	Neutral impact	Unknown impact	Both Positive and Negative impacts	Negative impact	Significant negative impact
Score Symbol	++	+	0	?	+/-	x	xx

### Legends

<u>Related SEA topic</u>	<u>Information source</u>	<u>Consultation required ( only if answer is Yes)</u>
Population and Human Health (PHH)	Geographic Information System (GIS)	Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
Climatic Factors (CF)	Site visit (SV)	Transport Scotland (TS)
Biodiversity (B)	Consultee (C)	Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
Landscape (L)	Other (O)	Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
Material Assets (MA)		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

### BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)	SACs	N	LNR	N	SPAs	N	SSSIs	N	
	NNR	N	Local wildlife sites		Natterjack toads		Great Crested Newts		
	RAMSAR	N	Geodiversity Sites		Other protected species	Y	Marine Consultation Zones		
	Ancient/semi-natural woodland								
<p>Comments: Much of this site appears to be woodland/parkland, which it would be preferential to retain: extensive development may not be possible if this is the case. Habitat very likely to support bats, a European Protected Species – assessment and/or mitigation required.</p> <p>The trees which surround the original lodge/house are a key landscape feature. This site includes the more mature trees on the northern, roadside boundary with those toward the front of the site being particularly prominent in views along the main route through the village. Tree cover on the eastern boundary is less mature. The amenity value coupled with potential habitat and green infrastructure assets warrant the protection of the trees on both the northern and eastern parts of the site. Development within existing open areas of the site may be appropriate provided there is sufficient offset from larger trees and the woodland resource can be protected and retained.</p> <p>SNH – good landscape structure comprising mature trees and hedgerows that should be retained.</p>									
Are there any known invasive species within the site		N							
Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity		Y	Habitat very likely to support bats , a European Protected Species		X	Habitat assessment and/or mitigation required. The amenity value coupled with potential habitat and green infrastructure assets warrant the protection of the trees on both the northern and eastern parts of the site.	0		
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	The need to retain the mature specimen trees would significantly limit the scale of development and number of units that could be developed on site.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Potential presence of bats, a European Protected Species. Habitat assessment and/or mitigation required. Mature specimen trees on the northern and eastern boundary require protection						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

### POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space	MA	N									
		Distance (km)	0.1								
Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them	MA or CF	Right of Way	N	Comment:							
		Core path	N								
		Cycle path	N								
What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)	CF	Community/village hall	1	Sports facilities	1	Hospitalities	1	Local shops (convenience)	1	Bus stop	0.1
What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km)	Primary		Secondary								
	School name:	Gretna				Annan					
	Capacity:	76				331					
	Distance:	1				10					

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere	MA and B	N		GIS	0		0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Within reasonable walking distance to existing facilities, school and Gretna station. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Within reasonable walking distance to existing facilities, school and Gretna station. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.						<b>SEA SCORE: +</b>	

SOILS								
Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land		N	Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)	Urban		0		0
Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)		N				0		0
Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site		N	No known previous contaminative use.			0		0
Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat	CF	?	Unknown			0		0
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Not applicable							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Not applicable						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>	

WATER								
Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site	B and L		Body of water adjacent to the site – on the eastern boundary		SV			
Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere	CF and PHH		DGC hold records of flooding in connection to the site. SEPA - hold various records of flooding in proximity of the site attributed to surface water/drainage issues. A minor watercourse flows along the site boundary which could represent a potential flood risk.		C	X	Flood Risk Assessment required which would require to be agreed with SEPA.	0
Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse)		N						
Is there sufficient capacity for the	PHH		Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient		C	0	Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact	

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required	
development to connect to the public foul sewer			capacity.			Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended. There is a Combined sewer running through site.			
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply	PHH		Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.	C	0	Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the requirements for this phase of the upgrade work. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October 2010) refers.			
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Flood risk assessment require to be agreed with SEPA. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended. There is a Combined sewer running through site.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Potential flood risk associated with site. Flood Risk Assessment required.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

AIR QUALITY									
Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA		N	There are no AQMA at present in the region	C	0		0		
What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby	PHH	N	North – hotel and housing. East – Gretna football and social club. South – agricultural land, allocated as site GTN. MU1. West – Raydale Masonic Lodge and housing beyond.	SV	0		0		
Does the development of the site introduce a new potentially significant air emission to the area (e.g. combined heat and power, an industrial process, large scale quarry of energy from the waste plant)		N			0		0		
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Site development unlikely to reduce air quality.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Site development unlikely to reduce air quality.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

MATERIAL ASSETS														
Is the site.....		Brownfield Greenfield	Y	Comment Site consists of residential properties associated garden ground and mature specimen trees.										
Is the site vacant or derelict		N	Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey		N	0	No known previous contaminative use.	0						
Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover on-site materials/resources		Y	The three smaller buildings on site (including the gate lodge) seem to originate with the hospital for the designed munition workers' town.		SV/ C	0	Any development proposal should seek to incorporate the existing buildings.	0						
Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction		N				0		0						
Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation	PHH	N				0		0						
Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9)		n/a				0		0						
Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site		Pylons		N	Bord Gais Eirann pipeline		N	Shell oil pipeline	N	Transco pipeline	N			
Comment No known servicing constraints														
Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies		Air Traffic/NATS		N	MoD		N	Carlisle Airport		N	Coal Authority	N	HSE	N
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b> Part greenfield/brownfield. Any development proposal should seek to incorporate the existing buildings.														
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b> Part greenfield/brownfield. Any development proposal should seek to incorporate the existing buildings.											<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>			

ROADS/ACCESS									
Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated		This site is situated to the south of B721 with an existing access which serves multiple dwellings. The boundary for the proposed site no longer bounds site GTN.MU1. There is an identified link from GTN.MU1 to Dominion Road, which may cross through part of this site. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and any residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards.							
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b> This site is situated to the south of B721 with an existing access which serves multiple dwellings. No roads constraints									

CLIMATIC FACTORS									
What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)		South			SV	0		0	

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required	
Can the site make best use of solar gain		Y		SV	0		0		
Is the site protected from prevailing winds		Y	Site bounded by mature trees	SV	0		0		
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Site can make best use of solar gain and protected by mature trees from prevailing wind								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Site can make best use of solar gain and protected by mature trees from prevailing wind						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

<b>CULTURAL HERITAGE</b>									
Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting	L	Listed Building	N	Scheduled Monuments	N	<p>Comment Archaeology - The three smaller buildings on site (including the gate lodge) seem to originate with the hospital for the designed munition workers' town. If so, then any proposal should try to incorporate them as they have strong stylistic links to the other architecture of the period, including the listed building opposite the site. If preservation of the existing buildings is not possible then a mitigation scheme of archaeological building recording will be required.</p> <p>Historic Built Environment - No Listed Buildings; no conservation area. However "Gretna was planned as a complete entity, with houses, shops, school, hospital, police station, churches, cinema and other recreational facilities" and "...Gretna which housed the workers is the surviving legacy of this munitions project. Almost nothing remains of the factory but, in Gretna, many of the original buildings remain." Elizabeth McCrone, by Historic Environment Scotland. Mapping information shows this to the site of the former hospital perhaps the buildings too. The site is a beautifully mature landscape and as this is not a common feature in Gretna it would be a shame to lose it. Individual dwellings would not be appropriate in the setting but flats within a large footprint building/s even conversion of the existing, which preserve the woodland could be accommodated. Comment on amended boundary: the new boundary excludes the Masonic Lodge building and the western side of the whole site. The three smaller buildings and the gateway are included. It is not clear how many units are proposed but as the main building and the clear part of the site are excluded the 45-55 or even a proportion of it is not realistic as the character of the site would be totally spoiled. Up to 5 modest dwellings might be incorporated among the trees subject to methods which do not damage or put the tree root systems under unnecessary pressure. My other comments are as before.</p>			
		Conservation Area	N	Inventory of Historic Battlefield	N				
		World Heritage Site	N	Inventory & Non-Inventory	N				
		Archaeological site	N	Garden or Designed Landscape	N				
Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment	L	Y							
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Potential impact on buildings of local historical importance which should be retained if possible. Given the mature landscape setting up to 5 modest dwellings might be incorporated among the trees subject to methods which do not damage or put the tree root systems under unnecessary pressure								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Potential impact on buildings of local historical importance which should be retained if possible. If preservation of the existing buildings is not possible then a mitigation scheme of archaeological building recording will be required. Given the mature landscape setting up to 5 modest dwellings might be incorporated among the trees subject to methods which do not damage or put the tree root systems under unnecessary pressure						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

LANDSCAPE								
Is the site within or adjoining any of the following			NSAs Wild Land	N N	RSAs TPOs	N N	Comment The trees which surround the original lodge/house are a key landscape feature. This site includes the more mature trees on the northern, roadside boundary with those toward the front of the site being particularly prominent in views along the main route through the village. Tree cover on the eastern boundary is less mature. The amenity value coupled with potential habitat and green infrastructure assets warrant the protection of the trees on both the northern and eastern parts of the site. Development within existing open areas of the site may be appropriate provided there is sufficient offset from larger trees and the woodland resource can be protected and retained.	
Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level		Y	Mature specimen trees which are a key landscape feature.		SV/C	0	Development within existing open areas of the site may be appropriate provided there is sufficient offset from larger trees and the woodland resource can be protected and retained. Impact on the number of units that can be developed on the site.	
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement		Y					0	
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		N	Site contained by mature trees.				0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Development within existing open areas of the site may be appropriate provided there is sufficient offset from larger trees and the woodland resource can be protected and retained. Given the mature landscape setting up to 5 modest dwellings might be incorporated among the trees subject to methods which do not damage or put the tree root systems under unnecessary pressure							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Potential negative impact on mature specimen trees. Development within existing open areas of the site may be appropriate provided there is sufficient offset from larger trees and the woodland resource can be protected and retained. Given the mature landscape setting up to 5 modest dwellings might be incorporated among the trees subject to methods which do not damage or put the tree root systems under unnecessary pressure						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>	

PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES		
Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	Y	Site within the Gretna Border settlement boundary identified as white land.
Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site	Y	Site submitted through the Call for Sites exercise and the landowner has confirmed interest in disposal of site.
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips	N	
Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe	Y	
<b>OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT</b>	Potential brownfield development site within settlement boundary subject to retaining mature trees. Potential impact on buildings of local historical importance which should be retained if possible Landscape and mature trees will limit the number of dwellings that can be accommodated on the site. Given the mature landscape setting up to 5 modest dwellings might be incorporated among the trees subject to methods which do not damage or put the tree root systems under unnecessary pressure	
<b>OVERALL SEA COMMENT</b>	Positive SEA impact in terms of Population and Health and Climatic Factors - Within reasonable walking distance to existing facilities, school and Gretna station. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport. Site can make best use of solar gain and protected by mature	

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

	trees from prevailing wind							
--	----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

<b>Site Ref:</b> GTN.H205	<b>Source of site suggestion:</b> Call for sites	<b>Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):</b> Relates in part to site 13/P/4/0374 PIP – expired. (Existing housing allocation GTN.H1)	
<b>Site name:</b> Adjacent to Hazeldene - Extended (part of GTN.H1)			
<b>Settlement:</b> Gretna Border	<b>Current use:</b> Agricultural Land	<b>Existing LDP allocations/ designations:</b> <b>Part allocation GTN.H1</b>	
<b>OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing):</b> 332274, 568168			
<b>Site Size (ha):</b> 5.39	<b>Proposed use:</b> Housing	<b>HMA:</b> Annan	<b>Date completed:</b> Oct/Nov 2016

TOPIC	Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora	Population and Human Health	Soils	Water	Air Quality	Material Assets	Climatic Factors	Cultural Heritage	Landscape
SCORE	0	+/x	X	0	X	0	X	0	X

### Scoring Guidance

Impact	Significant positive impact	Positive impact	Neutral impact	Unknown impact	Both Positive and Negative impacts	Negative impact	Significant negative impact
Score Symbol	++	+	0	?	+/x	x	xx

### Legends

<u>Related SEA topic</u>	<u>Information source</u>	<u>Consultation required ( only if answer is Yes)</u>
Population and Human Health (PHH)	Geographic Information System (GIS)	Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
Climatic Factors (CF)	Site visit (SV)	Transport Scotland (TS)
Biodiversity (B)	Consultee (C)	Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
Landscape (L)	Other (O)	Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
Material Assets (MA)		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

### BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)	SACs	N	LNR	N	SPAs	N	SSSIs	N
	NNR	N	Local wildlife sites	N	Natterjack toads		Great Crested Newts	
	RAMSAR	N	Geodiversity Sites	N	Other protected species		Marine Consultation Zones	N
	Ancient/semi-natural woodland		N	Comments: No strategic comments from SNH				
Are there any known invasive species within the site		N		GIS & SV	0		0	
Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity		N		SV	0	Greenfield site on edge of settlement. Careful consideration of design and planting could help create new habitats within this development	0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	No designations affecting this site							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No designations affecting this site						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>	

### POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space	MA	N									
		Distance (km)	1	Comment: Cycle route on western edge of site providing link to Gretna Station							
Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them	MA or CF	Right of Way	N								
		Core path	N								
		Cycle path	Y								
What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)	CF	Community/village hall	1	Sports facilities	1-5	Hospitalities	1	Local shops (convenience)	1-5	Bus stop	0.1
What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km)			Primary				Secondary				
	School name:		Springfield				Annan				
	Capacity:		31				331				
	Distance:		1				10				
Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere	MA and B	N		GIS	0		0				
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Site not within reasonable walking distance of the majority of community facilities and public open space. Close proximity to Gretna Station and could encourage active travel and use of sustainable transport.										
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Site not within reasonable walking distance of the majority of community facilities and public open space. Close proximity to Gretna Station and could encourage active travel and use of sustainable transport.						<b>SEA SCORE: +/X</b>				

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

SOILS									
Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land		Y	Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)	3.2	0	X	Prime quality agricultural land being actively farmed for cereal crops	X	
Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)		N	Generally flat site		SV	0		0	
Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site		N	No known previous use.		C	0		0	
Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat	CF	N			0	0		0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Loss of prime agricultural land currently in production								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Loss of prime agricultural land.						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>		

WATER									
Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site	B and L	N			SV	0		0	
Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere	CF and PHH	N	No comment with regard to flood risk.		C	0		0	
Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse)		N			0			0	
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer	PHH		Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.		C	0		0	
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply	PHH		Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.		C	0	Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the requirements for this phase of the upgrade work. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October	0	

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

						2010) refers			
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No known flood risk. Gretna – limited water capacity subject to planned upgrading by Scottish Water which will require developer contributions.						<b>SEA SCORE:0</b>		

AIR QUALITY									
Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA		N	There are no AQMA at present in the region	C	0		0		
What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby	PHH	Y	Housing and M74 motorway, slip roads and B7076 SEPA noted an issue with air quality given the sites location	C	X	M74 motorway and spur roads at height above site approx 5m embankment. Noise assessment required. Given that motorway at height mitigation measures are unlikely to be successful	X		
Does the development of the site introduce a new potentially significant air emission to the area (e.g. combined heat and power, an industrial process, large scale quarry of energy from the waste plant)		N			0		0		
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Significant environmental issues due to proximity of M74 and slip roads at height. Noise assessment required. Mitigation measures considered unlikely to be successful								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Significant environmental issues due to proximity of M74 and slip roads at height. Noise assessment required. Mitigation measures considered unlikely to be successful						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>		

MATERIAL ASSETS								
Is the site.....		Brownfield		Comment				
		Greenfield	G					
Is the site vacant or derelict		N	Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey	N		0	No known previous use.	0
Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover on-site materials/resources		N				0		0
Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction		N				0		0
Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore,	PHH	N				0		0

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

compromise the waste handling operation									
Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9)		n/a			0		0		
Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site			Pylons   N   Bord Gais Eirann pipeline   N   Shell oil pipeline   N   Transco pipeline   N						
			Comment No servicing constraints in relation to this site						
Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies			Air Traffic/NATS   N   MoD   N   Carlisle Airport   N   Coal Authority   N   HSE   N						
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Loss of greenfield site. No servicing constraints in relation to this site.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Loss of greenfield site						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>		

ROADS/ACCESS									
Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated			This site (158 units) is located to the south of the C141a with access also available onto Gretna Loaning U530a. Access onto the C141a will require significant infill to achieve satisfactory access gradients. This site incorporates site GTN.H1 (36 units). A Transport Assessment should be commissioned and a Masterplan should be provided for this site. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and a residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards						
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Access to be provided onto Gretna Loaning U530a. Access onto the C141a will require significant infill to achieve satisfactory access gradients. A Transport Assessment should be commissioned and a Masterplan should be provided for this site. Ability to access the land to the south for potential long term expansion of Springfield should not be compromised.								

CLIMATIC FACTORS								
What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)			South	SV	0		0	
Can the site make best use of solar gain			Y	SV	0		0	
Is the site protected from prevailing winds			N   Not sheltered from prevailing wind.	SV	X	May require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions	X	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Not sheltered from prevailing wind, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Not sheltered from prevailing wind, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>	

CULTURAL HERITAGE								
Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting	L	Listed Building	N	Scheduled Monuments	N	Comment Archaeology - Course of Roman Road thought to run through northern portion of site, evaluation will be required. Historic Built Environment - No Listed Buildings; no conservation area. However, the Smithy on the road junction is Category B Listed and of significant social historical		
Conservation Area		N	Inventory of Historic Battlefield	N				
World Heritage Site		N	Inventory & Non-Inventory	N				
Archaeological site		Y	Garden or Designed Landscape					

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

						interest. The church on the corner and the terrace of cottages on Gretna Loaning near the road junction were all built by the early 19 <sup>th</sup> century and represent the core of the village. Development should reinforce the local character.			
Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment	L	N				Development should reinforce local character evident at Gretna Loaning			
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Archaeological mitigation measures to be implemented due to potential course of Roman road running through northern part of site. Development should reinforce local character evident at Gretna Loaning								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Archaeological site potentially affects part of site and evaluation will be required.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

LANDSCAPE									
Is the site within or adjoining any of the following		NSAs Wild Land	N N	RSA TPOs	N N	Comment Really poor ambience/sense of place – unlikely to make an attractive place to live: dominated by traffic noise and influence of M74/slip road which are raised above the site. Possible scope for limited development to eastern edge of site with landscaping and woodland planting to remainder as mitigation (but planting would take many years to attain sufficient height!)			
Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level				M74 and slip roads dominate the site. Hedge and trees along site boundaries should be retained a boundary feature.		C & SV	X	Requires significant mitigation through bunding and tree planting to reduce dominance of M74/slip road. Even then creating a pleasant place to live would be challenging.	X
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement				M74 and slip roads dominate site and area so visual integration would be difficult to achieve		C & SV	X	Creating a pleasant place to live would be challenging.	X
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site						SV	0		0
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Requires significant mitigation through bunding and tree planting to reduce dominance of M74/slip road. Even then creating a pleasant place to live would be challenging.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Significant environmental issues due to proximity of M74 and slip roads at height. Mitigation measures considered unlikely to be successful.						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>		

PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES								
Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	Y	Northern part of site relates to existing housing allocation in adopted LDP – GTN.H1 and southern part of site lies outwith settlement boundary. Previous consent has now expired.						
Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site	Y	Land is available for development and the landowner would like to see this land brought forward for housing development.						
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips	N							
Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe	?							
<b>OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT</b>	Although the northern part of the site is an existing housing allocation in adopted LDP (GTN.H1) and southern part of site lies outwith settlement boundary							

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

	proposed housing use is not considered desirable due to proximity of M74 and associated slip road. Would require significant mitigation through bunding and tree planting to reduce dominance of M74/slip roads. Landscape view is that creating a pleasant place to live would be challenging. A Transport Assessment should be commissioned and a Masterplan should be provided for this site.							
<b>OVERALL SEA COMMENT</b>	Negative SEA impact due to loss of prime agricultural land and greenfield site. Distant from the majority of community facilities. Significant environmental issues due to proximity of M74 and slip roads at height. Mitigation measures considered unlikely to be successful.							

## LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

<b>Site Ref:</b> GTN.H206	<b>Source of site suggestion:</b> Call for Sites	<b>Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):</b>	
<b>Site name:</b> Stormont Crescent			
<b>Settlement:</b> Gretna Border	<b>Current use:</b> Agricultural land	<b>Existing LDP allocations/ designations:</b> None	
<b>OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing):</b>			
<b>Site Size (ha):</b> 1.3	<b>Proposed use:</b> Housing	<b>HMA:</b> Annan	<b>Date completed:</b> Oct/Nov 2016

TOPIC	Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora	Population and Human Health	Soils	Water	Air Quality	Material Assets	Climatic Factors	Cultural Heritage	Landscape
SCORE	O	+	?	XX	O	X	O	O	O

### Scoring Guidance

Impact	Significant positive impact	Positive impact	Neutral impact	Unknown impact	Both Positive and Negative impacts	Negative impact	Significant negative impact
Score Symbol	++	+	0	?	+/x	x	xx

### Legends

<b>Related SEA topic</b>	<b>Information source</b>	<b>Consultation required ( only if answer is Yes)</b>
Population and Human Health (PHH)	Geographic Information System (GIS)	Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
Climatic Factors (CF)	Site visit (SV)	Transport Scotland (TS)
Biodiversity (B)	Consultee (C)	Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
Landscape (L)	Other (O)	Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
Material Assets (MA)		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

### BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)	SACs	N	LNR	N	SPAs	N	SSSIs	N	
	NNR	N	Local wildlife sites	N	Natterjack toads	N	Great Crested Newts	N	
	RAMSAR	N	Geodiversity Sites	N	Other protected species	N	Marine Consultation Zones	N	
	Ancient/semi-natural woodland		N						
Comments: No comments									
Are there any known invasive species within the site	N								
Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity	N								
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	No impact on diversity designations								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No impact on diversity designations						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

### POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space	MA	N									
		Distance (km)	1								
Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them	MA or CF	Right of Way	N	Comment: On road national cycle route 7							
		Core path	N								
		Cycle path	N								
What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)	CF	Community/village hall	1	Sports facilities	1	Hospitalities	1	Local shops (convenience)	1	Bus stop	1
What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km)			Primary				Secondary				
	School name:	Gretna				Annan					
	Capacity:	76				331					
	Distance:		1				10				
Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere	MA and B	N		GIS	0			0			
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Within reasonable walking distance to community facilities and school, scope to encourage active travel										
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Within reasonable walking distance to community facilities and school, scope to encourage active travel. Gretna served by railway station – could encourage use of more sustainable transport and reduce carbon emissions from transport.						<b>SEA SCORE: +</b>				

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

SOILS								
Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land		N	Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute) Urban	O	O		O	
Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)		Y	Site low lying contained within a bowl adjacent to river embankment of River Esk		O		O	
Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site			No known previous use. Boundary is adjacent to railway. Garden ground adjacent o railway may require soil testing to make sure soil is suitable for use.		O		O	
Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat	CF	?	Unknown	O	?		?	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>								
Unknown impact re peatland.						SEA SCORE: ?		

WATER								
Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site	B and L	Y	Evidence of boggy areas		O		O	
Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere	CF and PHH	Y	SEPA - A substantial part of the site may lie within the 1 in 200 year floodplain of the River Esk. The site is potentially at medium to high risk of coastal flooding No development should take place within this area. Flood Risk Assessment required. Site appears in medium likelihood coastal SEPA flood maps. Full topographical survey required. Depending on content, Flood Risk Assessment may also be required.	C	XX	The site is potentially at medium to high risk of coastal flooding No development should take place within this area	XX	
Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse)								
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer	PHH	Y	Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.	C	O	Please note there is a Surface water sewer running along east of site. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.	O	
Is there sufficient capacity for the	PHH	Y	Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient	C	O	Scottish Water advise that there are water network	O	

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required	
development to connect to the mains water supply			capacity.			issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the requirements for this phase of the upgrade work. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October 2010) refers.			
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. Water main running along north boundary of site will require to be protected. Flood risk assessment required which would require to be agreed with SEPA.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Significant negative impact on the water environment as site within 1 in 200 year flood plain of the River Esk. The site is potentially at medium to high risk of coastal flooding. No development should take place within this area.						<b>SEA SCORE: XX</b>		

AIR QUALITY									
Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA		N	There are no AQMA at present in the region	C	0		0		
What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby	PHH	N	North – housing. East – agricultural land. south – line of former railway line. West - housing		O		O		
Does the development of the site introduce a new potentially significant air emission to the area (e.g. combined heat and power, an industrial process, large scale quarry of energy from the waste plant)		N			O		O		
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Unlikely to decrease air quality								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Unlikely to decrease air quality						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

MATERIAL ASSETS								
Is the site.....		Brownfield		Comment Currently in agricultural use				
		Greenfield	Y					
Is the site vacant or derelict		N	Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey		O		O	
Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or		N			O		O	

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

recycle or recover on-site materials/resources								
Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction		N			O		O	
Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation	PHH	N			O		O	
Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9)		n/a			O		O	
Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site			Pylons   N   Bord Gais Eirann pipeline   N   Shell oil pipeline   N   Transco pipeline   N					
			Comment. No known servicing constraints. It should be noted that low voltage electricity lines cross the site at the southern end and these would require to be rerouted.					
Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies			Air Traffic/NATS   N   MoD   N   Carlisle Airport   N   Coal Authority   N   HSE   N					
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	No known servicing constraints. Loss of greenfield land							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Negative SEA impact as loss of greenfield site						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>	

### ROADS/ACCESS

Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated			This site (16 units) can take access from Stormont Crescent U45a. There may be potential to take access via Rosomund Crescent (private) though this would require to be brought up to an adoptable standard. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and a residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards.					
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	This site (16 units) can take access from Stormont Crescent U45a. There may be potential to take access via Rosomund Crescent (private) though this would require to be brought up to an adoptable standard.							

### CLIMATIC FACTORS

What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)		South	SV	O	Due to south west aspect the use of solar gain could be used to great effect	O		
Can the site make best use of solar gain		Y	SV	O		O		
Is the site protected from prevailing winds		N	Exposed to prevailing winds to the south west.	SV	O	Appropriate landscaping and layout should take into account aspect and prevailing winds to the south west	O	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Appropriate landscaping and layout should take into account aspect and prevailing winds to the south west							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Exposed to prevailing winds, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>	

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

CULTURAL HERITAGE								
Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting	L		Listed Building		Scheduled Monuments	Comment Archaeology - Bounded to south by line of former railway. Lies within the boundary of the Inventory Battlefield for the Battle of Sark. Historic Environment - No Listed Buildings; no conservation area. HES - This site is located within the Battle of Sark (Inventory Battlefield, BTL40). Sensitive development is possible on this site, subject to an assessment of potential impacts on the historic battlefield. In line with this, we note the Council's comments that a historic assessment is required to identify mitigation measures, and support this approach.		
			Conservation Area		Inventory of Historic Battlefield			
			World Heritage Site		Inventory & Non-Inventory Garden or Designed Landscape			
			Archaeological site					
Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment	L							
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Site lies within the area of the Inventory Battlefield for the Battle of Sark. Appropriate archaeological investigation would be required and appropriate mitigation measures identified where development would not have a significant adverse impact on the character, appearance, setting or key features of the battlefield.							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Site lies within the area of the Inventory Battlefield for the Battle of Sark. Appropriate archaeological investigation would be required and appropriate mitigation measures identified where development would not have a significant adverse impact on the character, appearance, setting or key features of the battlefield.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>	

LANDSCAPE								
Is the site within or adjoining any of the following			NSAs	N	RSAs	N	Comment Near to /on floodplain but some containment / protection by disused railway line. Potential to enhance existing poor built edge.	
			Wild Land	N	TPOs	N		
Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level			Near to /on floodplain but some containment / protection by disused railway line					
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement		Y	Potential to enhance existing poor built edge.					
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		N						
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	No impact on landscape quality.							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No impact on landscape quality.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>	

PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES		
Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	Y	Site outwith but immediately adjacent settlement boundary for Gretna Border

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site		Y						
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips		N						
Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe		Y						
<b>OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT</b>			The site has not been included in the MIR for development because of significant flood risk issues. It would also involve the loss of greenfield land. A number of other sites have been included for development in the settlement that are considered to meet the identified housing strategy.					
<b>OVERALL SEA COMMENT</b>			Significant negative impact on the water environment as site within 1 in 200 year flood plain of the River Esk and potentially at medium to high risk of coastal flooding. Negative SEA impact as greenfield land. Positive SEA impact in terms of population and health - within reasonable walking distance to community facilities and school, scope to encourage active travel. Gretna served by railway station – could encourage use of more sustainable transport and reduce carbon emissions from transport.					

## LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

<b>Site Ref:</b> GTN.H207	<b>Source of site suggestion:</b> Call for Sites	<b>Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):</b>	
<b>Site name:</b> Old Graitney			
<b>Settlement:</b> Gretna Border	<b>Current use:</b> Agricultural land	<b>Existing LDP allocations/ designations:</b> none	
<b>OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing):</b>			
<b>Site Size (ha):</b> 3.9ha	<b>Proposed use:</b> Housing	<b>HMA:</b> Annan	<b>Date completed:</b> Oct/Nov 2016

TOPIC	Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora	Population and Human Health	Soils	Water	Air Quality	Material Assets	Climatic Factors	Cultural Heritage	Landscape
SCORE	0	+	X	0	0	X	0	0	0

### Scoring Guidance

Impact	Significant positive impact	Positive impact	Neutral impact	Unknown impact	Both Positive and Negative impacts	Negative impact	Significant negative impact
Score Symbol	++	+	0	?	+/x	x	xx

### Legends

<u>Related SEA topic</u>	<u>Information source</u>	<u>Consultation required ( only if answer is Yes)</u>
Population and Human Health (PHH) Climatic Factors (CF) Biodiversity (B) Landscape (L) Material Assets (MA)	Geographic Information System (GIS) Site visit (SV) Consultee (C) Other (O)	Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) Transport Scotland (TS) Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) Historic Environment Scotland (HES)

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA								
Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)	SACs	N	LNR	N	SPAs	N	SSSIs	N
	NNR	N	Local wildlife sites	N	Natterjack toads	N	Great Crested Newts	N
	RAMSAR	N	Geodiversity Sites	N	Other protected species	N	Marine Consultation Zones	N
	Ancient/semi-natural woodland		N					
Comments: No comments								
Are there any known invasive species within the site		N						
Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity		Y	Potential habitat fragmentation due to the loss of a greenfield site.			Where appropriate, measures to enhance biodiversity should be implemented, such as the use of locally native tree species in landscape schemes, habitat creation, and the creation of greenways and wildlife corridors along transport corridors, footpaths and cycleways, to encourage the movement of species.		
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Measures to enhance biodiversity should be implemented, such as the use of locally native tree species in landscape schemes, habitat creation, and the creation of greenways and wildlife corridors along transport corridors, footpaths and cycleways, to encourage the movement of species							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No designations affecting site						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>	

POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH											
Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space	MA	N									
			Distance (km)	1							
Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them	MA or CF	Right of Way	N	Comment: On road national cycle route 7 on southern boundary of site on Old Graitney Road to Eastgriggs and Annan							
		Core path	N								
		Cycle path	Y								
What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)	CF	Community/village hall	1	Sports facilities	1	Hospitalities	1	Local shops (convenience)	1	Bus stop	0.2
What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km)			Primary				Secondary				
	School name:		Gretna				Annan				
	Capacity:		76				331				
	Distance:		1				10				
Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere	MA and B	N				GIS	0				0
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Within reasonable walking distance to community facilities and school, scope to encourage active travel										

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Positive SEA impact as within reasonable walking distance to community facilities and school, scope to encourage active travel. Gretna served by railway station – could encourage use of more sustainable transport and reduce carbon emissions from transport.						<b>SEA SCORE: +</b>
---------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	---------------------

SOILS									
Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land		Y	Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)	3.1	O	X	Loss of prime agricultural land currently in grazing.	X	
Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)		N	Relatively flat open site		SV	O		O	
Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site		N	No known previous use.		C	O		O	
Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat	CF	N			0	0		0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Potential loss of prime agricultural land								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Negative SEA impact as potential loss of prime agricultural land						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>		

WATER									
Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site	B and L	Y	Body of water lies on eastern boundary of site		SV	O		O	
Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere	CF and PHH	Y	SEPA advise that a minor watercourse flows along the site boundary which could represent a potential flood risk. Body of water lies adjacent to the site. Drainage Impact Assessment required. Depending on content, Flood Risk Assessment may also be required.		C	X	A Flood Risk Assessment is required which would require to be agreed with SEPA	O	
Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse)		N						O	
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer	PHH	Y	Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.		C		Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.	O	
Is there sufficient capacity for the	PHH	Y	Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient		C		Scottish Water advise that there are water network		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required	
development to connect to the mains water supply			capacity.			issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the requirements for this phase of the upgrade work. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October 2010) refers.			
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. Flood risk assessment required. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing waste water network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Potential flood risk. Flood Risk Assessment required which would require to be agreed with SEPA						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

AIR QUALITY									
Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA		N	There are no AQMA at present in the region	C	0		0		
What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby	PHH	N	Surrounded by agricultural land.		0		0		
Does the development of the site introduce a new potentially significant air emission to the area (e.g. combined heat and power, an industrial process, large scale quarry of energy from the waste plant)		N			0		0		
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Unlikely to decrease air quality.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Unlikely to decrease air quality.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

MATERIAL ASSETS								
Is the site.....		Brownfield		Comment				
		Greenfield	Y					
Is the site vacant or derelict		N	Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey	N		0		0
Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or		N				0		0

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
recycle or recover on-site materials/resources								
Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction		N			0		0	
Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation	PHH	N			0		0	
Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9)		n/a			0		0	
Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site			Pylons   N   Bord Gais Eirann pipeline   N   Shell oil pipeline   N   Transco pipeline   N					
Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies			Air Traffic/NATS   N   MoD   N   Carlisle Airport   N   Coal Authority   N   HSE   N					
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	No known service constraints. Loss of greenfield land							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Negative SEA impact as loss of greenfield site						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>	

ROADS/ACCESS									
Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated			This site (110 units) is situated to the north and east of Old Graitney Road U171a with site GTN.H5 located along the eastern boundary and site GTN.H6 (20 units) located to the south of the U171a. Old Graitney Road is restrictive in nature and any development would require the widening and improvement of the carriageway to an appropriate standard. Any development on this site would trigger the relocation of the 30mph speed limit and extension of street lighting along the U171a to Loanwarth Road. It would also therefore be appropriate that any development of this site include the provision of a footway along the site frontage to link with the existing footway provisions on Empire Way/Dominion Road and Loanwarth Road. Any development of this site should not prejudice the adjacent sites. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and a residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards						
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	This site is situated to the north and east of Old Graitney Road U171a with site GTN.H5 located along the eastern boundary and site GTN.H6 (20 units) located to the south of the U171a. Old Graitney Road is restrictive in nature and any development would require the widening and improvement of the carriageway to an appropriate standard. Any development on this site would trigger the relocation of the 30mph speed limit and extension of street lighting along the U171a to Loanwarth Road. It would also therefore be appropriate that any development of this site include the provision of a footway along the site frontage to link with the existing footway provisions on Empire Way/Dominion Road and Loanwarth Road.								

CLIMATIC FACTORS										
What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)		Souht and west aspect						0		
Can the site make best use of solar gain		Y							0	
Is the site protected from prevailing winds		N	Exposed to prevailing winds		X	Appropriate landscaping and layout should take into account aspect and prevailing winds to the south west		0		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Appropriate landscaping and layout should take into account aspect and prevailing winds to the south west								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Due to south west aspect the use of solar gain could be used to great effect. Exposed to prevailing winds, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

CULTURAL HERITAGE									
Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting	L	N	Listed Building	N	Scheduled Monuments	N	Comment Archaeology - No historic environment issues identified for this site, as of July 2016, but borders the Inventory Battlefield for the Battle of Sark. Historic Built Environment - No Listed Buildings, no conservation area. As an entrance point to Gretna development should follow the road frontages with grid pattern streets behind to reflect the layout of Gretna HES - This site is located adjacent to the Battle of Sark (Inventory Battlefield, BTL40). We do not consider that development in this location would have a significant adverse impact on the setting of the historic battlefield.		
			Conservation Area	N	Inventory of Historic Battlefield	N			
			World Heritage Site	N	Inventory & Non-Inventory	N			
			Archaeological site	N	Garden or Designed Landscape				
Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment	L	N				O		O	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	No known cultural heritage issues directly affecting site. It should be noted that the site borders the Inventory Battlefield for the Battle of Sark to the south								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No known cultural heritage issues directly affecting site. It should be noted that the site borders the Inventory Battlefield for the Battle of Sark to the south						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

LANDSCAPE									
Is the site within or adjoining any of the following			NSAs	N	RSA's	N	Comment Development regrettable given historic small holding fields, which form an attractive rural setting to Gretna. However, otherwise the site forms a logical extension and is well contained.		
			Wild Land	N	TPOs	N			
Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level		Y	Site is relatively flat with trees and hedgerows along field boundaries.			SV	0	Trees and hedgerows should be reinforced with additional planting.	0
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement		N	Development regrettable given historic small holding fields, which form an attractive rural setting to Gretna			C	0	Otherwise the site forms a logical extension and is well contained	0
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		N				SV	0		0
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Trees and hedgerows should be reinforced with additional planting.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Minimal detrimental effect on landscape quality						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

### PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES

Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	Y	Site is outwith Gretna Border settlement boundary in adopted LDP but immediately adjacent to it.
Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site	Y	
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips	N	
Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe	Y	
<b>OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT</b>	The site has not been included in the MIR as development would involve the loss of prime agricultural land and greenfield land. Although it may be technically possible to develop this site it is not required to meet housing land requirements at this time. A number of other sites have been included for development that are considered to meet the identified housing strategy.	
<b>OVERALL SEA COMMENT</b>	Negative SEA impact as greenfield site and potential loss of prime agricultural land. Positive impact in terms of Population and Health as within reasonable walking distance to community facilities and school, scope to encourage active travel. Gretna served by railway station – could encourage use of more sustainable transport and reduce carbon emissions from transport.	

## LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

<b>Site Ref:</b> GTN.H208	<b>Source of site suggestion:</b> Call for Sites	<b>Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):</b>	
<b>Site name:</b> land to south of Braemar, Main Street			
<b>Settlement:</b> Gretna Border	<b>Current use:</b> Agricultural land	<b>Existing LDP allocations/ designations:</b> None	
<b>OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing):</b>			
<b>Site Size (ha):</b> 1.3ha	<b>Proposed use:</b> Housing	<b>HMA:</b> Annan	<b>Date completed:</b> Oct/Nov 2016

TOPIC	Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora	Population and Human Health	Soils	Water	Air Quality	Material Assets	Climatic Factors	Cultural Heritage	Landscape
SCORE	0	X/+	X	0	?	X	0	0	X

### Scoring Guidance

Impact	Significant positive impact	Positive impact	Neutral impact	Unknown impact	Both Positive and Negative impacts	Negative impact	Significant negative impact
Score Symbol	++	+	0	?	+/-	x	xx

### Legends

<u>Related SEA topic</u>	<u>Information source</u>	<u>Consultation required ( only if answer is Yes)</u>
Population and Human Health (PHH)	Geographic Information System (GIS)	Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
Climatic Factors (CF)	Site visit (SV)	Transport Scotland (TS)
Biodiversity (B)	Consultee (C)	Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
Landscape (L)	Other (O)	Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
Material Assets (MA)		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA								
Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)	SACs	N	LNR	N	SPAs	N	SSSIs	N
	NNR	N	Local wildlife sites	N	Natterjack toads	N	Great Crested Newts	N
	RAMSAR	N	Geodiversity Sites	N	Other protected species	N	Marine Consultation Zones	N
	Ancient/semi-natural woodland		N					
Comments: No comments								
Are there any known invasive species within the site	N				O		O	
Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity	N				O		O	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	No impact on biodiversity designations							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No impact on biodiversity designations							<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>

POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH											
Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space	MA	N				0			0		
		Distance (km)	1								
Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them	MA or CF	Right of Way	N	Comment: Core path 323 – Springfield to Gretna. Also heritage trail							
		Core path	N								
		Cycle path	Y								
What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)	CF	Community/village hall	1	Sports facilities	1-5	Hospitalities	1	Local shops (convenience)	1-5	Bus stop	0.1
What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km)			Primary				Secondary				
	School name:		Springfield				Annan				
	Capacity:		31				331				
	Distance:		1				10				
Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere	MA and B	N			GIS	0			0		
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Not within reasonable walking distance of the majority of community facilities, less likely to encourage active travel Proximity to Gretna Station and could encourage active travel and use of sustainable transport.										
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Not within reasonable walking distance of the majority of community facilities, less likely to encourage active travel. Proximity to Gretna Station which could encourage active travel and use of sustainable transport.								<b>SEA SCORE: X/+</b>		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

SOILS									
Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land		Y	Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)		3.2	X	Agricultural land currently in grazing.	X	
Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)			Site slopes steeply to east and south.						
Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site			No known previous use.						
Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat	CF	N				0		0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Would involve loss of prime agricultural land								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Negative SEA impact as would involve the loss of prime agricultural land						<b>SEA SCORE:X</b>		

WATER									
Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site	B and L	N				0		0	
Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere	CF and PHH	N	SEPA advise that no flood risk apparent		C	0		0	
Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse)		N				0		0	
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer	PHH	Y	Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.		C	0	Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.	0	
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply	PHH	Y	Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient		C	0	Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the	0	

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

						requirements for this phase of the upgrade work. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October 2010) refers.			
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October 2010) refers. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing waste water network. Early engagement with Scottish Water via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No known flood risk. Gretna – limited water capacity subject to planned upgrading by Scottish Water which will require developer contributions.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

AIR QUALITY									
Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA		N	There are no AQMA at present in the region	C	0		0		
What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby	PHH	N	North – housing. Site bounded by steeply sloping road embankments.			SEPA have noted a potential issue with air quality.	0		
Does the development of the site introduce a new potentially significant air emission to the area (e.g. combined heat and power, an industrial process, large scale quarry of energy from the waste plant)		N					0		
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Potential issue with air quality.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	SEPA have noted a potential issue with air quality.						<b>SEA SCORE: ?</b>		

MATERIAL ASSETS								
Is the site.....		Brownfield		Comment				
		Greenfield	Y					
Is the site vacant or derelict		N	Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey	N		O		O
Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover on-site materials/resources		N	No existing structure for reuse on site			O		O
Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction		N				O		O

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation	PHH	O			O		O	
Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9)		n/a						
Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site			Pylons N Bord Gais Eirann pipeline N Shell oil pipeline N Transco pipeline N					
Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies			Air Traffic/NATS N MoD N Carlisle Airport N Coal Authority N HSE N					
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	No known servicing constraints							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Negative SEA impact as would involve loss of greenfield land						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>	

### ROADS/ACCESS

Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated			This site has potential to be accessed from an existing private lane located to the east of the site off U42a Main Street that presently serves two dwellings. A second point of access appears to exist via a private lane beside 10 Main Street that also serves 2 dwellings and a former engineering business. These potential points of access may require either significant engineering works or challenges in providing an adoptable access and may require third party land. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and a residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards.					
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	This site has potential to be accessed from an existing private lane located to the east of the site off U42a Main Street that presently serves two dwellings. A second point of access appears to exist via a private lane beside 10 Main Street that also serves 2 dwellings and a former engineering business. These potential points of access may require either significant engineering works or challenges in providing an adoptable access and may require third party land.							

### CLIMATIC FACTORS

What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)		South		SV	0		0	
Can the site make best use of solar gain		Y		SV	0		0	
Is the site protected from prevailing winds		N	Exposed to prevailing wind.	SV	X	May require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions	0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Exposed to prevailing wind, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Exposed to prevailing wind, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions						<b>SEA SCORE: O</b>	

### CULTURAL HERITAGE

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required	
Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting	L		Listed Building	N	Scheduled Monuments	N	Comment Archaeology - Course of Roman road passes through the majority of the site, evaluation will be required. Historic Built Environment - No Listed Buildings, no conservation area. Backs onto former railway line		
			Conservation Area	N	Inventory of Historic Battlefield	N			
			World Heritage Site	N	Inventory & Non-Inventory				
			Archaeological site	Y	Garden or Designed Landscape				
Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment	L								
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Archaeological mitigation measures to be implemented due to course of Roman Road running through site.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Impact on archaeological feature which would be mitigated subject to archaeological evaluation.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

LANDSCAPE										
Is the site within or adjoining any of the following			NSAs	N	RSAs	N	Comment The site slopes to the east and is visually prominent from that direction with no physical containment. It is overlooked by existing dwellings to the north yet has a rural character and the existing hedgerow is an attractive feature which would be unlikely to survive development. Limited development adjacent to the lane might be appropriate with effective screening and containment.			
			Wild Land	N	TPOs	N				
Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level		Y	Trees and hedgerows should be retained.					0	Existing trees and hedgerows should be reinforced with additional planting.	0
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement		N	Significant issues raised in landscape advice s. Slopes steeply to east and south and bounded by roads.					X	For these reasons site should not be allocated for housing.	X
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		N								
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	For landscape reasons the site should not be allocated for housing.									
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Negative SEA impact in terms of landscape. Site slopes to the east and is visually prominent from that direction with no physical containment						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>			

PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES									
Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	Y	Site lies outwith settlement boundary for Gretna Border, but immediately adjacent to it.							
Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site									
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips	Y	Potential points of road access may require third party land outwith the site.							
Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe									

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

<b>OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT</b>	The site has not been included in the MIR as development would have a negative impact on the landscape. It would also involve the loss of prime agricultural land and greenfield land. There are issues regarding access to the site and it is distant from the majority of community facilities. A number of other sites have been included for development that are considered to meet the identified housing strategy.							
<b>OVERALL SEA COMMENT</b>	Negative SEA impact in terms of Soils as would involves prime agricultural land, material assets as greenfield site and adverse impact on landscape. Negative SEA impact in terms of Population and Health as distant from the majority of community facilities, but also positive as offset by proximity to Gretna Station and could encourage active travel and use of sustainable transport.							

## LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

<b>Site Ref:</b> GTN.H209	<b>Source of site suggestion:</b> Call for Sites	<b>Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):</b>	
<b>Site name:</b> Greenfield, Loanwarth Road			
<b>Settlement:</b> Gretna Border	<b>Current use:</b> Agricultural land	<b>Existing LDP allocations/ designations:</b> None	
<b>OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing):</b>			
<b>Site Size (ha):</b> 4.4	<b>Proposed use:</b> Leisure and Holiday Homes	<b>HMA:</b> Annan	<b>Date completed:</b> Oct/Nov 2016

TOPIC	Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora	Population and Human Health	Soils	Water	Air Quality	Material Assets	Climatic Factors	Cultural Heritage	Landscape
SCORE	0	X	X	0	0	X	0	0	XX

### Scoring Guidance

Impact	Significant positive impact	Positive impact	Neutral impact	Unknown impact	Both Positive and Negative impacts	Negative impact	Significant negative impact
Score Symbol	++	+	0	?	+/-	x	xx

### Legends

<b>Related SEA topic</b>	<b>Information source</b>	<b>Consultation required ( only if answer is Yes)</b>
Population and Human Health (PHH)	Geographic Information System (GIS)	Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
Climatic Factors (CF)	Site visit (SV)	Transport Scotland (TS)
Biodiversity (B)	Consultee (C)	Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
Landscape (L)	Other (O)	Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
Material Assets (MA)		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

### BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)	SACs	N	LNR	N	SPAs	N	SSSIs	N
	NNR	N	Local wildlife sites	N	Natterjack toads	N	Great Crested Newts	N
	RAMSAR	N	Geodiversity Sites	N	Other protected species	N	Marine Consultation Zones	N
	Ancient/semi-natural woodland		N					
Comments: No comments								
Are there any known invasive species within the site		N			O		O	
Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity		Y			O	Trees and the network of hedgerows should be retained and enhanced for biodiversity value.	O	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Trees and the network of hedgerows should be retained and enhanced for biodiversity value.							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No biodiversity designations affecting site.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>	

### POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space	MA	N									
		Distance (km)	5								
Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them	MA or CF	Right of Way		Comment:							
		Core path									
		Cycle path									
What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)	CF	Community/village hall	5	Sports facilities	5	Hospitalities	5	Local shops (convenience)	5	Bus stop	1
What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km)			Primary				Secondary				
	School name:		Gretna				Annan				
	Capacity:		76				331				
	Distance:		1				10				
Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere	MA and B	N		GIS	0		0				
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Site distant from community facilities										
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Negative SEA impact as site distant from community facilities						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>				

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

SOILS								
Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land		Y	Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute) 3.1	O	x	Loss of prime agricultural land currently in grazing	X	
Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)		N	Relatively flat open site. A very open site for this type of development without any natural topography to screen it.	O	0		O	
Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site			No known previous use.	C	0		O	
Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat	CF	N		O	0		O	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Would involve loss of prime agricultural land							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Negative impact as would involve loss of prime agricultural land						<b>SEA SCORE:X</b>	

WATER								
Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site	B and L	Y	Watercourse flows through the site					
Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere	CF and PHH	Y	SEPA - A minor watercourse with potentially culverted sections flows through the site which could represent a potential flood risk. Body of water traverses the site. Drainage Impact Assessment required. Depending on content, Flood Risk Assessment may also be required.	C	X	A Flood Risk Assessment is required which would require to be agreed with SEPA	0	
Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse)		N		C	0			
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer	PHH	Y	Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.	C	x	SEPA advise that site remote from public sewer - provision of private foul drainage may be restricted which could constrain development aspirations.	x	
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply	PHH	Y	Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.	C	0	Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the requirements for this phase of the upgrade work. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

						Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October 2010) refers.			
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	SEPA advise that site remote from public sewer - provision of private foul drainage may be restricted which could constrain development aspirations. Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. Potential flood risk identified which would require a Flood Risk Assessment to be agreed with SEPA								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Negative Sea impact as site remote from public sewer.						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>		

AIR QUALITY									
Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA		N	There are no AQMA at present in the region	C	0		0		
What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby	PHH	N	Small business units, house and stables immediately adjacent. Surrounded by countryside and agricultural land. Mixed use site GTN.MU1 lies to the north.	SV	0		0		
Does the development of the site introduce a new potentially significant air emission to the area (e.g. combined heat and power, an industrial process, large scale quarry of energy from the waste plant)		N			0		0		
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Unlikely to decrease air quality.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Unlikely to decrease air quality.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

MATERIAL ASSETS								
Is the site.....		Brownfield		Comment				
		Greenfield	Y					
Is the site vacant or derelict		N	Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey		0		0	
Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover on-site materials/resources		N			0		0	
Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction		N			0		0	
Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation	PHH	N			0		0	

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9)		n/a						
Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site			Pylons   N	Bord Gais Eirann pipeline   N		Shell oil pipeline   N	Transco pipeline   N	
Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies			Air Traffic/NATS   N	MoD   N	Carlisle Airport   N	Coal Authority   N	HSE   N	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	No known service constraints							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Negative SEA impact as greenfield site.						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>	

ROADS/ACCESS									
Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated			This site is situated to the south of Loanwath Road C67a adjacent to an existing business/equestrian centre. The C67a is restrictive in nature, therefore the carriageway to the B721 would require to be widened and a footway provided along its from the B721 to a point east of the site boundary. Provision of suitable pedestrian connectivity with Gretna would require improvements from the site frontage and east to the U171a, this would require further discussion and potentially third party land. Any development on this site would trigger the relocation of the 30mph speed limit and extension of street lighting. A Transport Assessment should be commissioned and a Masterplan should be provided. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and a residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards						
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	This site is situated to the south of Loanwath Road C67a adjacent to an existing business/equestrian centre. The C67a is restrictive in nature, therefore the carriageway to the B721 would require to be widened and a footway provided along it from the B721 to a point east of the site boundary. Provision of suitable pedestrian connectivity with Gretna would require improvements from the site frontage and east to the U171a, this would require further discussion and potentially third party land. Any development on this site would trigger the relocation of the 30mph speed limit and extension of street lighting. A Transport Assessment should be commissioned and a Masterplan should be provided.								

CLIMATIC FACTORS								
What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)		South and west			0		0	
Can the site make best use of solar gain		Y			0		0	
Is the site protected from prevailing winds		N	Potentially exposed to the west			0	Appropriate landscaping to the west could protect site from prevailing winds.	0
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Potentially exposed to the west however this will be partially mitigated by a reinforced woodland strip to the west							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Potentially exposed to the west however this will be partially mitigated by a reinforced woodland strip to the west						<b>SEA SCORE:0</b>	

CULTURAL HERITAGE								
Will the development of the site affect any	L	Listed Building   N	Scheduled Monuments   N	Comment Archaeology - No historic environment issues identified for this site, as of				

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
of the following including their setting			Conservation Area World Heritage Site Archaeological site	N N N	Inventory of Historic Battlefield Inventory & Non-Inventory Garden or Designed Landscape	N N	July 2016 Historic Built Environment - No Listed Buildings; no conservation area. A very open site for this type of development without any natural topography to screen it	
Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment	L							
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	No cultural designations affecting site							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No cultural designations affecting site							<b>SEA SCORE: O</b>

LANDSCAPE								
Is the site within or adjoining any of the following			NSAs Wild Land	N N	RSAs TPOs	N N	Comment Unlikely to be suitable: Greenfield site within open flat landscape. Remote from settlement though adjacent to small business units and stables. Site associates with wider countryside and holiday home development would be highly visible and incongruous with setting.	
Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level		Y	Greenfield site within open flat landscape. Remote from settlement. Site associates with wider countryside and holiday home development would be highly visible and incongruous with setting.			SV/C	XX	XX
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement		N				SVC		X
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		N						O
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Development of site would not be supported due to adverse impact on landscape setting.							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Significant negative SEA impact as site would be highly visible and incongruous in the wider landscape setting.							<b>SEA SCORE: XX</b>

PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES		
Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	Y	Outwith settlement boundary for Greta Border, but adjacent to settlement boundary in part. Site is in the main remote from the settlement.
Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site	Y	
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips	?	Improvements to pedestrian connectivity with Greta would require improvements from the site frontage and east to the U171a which would potentially require third party land.
Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe	?	
<b>OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT</b>	The site has been proposed for a tourist / leisure type development. The plan does not make any specific allocations for this type of development as there are policies which would be used to assess any proposal. Development of the site would have an adverse impact on the landscape. It would also involve the loss of prime agricultural land and greenfield land. The site is remote from the settlement and the majority of community facilities. There are issues regarding	

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

	appropriate pedestrian access from the site to Gretna.							
<b>OVERALL SEA COMMENT</b>	Significant negative SEA impact in terms of adverse landscape impact and negative impact in terms of Soils and Material Assets as would loss of prime agricultural land and greenfield site. Negative SEA impact in terms of Population and Health as site distant from community facilities.							

## LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

<b>Site Ref:</b> GTN.H210	<b>Source of site suggestion:</b> Call for Sites	<b>Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):</b> n/a	
<b>Site name:</b> land adj to School Lane			
<b>Settlement:</b> Gretna Border	<b>Current use:</b> Agricultural land		
<b>OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing):</b>		<b>Existing LDP allocations/ designations:</b> None	
<b>Site Size (ha):</b> 2.55	<b>Proposed use:</b> Housing	<b>HMA:</b> Annan	<b>Date completed:</b> Oct/Nov 2016

TOPIC	Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora	Population and Human Health	Soils	Water	Air Quality	Material Assets	Climatic Factors	Cultural Heritage	Landscape
SCORE	0	X/+	X	0	0	X	0	0	X

### Scoring Guidance

Impact	Significant positive impact	Positive impact	Neutral impact	Unknown impact	Both Positive and Negative impacts	Negative impact	Significant negative impact
Score Symbol	++	+	0	?	+/-	x	xx

### Legends

<u>Related SEA topic</u>	<u>Information source</u>	<u>Consultation required ( only if answer is Yes)</u>
Population and Human Health (PHH)	Geographic Information System (GIS)	Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
Climatic Factors (CF)	Site visit (SV)	Transport Scotland (TS)
Biodiversity (B)	Consultee (C)	Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
Landscape (L)	Other (O)	Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
Material Assets (MA)		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

### BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)	SACs	N	LNR	N	SPAs	N	SSSIs	N
	NNR	N	Local wildlife sites	N	Natterjack toads	N	Great Crested Newts	N
	RAMSAR	N	Geodiversity Sites	N	Other protected species	N	Marine Consultation Zones	N
	Ancient/semi-natural woodland		N					
Comments: No comments								
Are there any known invasive species within the site	N				0		0	
Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity	N				0		0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	No biodiversity designations apply							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No biodiversity designations apply						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>	

### POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space	MA	N	Immediately adjacent to open space (playing field) associated with Springfield PS								
		Distance (km)	0								
Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them	MA or CF	Right of Way	Y		Comment: Earlston to Springfield Right of Way (326). Also provides pedestrian access to Quintinshill.						
		Core path	N								
		Cycle path	N								
What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)	CF	Community/village hall	1	Sports facilities	0	Hospitalities	1	Local shops (convenience)	1-5	Bus stop	0.2
What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km)			Primary				Secondary				
	School name:		Springfield				Annan				
	Capacity:		31				331				
	Distance:		0				10				
Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere	MA and B	N			GIS	0			0		
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Site immediately adjacent to primary school, but on edge of settlement										
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Both negative and positive SEA impact. Not within reasonable walking distance of the majority of community facilities, less likely to encourage active travel. Immediately adjacent to Springfield PS and relative proximity to Gretna Station which could encourage active travel and use of sustainable transport.						<b>SEA SCORE: X/+</b>				

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

SOILS								
Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land		Y	Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)	3.2	O	X		X
Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)		N	Flat open site					
Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site			No known previous use.			0		0
Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat	CF	N			O	0		0
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Would involve loss of prime agricultural land							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Negative SEA impact as would involve the loss of prime agricultural land						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>	

WATER								
Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site	B and L	N			SV	0		0
Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere	CF and PHH	N	SEPA – No flood risk apparent		C	0		0
Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse)		N			C	0		0
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer	PHH	Y	Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.		C	0		0
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply	PHH	Y	Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient		C	0	Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the requirements for this phase of the upgrade work. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October	

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

						2010) refers.			
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No known flood risk. Gretna – limited water capacity subject to planned upgrading by Scottish Water which will require developer contributions.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

AIR QUALITY									
Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA		N	There are no AQMA at present in the region	C	0		0		
What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby	PHH		Largely surrounded by agricultural land. To west housing, protected area of open space and Springfield PS.		0		0		
Does the development of the site introduce a new potentially significant air emission to the area (e.g. combined heat and power, an industrial process, large scale quarry of energy from the waste plant)					0		0		
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Unlikely to decrease air quality								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Unlikely to decrease air quality						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

MATERIAL ASSETS									
Is the site.....		Brownfield		Comment Greenfield site currently in agricultural use.					
		Greenfield	Y						
Is the site vacant or derelict		N	Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey	N	O	O		O	
Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover on-site materials/resources		N			0			0	
Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction		N			0			0	
Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation	PHH	N			0			0	
Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria		n/a			0				

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9)											
Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site		Pylons	N	Bord Gais Eirann pipeline	N	Shell oil pipeline	NN	Transco pipeline	N		
		Comment No known servicing constraints									
Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies		Air Traffic/NATS	N	MoD	N	Carlisle Airport	N	Coal Authority	N	HSE	N
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	No known servicing constraints										
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Negative SEA impact as would involve the loss of greenfield land.							<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>			

ROADS/ACCESS										
Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated		This site has the U234a along its western border, the U233a along its northern and a link on its south east boundary to an existing private lane. The U233a and U234a are both restrictive in nature with existing drainage adjacent to the carriageway edge, any development of this site would require upgrading of both roads to allow suitable vehicle and pedestrian access incorporating pedestrian links along the U234a back to Main Street U42a. Should access be taken onto the U233a, this site would trigger the relocation of the 30mph speed limit and extension of street lighting. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and a residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards								
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	The U233a and U234a are both restrictive in nature with existing drainage adjacent to the carriageway edge. Development of this site would require upgrading of both roads to allow suitable vehicle and pedestrian access incorporating pedestrian links along the U234a back to Main Street U42a.									

CLIMATIC FACTORS										
What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)		South			SV	0		0		
Can the site make best use of solar gain		Y			SV	0		0		
Is the site protected from prevailing winds		N	Exposed to prevailing wind.			SV	X	May require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions	0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Exposed to prevailing wind, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions									
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Exposed to prevailing wind, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions							<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

CULTURAL HERITAGE										
Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting	L	Listed Building	N	Scheduled Monuments	N	Comment Archaeology - No historic environment issues identified for this site, as of July 2016 Historic Built Environment -No Listed Buildings; no conservation area. Potential for sensitive development in relation to the existing layout of Springfield				
		Conservation Area	N	Inventory of Historic Battlefield	N					
		World Heritage Site	N	Inventory & Non-Inventory	N					
		Archaeological site	N	Garden or Designed Landscape						
Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment	L	Y	Potential for sensitive development in relation to the existing layout of Springfield			C	0		0	

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Potential for sensitive development in relation to the existing layout of Springfield								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No impact on cultural heritage designations						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

LANDSCAPE										
Is the site within or adjoining any of the following			NSAs	N	RSAs	N	Comment Possible site: Greenfield site with overlooking farmland to East and north. Would enclose school playing field (positive) but no real defensible boundary to the east. May be possible to mitigate with hedgerow/tree planting.			
			Wild Land	N	TPOs	N				
Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level		Y	Greenfield site with overlooking farmland to East and north. Would enclose school playing field (positive). Site open to east and due to nature of topography and landscape no real defensible boundary to the east.				XX	May be possible to mitigate in part with landscaping and planting with hedgerow/tree planting.	X	
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement		N							X	
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		N								
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Site open to east and due to nature of topography and landscape no real defensible boundary to the east. Limited scope to mitigate in part with landscaping and planting with hedgerow/tree planting.									
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Negative SEA impact in terms of landscape.						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>			

PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES		
Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	Y	Site not allocated for housing development in adopted LDP. Site adjacent to settlement boundary for Gretna Border.
Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site	Y	
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips	N	
Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe	Y	
<b>OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT</b>	The site has not been included in the MIR as development would involve the loss of prime agricultural land and greenfield land. Development would have an adverse impact on the landscape. There is limited scope to mitigate in part with landscaping and planting, the site is open to the east and there is no defensible boundary given topography. A number of other sites have been included for development that are considered to meet the identified housing strategy.	
<b>OVERALL SEA COMMENT</b>	Negative SEA impact in terms of Soils as would involve the loss of prime agricultural land and material assets as greenfield site. Negative SEA impact in terms of Population and Health as distant from the majority of community facilities, but offset by proximity to Springfield Primary School. Negative SEA impact in terms of landscape, some limited scope to mitigate in part with landscaping and planting with hedgerow/tree planting.	

## LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

<b>Site Ref:</b> GTN.H211	<b>Source of site suggestion:</b> Call for Sites	<b>Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):</b>	
<b>Site name:</b> land to south of Braemar, Main Street			
<b>Settlement:</b> Gretna Border	<b>Current use:</b> Agricultural land	<b>Existing LDP allocations/ designations:</b> None	
<b>OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing):</b>			
<b>Site Size (ha):</b> 1.3ha	<b>Proposed use:</b> Site for Nursing Home	<b>HMA:</b> Annan	<b>Date completed:</b> Oct/Nov 2016

TOPIC	Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora	Population and Human Health	Soils	Water	Air Quality	Material Assets	Climatic Factors	Cultural Heritage	Landscape
SCORE	0	X/+	X	0	?	X	X	0	X

### Scoring Guidance

Impact	Significant positive impact	Positive impact	Neutral impact	Unknown impact	Both Positive and Negative impacts	Negative impact	Significant negative impact
Score Symbol	++	+	0	?	+/-	x	xx

### Legends

<u>Related SEA topic</u>	<u>Information source</u>	<u>Consultation required ( only if answer is Yes)</u>
Population and Human Health (PHH)	Geographic Information System (GIS)	Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
Climatic Factors (CF)	Site visit (SV)	Transport Scotland (TS)
Biodiversity (B)	Consultee (C)	Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
Landscape (L)	Other (O)	Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
Material Assets (MA)		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA								
Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)	SACs	N	LNR	N	SPAs	N	SSSIs	N
	NNR	N	Local wildlife sites	N	Natterjack toads	N	Great Crested Newts	N
	RAMSAR	N	Geodiversity Sites	N	Other protected species	N	Marine Consultation Zones	N
	Ancient/semi-natural woodland		N					
Comments: No comments								
Are there any known invasive species within the site	N				O		O	
Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity	N				O		O	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	No impact on biodiversity designations							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No impact on biodiversity designations							<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>

POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH											
Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space	MA	N				0			0		
		Distance (km)	1								
Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them	MA or CF	Right of Way	N	Comment: Core path 323 – Springfield to Gretna. Also heritage trail							
		Core path	N								
		Cycle path	Y								
What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)	CF	Community/village hall	1	Sports facilities	1-5	Hospitalities	1	Local shops (convenience)	1-5	Bus stop	0.1
What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km)			Primary				Secondary				
	School name:		n/a				n/a				
	Capacity:										
	Distance:										
Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere	MA and B	N			GIS	0			0		
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Not within reasonable walking distance of the majority of community facilities, less likely to encourage active travel Proximity to Gretna Station and could encourage active travel and use of sustainable transport.										
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Not within reasonable walking distance of the majority of community facilities, less likely to encourage active travel. Proximity to Gretna Station and could encourage active travel and use of sustainable transport.								<b>SEA SCORE: X/+</b>		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

SOILS									
Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land		Y	Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)		3.2	X	Agricultural land currently in grazing.	X	
Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)			Site slopes steeply to east and south.						
Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site			No known previous use.						
Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat	CF	N			0		0		
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Would involve loss of prime agricultural land								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Negative SEA impact as would involve the loss of prime agricultural land						<b>SEA SCORE:X</b>		

WATER								
Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site	B and L	N			0		0	
Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere	CF and PHH	N	SEPA advise that no flood risk apparent	C	0		0	
Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse)		N			0		0	
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer	PHH	Y	Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.	C	0	Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.	0	
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply	PHH	Y	Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient	C	0	Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the	0	

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

						requirements for this phase of the upgrade work. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October 2010) refers.			
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing waste water network. Early engagement with Scottish Water via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No known flood risk. Gretna – limited water capacity subject to planned upgrading by Scottish Water which will require developer contributions.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

AIR QUALITY									
Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA		N	There are no AQMA at present in the region	C	0		0		
What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby	PHH	N	North – housing. Site bounded by steeply sloping road embankments.			SEPA have noted a potential issue with air quality.	?		
Does the development of the site introduce a new potentially significant air emission to the area (e.g. combined heat and power, an industrial process, large scale quarry of energy from the waste plant)		N					0		
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Potential issue with air quality.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	SEPA have noted a potential issue with air quality.						<b>SEA SCORE: ?</b>		

MATERIAL ASSETS								
Is the site.....		Brownfield		Comment				
		Greenfield	Y					
Is the site vacant or derelict		N	Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey	N		O		O
Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover on-site materials/resources		N	No existing structure for reuse on site			O		O
Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction		N				O		O

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation	PHH	O			O		O	
Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9)		n/a						
Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site			Pylons N Bord Gais Eirann pipeline N Shell oil pipeline N Transco pipeline N					
Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies			Air Traffic/NATS N MoD N Carlisle Airport N Coal Authority N HSE N					
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	No known servicing constraints							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Negative SEA impact as would involve loss of greenfield land						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>	

### ROADS/ACCESS

Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated			This site has potential to be accessed from an existing private lane located to the east of the site off U42a Main Street that presently serves two dwellings. A second point of access appears to exist via a private lane beside 10 Main Street that also serves 2 dwellings and a former engineering business. These potential points of access may require either significant engineering works or challenges in providing an adoptable access and may require third party land. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and a residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards.					
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	This site has potential to be accessed from an existing private lane located to the east of the site off U42a Main Street that presently serves two dwellings. A second point of access appears to exist via a private lane beside 10 Main Street that also serves 2 dwellings and a former engineering business. These potential points of access may require either significant engineering works or challenges in providing an adoptable access and may require third party land.							

### CLIMATIC FACTORS

What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)		South		SV	0		0	
Can the site make best use of solar gain		Y		SV	0		0	
Is the site protected from prevailing winds		N	Not sheltered from prevailing wind.	SV	X	May require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions	X	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Not sheltered from prevailing wind, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Not sheltered from prevailing wind, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>	

### CULTURAL HERITAGE

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting	L	Listed Building	N	Scheduled Monuments	N	Comment Archaeology - Course of Roman road passes through the majority of the site, evaluation will be required. Historic Built Environment - No Listed Buildings, no conservation area. Backs onto former railway line			
		Conservation Area	N	Inventory of Historic Battlefield	N				
		World Heritage Site	N	Inventory & Non-Inventory					
		Archaeological site	Y	Garden or Designed Landscape					
Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment	L								
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Archaeological mitigation measures to be implemented due to course of Roman Road running through site.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Impact on archaeological feature which would be mitigated subject to archaeological evaluation.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

LANDSCAPE									
Is the site within or adjoining any of the following		NSAs	N	RSAs	N	Comment The site slopes to the east and is visually prominent from that direction with no physical containment. It is overlooked by existing dwellings to the north yet has a rural character and the existing hedgerow is an attractive feature which would be unlikely to survive development. Limited development adjacent to the lane might be appropriate with effective screening and containment.			
		Wild Land	N	TPOs	N				
Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level		Y	Trees and hedgerows should be retained.				0	Existing trees and hedgerows should be reinforced with additional planting.	0
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement		N	Slopes steeply to east and south and bounded by roads. Significant issues raised in landscape advice - site slopes to the east and is visually prominent from that direction with no physical containment				X	For these reasons site should not be allocated for housing.	X
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		N							
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	For landscape reasons the site should not be allocated for housing.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Negative SEA impact in terms of landscape. Site slopes to the east and is visually prominent from that direction with no physical containment						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>		

PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES								
Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	Y	Site lies outwith settlement boundary for Gretna Border, but immediately adjacent to it.						
Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site								
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips	Y	Potential points of road access may require third party land outwith the site.						

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe	
<b>OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT</b>	The site has been proposed for a nursing home. The plan does not make any specific allocations for this type of development as there are policies which would be used to assess any proposal. Development of the site would have a negative impact on the landscape. It would also involve the loss of prime agricultural land and greenfield land. There are issues regarding access to the site and it is distant from the majority of community facilities Policy H6 requires that such facilities are well located in relation to local services and facilities and are integrated with the local community.
<b>OVERALL SEA COMMENT</b>	Negative SEA impact in terms of Soils as would involves prime agricultural land, material assets as greenfield site and adverse impact on landscape. Negative SEA impact in terms of Population and Health as distant from the majority of community facilities, but also positive as offset by proximity to Gretna Station and could encourage active travel and use of sustainable transport.

## LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

<b>Site Ref:</b> GTN.MU201	<b>Source of site suggestion:</b> Call for Sites	<b>Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):</b>	
<b>Site name:</b>			
<b>Settlement:</b> Gretna Border	<b>Current use:</b> Agricultural land		
<b>OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing):</b>		<b>Existing LDP allocations/ designations:</b> None	
<b>Site Size (ha):</b> 2.0ha	<b>Proposed use:</b> Mixed use – retail, industrial/commercial and tourist recreation / leisure	<b>HMA:</b> Annan	<b>Date completed:</b> Oct/Nov 2016

TOPIC	Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora	Population and Human Health	Soils	Water	Air Quality	Material Assets	Climatic Factors	Cultural Heritage	Landscape
SCORE	0	+	X	XX	0	X	0	0	0

### Scoring Guidance

Impact	Significant positive impact	Positive impact	Neutral impact	Unknown impact	Both Positive and Negative impacts	Negative impact	Significant negative impact
Score Symbol	++	+	0	?	+/-	x	xx

### Legends

<u>Related SEA topic</u>	<u>Information source</u>	<u>Consultation required ( only if answer is Yes)</u>
Population and Human Health (PHH)	Geographic Information System (GIS)	Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
Climatic Factors (CF)	Site visit (SV)	Transport Scotland (TS)
Biodiversity (B)	Consultee (C)	Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
Landscape (L)	Other (O)	Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
Material Assets (MA)		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

### BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)	SACs	N	LNR	N	SPAs	N	SSSIs	N
	NNR	N	Local wildlife sites	N	Natterjack toads	N	Great Crested Newts	N
	RAMSAR	N	Geodiversity Sites	N	Other protected species	N	Marine Consultation Zones	N
	Ancient/semi-natural woodland		N					
Comments: No comments								
Are there any known invasive species within the site	N				O		O	
Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity	N				O		O	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	No biodiversity designations apply							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No biodiversity designations apply						<b>SEA SCORE: O</b>	

### POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space	MA	N									
		Distance (km)	1								
Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them	MA or CF	Right of Way	N	Comment: Core path 252 along River Sark							
		Core path	Y								
		Cycle path	N								
What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)	CF	Community/village hall	1	Sports facilities	1	Hospitalities	1	Local shops (convenience)	1	Bus stop	0.1
What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km)			Primary				Secondary				
	School name:		n/a				n/a				
	Capacity:										
	Distance:										
Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere	MA and B	N			GIS	0			0		
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Within close walking distance to existing facilities, school and access to Gretna station. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.										
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Within close walking distance to existing community facilities, and access to Gretna station. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.						<b>SEA SCORE: +</b>				

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

SOILS									
Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land		Y	Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)	3.1	O	X	Would involve loss of prime agricultural land	X	
Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)									
Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site		N	No known previous use.		C	O		O	
Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat	CF	N			O	O		O	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Loss of prime agricultural land.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Negative SEA impact as would involve loss of prime agricultural land.						<b>SEA SCORE:X</b>		

WATER									
Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site	B and L	Y	Site bounds River Sark where it is embanked. Boggy areas, marshy and low lying		SV	X		X	
Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere	CF and PHH	Y	SEPA – Site within potentially vulnerable area of fluvial and coastal flooding. Fully within the 1 in 200 year floodplain of River Esk. New development within this area is therefore viewed as un-acceptable.		C	XX	SEPA advise that this site should not be considered for development due to significant flood risk	XX	
Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse)		Y	Adequate buffer to River Sark which is adjacent to the site. If development adheres to good practice this should not result in further deterioration of the waterbody.		C	0		0	
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer	PHH	Y	Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.		C	0	Please note there Surface water sewer running along east of site. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.	0	
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply	PHH	Y	Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.		C	0	Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network	Y	

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

						issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the requirements for this phase of the upgrade work. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October 2010) refers			
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Development of this site is unacceptable due to flood risk - within potentially vulnerable area of fluvial and coastal flooding. Fully within the 1 in 200 year floodplain of River Esk. Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. Flood risk assessment required								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Significant negative SEA impact as site within an identified flood risk area.						<b>SEA SCORE: XX</b>		

AIR QUALITY									
Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA		N	There are no AQMA at present in the region	C	0		0		
What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby	PHH	N	North – hotel and car park serving Gretna Outlet Centre. East bounded by B7076 South – River Sark and embankments. West – agricultural land	SV	0		0		
Does the development of the site introduce a new potentially significant air emission to the area (e.g. combined heat and power, an industrial process, large scale quarry of energy from the waste plant)		N			0		0		
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Unlikely to decrease air quality.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Unlikely to decrease air quality.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

MATERIAL ASSETS								
Is the site.....		Brownfield		Comment				
		Greenfield	Y					
Is the site vacant or derelict		N	Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey	N	0		0	
Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover on-site materials/resources		N			0		0	

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required	
Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction		N			0		0		
Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation	PHH	N			0		0		
Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9)		n/a			0		0		
Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site			Pylons   N   Bord Gais Eirann pipeline   N   Shell oil pipeline   N   Transco pipeline   N						
Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies			Air Traffic/NATS   N   MoD   N   Carlisle Airport   N   Coal Authority   N   HSE   N						
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	No known servicing constraints								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Negative SEA impact as would involve loss of greenfield land.						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>		

### ROADS/ACCESS

Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated			This site located to the south of the B7076 at the national boundary, adjacent to the southern overflow car park for the Gretna Gateway Outlet and the Garden House Hotel. Access can be taken from either the existing hotel/carpark access or via the B7076. Development of this site will trigger the relocation of the 30mph speed limit. Any development of this proposed site should include access designed in accordance with the appropriate Dumfries and Galloway Council standard for the proposed type of development, with parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council parking standards					
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Access can be taken from either the existing hotel/carpark access or via the B7076. Development of this site will trigger the relocation of the 30mph speed limit							

### CLIMATIC FACTORS

What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)			South and West aspect	SV			0		
Can the site make best use of solar gain		Y		SV			0		
Is the site protected from prevailing winds		N	Exposed to prevailing winds	SV	X	Appropriate landscaping and layout should take into account aspect and prevailing winds to the south west	0		
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>									
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Due to south west aspect the use of solar gain could be used to great effect. Exposed to prevailing winds, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

### CULTURAL HERITAGE

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting	L	Listed Building	Y	Scheduled Monuments	N	Comment Archaeology - No historic environment issues identified for this site, as of July 2016 Historic Built Environment - Two Category B Listed structures – Sark Bridge and the Old Toll House both of which should be carefully considered in respect of access to the site and their setting. No conservation area.		
		Conservation Area	N	Inventory of Historic Battlefield	N			
		World Heritage Site	N	Inventory & Non-Inventory	N			
		Archaeological site	N	Garden or Designed Landscape				
Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment	L		The setting of the listed structures Sark Bridge (category B) and the Old Toll House (category B) should be carefully considered in respect of access to the site.		0		0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	The setting of the listed structures Sark Bridge (category B) and the Old Toll House (category B) should be carefully considered in respect of access to the site.							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Potential impact on setting of adjacent listed structures which will require to be carefully considered in respect of access to the site.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>	

LANDSCAPE								
Is the site within or adjoining any of the following		NSAs	N	RSAs	N	Comment Possible option depending on nature of development: Borders onto levee by River Sark whereas existing village boundary is set back from the river. Development would be seen on entrance to the village and would impact on existing hotel which looks out onto site		
		Wild Land	N	TPOs	N			
Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level		Y						
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement		Y	Development would be seen on entrance to the village and would impact on existing hotel which looks out onto site. Important site at entrance to Gretna and national boundary to Scotland			0	High quality of design would be required at this important site	0
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		N						
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	High quality of design would be required at this important prominent site at the entrance to Gretna and national boundary to Scotland							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Potential impact on landscape and mitigation measures identified should be implemented.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>	

PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES		
Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	Y	Site lies immediately outside settlement inset boundary for Gretna Border
Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site	Y	Site being promoted as a gateway site to Scotland. Promoted for tourist recreation/leisure uses, retail and high quality office accommodation.
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips	Y	
Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe	Y	

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

<b>OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT</b>	The site has not been included in the MIR due to significant flood risk and SEPA advise that the site should not be allocated for development. The site has been proposed for tourist recreation / leisure uses, retail and office development. The plan does not make any specific allocations for this type of development as there are policies which would be used to assess any proposal.
---------------------------------	--

<b>OVERALL SEA COMMENT</b>	Significant negative SEA impact in terms of water issues as significant flood risk. Negative SEA impact in terms of soils and material assets as prime agricultural land and greenfield site. Positive SEA impact in terms of Population and Human Health as within close walking distance to existing facilities, school and access to Gretna station. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.
----------------------------	---

## LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

<b>Site Ref:</b> GTN.MU202	<b>Source of site suggestion:</b> Call for Sites	<b>Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):</b> 12/P/4/0090 PIP granted 3 Sept 12 15/P/4/0232 Erection of Class 1 Foodstore (Approval of reserved matters specified in conditions of Planning Permission in Principle 12/P/4/0090) – relates in part to site and currently being determined	
<b>Site name:</b> Land adjacent to Toll Bar, East of B7076, Gretna			
<b>Settlement:</b> Gretna Border	<b>Current use:</b> Vacant site (former caravan park)		
<b>OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing):</b>		<b>Existing LDP allocations/ designations:</b>	
<b>Site Size (ha):</b> 2.1ha	<b>Proposed use:</b> Mixed use - tourist recreation/leisure uses, retail and office development	<b>HMA:</b> Annan	<b>Date completed:</b> Oct/Nov 2016

TOPIC	Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora	Population and Human Health	Soils	Water	Air Quality	Material Assets	Climatic Factors	Cultural Heritage	Landscape
<b>SCORE</b>	0	+	X	X	0	0	0	0	0

### Scoring Guidance

Impact	Significant positive impact	Positive impact	Neutral impact	Unknown impact	Both Positive and Negative impacts	Negative impact	Significant negative impact
<b>Score Symbol</b>	++	+	0	?	+/-	x	xx

### Legends

<u>Related SEA topic</u>	<u>Information source</u>	<u>Consultation required ( only if answer is Yes)</u>
Population and Human Health (PHH)	Geographic Information System (GIS)	Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
Climatic Factors (CF)	Site visit (SV)	Transport Scotland (TS)
Biodiversity (B)	Consultee (C)	Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
Landscape (L)	Other (O)	Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
Material Assets (MA)		

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

### BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)	SACs	N	LNR	N	SPAs	N	SSSIs	N
	NNR	N	Local wildlife sites	N	Natterjack toads	N	Great Crested Newts	N
	RAMSAR	N	Geodiversity Sites	N	Other protected species	N	Marine Consultation Zones	N
	Ancient/semi-natural woodland		N					
Comments: No comments								
Are there any known invasive species within the site	N				0		0	
Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity	N				0		0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	No biodiversity designations apply							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No biodiversity designations apply						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>	

### POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space	MA	N									
		Distance (km)	1								
Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them	MA or CF	Right of Way	N	Comment: Core path 253 linking Gretna to River Sark and riverside path							
		Core path	Y								
		Cycle path	N								
What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)	CF	Community/village hall	1	Sports facilities	1	Hospitalities	1	Local shops (convenience)	1	Bus stop	0.1
What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km)			Primary				Secondary				
	School name:		N/A				N/A				
	Capacity:										
	Distance:										
Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere	MA and B	N		GIS	0		0				
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Within close walking distance to existing facilities, school and access to Gretna station. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.										
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Within close walking distance to existing community facilities, and access to Gretna station. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.						<b>SEA SCORE: +</b>				

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

SOILS								
Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land		Y	Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)	3.1	O	X		X
Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)		N	Low lying site bounded by embankment of River Sark		SV			0
Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site		N	No known previous use.		0			0
Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat	CF	N			0			0
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Would involve loss of prime agricultural land							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Negative SEA impact as would involve loss of prime agricultural land						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>	

WATER								
Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site	B and L		Site bounds River Sark and river embankments					
Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere	CF and PHH		SEPA – potentially at medium to high risk of Fluvial flooding. Aware of a FRA having been undertaken at the site in support of a previous development enquiry. Existing private FRA in development.		X	Flood management measures would require to formalise embankment to provide 200 year standard of protection. A FRA would be required to be agreed with SEPA.	X	
Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse)		Y	Potential development of site could increase probability of flooding elsewhere.  Adequate buffer to River Sark which is adjacent to the site. If development adheres to good practice this should not result in further deterioration of the waterbody.	C	X		X	
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer	PHH	Y	Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.	C	O	Please note there is Combined sewer running through top of site. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.	O	
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply	PHH	Y	Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.	C	0	Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been	0	

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required	
						completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the requirements for this phase of the upgrade work. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October 2010) refers			
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Flood management measures would require to formalise river embankment to provide 200 year standard of protection. A FRA would be required to be agreed with SEPA. Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. Flood risk assessment required								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Negative SEA impact as high risk of fluvial flooding. Flood management measures would require to formalise embankment to provide 200 year standard of protection. A FRA would be required to be agreed with SEPA.						<b>SEA SCORE: X</b>		

AIR QUALITY									
Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA		N	There are no AQMA at present in the region	C	0		0		
What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby	PHH	N	North – Gretna Outlet Centre. East and South – River Sark and embankments. West bounded by B7076	SV	0		0		
Does the development of the site introduce a new potentially significant air emission to the area (e.g. combined heat and power, an industrial process, large scale quarry of energy from the waste plant)		N			0		0		
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Unlikely to decrease air quality.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Unlikely to decrease air quality.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

MATERIAL ASSETS									
Is the site.....		Brownfield	Y	Comment Site of former caravan park, currently disused					
		Greenfield							
Is the site vacant or derelict		V	Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey						
Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or		Y	Some structures remain on site also disused services.						

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

recycle or recover on-site materials/resources									
Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction		N			O		O		
Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation	PHH	N			O		O		
Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9)		n/a			O		O		
Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site			Pylons   N   Bord Gais Eirann pipeline   N   Shell oil pipeline   N   Transco pipeline   N						
			Comment No known servicing constraints						
Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies			Air Traffic/NATS   N   MoD   N   Carlisle Airport   N   Coal Authority   N   HSE   N						
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	No known servicing constraints								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	No impact as would result in development of brownfield site.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

### ROADS/ACCESS

Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated		This site located to the north of the B7076 at the national boundary incorporates part of a site currently subject to a planning application for a class 1 foodstore under 15/P/4/0232. Access to this site should utilise the access design proposed for this development. Consideration should also be given to core path 253 which enters the northern boundary of the site. Development of this site will trigger the relocation of the 30mph speed limit. Any development of this proposed site should be in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Councils Technical Advice Note 5 'Roads and Accesses for Industrial Developments' with parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards.						
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	This site incorporates part of a site currently subject to a planning application for a class 1 foodstore under 15/P/4/0232. Access to this site should utilise the access design proposed for this development.							

### CLIMATIC FACTORS

What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)		South and west aspect			SV		O	
Can the site make best use of solar gain		Y			SV		O	
Is the site protected from prevailing winds		N	Exposed to the prevailing winds		SV	X	O	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	Exposed to prevailing winds, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions							
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Due to south west aspect the use of solar gain could be used to great effect. Exposed to prevailing winds, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>	

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

CULTURAL HERITAGE									
Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting	L	Listed Building	Y	Scheduled Monuments	N	Comment Archaeology - No historic environment issues identified for this site, as of July 2016, but setting of historic tollbooth and bridge should be taken into account.  Historic Built Environment - No conservation area. Category B Listed structures – Old Toll House and Sark Bridge which should be very carefully considered both in terms of access to the site and setting around them.			
		Conservation Area	N	Inventory of Historic Battlefield	N				
		World Heritage Site	N	Inventory & Non-Inventory	N				
		Archaeological site	N	Garden or Designed Landscape					
Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment	L			The setting of the listed structures Sark Bridge (category B) and the Old Toll House (category B) should be carefully considered in respect of access to the site.		0		0	
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	The setting of the listed structures Sark Bridge (category B) and the Old Toll House (category B) should be carefully considered in respect of access to the site.								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Potential impact on setting of adjacent listed structures which will require to be carefully considered in respect of access to the site.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

LANDSCAPE									
Is the site within or adjoining any of the following		NSAs		RSA		Comment Possible depending on nature of development: Former caravan site surrounding 'iconic' Old Toll House. Borders onto levee by River Sark whereas existing village boundary is set back from the river. Development would be seen on entrance to the village in the context of the Toll house and would be affected by the M74. [nb includes site of 'Hands Across the Border' cairn constructed during referendum debate 2015]			
		Wild Land		TPO					
Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level		Y							
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement		Y		Development would be seen on entrance to the village and would impact on existing hotel which looks out onto site. Important site at entrance to Gretna and national boundary to Scotland		0	High quality of design would be required at this important site	0	
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		N							
<b>PLANNING OVERVIEW</b>	High quality of design would be required at this important prominent site at the entrance to Gretna and national boundary to Scotland								
<b>SEA OVERVIEW</b>	Potential impact on landscape and mitigation measures identified should be implemented.						<b>SEA SCORE: 0</b>		

PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES		
Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	Y	Site lies immediately outside settlement inset boundary for Gretna Border

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site		Y	Site being promoted as a gateway site to Scotland. Promoted for tourist recreation/leisure uses, retail and high quality office accommodation.					
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips		Y						
Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe		Y						
<b>OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT</b>			The site has not been included in the MIR due to high risk of flooding. Any development proposal would require to demonstrate that flood management measures could formalise the existing flood embankment at River Sark providing the required 200 year standard of protection. A Flood Risk Assessment would be required to be agreed with SEPA. The site has been proposed for tourist recreation / leisure uses, retail and office development. The plan does not make any specific allocations for this type of development as there are policies which would be used to assess any proposal.					
<b>OVERALL SEA COMMENT</b>			Negative SEA impact in terms of water issues as significant flood risk. Negative SEA impact in terms of soils as would involve the loss of prime agricultural land. Positive SEA impact in terms of Population and Human Health as within close walking distance to existing facilities and Gretna station. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.					