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

| Торіс | 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 |

| Related SEA topic | Information source | Consultation required (only if answer is Yes) |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 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 | 2 CO | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---|------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---|------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

| | | | | BIODIVERSITY, | FAUNA | AND FI | LOR | 4 | | | | |
|---|-------|------------|-------------------|---------------------------|-------|--------|-------------|---------|------------------|---|---------------------------|---|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests | | S | ACs N | LNR | N | | | | SPAs | Ν | SSSIs | Ν |
| affect or have connectivity to the site? (this | | N | INR N | Local wildlife sites | N | | | 1 | Natterjack toads | N | Great Crested Newts | Ν |
| includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | | RAMS | SAR N | Geodiversity Sites | N | | С | ther pr | otected species | N | Marine Consultation Zones | Ν |
| | | | Ancie | ent/semi-natural woodland | Ν | | | | | | | |
| | | Comm | ents: No strateo | gic 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 | | | | ę | SV | 0 | | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No de | esignation | ns affecting this | site | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No de | esignatior | ns affecting this | site | | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | |

| | | | | | POP | ULATION AND H | UMAN | HEALTH | ł | | | | | |
|---|----------------|-----------------------------|------------|-------------------|-------|---|-----------|----------------|--------|------------------|----------------------------------|---------------|---------------|----------|
| 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 Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them | MA or CF | | · / | 1 N N Y | Comme | ent: Cycle route on we | stern edo | je of site pro | ovidin | g link to | Gretna Station | | | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | Commu | iity/villa | • | 1 | Sports facilities | 1-5 | Hospita | lities | 1 | Local shops (convenience | 9) 1-5 | Bus stop | 0.1 |
| What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and | S | chool name | | mary ringfield | | | | | | Second Annan | dary | | | |
| what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | | Capacit Distance | | | | | | | | <u>331</u> 10 | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | N | | | | | | GIS | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | ot within rea and use of | | | | e of the majority of co | mmunity | facilities an | d pub | lic open | space. Close proximity to Gretna | Station and o | ould encourag | e active |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | | | | | e of the majority of co e travel and use of su | | | d pub | lic open | space. Close proximity to | SEA SCORE | E: -/+ | |

| | 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 3.2 (The James Hutton Institute) | 0 | Х | Prime quality agricultural land being actively farmed for cereal crops | х | |
| 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. | С | 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 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Loss | of prime | agricultural land currently in production | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Loss | of prime | agricultural land. | | | SEA Score: X | | |

| | 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. | С | 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 | РНН | Y | Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity. | С | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply | РНН | N | Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity. | С | 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 | Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

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

| | | | 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 | С | 0 | | 0 | | |
| What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby | РНН | Y | Housing and M74 motorway, slip roads and B7076 SEPA noted an issue with air quality given the sites location | С | 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 | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Signific succes | | vironmental issues due to proximity of M74 and slip roads at | t height. | Noise as | ssessment required. Mitigation measures considered unlike | ely to be | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | gnificant environmental issues due to proximity of M74 and slip roads at height. Noise assessment required. Mitigation SEA Score: X easures considered unlikely to be successful | | | | | | | |

| | MATERIAL ASSETS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|------|---------|-------------|--|--|---|--|------------------------|--|---|--|
| Is the site | | | vnfield | | Comment | | | | | | | |
| | | Gree | enfield | G | | | | | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | N | ls | it containe | ed 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 | | Z | | | | | 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 | Ν | | | | | 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 | | Pylons N Bord Gais Eirann pipeline N Shell oil pipeline N Transco pip | | | | | | | | | | | pipeline | Ν | | |
| constraints that impact on the development of the site | | Comment No servicing constraints in relation to this site | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Will development of the site require | | Air Traffic/ | NATS | Ν | MoD | Ν | | Carl | isle Airpo | ort N | Coa | al Authority | Ν | | HSE | Ν |
| consultation with any of the following bodies | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Loss of | greenfield site. I | lo servi | icing co | nstraints in relation | to this s | ite | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Loss of | loss of greenfield site SEA Score: X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | ROADS/ACCESS | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Are there any vehicular access constraints | 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 | | | | | | | | |
| or opportunities, can a suitable road access | significant infill to achieve satisfactory access gradients. Consideration should be given to site GTN.H205 (158 units) which incorporates this site | | | | | | | | |
| be achieved, does the access affect a trunk | 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 | | | | | | | | |
| road, is the road network capable of | should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and a residential | | | | | | | | |
| accommodating traffic generated | development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | 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.) | | Sout | h | SV | 0 | | | | | |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | | Y | | | 0 | | | | | |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | | Y SV 0 N Not sheltered from prevailing wind. SV x May require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Not she | eltered | from prevailing wind, may require greater energy use for hea | ating incr | easing c | carbon emissions | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Not she | ot sheltered from prevailing wind, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions SEA Score: X | | | | | | | | |

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

| Site assessment question | Comment | Pre mitigation Score mitigation Score Pre mitigation | Post mitigation score Consultation required | |
|--------------------------|---------|--|--|--|
|--------------------------|---------|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | the | road ju | he church on the corner and the terrace (inction were all built by the early 19 th cen evelopment should reinforce the local cha | tury and represent t | | | |
|---|--------|---|-------------------------|--|--------------|-----|---------|--|----------------------|--|--|--|
| Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment | L | N | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | chaeological mitigation measures to be implemented due to potential course of Roman road running through northern part of site. | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Archae | ologica | l site potentially affe | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | | | | | | |

_

| | LANDSCAPE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|--|--|---|----------|------------------------|-----------|----------|--|--------|--|--|--|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | | W | NSAs N ild Land N | RSAs TPOs | | Comment | | | | | | | |
| 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 | M74 and slip r Hedge and tre retained a a bo | es along site b | oundarie | | 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 | | N | | M74 and slip roads dominate site and area so visual integration would be difficult to achieve | | | | | 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 | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Require challen | • | ificant mitigation | n through bund | ng and | tree planting to reduc | ce domina | nce of N | M74/slip road. Even then creating a pleasant place to live wo | uld be | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | • | Significant environmental issues due to proximity of M74 and slip roads at height. Mitigation measures considered unlikely to be successful. | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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 | Ν | | | | | | | | | |
| Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe | ? | | | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT | slip | bugh the site is an existing housing allocation in adopted LDP proposed housing use is not considered desirable due to proximity of M74 and associated road. Would require significant mitigation through bunding and tree planting to reduce dominance of M74/slip roads. Landscape view is that creating a sant place to live would be challenging. Review site as an option for inclusion in LDP2. | | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | Neg | ative 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.

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

| Торіс | 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 |
|---|--------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| s | Score Symbol | ++ | + | 0 | ? | +/x | x | XX |

| Related SEA topic | Information source | Consultation required (only if answer is Yes) |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 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 | 2 CO | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---|------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---|------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

| | | | | | BIODIVERSITY, | FAUNA | AND | FLORA | ١ | | | | | | |
|---|-------|--------------------|-------------|-----------|----------------------------|-----------|---------|------------|----------|---|-------------|----------------|----------------------|-------|---|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests | | S | ACs | Ν | LNR | Ν | | | | SPAs | N | | 0 | SSSIs | Ν |
| affect or have connectivity to the site? (this | | | NNR | Ν | Local wildlife sites | N | | | N | latterjack toads | N | | Great Crested I | Vewts | Ν |
| includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | | RAM | SAR | Ν | Geodiversity Sites | N | | 0 | ther pro | otected species | N | М | arine Consultation 2 | Zones | Ν |
| | | | | Ancien | nt/semi-natural woodland | Ν | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Comm | nents: No | strateg | ic 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 consideration of new habitats w | of design a | nd planting co | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | signatio opment | ns affectin | ng this s | site. No strategic comment | s from SN | H. Care | ful consid | deration | of design and pl | anting cou | ld help create | new habitats within | this | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No de | signatio | ns affectin | ng this s | site | | | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| | | | | | POP | ULATION AND H | UMAN | HEALTH | ł | | | | | |
|---|------------------|-----------|------------------------------|-------------------|-------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------|---------|------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|----------------|----------|
| 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 Dist | ance (ł | km) 0.2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them | MA or CF | | ht of V Core p Cycle p | oath N | Comme | ent: Footpath and cycl | e route o | on western | edge (| of site giv | ing direct link to Gretna Station | | | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | Com | munity/ | /village hall | 1 | Sports facilities | 1 | Hospita | alities | 1 | Local shops (conveniend | e) 1 | Bus stop | 0.1 |
| What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and | S | ichool n | ame: | Primary Gretna | | | | | | Seconda Annan | ary | | | |
| what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | | | acity: ance: | 76 0.1 | | | | | | 331 10 | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | N | I | | | | | GIS | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Within transp | | valking | distance to e | existing fa | acilities, school and di | rect acce | ess to Gretn | a stat | ion. Coul | d encourage walking and cycling | and reduce | carbon emissio | ons from |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Within | close v | valking | distance to | existing fa | acilities, school and di | rect acce | ess to Gretn | a stat | ion. Coul | d encourage walking and | SEA SCOR | E: + | |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic | Comment | ource | Pre mitigation score | Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--------------------------|----------------------|---------|-------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------------------|----------------------|---------|-------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.

| | | | SOILS | | | | | |
|--|-------|-----------|--|----|---|--|---|--|
| Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land | | Y | Soil classification 3.1 (The James Hutton Institute) | 0 | X | Prime quality agricultural land being actively farmed for cereal crops | Х | |
| 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 | С | 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 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Loss | of prime | agricultural land currently in production | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Would | l involve | e loss of prime agricultural land | | | SEA SCORE: X | | |

| | | | 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. | С | 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 | РНН | | Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity. | С | 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 | С | 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 | ource | Pre mitigation score | Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

| supply | 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. 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. | |
|-------------------|--|------|
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | 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 distar vill have to be established with Scottish Water's Asset Impact team. | nces |
| SEA OVERVIEW | 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. | |

| | | | 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 | С | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby | РНН | 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 | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | will nee | ed to b | sessment would be required together with any necessary mitigation will be required to address cumulative noise pollution from A75 and railway. Consideration to be given to appropriate landscaping and screening | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Noise a railway | assess . Cons | ment would be required together with any necessary mitigatic ideration would need to be given to appropriate landscaping a | on to add and scree | ress cur ening | nulative noise pollution from A75 and SEA Score:0 | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | MATERI | AL ASS | SETS | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------|-------|----------------------|-----------|---------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|------|------------|-----------|-------------|----------------|-----|----------|----------|---|
| Is the site | | | nfield nfield | G | Commen | t | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | Ν | ls it | containe | ed within the | e Vacant and Land | Derelict Survey | N | | | No kno | own previou | is 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 | e no exis | ting structur | e for reuse or | the site | | SV | 0 | | | | | | 0 | |
| Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction | | Ν | | | | | | | 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 | | Com | Pylons ment There | | | d Gais Eirann Instraints in re | | | | | Shell oil | pipeline N | 1 | | Transco | pipeline | Ν |
| Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies | | | Air Traffic/I | | N | MoD | N | | | lisle Airp | ort N | | Coal Authority | Ν | | HSE | Ν |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | - | | here are | no servicin | g constraints | in relation | n to this | site | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Loss of | green | field site. | | | | | | | | | | | SEA | SCORE: X | | |

| | 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 |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | 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 | ource ni mi | D Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|----------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|----------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|

| | CLIMATIC FACTORS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|------|---------------------------|----|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.) | | Sout | th | 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 | | Υ | Open relatively flat site | SV | 0 | | 0 | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | SEA OVERVIEW Site is southerly facing. Housing design could make use of passive solar gain, reducing energy use and carbon emissions. SEA Score: + | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | CULTURAL HERITA | GE | | |
|--|---------|---------|---------------------|---------|-----------------------------------|-------|---------------|--|
| Will the development of the site affect any | | | Listed Building | Ν | Scheduled Monuments | Ν | Comment | t Archaeology - No historic environment issues identified for this site, as of |
| of the following including their setting | | Co | onservation Area | Ν | Inventory of Historic Battlefield | Ν | July 2016 | |
| | I | Wo | orld Heritage Site | Ν | Inventory & Non-Inventory | | Historic B | Built Environment - No Listed Buildings; no conservation area. However, |
| | - | Ar | chaeological site | Ν | Garden or Designed Landscape | | developm | nent should reinforce the layout of the planned town of Gretna which is of |
| | | | | | | | | vartime interest. The church on the corner of Victory Ave and Burnside Road |
| | | | r | | | | is Catego | ry B Listed. |
| Will the development of the site result in the | | Ν | | | | | | |
| opportunity to enhance or improve access | L | | | | | | | |
| to the historic environment | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | | | | which | is of nationa | al wartime interest. The design of buildings should integrate street scene |
| | along V | 'ictory | Avenue and take | acco | unt of nearby listed buildings. | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No cult | ural he | eritage issues ider | ntified | • | | | SEA SCORE: 0 |

| | | | | | | L | ANDSCAPE | | | | | |
|---|--------|--------|-----------|-----------|----------------|---------|----------------------------|-----------|-----------|--|---|--|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the | | | NSAs | Ν | RSAs | Ν | Comment Open la | ndscape - | - no tree | es or hedgerows. | | |
| following | | Wi | ld Land | Ν | TPOs | Ν | | | | | | |
| 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 | | | masterplanning | | se apply. Screen nting. | 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 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Design | in com | nbination | with site | es H3, H4, H7 | and exi | sting residential devel | opments | to ensur | e 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 |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

SEA OVERVIEW Screen from slip road/A75 with woodland and planting.

SEA SCORE: 0

| | PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT | an o footp shou listee to th | allocated for housing in adopted LDP and current developer interest - Proposal of Application Notice 16/N/4/001 (June 2016). Masterplan should include: verall road layout including access into the adjoining site GTN.H7 and a roundabout access into the site, phasing of the development, open space and both links integrated with the existing pedestrian/cycle path connecting to Gretna Green railway station. Should this site be developed in isolation, this uld not prejudice the future development of adjacent sites. The design of buildings should integrate street-scene along Victory Avenue and especially with d buildings. A noise assessment along with any necessary mitigation will be required to address cumulative noise pollution from the A75 and railway line is north. | | | | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | | ative SEA impact as greenfield site and loss of prime agricultural land. Proximity of site to community facilities and railway station. Potential to encourage je of sustainable transport modes | | | | | | | | | | |

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

| Торіс | 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 |

| Related SEA topic | Information source | Consultation required (only if answer is Yes) |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 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 | 2 CO | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---|------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---|------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

| BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|--|--|------------|----------------------|---|---|--|---|------------------|---|---|---------------|-------|---|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests | | S | ACs | N | LNR | ١ | 1 | | | SPAs | Ν | | | SSSIs | Ν |
| affect or have connectivity to the site? (this | | | NNR I | Ν | Local wildlife sites | Ν | I | | ١ | latterjack toads | Ν | | Great Crested | Newts | Ν |
| includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | | RAM | AMSAR N Geodiversity Sites N Other protected species N Marine Consultation Zones 1 | | | | | | | | | Ν | | | |
| | | | An | cient/sen | ni-natural woodland | Ν | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Comm | ents: No stra | itegic cor | nments 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 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No bio | odiversit | y designation | s affect s | site | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No de | No designations affecting site SEA Score:0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | POP | ULATION AN | ID HU | JMAN | HEALTH | 4 | | | | | | |
|---|-----|--------------------------|---------|---------|------|-------|---------------------|--------|-----------|--------------|---------|------------|-------------------------------|----------|--------|----|-----|
| Will the development of the site affect the | | N | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space | MA | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| or result in a loss of open space. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Distance to nearest area of open space | | Distar | (| / | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any of the following within or | MA | Right | | | N | Comme | ent: Within 1km c | f pede | strian cy | cle route to | o Gret | tna railwa | ay station | | | | |
| adjacent to the site and will development | or | | pre pa | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| impact on them | CF | , | cle pa | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following | 05 | Comm | inity/v | village | hall | 1 | Sports facili | ties | 1 | Hospita | alities | 1 | Local shops (conveniend | e) 1 | Bus st | ор | 0.1 |
| services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| What is the education catchment area | | | | Prima | | | | | | | | Second | | | | | |
| (primary and secondary) for the site and | | chool nar | | Gretn | | | | | | | | Annan | lary | | | | |
| what is the remaining capacity within the | 3 | | - | 76 | d | | | | | | | 331 | | | | | |
| catchment. (October 2015). Distance from | | Capac | - | 10 | | | | | | | | 10 | | | | | |
| site (km) | | Distan | Je. | I | | | | | | | | 10 | | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to | MA | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| the core areas of the biosphere | and | Ν | | | | | | | | GIS | 0 | | | | (|) | |
| | В | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | | | | - | acilities, school a | | | - | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | n close wa e carbon e | | | | | acilities, school a | nd Gr | etna rai | way station | n. Cou | uld encou | urage walking and cycling and | SEA SCOR | E: + | | |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic Yes/No | Comment | ource | | 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 | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No im | No impact on soils | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No im | No impact SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | 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. | С | 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 | РНН | Y | Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity. | С | 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 | РНН | Y | Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity. | С | 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 upgra Supplementary Guidance Developer Co Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Bo 2010) refers. | ontributions to | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|---|--|---|-----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Gretna – limit | a – 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. | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Potential floor | ential flood risk. Drainage Impact Assessment required. Depending on content, Flood Risk Assessment may also be required SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | which will requ | uire to be agreed with SEPA | | | | | | | | | | |

| | 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 | | Ν | There are no AQMA at present in the region | С | 0 | | 0 | | | | | | |
| What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby | PHH | Ν | 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) | | Ν | | | 0 | | 0 | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | OVERVIEW Unlikely to decrease air quality | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Unlikely | ely to decrease air quality SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | MATERIAL ASSETS | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------|-------|------------|--|--|--|---------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Is the site | | Brownfi | | В | Comment | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Greenfi | ield | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | N | ls it | t containe | ed within the Vacant and Derelict N Land Survey | | | 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 | | Pylons N | | Bord Gais Eirann | pipelin | e N | | S | shell oil pipe | line N | | | Transco pipeli | ne | Ν |
| constraints that impact on the development of the site | | Comment no known se | nent no known service constraints | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Will development of the site require | | Air Traffic/NATS | Ν | MoD | Ν | | Carl | isle Airpo | ort N | Co | al Authority | Ν | H | SE | Ν |
| consultation with any of the following bodies | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Brownfi | eld site and benefits fro | m proxii | mity to existing infra | structu | e | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Brownfi | eld site and benefits fro | m proxi | mity to existing infra | structu | e | | | | | | SEA | SCORE: + | | |

| | 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 |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | 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 | Y | | | | | | | | | |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | Y | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Southerly aspect: housing design could make best use of passive solar gain. | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Sea Overview Southerly aspect: housing design could make best use of passive solar gain, reducing energy use and carbon emissions SEA Score: + | | | | | | | | | | |

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

| Site assessment question | Comment | Pre mitigation it appropriate score score | Post mitigation score | Consultation required | |
|--------------------------|---------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
|--------------------------|---------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|

| | | | | | | | Category B Listed hotel The Gables designed by Raymond Unwin as part of the new town. Development should respect proximity of the setting. Also in main viewestern 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. | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Ŭ | | • | | | | • | tting and proximity of listed building on southern boundary. | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Impact charact | t on planned town of Gretna and setting of listed building on southern boundary. Design should reflect and reinforce historic SEA Score: 0 ster. | | | | | | | | | | |

| | LANDSCAPE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|--------|----------|----------------------|---|-----------|-------------------------------------|-----|------------|----------|--|--------------|---|--|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the | | 14/2 | NSAs | N | RSAs | | Comment | | | | | | | |
| following Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level Will development of the site be well | | Y | | e for de ape elen | TPOs velopment: No nents or views | o particu | larly strong as caravan park | and | | + | Design in combination with H2, H4, H7 ar residential developments to ensure permo- sense of place. | | + | |
| integrated visually with the existing settlement | | · | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site | | Ν | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | - | | | | | - | | | its to ens | sure per | meability and sense of place | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No impa | act on | landscap | e elem | ents or views. | Suitable | e for developme | nt. | | | | SEA SCORE: + | | |

| | 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 | Υ | Current planning application being determined and current developer interest | | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT | | cated housing site in adopted LDP and current planning application 16/P/4/0212 for 46units (Phase 5) by Hadrian Homes. Effective housing site with ent developer interest. | | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | | itive SEA impact - development of brownfield site and proximity to community facilities, school and Gretna railway station. Could encourage walking and ing 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 | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|

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

| Торіс | 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 | x | xx |

| Related SEA topic | Information source | Consultation required (only if answer is Yes) |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 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 | 2 CO | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---|------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---|------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

| BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|--|--------------|----------|--------------------------|---|--|---|---------|------------------|---|---|------------------------|------|---|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests | | S | SACs | Ν | LNR | N | | | | SPAs | Ν | | SS | SSIs | Ν |
| affect or have connectivity to the site? (this | | | NNR | Ν | Local wildlife sites | N | | | ١ | Natterjack toads | Ν | | Great Crested Ne | ewts | Ν |
| includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | | RAM | SAR | Ν | Geodiversity Sites | N | | С | ther pr | otected species | Ν | Μ | larine Consultation Zo | nes | Ν |
| | | | | Ancien | nt/semi-natural woodland | Ν | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Comm | nents: No | strategi | ic comments from SNH | | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any known invasive species within the site | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | | C | |
| 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 | | | | |) | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No de | esignatio | ons affectin | g site | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No de | designations affecting site SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | POI | PULATION AND H | UMAN | HEALTH | 4 | | | | | |
|--|----------|---------------------------------|-------------|--------------|----------------------------|-----------|---------------|---------|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-----|
| Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and | | N | | | | | | | | | | | |
| connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. | MA | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Distance to nearest area of open space | | Distance | (km) 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any of the following within or | MA | Right of | | Comn | nent: Within 1km of pede | estrian c | ycle route to | o Gret | tna railway | / station | | | |
| adjacent to the site and will development impact on them | or CF | Core Cycle | | | | | | | | | | | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | Communit | //village h | all 1 | Sports facilities | 1 | Hospita | alities | 1 | Local shops (convenience) | 1 | Bus stop | 0.1 |
| What is the education catchment area | | | Primary | , | | | | | Seconda | iry | | | |
| (primary and secondary) for the site and | S | School name: | Gretna | | | | | | Annan | | | | |
| what is the remaining capacity within the | | Capacity: | 76 | | | | | | 331 | | | | |
| catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | | Distance: | 1 | | | | | | 10 | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to | MA | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| the core areas of the biosphere | and B | N | | | | | GIS | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Within | reasonable v | valking di | stance of ex | kisting community faciliti | es and C | Gretna railw | ay sta | ation - sc | ope to encourage variety of sustain | able transp | port modes. | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | n reasonable v nable transpo | | stance of ex | xisting community faciliti | es and C | Gretna railw | ay sta | ation – sc | ope to encourage variety of | SEA SCORE | ::+ | |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic Yes/No | Comment | ource | | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|

| | | | SOILS | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land | | Ν | 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 | | | | | | |
| Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site | | Y | The site is currently in us as a dog racing track and lorry park. Some further investigation may be required. SV/C X Contaminated land investigation may be required. | | | | | | |
| Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat | CF | N | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW Contaminated land investigation may be required given previous uses as a dog racing track and lorry park | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | EA OVERVIEW Contaminated land investigation may be required SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | |

| | | | 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 | С | 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 | РНН | | Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity. | С | 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 | РНН | | 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 | Mitigation if appropriate و | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

| | Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributio Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (Oc 2010) refers. | october | |
|-------------------|--|----------------------|-------|
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Gui Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be what impact, if any this development has on the existing waste water network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry p recommended. | be required to estal | blish |
| SEA OVERVIEW | 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. | CORE: 0 | |

| | | | 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 | РНН | | 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 | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW SEA OVERVIEW | Potenti pollutio | propriate mitigation required against noise pollution and landscaping required to minimise impact from adjoining A75 and trains using railway line due north. tential significant noise impact from A75 and railway line to north. Appropriate mitigation and landscaping to minimise noise llution. Railway station in settlement: could encourage use of more sustainable transport and reduce carbon emissions from nsport. SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | |

| | | | MATERIAL ASSETS | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|--|
| Is the site | Brownfield Greenfield | В | Comment Dog racing park and lorry park | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | it containe | d 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 | nform | 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 or | n site associa | ited with raci | ng track | | 0 | | | | | | 0 | |
|--|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------|-------------|-----------|------------------|--------------|--------------|-----|----------|----------|---|
| Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction | | Ν | | | | | | 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 | | Com | Pylons N nment No known servii | | ais Eirann pi s | peline N | | S | Shell oil pipeli | ne N | | | Transco | pipeline | N |
| Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies | | | Air Traffic/NATS N | | MoD N | 1 | Carl | isle Airp | ort N | Co | al Authority | N | | HSE | N |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | te in proximity to existi | • | | | | | | • | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Brownf | ield sit | te in proximity to existi | ing infrastruct | ure. Some fu | irther inves | tigation ma | y be req | uired given pr | revious uses | s. | SEA | SCORE: + | | |

| | 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 | 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 | | | | | |
| accommodating traffic generated | 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 | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW 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. 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 Masterp 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 | 5 | | | | | |
|---|--|------|--------------------------------|----|---|--|---|--|--|
| What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.) | | Sout | th | SV | 0 | | 0 | | |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | | Υ | Generally flat site | SV | 0 | | 0 | | |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | | Y | Exposed to the south and west. | SV | Х | Appropriate landscaping and layout should take into account aspect and prevailing winds to the south west | 0 | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW Appropriate landscaping and layout should take into account aspect and prevailing winds to the south west | | | | | | | | | |

| Site assessment question | Information Information Source Source Pre mitigation Score Post mitigation Mitigation | core core consultatio equired |
|--------------------------|---|--|
|--------------------------|---|--|

SEA OVERVIEW 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

| | CULTURAL HERITAGE | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|--|----|-----------------------------------|---|------------|---|--------------------------|----------|---|--|--|
| Will the development of the site affect any | | Listed Building | Ν | Scheduled Monuments | Ν | Comment | No historic environment issues identified | I for this site, as of J | uly 2016 | 6 | | |
| of the following including their setting | | Conservation Area | Ν | Inventory of Historic Battlefield | Ν | | | | | | | |
| | L | World Heritage Site | Ν | Inventory & Non-Inventory | Ν | | Historic Built Environment - Not Listed not in conservation area. | | | | | |
| | | Archaeological site | Ν | Garden or Designed Landscape | | Note – rac | | | | | | |
| Will the development of the site result in the | | N | | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | |
| opportunity to enhance or improve access | L | | | | | | | | | | | |
| to the historic environment | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No kno | wn cultural issues identifie | ed | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No kno | No known cultural issues identified SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | I | LANDSCAPE | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|--------|-------------------------------------|--|----------|---|----------|----------|---|--------|----------|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | - | W | NSAs N ild Land N | RSAs TPOs | | Comment | | | | | |
| Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level | | | footprint: No pa though the site | elopment would be consistent with existing village print: No particularly strong landscape elements gh the site is clearly seen from the A75 and western pach to the village. Formerly developed as football nd. | | | | 0 | Design in combination with H3, H7 and existing residential developments to ensure permeability and sense of place (comments on masterplanning exercise apply). | | |
| Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement | | N | Western bound | Western boundary is weak. | | | | 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. | | |
| Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site | | Ν | | | | | SV | 0 | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Westerr A75. | ר bour | ndary needs to be | e strengthened | d by hed | lgerow and tree plantir | ng. Tree | planting | on the western and northern boundary would help mitigate i | mpacts | from the |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | | | | | n boundary needs to b ld help mitigate impac | | | by hedgerow and tree planting. Tree SEA Score: 0 | | |

| 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 | 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 | Ν | |
| strips | | |
| Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe | Y | |
| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT | | ated housing site within the adopted LDP. Effective housing site with extant planning permission in principle 12/P/4/0004 PIP Granted Feb 2014 expires 2017 and subject to a concluded Section 75 agreement. |
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | Posit | ive SEA impact. Reuse of brownfield site and within reasonable walking distance of existing community facilities and railway station- scope to encourage |
| | varie | ty of sustainable transport modes and reduce carbon emissions from transport. |

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

| Торіс | 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 |

| Related SEA topic | Information source | Consultation required (only if answer is Yes) |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 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 | Mitigation if appropriate ອັດ ຜູ້ | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|

| | | | | BIODIVERSITY, | FAUNA | AND F | | • | | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------|---|----------------------------|-------|-------|------|----|---|--|---|---|-------|---|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests | | | ACs N | LNR | N | | SPAs | | | N | | | SSSIs | Ν |
| affect or have connectivity to the site? (this | | | NNR N | Local wildlife sites | N | | | N | atterjack toads | N | | Great Crested | Newts | N |
| includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | | RAM | ASAR N Geodiversity Sites N Other protected species N | | | | | Ma | arine Consultation | Zones | Ν | | | |
| | | | Anc | ient/semi-natural woodland | N | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Comm | ents: No strate | egic 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 | greenfield sit | | | | | x | tree species in and the creation along transport encourage the | emented, s landscape n of green corridors, movemen | such as the use schemes, hat ways and wildl footpaths and t of species. | e of locally native bitat creation, life corridors cycleways, to | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | 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. | | | | | | | | | | on of | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No de | esignatio | ns affecting sit | e | | | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| | | | | | POP | ULATION AND H | UMAN | HEALTH | 1 | | | | | |
|---|----------------|-----------|---------|-------------------|-----------|--------------------------|------------|-------------|---------|------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------|----------|-----|
| 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 Dist | ance (k | (m) 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them | MA or CF | Rig | | Vay N ath N | Comme | ent: On road national c | ycle rout | e 7 on sout | hern l | boundary | of site on Old Graitney Road to East | riggs and A | nnan | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | Com | munity/ | /village hall | 1 | Sports facilities | 1 | Hospita | alities | 1 | Local shops (convenience) | 1 | Bus stop | 0.2 |
| What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and | S | chool n | ame: | Primary Gretna | | | | | | Seconda Annan | ary | | | |
| what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | | | | 76 1 | | | | | | 331 10 | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | Ν | | | | | | GIS | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Within | reason | able wa | alking distand | ce to cor | mmunity facilities and s | school, so | cope to end | courag | e active ti | ravel | | • | |

| Site assessment direction Post mitigation Yes/No Yes/No Related SEA Topic Secore Source source Secore Score Secore Consultation |
|---|
|---|

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

| | | | SOILS | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|---|---|----|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land | | Y | Soil classification 3.1 (The James Hutton Institute) | | х | | х | | | | |
| 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 | | N | No known previous use. | С | 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 | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Poten | tial loss | of prime agricultural land | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negat | ative SEA impact as potential loss of prime agricultural land SEA Score:X | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | 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. | С | × | 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. | С | 0 | | 0 | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply | РНН | Y | Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity. | С | 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 requirements for this phase of the upgr Supplementary Guidance Developer C Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna B 2010) refers. | ade work. contributions to | |
|-------------------|-------------|--|----------------|--|-------------------------------|--|
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgradi ions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. Flood ri | | | entary Guidance Developer | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Potential f | flood risk. Flood Risk Assessment required which would require to | o be agreed wi | th SEPA | SEA SCORE: 0 | |

| | 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 | С | 0 | | 0 | | | | | |
| What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby | РНН | 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 | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | crease air quality. | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Unlikel | ikely to decrease air quality. SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | | | |

| | MATERIAL ASSETS | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|------------------|-------------|---|--|---|-----------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Is the site | | | nfield nfield | v | Comment | | | | | | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | N | | it containe | d 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 | | Pylons N | | Bord Gais Eirann | pipelin | e N | | S | hell oil pipe | line N | | | Transco | oipeline | Ν |
| constraints that impact on the development of the site | | Comment No known se | ervice | constraints | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Will development of the site require | | Air Traffic/NATS | Ν | MoD | Ν | | Carl | isle Airpo | ort N | C | cal Authority | Ν | | HSE | Ν |
| consultation with any of the following bodies | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No kno | wn service constraints. L | oss of | greenfield land | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negativ | ve SEA impact as loss of | greenf | ield site | | | | | | | | SEA | SCORE: X | | |

| 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 | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | 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.) | | Sout | h 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 | Х | Appropriate landscaping and layout should account aspect and prevailing winds to the | | 0 | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Appropria | ate la | ndscaping and layout should take into account asp | ect and prevailing | winds | to the south west | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | | west aspect the use of solar gain could be used to g r heating increasing carbon emissions | great effect. Expo | sed to | prevailing winds, may require greater SE | EA SCORE: 0 | | | |

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

| CULTURAL HERITAGE | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--------|---|-----------------------------|------------|-------|--|--|--|
| Will the development of the site affect any | | Listed Building N | Scheduled Monuments | Ν | Comment Archaeology - No historic environme | nt issues identified for th | is site, a | as of | | | |
| of the following including their setting | | Conservation Area N | Inventory of Historic Battlefield | Ν | July 2016, but borders the Inventory Battlefield f | | he south | า | | | |
| | L | World Heritage Site N | Inventory & Non-Inventory | Ν | Historic Built Environment - No Listed Buildings. | No conservation area. | | | | | |
| | | Archaeological site N | Garden or Designed Landscape | | | | | | | | |
| Will the development of the site result in the | | N | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | |
| opportunity to enhance or improve access | L | | | | | | | | | | |
| to the historic environment | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | U | , , | | at the site borders the Inventory Battlefield for the B | attle of Sark to the south | า | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | wn cultural heritage issues di of Sark to the south | rectly affecting site. It should be not | ed tha | at the site borders the Inventory Battlefield for the | SEA SCORE: 0 | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | L | ANDSCAPE | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|--------------|---------|-------|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the | - | | | N | RSA | - | | Comment Site is relatively flat with hedge boundary along the road side. | | | | | | | |
| following | | Wi | ld Land | Ν | TPO | 5 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 | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | The site | forms | s a logical | extens | ion and is w | ell coi | ntain | ed | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Minimal | detrin | nental effe | ect on la | andscape qu | ality | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | | | |

| 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 | | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|

| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT | 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. |
|--------------------------|---|
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | 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. |

| Site Ref: GTN.H6 | Source of site suggestion: | Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. No | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|---|---------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Site name: Land south of Old Graitney Road | LDP Allocations | where applicable and approval date): | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Settlement: Gretna Border | Current use: Agricultural land | | | | | | | |
| OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): | | Existing LDP allocations/ designations: | | | | | | |
| 331450, 566681 | | Yes | | | | | | |
| Site Size (ha): 1.02 | Proposed use: Housing | HMA: Annan Date com | pleted: | | | | | |
| | | Oct/Nov 2 | 016 | | | | | |

| Торіс | 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 |

| Related SEA topic | Information source | Consultation required (only if answer is Yes) |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 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 | | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|

| | | | | BIODIVERSITY, | FAUNA A | AND FI | LORA | • | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|---|---------------------------------|--|--------------------|--------|------|---|--|--|--|---|----------|-------|--|--|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests | | | ACs N | LNR N | | | | | SPAs | N | SSS | | | Ν | | |
| affect or have connectivity to the site? (this | | | NNR N | Local wildlife sites | N | | | | latterjack toads | N | | Great Crested I | | Ν | | |
| includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | | RAMSAR N Geodiversity Sites N Other protected species N | | Ma | arine Consultation | Zones | Ν | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Ancient/semi-natural woodland N | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Comm | nents: No strate | ts: 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 | greenfield site | | | | | x | tree species in and the creatio along transport encourage the | emented, s landscape n of green corridors, movemen | such as the use schemes, hal ways and wild footpaths and t of species. | e of locally native bitat creation, life corridors l cycleways, to | + | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | | ersity should be implemente ors along transport corridors | | | | | | | | itat creation, and th | e creati | on of | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No de | esignatio | ns affecting site |) | | | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | | | |

| | 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 Dist | ance (k | km) 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them | MA or CF | Rig | ht of W Core p Cycle p | Vay N bath N | Comme | ent: On road national c | ycle rout | e 7 on nortl | hern b | oundary o | of site on Old Graitney Road to Eastri | iggs and Ar | nan | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | Comr | munity/ | /village hall | 1 | Sports facilities | 1 | Hospita | alities | 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 | S | chool na Capa Dista | acity: | Primary Gretna 76 1 | | | | | | Seconda Annan 331 10 | ary | | | |
| site (km) Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | N | | | | | | GIS | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | _ | reason | able wa | alking distand | ce to cor | mmunity facilities and s | chool, so | ope to enc | ourag | e active tr | ravel | | | |

| Site assessment question | Information source source source Pre mitigation score Post mitigation score Score consultation required required |
|--------------------------|--|
|--------------------------|--|

SEA OVERVIEW

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.

| SOILS | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------|---|---|----|---|---|----------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Will development of the site result in the | | Y | Soil classification 3.1 | | 0 | Loss of prime quality agricultural land curre | ently in | 0 | | | | | |
| loss of the best quality agricultural land | | | (The James Hutton Institute) | | | agricultural use | | | | | | | |
| 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. | С | 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 | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Loss | of prime | quality agricultural land currently in agricultural use | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Loss | Loss of prime quality agricultural land currently in agricultural use SEA Score:X | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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. | С | Х | 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. | С | 0 | | 0 | | | | | | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply | РНН | | Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity. | С | 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 |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|--|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|--|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Gretna | – limite | requirements for this phase of the upg Supplementary Guidance Developer C Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna E 2010) refers. 6" water main running along North of s ad capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplement | contributions to Border (October ite boundary | | | | | |
|-------------------|--------|--|---|---|------|--|--|--|--|
| | | | to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. Water main running along north boundary of site will require to l would require to be agreed with SEPA. | be protected. Flood risk assess | ment | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | otential flood risk. Flood Risk Assessment required which would require to be agreed with SEPA. Gretna – limited water SEA Score: 0 set work capacity subject to planned upgrading by Scottish Water which will require developer contributions. | | | | | | | |

| | 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 | С | 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 | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Unlikel | y to de | crease air quality. | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | EA OVERVIEW Unlikely to decrease air quality. SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | MATERIAL ASSETS | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|------|--------|-------------|--|---|---|-----------------------|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Is the site | | Brow | nfield | | Comment currently in agricultural us | е | | | | | | | | |
| | | Gree | nfield | Y | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | N | ls | it containe | ed 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 | РНН | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|---|---|-----|----|--|------|------------|------|----|--------------|---|----------|-----|---|
| 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 Comment No known se | Pylons N Bord Gais Eirann pipeline N Shell oil pipeline N Transco pipelir omment No known servicing constraints N Shell oil pipeline N Transco pipeline | | | | | | | | | | pipeline | N | |
| Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies | | Air Traffic/NATS | Ν | MoD | NN | | Carl | sle Airpor | rt N | Co | al Authority | N | | HSE | N |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | wn servicing constraints. | | • | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negativ | egative SEA impact as loss of greenfield site SEA SCORE:X | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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 | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | 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.) | | Sout | th and West aspect | SV | Τ | | 0 | 1 | |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | | Y | | | | | 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 | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Appropri | iate la | andscaping and layout should take into account aspect and p | revailing | winds to | o the south west | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | ue to south west aspect the use of solar gain could be used to great effect. Exposed to prevailing winds, may require greater SEA SCORE: 0 nergy use for heating increasing carbon emissions | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | CULTURAL HERITA | GE | E |
|---|----------------------|--|---|--------|---|-------------|--|
| Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting | L | Wo | Listed Building onservation Area rld Heritage Site chaeological site | N N | Scheduled Monuments Inventory of Historic Battlefield Inventory & Non-Inventory Garden or Designed Landscape | N Y N | N Comment Archaeology - Lies within the Inventory Battlefield for the Battle of Sark. Y Historic Built Environment - No Listed Buildings. No conservation area. N 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 potentia 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. |
| Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment | L | N | | | | | 0 |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | ite lies within the area of the Inventory Battlefield for the Battle of Sark. Appropriate archaeological investigation would be required and appropriate mitigation leasures identified where development would not have a significant adverse impact on the character, appearance, setting or key features of the battlefield. | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Site lies require | lies within the area of the Inventory Battlefield for the Battle of Sark. Appropriate archaeological investigation would be irred and appropriate mitigation measures identified where development would not have a significant adverse impact on the acter, appearance, setting or key features of the battlefield. | | | | | |

| | | | | | | L | ANDSCAPE | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------|---------|-----------|---------------|--------|---------------------|-------------|-----------|--|---|--|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the | | | | Ν | RSAs | Ν | Comment Site is rel | atively fla | at with h | edge boundary along the road side. | | |
| following | | | d Land | | TPOs | | | | | | | |
| 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 sign | ificant i | ssues and cor | tained | | С | 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 | 0 | |
| Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site | | N | | | | | | | 0 | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | PLANNING OVERVIEW No impact on landscape quality | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No imp | act on la | | | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| 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 | Pre mitigation it abbrobriate score score | 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 | ? |
| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT | 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. |
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | 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. |

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

| Торіс | 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

| Impa | ct | Significant positive impact | Positive impact | Neutral impact | Unknown impact | Both Positive and Negative impacts | Negative impact | Significant negative impact |
|----------|------|--------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| Score Sy | mbol | ++ | + | 0 | ? | +/x | x | xx |

| Related SEA topic | Information source | Consultation required (only if answer is Yes) |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 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 | 2 CO | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---|------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---|------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

| | | | | | BIODIVERSITY, | FAUNA | AND | FLORA | • | | | | | | |
|---|--------|------------|------------|--|----------------------------|-------------|-------|-------------|----------|---|--------------|----------------|---------------|-------|---|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests | | S | ACs | Ν | LNR | Ν | | | | SPAs | Ν | | | SSSIs | Ν |
| affect or have connectivity to the site? (this | | 1 | NNR | Ν | Local wildlife sites | Ν | | | Ν | latterjack toads | N | | Great Crested | Newts | Ν |
| includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | | RAM | SAR | R N Geodiversity Sites N Other protected species N Marine Consultation Zones N | | | | | | | | | Ν | | |
| | | | | Ancien | t/semi-natural woodland | Ν | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Comm | ents: No | strategi | ic 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 consideration o new habitats wi | of design ar | nd planting co | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Green | field site | e on edge | of settle | ement. Careful considerati | on of desig | n and | planting of | could he | elp create new ha | bitats withi | n this develop | oment | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No bio | odiversit | y designat | ions aff | fecting site | | | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| | | | | | POP | JLATION AND H | UMAN | HEALTH | 4 | | | | | |
|---|----------------|------------------|--|-------------------------|-------|-----------------------|---------|--------------|----------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----|----------|-----|
| 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 | | - 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Distance to nearest area of open space Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them | MA or CF | Rigl (| nce (km nt of Wa Core pat ycle pat | ý h | Comme | nt: Footpath and cycl | e route | traverses si | ite givi | ng direct | link to Gretna Station | | | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | | nunity/vi | llage hall | 1 | Sports facilities | 1 | Hospita | alities | 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 | S | chool na Capa | ime: C | Primary Gretna 76 | | | | | | Seconda Annan 331 | ary | | | |
| catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | MA | Dista | nce: (|).1 | | | | | | 10 | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | and B | Ν | | | | | | GIS | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Statio | n | Ũ | | Ŭ | | | | | | bath and cycle route traverses site | 0 0 | | a |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | | close walking distance to existing facilities, school and direct access to Gretna station. Could encourage walking and and reduce carbon emissions from transport. | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic Yes/No | Comment | ource | 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 3.1 (The James Hutton Institute) | 0 | | Currently in agricultural use | | Х | |
| 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 | С | | | | 0 | |
| Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat | CF | N | | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Would | d involve | e loss of prime agricultural land | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Would | /ould involve loss of prime agricultural land SEA SCORE: X | | | | | | | |

| | | | 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 | | Х | 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 | РНН | | Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity. | С | 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 | РНН | | Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity. | С | 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 | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
|--------------------------|----------------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--|

| PLANNING OVERVIEW | 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. 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. | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | otential flood risk. Drainage Impact Assessment required. Depending on content, Flood Risk Assessment may also be required SEA Score: 0 be agreed with SEPA. Gretna – limited water network capacity subject to planned upgrading by Scottish Water which will SEA Score: 0 quire developer contributions. Sea Score: 0 | | | | | | | |

| | | | 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 | С | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby | РНН | 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 Image: N Im | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | oise assessment would be required together with any necessary mitigation will be required to address cumulative noise pollution from A75 and railway. Consideration ill need to be given to appropriate landscaping and screening | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | oise assessment would be required together with any necessary mitigation will be required to address cumulative noise pollution SEA Score: 0 or A75 and railway. Consideration will need to be given to appropriate landscaping and screening | | | | | | | | |

| Site assessment question | Information source sourcePre mitigation scorePost mitigation scoreConsultation required |
|--------------------------|--|
|--------------------------|--|

| | | | | | | MATI | ERIA | L AS | SETS | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------|--------------|---------------------|-----------|----------|-------------------------------|---------|-------------------|------------|-------------|------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|-----|----------|----------|---|
| Is the site | | Brow Gree | | G | Co | omment Greenfi | eld sit | e curre | ently in a | gricultural | use. | | | | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | N | ls i | t contair | ned wit | thin the Vacant I | | erelict Survey | | | N | o known p | 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 | | Comr | Pylons ment No k | | ervicing | Bord Gais Ei g constraints | irann p | pipeline | e N | | Shel | ll oil pipeli | ne N | | | Transco | pipeline | N |
| Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies | | | Air Traffic/ | | Ν | | 1oD | N | | Carlis | le Airport | N | Coa | al Authority | N | | HSE | N |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | - | | | | ricultural use. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negativ | /e SEA | impact as | involve | es loss | of greenfield la | nd. | | | | | | | | SEA | SCORE: X | | |

| | 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 |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | 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 | nformatio ource | Pre mitigation score | Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--|

| CLIMATIC FACTORS | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.) | | Sout | th | | | | | | | |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | | Y | Øpen 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 | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | LANNING OVERVIEW Housing design could make use of passive solar gain, reducing energy use and carbon emissions. | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | SEA OVERVIEW Site is southerly facing. Housing design could make use of passive solar gain, reducing energy use and carbon emissions. SEA Score: + | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | CULTURAL HERITA | GE | | | | | |
|--|---------|---------------------------|--------|------------------------------------|-------|---------------|--|------------------------|-------------|---------|
| Will the development of the site affect any | | Listed Building | Ν | Scheduled Monuments | Ν | Comment | Archaeology - No historic environment is | sues identified for th | nis site, a | as of |
| of the following including their setting | | Conservation Area | Ν | Inventory of Historic Battlefield | Ν | July 2016 | | | | |
| | L | World Heritage Site | Ν | Inventory & Non-Inventory | | | uilt Environment - No Listed Buildings; no | | | |
| | | Archaeological site | Ν | Garden or Designed Landscape | | | und the planned town with GTN H2 and s | | l using tl | he same |
| | | _ | | | | successfu | I design principles in a modern interpreta | tion. | | |
| Will the development of the site result in the | | N | | | | | | | | |
| opportunity to enhance or improve access | L | | | | | | | | | |
| to the historic environment | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Develo | pment should reinforce t | he la | yout of the planned town of Gretna | which | is of nationa | I wartime interest. The design of building | s should integrate st | reet sce | ne |
| | along \ | /ictory Avenue and take | acco | unt of nearby listed buildings. | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No cult | ural heritage issues ider | tified | • | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| | | | | | | LANDSCAPE | | | | | |
|---|--------|---------|--|----------------|-----------|-------------------------------|-------------|---------|--|------------|-----------|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | | W | NSAs N ild Land N | RSAs TPOs | N N | Comment Site ger boundaries. | ntly slopes | with la | nd rising towards north and A75 trunk road. Hedgerows and | l trees al | ong field |
| 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 from slip road/ | | | sise apply. Screen anting. | С | | 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 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Consid | eratior | n will need to be g | given to appro | priate la | andscaping and screer | ning along | northe | rn boundary | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | | nbination with H2 d/A75 with woodla | | | g residential developm | ents to en | sure pe | ermeability and sense of place. Screen SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic Yes/No | Comment | Information source Pre mitigation | | 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) |
| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT | | cated long term housing site (beyond 2024) in adopted LDP. Further information is required on its relative effectiveness given that the site is in multiple erships. Review site as an option for inclusion in LDP2. |
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | | ative SEA impact as greenfield site and loss of prime agricultural land. Positive SEA impact as proximity of site to community facilities and railway station. Intial to encourage range of sustainable transport modes. |

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

| Торіс | 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 |

| 100000 | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Related SEA topic | Information source | Consultation required (only if answer is Yes) |
| 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 | ource | Pre mitigation score | Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|

| | | | | | BIODIVERSITY, | FAUNA | AND | FLORA | 4 | | | | | |
|---|-------|-----------|-----------|------------|---------------------------|------------|---------|------------|----------|------------------|--------------|---|---------|---|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests | | SA | ACs | Ν | LNR | N | | | | SPAs | Ν | | SSSIs | Ν |
| affect or have connectivity to the site? (this | | N | INR | N | Local wildlife sites | Ν | | | Ν | latterjack toads | Ν | Great Creste | d Newts | Ν |
| includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | | RAMS | SAR | Ν | Geodiversity Sites | N | | 0 | ther pro | otected species | Ν | Marine Consultatio | n Zones | Ν |
| | | | | Ancier | nt/semi-natural woodland | Ν | | | | | | | | |
| | | Comme | ents: N | lo strateg | ic 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 | retained and er | | work of hedgerows should be or biodiversity value. | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Matur | e trees a | ind the r | network of | of hedgerows should be re | tained and | lenhand | ced for bi | odivers | ity value. | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No de | signation | ns affect | ting site. | Mature trees and the netw | ork of hed | gerows | should b | e retair | ed and enhanced | d for biodiv | versity value. SEA Score: 0 | | |

| | | | | | POPU | LATION AND H | IUMAN | HEALTH | 4 | | | | | |
|---|----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------|---------|---------|-----------------------------------|------------|------------------|---------|
| Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space | MA | N | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space | IVIA | Distanc | (km) | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them | MA or CF | Right c Cor | f Way e path | N N | Commen | t: | | | | | | | | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | Commur | | N e hall | 1 | Sports facilities | 1 | Hospita | alities | 1 | Local shops (convenience |) 1 | Bus stop | 0.1 |
| What is the education catchment area | | | Prim | ary | | | | | | Second | ary | | | |
| (primary and secondary) for the site and | S | School name | | na | | | | | | Annan | | | | |
| what is the remaining capacity within the | | Capacity | | | | | | | | 331 | | | | |
| catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | | Distance | : 1 | | | | | | | 10 | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | N | | | | | | GIS | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Withir | reasonable | walking |) distan | ce to existi | ng facilities, school | and Gret | na station. | Could | encoura | ge walking and cycling and reduce | carbon emi | ssions from tran | nsport. |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | n reasonable e carbon en | | | | ng facilities, school | and Gret | na station. | Could | encoura | ge walking and cycling and | SEA SCORE | :: + | |

| Site assessment question | 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 3.1 (The James Hutton Institute) | 0 | Currently in agricultural use for cattle grazi use golf course. | ng. Former | Х |
| 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. | С | Consideration should be given to removing material in those areas with a garden end t tracing and remedying the source of sewag during development. | use and to | 0 |
| Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat | CF | N | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | e loss of prime agricultural land. There is evidence of waste n end use and to tracing and remedying the source of sewage | | | aste material in t | hose areas |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Would | d involve | e loss of prime agricultural land | | SE | EA SCORE: X | |

| | | | 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 | РНН | Y | Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity. | С | 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 | Pre mitigation if appropriate 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 | РНН | Y | Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity. | bacity. bacity | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Contri what in | butions npact, i | apacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Devel Ipgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to y this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recom s drainage to be provided. There is an existing sewer infrastructure within the site. | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | ential flood risk identified and objection from SEPA. SEPA objection subsequently removed following submission of additional SEA Score: 0 rmation. | | | | | | |

| | | | 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 | С | 0 | | 0 | |
| What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby | РНН | 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 | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Unlikel | y to de | crease air quality. | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Unlikel | y to de | crease air quality. | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| | | 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 | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
|--------------------------|----------------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|

| | | Gree | enfield | G | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------|----------|----------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|-------------|--------------------|----------|-------------|-----------|---|---|--|---|---|----------|---|
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | N | ls | t contai | ned wit | thin the Va | | Derelict Survey | | | | up ground a reported to given to rer a garden er | and waste the east of moving this nd use and | are noted to co material and a the site. Cons waste materia to tracing and ur during deve | sewage ideration al in those remedyi | odour was should be areas with ing the | | |
| 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 | | Ν | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | Com | Pylons Iment No k | | ervice | Bord Ga constraints | is Eirann | pipeline | e N | | SI | hell oil pipeli | ine N | | | Transco | pipeline | N |
| Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies | | | Air Traffic/ | | Ν | | MoD | Ν | | | sle Airpo | | C | coal Authority | N | | HSE | N |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Greenf | ield sit | e but bene | fits from | n proxir | mity to exist | ting infras | structure | . No kn | own servi | ce constr | aints | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negativ | /e SE/ | A impact as | s greenf | ield site | e but benef | its from p | roximity | to exist | ting infras | tructure | | | | SEA | SCORE: X | | |

| | 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 | 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) Council Roads Authority - No objections subject to conditions 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. |
| | b) As the proposed access is outwith the existing Gretna 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. 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 |

| 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) 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 employm | | | | | |
|-------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | 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 la hall set out proposals for reducing dependency on the private car. Council Roads Authority - No objections subject to conditions (Committee report 24/5/10) | | | | | |

| CLIMATIC FACTORS | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--|--|----------------------|------|---|---|---|--|
| What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.) | | South and west | | | | | 0 | 1 | |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | | Y | | 0 | | Housing design could make best use of passive solar gain, reducing energy use and carbon emissions. | 0 | | |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | | N Potential | ly exposed to the west | 0 | | PIP indicates a reinforced woodland strip to the west and north west with further woodland planting through the site. | 0 | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Potentia | ally exposed to th | e west however this will be partially mitigate | ed by a reinforced w | vood | land strip to the west and north west. | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Potentia | ntially exposed to the west however this will be partially mitigated by a reinforced woodland strip to the west and north west. SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | |

| CULTURAL HERITAGE | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|---|----------------|-------------------------|-------|----------|----------|---|----------------------|--|--|
| Will the development of the site affect any | | Listed Building N | | cheduled Monuments | | | | Archaeology - The site landscape situation lend | | | |
| of the following including their setting | 1 | Conservation Area N | Inventory | of Historic Battlefield | Ν | | | nce of unknown archaeological material. No obje | | | |
| | L . | World Heritage Site N | | ntory & Non-Inventory | Ν | requ | iiring t | he submission of a scheme of archaeological in | gical investigation. | | |
| | | 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 | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Schem | e of archaeological investiga | tion required. | Refer condition in com | mitte | e report | 25/4 | /16 | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No des | designations affecting site. Scheme of archaeological investigation required. | | | | | | | SCORE: 0 | | |

| LANDSCAPE | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the | NSAs N RSAs N Comment | | | | | | | | |
| following | 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 | Comment | Pre Mitigation if appropriate Score Britication if appropriate | Post mitigation score Consultation required |
|--------------------------|---------|---|--|
|--------------------------|---------|---|--|

| slopes/changes in level | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Will development of the site be well | | Y | | | | | | | |
| integrated visually with the existing | | | | | | | | | |
| settlement | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any locally attractive views that | | Ν | | | | | | | |
| will be impacted by development of the site | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Mature | Mature trees and the network of hedgerows should be retained and enhanced for biodiversity value. | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Mature | Mature trees and the network of hedgerows should be retained and enhanced for biodiversity value. SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | |

| PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 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 | Ν | | | | | | |
| Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe | Y | | | | | | |
| | | ated mixed use site in adopted LDP with the benefit of Planning in Principle subject to successful completion of S75 Planning Obligation and conditions n 6 month period of 05/16. | | | | | |
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | | ative SEA impact as would involve loss of prime agricultural land and greenfield site. Positive in terms of population and human health as within onable walking distance to existing community facilities. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport. | | | | | |

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

| Торіс | Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora | Population and Human Health | Soils | Water | Air Quality | Material Assets | Climatic Factors | Cultural Heritage | Landscape |
|-------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------|-------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| SCORE | 0 | X/+ | Х | 0 | х | х | 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 | X | xx |

| Related SEA topic | Information source | Consultation required (only if answer is Yes) |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 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 | | S | SACs | N | LNR | Ν | | | | SPAs | Ν | | SS | SIs | Ν |
| affect or have connectivity to the site? (this | | | NNR | Ν | Local wildlife sites | Ν | | Natterjack toads N | | | Ν | | Great Crested Net | vts | Ν |
| includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | | RAM | SAR | Ν | | Other protected species N | | | | Ma | arine Consultation Zor | nes | Ν | | |
| | | | Ancient/semi-natural woodland N | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Comn | mments: 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No im | lo impact on biodiversity designations | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No im | No impact on biodiversity designations SEA Score: O | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | POP | ULATION AND H | UMAN | HEALTH | 4 | | | | | |
|---|----------------|----------------------|--|-------------------|-------|--|------|---------|---------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------|----------|-----|
| 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 Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them | MA or CF | Cor | e (km) of Way e path e path | 1 N N Y | Comme | omment: Cycle route on western edge of site providing link to Gretna Station | | | | | | | | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | Commur | iity/villa | • | 1 | Sports facilities | 1 | Hospita | alities | 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 | S | School name | : Sp | mary ringfield | | | | | | Seconda Annan | ary | | | |
| catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | | Capacity Distance | | | | | | | | <u>331</u> 10 | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | Ν | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | travel | and use of | easonable walking distance of the majority of community facilities and public open space. Close proximity to Gretna Station and could encourage active of sustainable transport. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | | Ind use of sustainable transport. t within reasonable walking distance of the majority of community facilities and public open space. Close proximity to Station and could encourage active travel and use of sustainable transport. | | | | | | | | | SEA Scori | E: +/X | |

| 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 3.2 (The James Hutton Institute) | 0 | | Loss of prime quality agricultural land being actively farmed for cereal crops | Х | | | |
| 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 | | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site | | N | No known previous use | С | 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 | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | ss of prime agricultural land currently in production | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negat | Negative SEA impact asloss of prime agricultural land. SEA Score: X | | | | | | | | |

| | | | 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 | РНН | 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 | РНН | 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 Supplementary Guidance Devel Upgrade the Water Supply at Guidance 2010) refers. | oper Contributions to |
|-------------------|--|--|
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Sup Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assesses what impact, if any this development has on the existing waste water network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Develor recommended. | ent (DIA) may be required to establish |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No known flood risk. Gretna – limited water network capacity subject to planned upgrading by Scottish Water which will requir developer contributions. | SEA SCORE: 0 |

| | 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 | С | 0 | | | 0 | | |
| What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby | РНН | 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. Give motorway at height mitigation measures are unl be successful | en that | 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) | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Signific succes | icant environmental issues due to proximity of M74 at height and railway line. Noise assessment required. Mitigation measures considered unlikely to be ssful. | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | ificant environmental issues due to proximity of M74 and slip roads at height. Noise assessment required. Mitigation SEA Score: X sures considered unlikely to be successful | | | | | | | | |

| | | | MATERI | AL ASSETS | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-----------|----------------------------------|----------------------|---|--|---|--|
| Is the site | Brownfield Greenfield | | Comment | | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | N | Is it con | ained within the Vacant and Land | Derelict N 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 | 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 | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
|--------------------------|----------------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|

| 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 | | Com | Pylons N Bord Gais Eirann pipeline N Shell oil pipeline N Comment | | | | | | | | | | Transco | pipeline | N | |
| Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies | | | Air Traffic/NAT | - | MoD | Ν | | Carl | isle Airpo | ort N | Co | al Authority | Ν | | HSE | N |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No ser | rvicing constraints in relation to this site | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negativ | tive SEA impact as loss of greenfield site SEA Score: X | | | | | | | | | SCORE: X | | | | | |

| 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 | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | The sit | e 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 | y aspect | | 0 | | 0 | | |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | Y | Y 0 0 | | | | | | |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | Y | | | 0 | | 0 | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No impact on clim | p impact on climatic factors. | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No impact on clim | b impact on climatic factors. SEA SCOREO | | | | | | |

| | | | | CULTURAL HERITAGE | E | |
|---|---|-------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| Will the development of the site affect any | - | Listed Building | Ν | Scheduled Monuments N | N | Comment Archaeology - No historic environment issues identified for this site, as of |
| of the following including their setting | L | Conservation Area | Ν | Inventory of Historic Battlefield N | N | 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 S | te N | Inventor | / & Non-Inventory | Ν | Historic B | Built Environment - Nearest Listed Buildings are Gretna Hall Hotel, |
|--|---------|-----------------------|------|---------------------|--------------------|---------|---------------|--|
| | | Archaeological s | te N | Garden or Des | igned Landscape | | | th's Shop and Gretna Old Church and churchyard features. No conservation |
| | | | | | | | | e landscape around Gretna Hall is a 19th century designed landscape. The along the front of the site are large detached and care will be needed not to |
| | | | | | | | | along the front of the site are large detached and care will be needed not to is character. |
| Will the development of the site result in the | | | | • | | | 0 | 0 |
| opportunity to enhance or improve access | L | | | | | | | |
| to the historic environment | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | | | | | | esigned landscape). The dwellings along the front of the site are large |
| | detach | ed and care will be r | eded | hat development of | loes not impact on | its cha | racter | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | | | Il require to ensur | e that development | does | not impact of | on the non Inventory Designed SEA Score: O |
| | landsca | ape around Gretna H | all. | | | | | |

| | | | | | L | ANDSCAPE | | | | | |
|---|----------|---|-----------------------|--------------|---|--|--|----|--|--------|------|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | | w | NSAs N /ild Land N | RSAs TPOs | Ν | the M74 which is ov | | | Dominated by M74, A75 and railway line which a are particularly significant. Very little scope to | npacts | from |
| 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 | | om the M74 w | | line which abut the overlooking the site | | 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 | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Not sui | ot suitable for housing development due to significant adverse landscape reasons. | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Signific | prificant negative impact as site dominated by M74, A75 and railway line which abut the site. Impacts from the M74 which is SEA Score:XX erlooking the site are particularly significant and very little scope to mitigate impact | | | | | | | | | |

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

| | A number of other sites have been included for development in the settlement that are considered to meet the identified housing strategy. |
|---------------------|---|
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | 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 |

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

| Торіс | 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 | x | xx |

| Related SEA topic | Information source | Consultation required (only if answer is Yes) |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 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 FLO | DRA | | | | | | |
|---|---------|---|--|--|-------|---------|----------|------------------|---|------------|-----------------|------------|--|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests | | SAC | Cs N | LNR | Ν | | | SPAs | Ν | | SSSIs | Ν | |
| affect or have connectivity to the site? (this | | NN | IR N | Local wildlife sites | | | ١ | Natterjack toads | | Great | t Crested Newts | | |
| includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | | RAMSA | AR N | Geodiversity Sites | | | Other pr | otected species | Y | Marine Con | sultation Zones | | |
| | | | | nt/semi-natural woodland is site appears to be wood | | | | | | | | - i | |
| | | this is the case. Habitat very likely to support bats, a European Protected Species – assessment and/or mitigation required. 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. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any known invasive species within the site | ١ | N | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity | ١ | | Habitat very likely to support bats , a European Protected X Habitat assessment and/or mitigation required. 0 Species 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 | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | The nee | need to retain the mature specimen trees would significantly limit the scale of development and number of units that could be developed on site. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | ential presence of bats, a European Protected Species. Habitat assessment and/or mitigation required. Mature specimen trees SEA Score: 0 ne northern and eastern boundary require protection | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | POPL | ILATION AND H | UMAN | HEALTH | 4 | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------|-------------------|------|---------|---------|---------|---------------------------|---|----------|-----|
| 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 (| 7 - | - | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them | MA or CF | | Vay N bath N bath N | Commer | nt: | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | Hospita | alities | 1 | Local shops (convenience) | 1 | Bus stop | 0.1 |
| What is the education catchment area | | | Primary | | | | | | Seconda | iry | | | |
| (primary and secondary) for the site and | S | chool name: | Gretna | | | | | | Annan | | | | |
| what is the remaining capacity within the | | Capacity: | 76 | | | | | | 331 | | | | |
| catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | | Distance: | 1 | | | | | | 10 | | | | |

| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to | MA | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|--------|---|----------|---------|---|------------------------|--------|---------|
| the core areas of the biosphere | and | Ν | | GIS | 0 | | | 0 | |
| | В | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Within | reason | able walking distance to existing facilities, school and Gretna | station. | Could e | ncourage walking and cycling and reduce | e carbon emissions fro | om tra | nsport. |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Within | reason | able walking distance to existing facilities, school and Gretna | station. | Could e | ncourage walking and cycling and | SEA SCORE: + | | |
| | reduce | carbor | n emissions from transport. | | | | | | |

| | | | SOILS | | | | | |
|--|--------|-----------|---|---|---|--------------|---|--|
| Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land | | Ν | Soil classification Urban (The James Hutton Institute) | C |) | | 0 | |
| Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes) | | N | | (|) | | 0 | |
| Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site | | N | No known previous contaminative use. | (|) | | 0 | |
| Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat | CF | ? | Unknown | (|) | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Not a | oplicable | 9 | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Not ap | oplicable | 3 | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| | | | 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. | С | 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 | С | 0 | Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact | | |

| Site assessment question | Information source mitigation it abbrobriate score mitigation | Post mitigation score Consultation required |
|--------------------------|--|--|
|--------------------------|--|--|

| development to connect to the public foul sewer | | capacity. | | | Assessment (DIA) may be required to impact, if any this development has on network. Early engagement with SW v Development Enquiry process is strony recommended. There is a Combined s through site. | the existing via the Pre- gly | | | | |
|---|----------------------|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply | РНН | Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity. | С | 0 | Scottish Water advise that there are w issues within Gretna at present. Phase alleviate this and permit new connection completed. Phase 2 works will require contributions to further alleviate the wa issues here. Scottish Water is currently requirements for this phase of the upg Supplementary Guidance Developer C Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna E 2010) refers. | a 1 of the works to ons has been developer ter network y examining the rade work. contributions to | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Contribu what imp | - limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer utions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establist pact, 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- oment Enquiry process is strongly recommended. There is a Combined sewer running through site. | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Potentia | I flood risk associated with site. Flood Risk Assessment required. | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | | | |

| | | | 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 | С | 0 | | 0 | | | | | |
| What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby | РНН | 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 | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Site de | Site development unlikely to reduce air quality. | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Site de | te development unlikely to reduce air quality. SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | MATERIA | L ASSETS | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------|---------|--|----------|--|-----------------|------------|------------|------------------|---------------------------|---------------|------------|----------|----------|---|
| Is the site | | | ownfield Y Comment Site consists of residential properties associated garden ground and mature specimen tree | | | | | | | | ien trees. | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | N | N Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey | | | | | 0 | No known p | previous cont | aminative us | 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 | | originat | dings on site (including te with the hospital for n. | | SV/ C | 0 | Any develo | pment propo buildings. | sal should se | eek to inc | orporate | 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 | РНН | 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 | | Com | Pylons N ment No known | servicir | Bord Gais Eirann p ng constraints | vipeline N | | | Shell oil pipeli | ne N | | | Transco | pipeline | N |
| Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies | | | Air Traffic/NATS | | | N | | lisle Airp | | Co | al Authority | N | | HSE | Ν |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | - | | | | opment proposal shou | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Part gr | eenfiel | d/brownfield. An | y develo | opment proposal shou | ld seek to inco | rporate tl | he existii | ng buildings. | | | SEAS | SCORE: 0 | | |

| | 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 | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | 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 | Pre mitigation if appropriate 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 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Site car | Site can make best use of solar gain and protected by mature trees from prevailing wind | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Site car | Site can make best use of solar gain and protected by mature trees from prevailing wind SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | ~ - | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|--|-------------------|---|-----------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | CULTURAL HERITAC | | | | | | |
| Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting | L | Listed Building Conservation Area World Heritage Site Archaeological site | N N | Scheduled Monuments Inventory of Historic Battlefield Inventory & Non-Inventory Garden or Designed Landscape | N | Comment Archaeology - The three smaller buildings on site (including the gate lodg seem to originate with the hospital for the designed munition workers' town. If so, the 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. Historic Built Environment - No Listed Buildings; no conservation area. However "Gretna was planned as a complete entity, with houses, shops, school, hospital, poli station, churches, cinema and other recreational facilities" and "Gretna which hous the workers is the surviving legacy of this munitions project. Almost nothing remains 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. Individ 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 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 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. | | | | |
| Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment | L | Y | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Potenti incorpo | al impact on buildings or prated among the trees | of loca subjec | I historical importance which should to methods which do not damage | be retai or put th | tained if possible. Given the mature landscape setting up to 5 modest dwellings might the tree root systems under unnecessary pressure | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | building landsc | ential impact on buildings of local historical importance which should be retained if possible. If preservation of the existing dings is not possible then a mitigation scheme of archaeological building recording will be required. Given the mature discape setting up to 5 modest dwellings might be incorporated among the trees subject to methods which do not damage or the tree root systems under unnecessary pressure | | | | | | | | |

| Site assessment question | Comment | Information source Pre mitigation score | ation if appropriate | core core consultation | required |
|--------------------------|---------|--|----------------------|------------------------------|----------|
|--------------------------|---------|--|----------------------|------------------------------|----------|

| | | | | | | L | ANDSCAPE | | | | | | |
|--|---|--------------------|---------------------------|--|-----------------|----------------------|---|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | | W | NSAs ild Land | | RSAs TPOs | N N | more mature trees prominent in views The amenity value trees on both the n | on the nor along the coupled w orthern an | thern, i main ro ith pote d easte | the original lodge/house are a key landscape roadside boundary with those toward the front oute through the village. Tree cover on the ea- ential habitat and green infrastructure assets v ern parts of the site. Development within existi ficient offset from larger trees and the woodlar | t of the site beir astern boundary warrant the prot ing open areas | ng partion is less ection of of the s | cularly mature. of the ite may |
| Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing | | Y Y | Mature feature | ture specimen trees which are a key landscape SV/C | | | | SV/C | 0 | Development within existing open areas of be appropriate provided there is sufficient of larger trees and the woodland resource car protected and retained. Impact on the numl that can be developed on the site. | offset from n be | 0 | |
| Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site | | N | Site co | ntained | by mature tree | es. | | | | | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA Overview | provide landsc | ed there ape se | e is suffic tting up t | cient offs o 5 mode | set from larger | trees ar night be | d the woodland reso | urce can b | e prote | eas of the site may be appropriate Sected and retained. Given the mature to methods which do not damage or put | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| | 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 | Ν | | | | | | | | | |
| Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe | Y | | | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT Potential brownfield development site within settlement boundary subject to retaining mature trees. Potential impact on buildings of local historical which should be retained if possible Landscape and mature trees will limit the number of dwellings that can be accommodated on the site. Given 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 under unnecessary pressure | | | | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | | tive SEA impact in terms of Population and Health and Climatic Factors - Within reasonable walking distance to existing facilities, school and Gretna on. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport. Site can make best use of solar gain and protected by mature | | | | | | | | |

| Site assessm | Related S RA Related S RA S RA S RA S RA S RA S RA S RA S RA | Topic Yes/No | Comment | Information source | Pre mitigation score | Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--------------|---|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------|---|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

trees from prevailing wind

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

| Торіс | 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 |

| Related SEA topic | Information source | Consultation required (only if answer is Yes) |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 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 | | Post mitigation score | Consultation required | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|--|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|--|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|

| BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|----------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|-------------|---------|---|----------|--------------------|------------------|-------|---|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests | | - | SACs N | LNR | N | | | | SPAs | Ν | | | SSSIs | Ν |
| affect or have connectivity to the site? (this | | | NNR N | Local wildlife sites | N | | | ١ | Natterjack toads | | | Great Crested | Newts | |
| includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | | RAM | SAR N | Geodiversity Sites | N | | 0 | ther pr | otected species | | Mari | ine Consultation | Zones | Ν |
| | | | Ancient/semi-natural woodland N | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Comm | nents: No strate | gic 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 c consideration of new habitats wit | design a | and planting could | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No de | signatio | ons affecting this | s site | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No de | signatio | ons affecting this | s site | | | | | | | ; | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| 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 Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them | MA or CF | Čo | e (km) of Way e path e path | 1 N N Y | Comme | ent: Cycle route on we | stern edç | ge of site pr | ovidin | g link to | Gretna Station | | | |
| 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 | Hospita | Hospitalities | | Local shops (convenience |) 1-5 | Bus stop | 0.1 |
| What is the education catchment area | | | | mary | | | | | | Second | | | | |
| (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the | 5 | chool nam Capacii | | ringfield | | | | | | Annan 331 | | | | |
| catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | | Distanc | <i>,</i> | | | | | | | 10 | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | Ν | | | | | | GIS | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | not within reasonable walking distance of the majority of community facilities and public open space. Close proximity to Gretna Station and could encourage active el and use of sustainable transport. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | | | | | e of the majority of co e travel and use of su | | | nd pub | lic open | a space. Close proximity to | SEA SCORE | E: +/X | |

| Site assessment question Xes/No | Comment Source | Are 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 3.2 (The James Hutton Institute) | 0 | Х | Prime quality agricultural land being actively farmed for cereal crops | х | | | | | | |
| 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. | С | 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 | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Loss | of prime | agricultural land currently in production | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Loss | Loss of prime agricultural land. SEA Score: X | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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. | С | 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. | С | 0 | | 0 | | | | | | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply | РНН | | Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity. | С | 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 | nformatio ource | Pre mitigation score | Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

| | 2010) refers | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | etna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer ntributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | o known flood risk. Gretna – limited water capacity subject to planned upgrading by Scottish Water which will require developer ontributions. | SEA SCORE:0 | | | | | | | |

| | 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 | С | 0 | | 0 | | | | | | | |
| What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby | РНН | 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 | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Signific succes | | vironmental issues due to proximity of M74 and slip roads at | height. I | Noise as | ssessment required. Mitigation measures considered unlike | ely to be | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | ificant environmental issues due to proximity of M74 and slip roads at height. Noise assessment required. Mitigation SEA Score: X Isures considered unlikely to be successful | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | MATERIAL ASSETS | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|------|---------|-------------|--|--|--|---|------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Is the site | | - | vnfield | | Comment | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Gree | enfield | G | | | | | | | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | N | ls | it containe | ed 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 | | | | | | 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 | Ν | | | | | | 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 | | Pylons N | Pylons N Bord Gais Eirann pipeline N Shell oil pipeline N | | | | | | | | | | Transco pipeline | | Ν |
| constraints that impact on the development of the site | | Comment No servicin | nent 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 | Ν | | Carl | isle Airpo | rt N | Co | al Authority | N | | HSE | N |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Loss of | of greenfield site. No servicing constraints in relation to this site. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Loss of | ss of greenfield site SEA | | | | | | | | SCORE: X | | | | | |

| | 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 set (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 | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | CLIMATIC FACTORS | 5 | | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------------------|------------------|----|---|---|------|--|
| What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.) | | Sout | h | 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. | | | Х | May require greater energy use for heating increasi carbon emissions | ng X | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | OVERVIEW Not sheltered from prevailing wind, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | SEA OVERVIEW Not sheltered from prevailing wind, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions SEA Score: X | | | | | | | |

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

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic Yes/No | Comment | our | Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-----|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-----|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|

| | | | | the | e road ju | ne church on the corner and the terrace of nction were all built by the early 19 th cen evelopment should reinforce the local cha | tury and represent th | |
|---|--------|--|--|-----|-----------|--|-----------------------|--|
| Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment | L | Ν | | | | Development should reinforce local ch Gretna Loaning | aracter evident at | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | chaeological mitigation measures to be implemented due to potential course of Roman road running through northern part of site. Development should reinforce local aracter evident at Gretna Loaning | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Archae | naeological site potentially affects part of site and evaluation will be required. SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | |

| | | | | | L | ANDSCAPE | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------|--|---------|------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|--|----------|---------|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | Wild | NSAs d Land | N N | RSAs TPOs | N N | noise and influend | e of M74/s te with land | lip roac Iscapin | nse of place – unlikely to make an attractive place to live: don d which are raised above the site. Possible scope for limited c ng and woodland planting to remainder as mitigation (but plan nt!) | levelopn | nent to |
| Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level | | Hedge | and tree | ads dominate is along site bo idary 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 | | | | ads dominate Id be difficult t | | d area so visual ve | C & SV | х | Creating a pleasant place to live would be challenging. | Х | |
| Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site | | | | | | | SV | 0 | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | challenging. | 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. | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Significant env successful. | ironmen | ntal issue | es due to proxi | mity of | M74 and slip roads a | at height. N | litigatio | on measures considered unlikely to be SEA SCORE: X | | |

| | 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 | ? | | | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT | Alth | ough 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 source | 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. |
|---------------------|--|
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | 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. |

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

| Торіс | Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora | Population and Human Health | Soils | Water | Air Quality | Material Assets | Climatic Factors | Cultural Heritage | Landscape |
|-------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------|-------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| SCORE | 0 | + | ? | XX | 0 | Х | 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 | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Related SEA topic | Information source | Consultation required (only if answer is Yes) |
| 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 FLO | ORA | | | | |
|---|-------|---------|------------------|---------------------------|-------|---------|-----------|------------------|---|---------------------------|---|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests | | S | ACs N | LNR | N | | | SPAs | Ν | SSSIs | Ν |
| affect or have connectivity to the site? (this | | | NNR N | Local wildlife sites | N | | N | latterjack toads | Ν | Great Crested Newts | Ν |
| includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | | RAM | SAR N | Geodiversity Sites | N | | Other pro | otected species | Ν | Marine Consultation Zones | Ν |
| | | | Ancie | ent/semi-natural woodland | Ν | | | | | | |
| | | Comm | nents: No comm | ents | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No im | pact on | diversity design | ations | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No im | pact on | diversity design | ations | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | |

| | | | | POF | PULATION AND H | UMAN | HEALTH | ł | | |
|--|-----------|--------------|------------------|------|---|-----------|---------|---------|--|---|
| Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and | | N | | | | | | | | |
| connectivity and accessibility to open space | MA | | | | | | | | | |
| or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space | | Distance | (km) 1 | | | | | | | |
| Are there any of the following within or | MA | Right of | Waý N | Comm | nent: On road national of | ycle rout | e 7 | | | |
| adjacent to the site and will development impact on them | or CF | | path N path N | | | | | | | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | | y/village ha | 1 | Sports facilities | 1 | Hospita | alities | es 1 Local shops (convenience) 1 Bus stop | 1 |
| What is the education catchment area | | | Primary | • | | | | | Secondary | |
| (primary and secondary) for the site and | 5 | School name: | Gretna | | | | | | Annan | |
| what is the remaining capacity within the | | Capacity | | | | | | | 331 | |
| catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | | Distance | 1 | | | | | | 10 | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and | N | | | | | GIS | 0 | 0 0 | |
| | В | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | | | mmunity facilities and | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | | | | ommunity facilities and substainable transport an | | | | rage active travel. Gretna served by railway SEA SCORE: + ons from transport. | |

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

| | | | SOILS | | | | | |
|--|-------|---------|--|---|---|-----------|----|--|
| Will development of the site result in the | | Ν | Soil classification Urban | 0 | 0 | | 0 | |
| loss of the best quality agricultural land Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes) | | Y | (The James Hutton Institute) Site low lying contained within a bowl adjacent to river emabankment of River Esk | | 0 | | 0 | |
| 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. | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat | CF | ? | Unknown | 0 | ? | | ? | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Unkno | own imp | act 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 | | 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 | 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. | С | 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 | РНН | Y | Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity. | С | 0 | 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. | 0 | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the | PHH | Y | Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient | С | 0 | Scottish Water advise that there are water network | 0 | |

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

| development to connect to the mains water supply | | capacity. | issues within Gretna at present. Phase alleviate this and permit new connectio completed. Phase 2 works will require contributions to further alleviate the wa issues here. Scottish Water is currently requirements for this phase of the upgr Supplementary Guidance Developer C Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna B 2010) refers. | ons has been developer ter network / examining the rade work. contributions to | |
|--|--------------|---|---|---|--|
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Contribution | ted capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgra to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. Wate th would require to be agreed with SEPA. | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | egative impact on the water environment as site within 1 in 20 medium to high risk of coastal flooding. No development sho | | SEA SCORE: XX | |

| | | | 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 | | Z | There are no AQMA at present in the region | С | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby | PHH | Ν | North – housing. East – agricultural land. south – line of former railway line. West - 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 | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | crease air quality | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | VIEW Unlikely to decrease air quality SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | | |

| MATERIAL ASSETS | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------|---------------|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| Is the site | - | Brownfield Greenfield | Y | Comment Currently in agricultural use | 1 | | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | N I | s it containe | d 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 | | N | | | 0 | | 0 | | | |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic Yes/No | Comment | ource | | 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 | РНН | 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 ment. No known ire to be rerouted | | Bord Gais Eira g constraints. It s | | low volta | | Shell oil pipeli tricity lines ci | | at the southe | ern end a | Transco nd these wou | | N |
| Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies | | | Air Traffic/NATS | Ν | Мс | D N | Carli | isle Airpo | ort N | Co | al Authority | N | | HSE | N |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No kno | wn sei | rvicing constraints | . Loss c | of greenfield land | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negativ | ve SEA | impact as loss o | f greenf | ield site | | | | | | | SEA | SCORE: X | | |

| 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. | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW 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.) | | Sout | th | SV | 0 | Due to south west aspect the use of solar gain could be used to great effect | 0 | | | | |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | | Υ | | SV | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | 0 | Appropriate landscaping and layout should take into account aspect and prevailing winds to the south west | 0 | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | SEA OVERVIEW Exposed to prevailing winds, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | CULTURAL HERITAG | E | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|---|--|--|---|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting | L | Wo | Listed Building onservation Area orld Heritage Site chaeological site | | Scheduled Monuments Inventory of Historic Battlefield Inventory & Non-Inventory Garden or Designed Landscape | L H S iii a | oundary listoric Er IES - This Sensitive on pacts or | t Archaeology - Bounded to south by line of former railway. Lies within the of the Inventory Battlefield for the Battle of Sark. Invironment - No Listed Buildings; no conservation area. is site is located within the Battle of Sark (Inventory Battlefield, BTL40). development is possible on this site, subject to an assessment of potential on the historic battlefield. In line with this, we note the Council's comments the assessment is required to identify mitigation measures, and support this | | | |
| Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment | L | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Site lie measu | lies within the area of the Inventory Battlefield for the Battle of Sark. Appropriate archaeological investigation would be required and appropriate mitigation sures identified where development would not have a significant adverse impact on the character, appearance, setting or key features of the battlefield. | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | require | s within the area of the Inventory Battlefield for the Battle of Sark. Appropriate archaeological investigation would be d and appropriate mitigation measures identified where development would not have a significant adverse impact on the ter, appearance, setting or key features of the battlefield. | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | L | LAND | SCAPE | | | | |
|---|--------|--------|-----------|----------|-------------|--------|---------|----------|----------------|-------|-------|-----------|---|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the | | | | N | | As | | | | | odpla | ain but s | some containment / protection by disused railway line. Potential to enhance |
| following | | W | ild Land | N | TP | Os | Ν | exis | ing poor built | edge. | | | |
| Will development of the site affect features | | | Near to / | on floc | odplain but | som | e conta | ainmer | t / protection | | | | |
| of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, | | | by disuse | ed railv | way line | | | | | | | | |
| including watercourses, landforms, | | | - | | | | | | | | | | |
| trees/woodland or significant | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| slopes/changes in level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Will development of the site be well | | Y | Potential | to enh | nance exist | ting p | ooor bu | uilt edg | Э. | | | | |
| integrated visually with the existing | | | | | | • • | | • | | | | | |
| settlement | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any locally attractive views that | | Ν | | | | | | | | | | | |
| will be impacted by development of the site | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No imp | act on | landscape | qualit | y. | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No imp | act on | landscape | qualit | y. | | | | | | | | SEA SCORE: O |

| | | 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 | Ν |
| Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe | Y |
| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT | 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. |
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | 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. |

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

| Торіс | Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora | Population and Human Health | Soils | Water | Air Quality | Material Assets | Climatic Factors | Cultural Heritage | Landscape |
|-------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------|-------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| SCORE | 0 | + | Х | 0 | 0 | х | 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 |

| 8 | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Related SEA topic | Information source | Consultation required (only if answer is Yes) |
| 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 | Mitigation if appropriate ອັດ ຜູ້ | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|

| BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|---|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------|-------|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests | | | ACs N | LNR | N | | SPAs N | | | | - | SSIs | N | |
| affect or have connectivity to the site? (this | | | NNR N | Local wildlife sites | N | | | | atterjack toads | N | | Great Crested N | | Ν |
| includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | | RAM | SAR N | Geodiversity Sites | N | | 0 | ther pro | otected species | N | Mar | rine Consultation Z | ones | Ν |
| | | | Anci | ent/semi-natural woodland | Il woodland N | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Comm | omments: 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 | greenfield site | ifield site. s tr a | | | | | 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. | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Meas green | ures to e ways ar | enhance biodive d wildlife corrid | ersity should be implementer lors along transport corridors | d, such as th s, footpaths a | ne use o and cyc | of locally leways, | native to enco | tree species in la ourage the mover | andscape ment of sp | schemes, habita pecies | at creation, and the | creati | on of |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No de | esignatio | ns affecting site | 9 | | | | | | | | SEA SCORE: O | | |

| | | | | | POP | ULATION AND H | UMAN | HEALTH | 4 | | | | | |
|---|----------------|-----------|-------------|-------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|------------|-------------|---------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|----------|-----|
| 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 Dist | ance (k | rm) 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them | MA or CF | Rig | | /aý N ath N | Comme | ent: On road national c | cycle rout | e 7 on sout | thern t | ooundary o | of site on Old Graitney Road to Eastr | iggs and A | Innan | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | Com | munity/ | village hall | 1 | Sports facilities | 1 | Hospita | alities | 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 | S | | acity: | Primary Gretna 76 | | | | | | Secondary Annan 331 | | | | |
| site (km) Is the site within or immediately adjacent to | MA | Dista | Distance: 1 | | | | | | | 10 | | | | |
| the core areas of the biosphere | and B | Ν | | | | | | GIS | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Within | reason | able wa | alking distan | ce to con | mmunity facilities and s | school, so | cope to end | ourag | e active tra | avel | | | |

| Site assessment drestion Related SEA Ves/No Yes/No Pre-mitigation Pre-mitigation Pre-mitigation No | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|

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

| | SOILS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|-----------|---|----|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land | | Y | Soil classification 3.1 (The James Hutton Institute) | 0 | Х | Loss of prime agricultural land currently in grazing. | х | | | | | | |
| 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 | | N | No known previous use. | С | 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 | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Poten | tial loss | of prime agricultural land | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negat | ive SEA | impact as potential loss of prime agricultural land | | | SEA SCORE: X | | | | | | | |

| | 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 | 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 | 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. | С | 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 | | | | | 0 | | | | | | | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer | РНН | Y | Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity. | С | | 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 | PHH | Y | Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient | С | | Scottish Water advise that there are water network | | | | | | | | |

| development to connect to the mains water supply PLANNING OVERVIEW | Contributio | limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrad | risk assessme | nt required. Further investigation such as a Draina | s been oper twork nining the rork. utions to (October Guidance Developer age Impact Assessme | ent | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|-----|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | (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-Devel Enquiry process is strongly recommended. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Potential f | flood risk. Flood Risk Assessment required which would require | Potential flood risk. Flood Risk Assessment required which would require to be agreed with SEPA SEA SCORE: 0 | | | | | | | | | |

| | 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 | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Unlikel | y to de | ecrease air quality. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Unlikel | y to de | ecrease air quality. | | | SEA SCORE: O | | | | | | | | |

| MATERIAL ASSETS | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-------|----|-------------|---|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Is the site | | Brown | | Y | Comment | | | | | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | N | ls | it containe | d within the Vacant and Derelict N 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 | | N | | | | | 0 | | 0 | | | | |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic Yes/No | Comment | ource | | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|

| recycle or recover on-site | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------|--|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|----------|-----|------|------------|----------------|--------|--------------|---|---------|----------|---|
| materials/resources | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Does the site have existing and potential | | Ν | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | | | 0 | |
| mineral extraction | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Is the site in the vicinity of a waste | | Ν | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | | | 0 | |
| management site and could, therefore, | PHH | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| compromise the waste handling operation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Do sites for potential waste management | | n/a | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | | | 0 | |
| facilities comply with the locational criteria | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (paragraph 4.9) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - |
| Are there any of the following servicing | | | Pylons N | | Bord Gai | s Eirann | pipeline | e N | | S | Shell oil pipe | line N | | | Transco | pipeline | Ν |
| constraints that impact on the development | | Com | ment No knowr | service of | constraints | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| of the site | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | - |
| Will development of the site require | | | Air Traffic/NAT | S N | | MoD | Ν | | Carl | isle Airpo | ort N | Co | al Authority | Ν | | HSE | Ν |
| consultation with any of the following bodies | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No kno | wn sei | vice constraints | . Loss of | greenfield I | and | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negativ | ative SEA impact as loss of greenfield site SEA Score: X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | 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 |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | 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.) | Sou | uht 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 | | Х | Appropriate landscaping and layout should take into account aspect and prevailing winds to the south west | 0 | | | | | | |

| Site assessment question | re miti – | D Mitigation if appropriate | Consultation required |
|--------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|

| PLANNING OVERVIEW Appropriate landscaping and layout should take into account aspect and prevailing winds to the south west | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| SEA SCORE: 0 | SEA OVERVIEW Due to south west aspect the use of solar gain could be used to great effect. Exposed to prevailing winds, may require greater | | | | | | |
| SEA SCORE: 0 | SEA OVERVIEW 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 | | | | | | |

| | CULTURAL HERITAGE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|---|--|--------|---|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting | L | Wo | Listed Building onservation Area orld Heritage Site chaeological site | N N | Scheduled Monuments Inventory of Historic Battlefield Inventory & Non-Inventory Garden or Designed Landscape | N N N | July 2 Histor point behin HES We de | omment Archaeology - No historic environment issues identified for this site, as of uly 2016, but borders the Inventory Battlefield for the Battle of Sark. istoric Built Environment - No Listed Buildings, no conservation area. As an entrance bint to Gretna development should follow the road frontages with grid pattern streets whind to reflect the layout of Gretna ES - 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 hapact on the setting of the historic battlefield. | | | | | | |
| Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment | L | N | | | | | (| 0 0 | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW SEA OVERVIEW | No kno | nown 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 nown cultural heritage issues directly affecting site. It should be noted that the site borders the Inventory Battlefield for the SEA Score: 0 e of Sark to the south | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | L | ANDSCAPE | | | | | |
|---|--------|----------|--------------------------------|-------------------|--------|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|---|-------------|-------|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | | W | NSAs N ild Land N | RSAs TPOs | | Comment Developn Gretna. However, o | nent regr therwise | ettable (the site | given historic small holding fields, which form an attractive r forms a logical extension and is well contained. | ural settir | ig to |
| 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 boundaries. | / flat with trees | and he | edgerows along field | 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 | | | | ic small holding setting to Gretna | С | 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 | | Ν | | | | | SV | 0 | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | dgerows should b | | | itional planting. | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Minima | l detrir | mental effect on la | andscape qua | ity | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic Yes/No | Comment | Information source Pre mitigation | e ອັດ ຜູ້ | 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 | Ν | | | | |
| Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe | Y | | | | |
| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT 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 teen 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 are considered to meet the identified housing strategy. | | | | | |
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | walk | ative SEA impact as greenfield site and potential loss of prime agricultural land. Positive impact in terms of Population and Health as within reasonable ing distance to community facilities and school, scope to encourage active travel. Gretna served by railway station – could encourage use of more ainable transport and reduce carbon emissions from transport. | | | |

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

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

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 |

| Related SEA topic | Information source | Consultation required (only if answer is Yes) |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 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 F | FLORA | ١ | | | | | | |
|---|-------|---|-----------------|----------|-----------------------|-------|-------|-------|----------|------------------|---|----|---------------------|-------|---|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests | | S | SACs | Ν | LNR | Ν | | | | SPAs | Ν | | c, | SSIs | Ν |
| affect or have connectivity to the site? (this | | | NNR | Ν | Local wildlife sites | Ν | | | Ν | latterjack toads | Ν | | Great Crested N | lewts | Ν |
| includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | | RAM | SAR | Ν | Geodiversity Sites | Ν | | 0 | ther pro | otected species | Ν | Ma | rine Consultation Z | ones | Ν |
| | | | Ar | ncient/s | semi-natural woodland | Ν | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Comn | nents: No co | mment | ts | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No im | pact on | biodiversity of | designa | ations | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No im | lo impact on biodiversity designations SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | POP | ULATION AND H | UMAN | HEALTH | 1 | | | | | |
|---|----------------|-----------|--|-------------|-------|--|------------|--------------|---------|-----------|---------------------------------|-----------|----------|-----|
| 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 | | | | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| Distance to nearest area of open space | | | ce (km) | 1 | | | | | A 1 | | | | | |
| Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them | MA or CF | Č | of Way ore path cle path | N N Y | Comme | ent: Core path 323 – S | pringfield | I to Gretna. | Also | heritage | trail | | | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | Comm | ommunity/villa | | 1 | Sports facilities | 1-5 | Hospita | alities | 1 | Local shops (convenience) | 1-5 | Bus stop | 0.1 |
| What is the education catchment area | | | | mary | | | | | | Second | ary | | | |
| (primary and secondary) for the site and | S | chool nan | | ringfield | | | | | | Annan | | | | |
| what is the remaining capacity within the | | Capac | - | | | | | | | 331 | | | | |
| catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | | Distan | ce: 1 | | | | | | | 10 | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | N | | | | | | GIS | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | sonable walking distance of the majority of community facilities, less likely to encourage active travel Proximity to Gretna Station and could encourage and use of sustainable transport. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | | | | | the majority of commi ive travel and use of s | | | | o encoura | age active travel. Proximity to | SEA SCORI | E: X/+ | |

| | 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 | Х | Agricultural land currently in grazing. | Х | | |
| 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 | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | e loss of prime agricultural land | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negat | legative SEA impact as would involve the loss of prime agricultural land SEA Score:X | | | | | | | |

| | | | 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 | С | 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 | РНН | Y | Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity. | С | 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 | РНН | Y | Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient | С | 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. |
|-------------------|--|
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | 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. |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No known flood risk. Gretna – limited water capacity subject to planned upgrading by Scottish Water which will require developer contributions. |

| | | | 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 | С | 0 | | 0 | |
| What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby | PHH | Ν | 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 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Potenti | al issu | e with air quality. | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | SEPA I | nave n | oted a potential issue with air quality. | | | SEA Score: ? | | |

| | | | MATERIAL AS | SETS | | | |
|--|-----|------------|---|------|---|---|--|
| Is the site | | wnfield | Comment | | | | |
| | Gre | enfield | Y | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | N | ls it | t 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 | No existin | ng structure for reuse on site | | 0 | 0 | |
| Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction | 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 |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|--|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|--|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

| Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation | РНН | 0 | | | | | | | 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site | | Comm | Pylons N Bord Gais Eirann pipeline N Shell oil pipeline N Transco pipeline N nment No known service constraints Image: Shell oil pipeline N Ima | | | | | | | | | | N | | |
| Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies | | A | ir Traffic/NATS | Ν | MoD | Ν | | Carli | sle Airpo | ort N | C | oal Authority | N | HSE | N |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No kno | known servicing constraints | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negativ | ative SEA impact as would involve loss of greenfield land SEA Score: X | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | 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. | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW 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.) | | Sout | h | SV | 0 | | 0 | |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | | Y | | | 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 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Exposed | d to p | revailing wind, may require greater energy use for heating inc | reasing | carbon (| emissions | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Exposed | xposed to prevailing wind, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions SEA SCORE: O | | | | | | |

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 | | Listed Building | Ν | Scheduled Monuments | Ν | Comment | Archaeology - Course of Roman road pa | asses through the ma | jority of | the | | |
|--|--------|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|-------------|--|----------------------------------|-----------|-----|--|--|
| of the following including their setting | | Conservation Area | Ν | Inventory of Historic Battlefield | Ν | | ation will be required. | | | | | |
| | L | World Heritage Site | Ν | Inventory & Non-Inventory | | | uilt Environment - No Listed Buildings, no | no conservation area. Backs onto | | | | |
| | | Archaeological site | Υ | Garden or Designed Landscape | | former rail | way line | | | | | |
| Will the development of the site result in the | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| opportunity to enhance or improve access | L | | | | | | | | | | | |
| to the historic environment | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Archae | Archaeological mitigation measures to be implemented due to course of Roman Road running through site. | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Impact | pact on archaeological feature which would be mitigated subject to archaeological evaluation. SEA SCORE: 0 | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | I | LANDSCAPE | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|-------|------------------|------------|----------------------------------|-----------|---|------------|--------|---|---|--|--|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | | W | NSAs ild Land | | RSAs TPOs | N 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 attracter feature which would be unlikely to survive development. Limited development adjacent to the lane might be appropriate with effective screening and containment. | | | | | | |
| 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 a | and hedg | erows should | l be reta | ained. | | 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 | | | es raised in la and south and | | e advice s. Slopes ed by roads. | | Х | X For these reasons site should not be allocated for X housing. | | | |
| Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site | | N | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | For lan | dscap | e reasons | s the site | should not be | e alloca | ted for housing. | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negativ contair | | A impact | in terms o | of landscape. | Site slo | ppes to the east and is | visually p | romine | nt from that direction with no physical SEA SCORE: X | | | |

| PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP | Y | Site lies outhwith 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 | Yes/No Yes/No Comment | Information source Pre mitigation score | igation if appropriate | Consultation required |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--|------------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--|------------------------|--------------------------|

| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT | 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. |
|--------------------------|---|
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | 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. |

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

| Торіс | Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora | Population and Human Health | Soils | Water | Air Quality | Material Assets | Climatic Factors | Cultural Heritage | Landscape |
|-------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------|-------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| SCORE | 0 | Х | Х | 0 | 0 | Х | 0 | 0 | ХХ |

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 |

| Legenus | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Related SEA topic | Information source | Consultation required (only if answer is Yes) |
| 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 | ource | | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|

| | | | | | BIODIVERSITY, | FAUNA | AND | FLOR | 4 | | | | | | |
|---|--------|------------|----------|-----------|--------------------------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|------------------|---|---|----------------------------|-------|---|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests | | SA | ACs | Ν | LNR | Ν | | | | SPAs | Ν | | | SSSIs | Ν |
| affect or have connectivity to the site? (this | | N | INR | Ν | Local wildlife sites | Ν | | | N | latterjack toads | Ν | | Great Crested | Newts | Ν |
| includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | | RAMS | SAR | Ν | Geodiversity Sites | Ν | | C | ther pro | otected species | Ν | N | Narine Consultation | Zones | Ν |
| | | | | Ancier | nt/semi-natural woodland | Ν | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Comme | ents: No | o comme | nts | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | Y | | | | | | | 0 | and enhanced | | | hould be retained | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Trees | and the r | network | of hedg | erows should be retained | and enhar | nced for | biodivers | sity valu | e. | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No bio | odiversity | designa | ations af | fecting site. | | | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| | | | | | POPUI | ATION AND H | IUMAN | HEALTH | 1 | | | | | |
|--|-------|-----------|---------------|-------------|-------------|--------------------|-------|---------|---------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------|----------|---|
| Will the development of the site affect the | | Ν | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| quality and quantity of open space and | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| connectivity and accessibility to open space | MA | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space | | Dista | nce (km) | 5 | | | | | | | | | I | |
| Are there any of the following within or | MA | | t of Way | | Comment | • | | | | | | | | |
| adjacent to the site and will development | or | 0 | ore path | | ••••• | | | | | | | | | |
| impact on them | CF | | , cle path | | | | | | | | | | | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following | | Comm | unity/vill | age hall | 5 | Sports facilities | 5 | Hospita | alities | 5 | Local shops (convenience |) 5 | Bus stop | 1 |
| services where they exist in the settlement | CF | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (Autumn 2015) What is the education catchment area | | | | imarv | | | | | | <u> </u> | | | | |
| (primary and secondary) for the site and | | chool na | | retna | | | | | | Secondary Annan | | | | |
| what is the remaining capacity within the | | Capad | | | | | | | | 331 | | | | |
| catchment. (October 2015). Distance from | | Distar | | , | | | | | | 10 | | | | |
| site (km) | | 2.010 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to | MA | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| the core areas of the biosphere | and | Ν | | | | | | GIS | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | | | | | | | | | | 054.00000 | v | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negat | IVE SEA I | impact a | s site dist | ant from co | mmunity facilities | | | | | | SEA SCORE: | X | |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic Yes/No | Comment | ource | | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|

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

| | | | 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. | С | 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. | С | 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 | РНН | Y | Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity. | С | 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 | | Comment | ource | Pre mitigation score | Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--------------------------|--|---------|-------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------------------|--|---------|-------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

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

| | 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 | | 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 | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Unlikel | y to de | crease air quality. | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Unlikel | y to de | crease air quality. | | | SEA Sc | ORE: 0 | | | | | |

| | MATERIAL ASSETS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------|-------|-------------|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Is the site | | Brown | | | Comment | | | | | | | | |
| | | Green | field | Y | | | | | | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | N | ls | it containe | ed 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 | | Pylons N Comment No known | service | Bord Gais Eirann constraints | pipeline | N | Shel | l oil pipeline | Ν | | | Transco p | pipeline | N |
| of the site | | | 0011100 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies | | Air Traffic/NATS | S N | MoD | N | | Carlisle Airport | Ν | Coa | al Authority | Ν | | HSE | N |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No know | wn service constraints | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negativ | e SEA impact as gree | nfield sit | e. | | | | | | | SEA | SCORE: X | | |

| | 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 |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | 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.) | | Sout | th and west | | 0 | | | 0 | | |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | | Υ | | | 0 | | | 0 | | |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | | Ν | Potentially exposed to the west | | 0 | Appropriate landscaping to the west could protect site from prevailing winds. | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Potentia | ally ex | posed to the west however this will be partially mitigated by a | reinforce | ed wood | land strip to the west | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Potentia | entially exposed to the west however this will be partially mitigated by a reinforced woodland strip to the west SEA Score:0 | | | | | | | | |

| | | | 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 | ອ ອ ວິ ຜູ | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

| of the following including their setting | | Co | onservation Area | Ν | Inventory of Historic Battlefield | Ν | July 2016 | | | |
|--|---------|--|---------------------|--------|-----------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------|----|-----------|
| | | Wo | rld Heritage Site | Ν | Inventory & Non-Inventory | Ν | Historic Built Environment - No Listed E | | | open site |
| | | Ar | chaeological site | Ν | Garden or Designed Landscape | | for this type of development without an | y natural topography to screen | it | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Will the development of the site result in the | | | | | | | | | | |
| opportunity to enhance or improve access | L | | | | | | | | | |
| to the historic environment | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No cult | o cultural designations affecting site | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No cult | ural de | signations affectir | ng sit | e | | | SEA SCORE: O | | |

| | LANDSCAPE | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|--------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|-----------|---|---------------------------|-------------------------|---|--------------|-----|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | | W | NSAs ild Land | N N | RSAs TPOs | N N | | in open fla iates with | at landscape. Remote fi | rom settlement though adjace holiday home development wo | | and |
| 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 | settlem holiday | ent. Site home de | e associates v | vith wide | cape. Remote from er countryside and highly visible and | 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 | | Ν | | | | | | | | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | - | | | | | adverse impact on lar | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Signific | ant ne | egative SE | EA impac | t as site woul | d be hig | phly visible and incong | gruous in t | the wider landscape set | tting. S | EA SCORE: XX | |

| | PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP | Y | Outwith settlement boundary for Gretna 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 Gretna 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 | ? | | | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT 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 | | | | | | | | | | |

GTN.H209

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

| | appropriate pedestrian access from the site to Gretna. |
|---------------------|---|
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | 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. |

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

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

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 |

| Related SEA topic | Information source | Consultation required (only if answer is Yes) |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 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 | | SA | Cs N | LNR | N | | | SPAs | N | SSSIs | Ν | | |
| affect or have connectivity to the site? (this | | N | NR N | Local wildlife sites | N | Natterjack toads | | latterjack toads | N | Great Crested Newts | Ν | | |
| includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | | RAMS | AR N | Geodiversity Sites | N | Other protected species | | | Ν | Marine Consultation Zones | Ν | | |
| | | | Ancier | nt/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 | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No bio | odiversity | designations a | oply | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | SEA OVERVIEW No biodiversity designations apply SEA Score: o | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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. | | N Immediately adjacent to associated with Springfie | | | | | ent to open space (playing field) ringfield PS | | | | | | | | |
| Distance to nearest area of open space | | Dista | ance (kr | n) (| 0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any of the following within or | MA | MA Right of W or Core p | | | Y | Comme | ent: Earlston to Spring | field Righ | nt of Way (3 | 326). <i>I</i> | Also pro | ovides pedestrian access to Quinting | shill. | | |
| adjacent to the site and will development | | | | | N | | | | | | | | | | |
| impact on them | CF | C | Cycle pa | th I | N | | | | | | | | | | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | | | | nunity/village hall 1 S | | | 0 | Hospita | Hospitalities | | 1 Local shops (convenience | e) 1-5 | Bus stop | 0.2 |
| What is the education catchment area | | 1 | Primary Secondary | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (primary and secondary) for the site and | S | chool na | | | | | | | | | Annan | | | | |
| what is the remaining capacity within the | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| catchment. (October 2015). Distance from | | | istance: 0 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| site (km) | | Diote | | 0 | | | | | | | 10 | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | and N | | | | | GIS | | | | | | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Site in | nmediat | ely adja | cent t | to prim | ary scho | ool, but on edge of sett | lement | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | to end | 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. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Site assessment question Xes/No | Comment Source | Are 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 3.2 (The James Hutton Institute) | 0 | Х | | Х | | |
| 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 | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | PLANNING OVERVIEW Would involve loss of prime agricultural land | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negat | gative SEA impact as would involve the loss of prime agricultural land SEA Score: X | | | | | | | |

| | | | 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 | | С | 0 | | 0 | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer | РНН | Y | Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity. | С | 0 | | 0 | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply | РНН | Y | Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient | С | 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 | | e o | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|--|--------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|--|--------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

| | | 2010) refers. | | |
|--------------|-------------------|--|---------------------------|--|
| | | d capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Suppleme o Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. | entary Guidance Developer | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No kno contrik | d risk. Gretna - limited water capacity subject to planned upgrading by Scottish Water which will require developer | SEA SCORE: 0 | |

| | 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 | С | 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 | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | PLANNING OVERVIEW Unlikely to decrease air quality | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Unlikely to decrease air quality SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | MATERIAL ASSET | S | | | |
|--|-----|----------------------|----|-------------|--|-------------|-----------|---|--|
| Is the site | | Brownfie Greenfie | | Y | Comment Greenfield site currently in | n agriculti | ural use. | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | N | ls | it containe | ed within the Vacant and Derelict N Land Survey | 0 | 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 | РНН | 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 | ອ ອ ວິ ຜູ | 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 | | Pylons N | | Bord Gais Eirann | pipelin | θN | | S | nell oil pipel | ine NN | | | Transco pipeline | N |
| constraints that impact on the development of the site | | Comment No known se | ervicing | onstraints | | | | | | | | | | |
| Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies | | Air Traffic/NATS | Ν | MoD | Ν | | Carli | sle Airpo | rt N | Co | al Authority | N | HSE | N |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No kno | wn servicing constraints | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negativ | e SEA impact as would i | involve | the loss of greenfie | ld land. | | | | | | | SEA | SCORE: X | |

| 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 | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW 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.) | | Sout | th | 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 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Expose | Exposed to prevailing wind, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Expose | losed to prevailing wind, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | |

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

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

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

| | | | | | | L | ANDSCAPE | | | | | |
|---|---------|--------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------|-----------------------|--|-----------|-------|---|----------|-----|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | | Wi | NSAs Id Land | N N | RSAs TPOs | N N | |) but no | | site with overlooking farmland to East and north. Would end fensible boundary to the east. May be possible to mitigate v | | loc |
| 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 | north. \ Site op | Nould ei en to ea | nclose school | playing t nature o | and to East and field (positive). of topography and ry 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 | | Ν | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | ast and onedgerov | | | raphy ar | nd landscape no real de | efensible | bound | ary to the east. Limited scope to mitigate in part with landso | aping an | d |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negativ | /e SEA | impact i | in terms | of landscape. | | | | | SEA Score: X | | |

| | | 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 | |
| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT | adve defer strate | |
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | of Po | tive 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 pulation and Health as distant from the majority of community facilities, but offset by proximity to Springfield Primary School. Negative SEA impact in sof landscape, some limited scope to mitigate in part with landscaping and planting with hedgerow/tree planting. |

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

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

| Торіс | Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora | Population and Human HealthSoX/+X | Soils | Water | Air Quality | Material Assets | Climatic Factors | Cultural Heritage | Landscape |
|-------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| SCORE | 0 | X/+ | Х | 0 | ? | Х | Х | 0 | Х |

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

| Related SEA topic | Information source | Consultation required (only if answer is Yes) |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 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 F | FLORA | ١ | | | | | | |
|---|-------|---------|-----------------|----------|-----------------------|-------|-------|-------|----------|------------------|---|----|---------------------|-------|---|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests | | S | SACs | Ν | LNR | Ν | | | | SPAs | Ν | | c, | SSIs | Ν |
| affect or have connectivity to the site? (this | | | NNR | Ν | Local wildlife sites | Ν | | | Ν | latterjack toads | Ν | | Great Crested N | lewts | Ν |
| includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | | RAM | SAR | Ν | Geodiversity Sites | Ν | | 0 | ther pro | otected species | Ν | Ma | rine Consultation Z | ones | Ν |
| | | | Ar | ncient/s | semi-natural woodland | Ν | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Comn | nents: No co | mment | ts | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No im | pact on | biodiversity of | designa | ations | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No im | pact on | biodiversity of | designa | ations | | | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| | | | | | POP | ULATION AND H | UMAN | HEALTH | 4 | | | | | |
|---|----------------|------------------------|-----------|---------|-------|---|------------|----------------|---------|----------|--------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|-------|
| 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 | Ν | | | | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| Distance to nearest area of open space Are there any of the following within or | MA | Distanc Right c | · · · | 1 N | Comme | ent: Core path 323 – S | prinafiel | to Gretna | Also | heritage | e trail | | | |
| adjacent to the site and will development impact on them | or CF | Cor | e path | N Y | Comme | | philghen | | . 7 100 | nomago | | | | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | Commur | ity/villa | ge hall | 1 | Sports facilities | 1-5 | Hospita | alities | 1 | Local shops (convenience | 1-5 | Bus stop | 0.1 |
| What is the education catchment area | | | | mary | | | | | | Second | dary | | | |
| (primary and secondary) for the site and | S | chool name | | | | | | | | n/a | | | | |
| what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from | | Capacity | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| site (km) | | Distance | : | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | N | | | | | | GIS | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | thin reason travel and | | | | | unity faci | ities, less li | kely to | o encour | rage active travel Proximity to Gret | na Station a | ind could enco | urage |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | | | | | the majority of comme travel and use of su | | | kely to | o encour | rage active travel. Proximity to | SEA SCOR | E: X/+ | |

| | 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 | Х | Agricultural land currently in grazing. | Х | |
| 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 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | e loss of prime agricultural land | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negat | ive SEA | A impact as would involve the loss of prime agricultural land | | | SEAS | CORE:X | |

| | | | 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 | С | 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 | РНН | Y | Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity. | С | 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 | РНН | Y | Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient | С | 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. | |
|-------------------|---|-------------------|
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance I Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required what impact, if any this development has on the existing waste water network. Early engagement with Scottish Water via the Pre-Development Enquired strongly recommended. | ired to establish |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No known flood risk. Gretna – limited water capacity subject to planned upgrading by Scottish Water which will require developer SEA Score: 0 contributions. | |

| | 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 | С | 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 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Potenti | tential issue with air quality. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | SEPA | have n | oted a potential issue with air quality. | | | SEA SCOR | E: ? | | | | | | |

| | MATERIAL ASSETS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------|--------------|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Is the site | Bro | wnfield | | Comment | | | | | | | | |
| | Gre | enfield | Y | | | | | | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | N | ls | it containe | ed within the Vacant and Derelict N 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 | No exis | ting structu | Ire for reuse on site | | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction | 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 |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|--|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|--|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

| Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation | РНН | 0 | | | | | | | 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site | | Comm | Pylons N nent No known se | ervice c | Bord Gais Eirann constraints | pipeline | e N | | S | Shell oil pipe | eline N | | | Transco | pipeline | N |
| Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies | | A | ir Traffic/NATS | Ν | MoD | Ν | | Carli | sle Airpo | ort N | C | oal Authority | N | | HSE | N |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No kno | wn serv | icing constraints | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negativ | ve SEA i | impact as would i | nvolve | loss of greenfield la | Ind | | | | | | | SEAS | SCORE: X | | |

| | 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. |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | 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.) | | Sout | th | SV | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | | Y SV 0 0 | | | | | | | | |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | | Ν | Not sheltered from prevailing wind. | SV | Х | May require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions | х | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Not she | Not sheltered from prevailing wind, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Not she | lot sheltered from prevailing wind, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions SEA Score: X | | | | | | | | |

CULTURAL HERITAGE

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

| Will the development of the site affect any | | Listed Building | Ν | Scheduled Monuments | Ν | Comment | Archaeology - Course of Roman road pa | sses through the maj | ority of | the |
|--|--------|---|---|------------------------------------|---|-------------|--|----------------------|----------|-----|
| of the following including their setting | | Conservation Area | Ν | Inventory of Historic Battlefield | Ν | | ation will be required. | | | |
| | L | World Heritage Site | Ν | Inventory & Non-Inventory | | | uilt Environment - No Listed Buildings, no | conservation area. B | acks o | nto |
| | | Archaeological site | Υ | Garden or Designed Landscape | | former rail | way line | | | |
| Will the development of the site result in the | | | | | | | | | | |
| opportunity to enhance or improve access | L | | | | | | | | | |
| to the historic environment | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | 0 0 | | to be implemented due to course of | | | 0 0 | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Impact | npact on archaeological feature which would be mitigated subject to archaeological evaluation. SEA SCORE: 0 | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | I | ANDSCAPE | | | | | |
|---|---------|--|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|--|----------|---------|---|---|-----------|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | | NSAs N RSAs N Comment Wild Land N TPOs N 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 attract feature which would be unlikely to survive development. Limited development adjacent to the lane might be appropriate with effective screening and containment. | | | | | | | | | | ttractive |
| 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 a | and hedg | gerows should | be reta | ined. | | 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 | | Ν | Signific slopes | ant issu to the ea | es raised in la | ndscape ally proi | I bounded by roads. e advice - site minent from that nt | | 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 | | Ν | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW SEA OVERVIEW | | | | | | | ted for housing. | visually | oromine | ent from that direction with no physical SEA SCORE: X | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | contain | | inpacti | in torinio | or landsoape. | Cite Sit | | violaliy | | | | |

| | | 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 | nformation ource | Pre mitigation score | Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|

| Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe | |
|--|---|
| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT | 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. |
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | 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

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

| Торіс | Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora | Population and Human Health | Soils | Water | Air Quality | Material Assets | Climatic Factors | Cultural Heritage | Landscape |
|-------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------|-------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| SCORE | 0 | + | Х | XX | 0 | Х | 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

| LeBenas | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
| Related SEA topic | Information source | Consultation required (only if answer is Yes) |
| Population and Human Health (PH | IH) 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 | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
|--------------------------|----------------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|

| | | | | BIODIVERSIT | Y, FAUNA | AND F | LORA | L | | | | |
|---|--------|-----------|---------------|----------------------------|----------|-------|------|---------|------------------|---|---------------------------|---|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests | | S | ACs I | N LN | R N | | | | SPAs | Ν | SSSIs | Ν |
| affect or have connectivity to the site? (this | | | NNR I | N Local wildlife site | s N | | | Ν | latterjack toads | N | Great Crested Newts | Ν |
| includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | | RAM | SAR I | N Geodiversity Site | s N | | Ot | ther pr | otected species | Ν | Marine Consultation Zones | Ν |
| | | | An | cient/semi-natural woodlan | d N | | | | | | | |
| | | Comm | nents: No com | iments | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No bio | odiversit | y designation | s apply | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No bio | odiversit | y designation | s apply | | | | | | | SEA SCORE: O | |

| | | | | | POP | ULATION AND H | IUMAN | HEALTH | 4 | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----------|---|-----------|----------|--------------------------|----------|--------------|---------|-----------|------------------------------------|------------|---------|---------|-----|
| 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 Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them | MA or CF | Rigl (| nce (km) nt of Way Core path ycle path | N Y | Comm | ent: Core path 252 alo | ng River | Sark | | | | | | | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | | nunity/vill | age hall | 1 | Sports facilities | 1 | Hospita | alities | | Local shops (convenience | 1 | Bus | stop | 0.1 |
| What is the education catchment area | | | | imary | | | | | | Second | Jary | | | | |
| (primary and secondary) for the site and | S | chool na | | а | | | | | | n/a | | | | | |
| what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from | | Capa | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| site (km) | | Dista | nce: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | N | | | | | | GIS | 0 | | | | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Within transp | | alking dis | stance to | existing | facilities, school and a | ccess to | Gretna stati | on. C | ould enco | ourage walking and cycling and rec | uce carbon | emissio | ns from | l |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Withir | close w | alking dis rbon emi | | | | nd acces | s to Gretna | a stati | on. Could | d encourage walking and cycling | SEA SCORI | E: + | | |

| 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 3.1 (The James Hutton Institute) | 0 | Х | 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. | С | 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 | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Loss | of prime | agricultural land. | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negative SEA impact as would involve loss of prime agricultural land. SEA Score:X | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | 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 | | Х | | | | | |
| 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. | С | 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. | С | 0 | | 0 | | | | | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer | РНН | Y | Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity. | С | 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 | РНН | Y | Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity. | С | 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 o requirements for this phase of t Supplementary Guidance Deve Upgrade the Water Supply at G 2010) refers | e upgrade work. oper Contributions to | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Development River Esk. | velopment 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 | | | | | | | | |
| | | er Esk. etna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer | | | | | | | | |
| | | ontributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. Flood risk assessment required | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Significant ne | gative SEA impact as site within an identified flood risk area. | SEA SCORE: XX | | | | | | | |

| 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 | С | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby | РНН | 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 | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Unlikely | y to de | crease air quality. | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Unlikely to decrease air quality. SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | | | |

| | MATERIAL ASSETS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|------|---------|------------|-----------------|-------------------|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Is the site | | Brov | vnfield | | Comment | | | | | | | | |
| | | Gree | enfield | Y | | | | | | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | N | ls i | t containe | d within the Va | cant and Derelict | 1 | N | 0 | | 0 | | |
| | | | | | | Land Survey | | | | | | | |
| Will development of the site minimise | | N | | | | | | | 0 | | 0 | | |
| demand on primary resources e.g. does the | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| development re-use an existing structure or | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| recycle or recover on-site | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| materials/resources | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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 | | N | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | | | 0 | |
|--|---------|----------------------------|----------------|----------|--------|-----------------------|----------|-----|------|------------|-----------------|--------|--------------|-----|----------|----------|---|
| mineral extraction | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Is the site in the vicinity of a waste | | Ν | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | | | 0 | |
| management site and could, therefore, | PHH | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| compromise the waste handling operation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Do sites for potential waste management | | n/a | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | | | 0 | |
| facilities comply with the locational criteria | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (paragraph 4.9) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any of the following servicing | | | Pylons 1 | ١ | | Bord Gais Eirann | pipeline | e N | | S | Shell oil pipel | line N | | | Transco | pipeline | Ν |
| constraints that impact on the development | | Com | ment No know | /n ser\ | vicing | constraints | | | | | | | | | | | |
| of the site | | | | | • | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Will development of the site require | | | Air Traffic/NA | TS N | Ν | MoD | Ν | | Carl | isle Airpo | ort N | Co | al Authority | Ν | | HSE | Ν |
| consultation with any of the following bodies | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No kno | nown servicing constraints | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negativ | ve SEA | A impact as wo | ould inv | volve | loss of greenfield la | ınd. | | | | | | | SEA | SCORE: X | | |

| 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 | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW 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.) | | Sout | h and West aspect | SV | | | 0 | | | |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | | Y SV | | | | 0 | | | | |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | | Ν | Exposed to prevailing winds | SV | Х | Appropriate landscaping and layout should take into account aspect and prevailing winds to the south we | 0 st | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | • | | | | | • | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | SEA OVERVIEW Due to south west aspect the use of solar gain could be used to great effect. Exposed to prevailing winds, may require greater SEA SCORE: 0 energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions | | | | | | | | | |

CULTURAL HERITAGE

| Site assessment question Copic A SEA | Comment | Information source Score Score | Post mitigation score Consultation required | |
|--|---------|---|--|--|
|--|---------|---|--|--|

| Will the development of the site affect any | | Listed Building | Y | Scheduled Monuments | Ν | Comment Ar | chaeology - No historic environment is | sues identified for th | nis site, a | as of |
|--|----------|--|--------|-------------------------------------|--|----------------------|---|------------------------|-------------|-----------|
| of the following including their setting | | Conservation Area | Ν | Inventory of Historic Battlefield | Ν | July 2016 | | | | |
| | L | World Heritage Site | | Inventory & Non-Inventory | Ν | | Environment - Two Category B Listed | | | |
| | | Archaeological site | Ν | Garden or Designed Landscape | | | se both of which should be carefully co | onsidered in respect | of acces | ss to the |
| | | | | | | site and their | r setting. No conservation area. | | | |
| Will the development of the site result in the | | The setting of th | e list | ed structures Sark Bridge (category | | 0 | | | 0 | |
| opportunity to enhance or improve access | L | | | ouse (category B) should be | | | | | | |
| to the historic environment | | carefully conside | ered i | in respect of access to the site. | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | The set | ting of the listed structur | es Sa | ark Bridge (category B) and the Old | / B) should be carefully considered in r | respect of access to | the site. | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Potentia | Potential impact on setting of adjacent listed structures which will require to be carefully considered in respect of access to the SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | |
| | site. | te. | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | L | ANDSCAPE | | | | | | |
|---|----------|---|------------|----------|-------------------|----------|--------------------------|-----------|----------|--|---------------------|-----------|-----|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the | | | NSAs | Ν | RSAs | Ν | | | | g on nature of development: | | | |
| following | | Wild Land N TPOs N Borders onto levee by River Sark whereas existing village boundary is s | | | | | | | | nereas existing village boundary is set back | k from the river. I | Developme | ent |
| | | would be seen on entrance to the village and would impact on existing hotel which looks out onto site | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Will development of the site affect features | | Y | | | | | | | | | | | |
| of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| including watercourses, landforms, | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| trees/woodland or significant | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| slopes/changes in level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Will development of the site be well | | Y | | | | | nce to the village | | 0 | High quality of design would be required | l at this | 0 | |
| integrated visually with the existing | | | | | | | nich looks out onto | | | important site | | | |
| settlement | | | | | | e to Gre | tna and national | | | | | | |
| | | | bounda | ry to Sc | otland | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any locally attractive views that | | Ν | | | | | | | | | | | |
| will be impacted by development of the site | | | | | | | | L | <u> </u> | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | High qu | ality o | f design | would be | e required at the | nis impo | rtant prominent site at | the entra | ance to | Gretna and national boundary to Scotland | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Potentia | al impa | act on lar | ndscape | and mitigatior | measu | res identified should be | e implem | ented. | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| | | 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 | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|
|--------------------------|----------------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|

| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT | 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. |
|--------------------------|---|
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | 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

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

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

| EcBenas | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Related SEA topic | Information source | Consultation required (only if answer is Yes) |
| 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 | 2 CO | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---|------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---|------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

| | | | | BIODIVERSITY, | FAUNA | AND FL | ORA | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|--|------------------|---------------------------|-------|--------|-----|---------|------------------|---|---|-------------------------|-----|---|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests | | S | ACs N | LNR | Ν | | | | SPAs | Ν | | SSS | s N | N |
| affect or have connectivity to the site? (this | | | NNR N | Local wildlife sites | N | | | N | latterjack toads | N | | Great Crested New | s N | N |
| includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | | RAM | SAR N | Geodiversity Sites | N | | Oth | ner pro | otected species | Ν | М | arine Consultation Zone | s N | ٧ |
| | | | Ancie | ent/semi-natural woodland | Ν | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Comm | nents: No comm | ents | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No bio | odiversit | y designations a | apply | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No bio | biodiversity designations apply SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | POP | ULATION AND H | UMAN | HEALTH | 4 | | | | | |
|---|------------------|---|-------------|------------------|------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------|---------|----------|---------------------------------------|-------------|----------------|-----|
| 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 Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them | MA or CF | Distance (Right of V Core Cycle | Way bath | 1 N Y N | Comme | ent: Core path 253 link | ing Greti | na to River | Sark a | and rive | verside path | | | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | Community | //village | e hall | 1 | Sports facilities | 1 | Hospita | alities | | 1 Local shops (convenience |) 1 | Bus stop | 0.1 |
| What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and | | ahaal waxaa | Prim | nary | | | | | | | ondary | | | |
| what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | | Capacity: Distance: | N/A | | | | | | | N/A | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | N | • | | | | | GIS | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Within transp | | g dista | nce to ex | xisting fa | acilities, school and ac | cess to | Gretna stati | ion. C | ould er | encourage walking and cycling and rea | luce carbon | emissions from | n |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | close walking duce carbon | | | | | nd acces | s to Gretna | statio | n. Cou | uld encourage walking and cycling | SEA SCORI | E: + | |

| 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 3.1 (The James Hutton Institute) | 0 | Х | | Х | |
| 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 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | e loss of prime agricultural land | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negat | tive SEA | A impact as would involve loss of prime agricultural land | | | SEA SCORE: 3 | (| |

| | | | 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 Fluival 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. | С | X | | X | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer | РНН | Y | Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity. | С | 0 | 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. | 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. | С | 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 requi contributions to further alleviate the issues here. Scottish Water is curre requirements for this phase of the u Supplementary Guidance Develope Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna 2010) refers | water network htly examining the ograde work. • Contributions to |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|--|---|
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Flood manage SEPA. | ement measures would require to formalise river embankment to provide 200 year standard of protection. A FRA w | ould be required to be agreed with |
| | Gretna – limit Contributions | ed capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supple to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. Flood risk assessment required | mentary Guidance Developer |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | impact as high risk of fluvial flooding. Flood management measures would require to formalise embankment to ear standard of protection. A FRA would be required to be agreed with SEPA. | SEA SCORE: X |

| | 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 | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Unlikel | nlikely to decrease air quality. | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Unlikel | / to de | crease air quality. | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | | | |

| MATERIAL ASSETS | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|------------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|
| Is the site | | | nfield nfield | Y | Comment Site of former caravan park, currently disused | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | V | ls | it containe | ed 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 st | ructures re | remain on site also disused services. | | | |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic Yes/No | Comment | ource | | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|

| recycle or recover on-site | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|--------|----------------|--------------|---------------|------------|----------|-----|------|------------|----------------|--------|--------------|-----|----------|----------|---|
| materials/resources | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Does the site have existing and potential | | N | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | | | 0 | |
| mineral extraction | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Is the site in the vicinity of a waste | | Ν | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | | | 0 | |
| management site and could, therefore, | PHH | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| compromise the waste handling operation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Do sites for potential waste management | | n/a | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | | | 0 | |
| facilities comply with the locational criteria | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (paragraph 4.9) | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | |
| Are there any of the following servicing | | | Pylons | Ν | Bord Gai | s Eirann | pipeline | e N | | S | Shell oil pipe | line N | | | Transco | pipeline | Ν |
| constraints that impact on the development | | Com | ment No kno | wn servicing | g constraints | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| of the site | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | | | |
| Will development of the site require | | | Air Traffic/NA | ATS N | | MoD | Ν | | Carl | isle Airpo | ort N | Co | al Authority | Ν | | HSE | Ν |
| consultation with any of the following bodies | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | vicing constr | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No imp | act as | would result | in developm | ent of brow | nfield sit | е. | | | | | | | SEA | SCORE: 0 | | |

| 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. | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW 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.) | | Sout | th and west aspect | SV | | | | 0 | | |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | | Υ | | SV | | | | 0 | | |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | | N Exposed to the prevailing winds SV X O | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW 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 SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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 | | Listed Building | Y | Scheduled Monuments | Ν | Comment | Archaeology - No historic environment issues identified for this site, as of | |
|--|---------|-----------------------------|-------|---|---------|-----------------|--|-----|
| of the following including their setting | | Conservation Area | Ν | Inventory of Historic Battlefield | Ν | July 2016, | but setting of historic tollbooth and bridge should be taken into account. | |
| | 1 | World Heritage Site | Ν | Inventory & Non-Inventory | Ν | | | |
| | - | Archaeological site | Ν | Garden or Designed Landscape | | Historic Bu | uilt Environment - No conservation area. Category B Listed structures - O | ۶ld |
| | | Ũ | | | | | and Sark Bridge which should be very carefully considered both in terms | of |
| | | | | | | access to t | the site and setting around them. | |
| Will the development of the site result in the | | | | ed structures Sark Bridge (category | | 0 | 0 | |
| opportunity to enhance or improve access | L | | | louse (category B) should be | | | | |
| to the historic environment | | carefully consid | ered | in respect of access to the site. | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | The set | tting of the listed structu | res S | ark Bridge (category B) and the Old | Toll H | House (catego | bry B) should be carefully considered in respect of access to the site. | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | al impact on setting of a | djace | nt listed structures which will require | e to be | e carefully cor | nsidered in respect of access to the SEA Score: 0 | |
| | site. | | | | | | | |

| LANDSCAPE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--------------|--|---|--|--|---------|---|--|--|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | NSAs Wild Land | | | RSAs TPOs | | Former caravan site | e depending on nature of development: the surrounding 'iconic' Old Toll House. Borders onto levee by River Sark whereas existing set host from the river. Development would be seen on extremes to the village in the context. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | village boundary is set back from the river. Development would be seen on entrance to the village in the of the Toll house and would be affected by the M74. [nb includes site of 'Hands Across the Border' cail constructed during referendum debate 2015] | | | | | | |
| 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 a important site | at this | 0 | | |
| Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site | | Ν | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | High quality of design would be required at this important prominent site at the entrance to Gretna and national boundary to Scotland | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Potential impact on landscape and mitigation measures identified should be implemented. SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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 | Comment | Pre mitigation if appropriate so urce score figation score figation | 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 | Y | | | |
| strips | | | | |
| Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe | Υ | | | |
| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT | 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. | | | |
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | 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. | | | |