LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

| Site Ref: KCN.H1 | Source of site suggestion: LDP allocation | Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date): |
|--|--|--|
| Site name: Glenaber Avenue | | n/a |
| Settlement: Kirkconnel/Kelloholm | Current use: Vacant/ open space | |
| OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): | | Existing LDP allocations/ designations: |
| 273896, 611603 | | No |
| Site Size (ha): 3.28 | Proposed use: | HMA: Dumfries Date completed: |
| | Housing | 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 | X | +/x | 0 | 0 |

Scoring Guidance

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

Legends

| TeBerras | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 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 | | S | SACs | Ν | LNR | N | | | SPAs | Ν | | | SSSIs | Ν |
| affect or have connectivity to the site? (this | | 1 | NNR | Ν | Local wildlife sites | N | | | Natterjack toads | N | | Great Crested | Newts | Ν |
| includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | | RAM | SAR | Ν | Geodiversity Sites | N | | Other p | protected species | N | M | larine Consultation | Zones | Ν |
| | | | Ancient/semi-natural woodland N | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Comm | nents: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any known invasive species within the site | | N | | | | | GIS | 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 | Y Potential habitat fragmentation due to the loss of a greenfield site SV X Where appropriate, measures to enhance biodiversity should be implemented, such as the use of locally native tree species in landscape schemes + | | | | | | | + | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | There | are no | known b | biodiversity | y issue affecting the site. | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | There | are no | known S | SEA issue | S. | | | | | | | 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 | w a | | | | ected Open Space development SV X oss of an area used as an informal | | | The current site includes no landscape features and is relatively nondescript. Improvements to the wider open space to compensate for the loss of this area may help to ameliorate its loss. | | | pen | | |
| 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 | Right Co | Distance (km) 0-1 Right of Way N Core path N Cycle path N | | | comment: The site is easily accessible and is located close to footpaths and cycleways | | | | | | | | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | Commu | | 0 | 0-1 | Sports facilities | 0-1 | Hospita | alities | 1-5 | Local shops (convenience |) 0-1 | 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 nam | Primary Secondary pol name: Kelloholm Sanquhar Academy Capacity: 71 217 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | | Distanc | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | Ν | • | | | | | GIS | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Reside | ential deve | lopmer | t will hel | p to suppo | ort services and faciliti | ies in the | area which | n woul | d compen | ose to the site providing easy acc sate for the loss of open space. | ess to active | e travel provisio | ons. |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | te is well lo ng in posit | | | | rovides options for ac | tive trave | and devel | lopme | ent would a | also support local facilities | SEA SCOR | E: + | |

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

| | SOILS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|------------------------------------|---|----|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land | | N | Soil classification urban (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 | | 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 | There | are no | known soils issues | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | There | ere are no SEA issues 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 | A culvert with trash screen is located within the site boundary. The council and SEPA hold flood records in connection to this site. | | | A Flood Risk Assessment and culvert investigation are required and any measures identified should be implemented. | | |
| 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 | There is a surface water sewer within site. | C | 0 | The DIA would also establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing waste water network and any measures identified should be implemented. As Scottish Water are funded for Growth they can instigate a Growth project when the Developer meets their 5 Growth criteria. | 0 | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply | РНН | Y | | С | 0 | Further investigation such as Flow and Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network and any measures identified should be | 0 | |

| | | implemented. As Scottish Water are fu they can instigate a Growth project wh meets their 5 Growth criteria. | |
|-------------------|---|---|------------------------------------|
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | There is a possibility of flood risk on this site. Any flood risk will need to be fully investig extent of the flood risk, demonstrate developable part (s) of the site and identify any me There is limited capacity for both waste water and water supply and further investigation necessary, mitigation measures put in place. | easures to be taken to ensure that flood risk is | ssues are satisfactorily resolved. |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Provided all the necessary mitigation measures are implemented there should be no SE | EA issues | 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 | The site lies close to business/industrial premises, adjacent to the school and other residential properties. | SV | X | Development proposals will be assessed against policy OP1a. A Noise Assessment may be required in relation to the nearby business premises and any noise attenuation measures identified should be implemented | 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 | The proposed use is for residential development which would be compatible with surrounding uses. | SV | 0 | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | INING OVERVIEW There are possible noise issues related to the adjacent commercial premises and any design and layout of the development should take this into account and employ any necessary measures to ensure that the amenity of future residents is acceptable without harming the business operations of the occupiers of the adjacent premises. | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Provide | vided that mitigation measures are taken in relation to the noise issues then there should be no negative impacts. SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | |

| | | | | MATERIAL ASSETS | 6 | | | | |
|--|---|---|----------------------|--|------------|----------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| Is the site | - | - | nfield Prfield Y | Comment: This is a greenfield site th | at current | ly forms | part of a wider area of open space | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | Ν | Is 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 | This is a greenfield | d site. | SV | X | | X | |

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

| Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction | | ? | Possibly althoug unlikely. | gh it's lo | cation within the to | vn make | es it | GIS | 0 | | | | | | 0 | |
|---|---------|--|--|------------|---|---------|-------|--------|------------|----------------|---------|--------------|---|---------|----------|---|
| Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation | PHH | N | drinkory. | | | | | 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 | | Com | Pylons N ment: There are r | no servi | Bord Gais Eirann cing constraints in r | | | Э. | S | Shell oil pipe | eline N | | | Transco | pipeline | N |
| Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies | | | Air Traffic/NATS | N | MoD | Y | | Carl | isle Airpo | ort N | Co | al Authority | Y | | HSE | N |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | elopment of this site would result in the loss of greenfield land. Although any development of the site is unlikely to impact on air traffic control operations there are possibility of mineral reserves in the area. | | | | | | re are | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | The los | ss of gr | s of greenfield land would be a negative SEA impact 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 proposed site for housing, is currently public open space at Kelloholm with frontage access onto the C33n Greystone Avenue, C129n Glengaber Avenue and U439n Niviston Road. The LDP1 notes ground condition problems in the locality. Public footpaths cross the site and there is also a watercourse/surface water drainage system that serves the majority of Kelloholm, running through this site that was subject to flood prevention improvement works in 2003. I would not be in favour of any development that might have a negative impact upon this system. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and any residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards. | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW Access to the site is achievable. | | | | | | | | |

| CLIMATIC FACTORS | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|----|---|---|---|--|
| What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.) | 1 | This is a generally flat site SV 0 | | | | | | |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | 1 | ? F | Possibly due to the generally open nature of the site | SV | 0 | The layout and design should ensure solar gain and look to create sustainable buildings in line with policies OP1f and OP2 | + | |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | 1 | N The site is partially protected by existing developme can be a windswept site. | | | X | Sustainable design and construction techniques can incorporate energy efficiency measures in line with policies OP1f and OP2 to make the buildings more resilient to climatic factors. | + | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW Any new buildings should be built in such a way as to integrate solar gain and sustainability measures into their design and construction. This is a large site that once developed could generate a large number of traffic movements which is unknown at the current time | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | SEA OVERVIEW The positive SEA impacts gained through solar gain and sustainable construction techniques could balance out the possible SEA Score: +/X | | | | | | | |

| Site assessment question | Information source Score mitigation it approbriate Score score sco | Post mitigation score Consultation required |
|--------------------------|---|--|
|--------------------------|---|--|

negative SEA issues created as a result of a large number of traffic movements

| | | | | CULTURAL HERITAC | θE | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|----|----------|--------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Will the development of the site affect any | | Listed Building | Ν | Scheduled Monuments | Ν | Comment: | No historic environment issues | | | |
| of the following including their setting | | Conservation Area | Ν | Inventory of Historic Battlefield | Ν | 1 | | | | |
| | L | World Heritage Site | Ν | Inventory & Non-Inventory | Ν | | | | | |
| | | Archaeological site | Ν | Garden or Designed Landscape | | | | | | |
| Will the development of the site result in the | | N | | | S | V 0 | | | 0 | |
| opportunity to enhance or improve access | L | | | | | | | | | |
| to the historic environment | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | PLANNING OVERVIEW There are no historic environment issues | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Therea | e are no SEA issues. SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | L | ANDSCAPE | | | | | | |
|---|----------|-----------------------------------|---|------------------|-----------|--|----------|----------|--|-----------|---|--|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | | Wi | 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 | | Ν | Development c enclosing the s | | setting o | of the school by | С | 0 | The development would need to be softene avenues of tree planting and green corrido maintain pedestrian access across the site | ors which | 0 | |
| Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement | | Y | Although seen a centre of the se context. | | | n space it lies in the viewed in this | SV | 0 | | | 0 | |
| Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site | | N | | | | | SV | 0 | | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | The site | e is loc | ated in the centre | e of the town. I | Develop | ment in this location w | vould no | t advers | ely impact on the wider landscape. | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | There a | re are no SEA issues SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | | | |

| PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP | Y | The site is currently allocated for housing development within the settlement boundary | | | | |
| Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site | Y | The site is currently owned by a housing association however they are not understood to have any development plans at the moment. | | | | |
| Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips | Ν | | | | | |

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

| Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe | Y There are no known physical constraints in bringing this site forward depending on market demand |
|--|--|
| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT | This site is a current housing allocation in the LDP and is well located in the centre of the settlement close to the school, medical centre and other facilities. |
| | There are some concerns over market demand in the area however it is still considered to be the most suitable site for development and would help to |
| | consolidate the town which is currently very spread out in terms of its overall layout. It is recommended to continue this site through into LDP2. |
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | Minor negative SEA issues, including loss of greenfield land and increased traffic movements resulting in increasing carbon emissions. However, the site is |
| | within walking distance of existing services and facilities and benefits could be gained through the use of solar gain and sustainable construction techniques. |

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

| Site Ref: KCN.B&I1 | Source of site suggestion: LDP allocation | Site history/previous planni where applicable and approv | |
|--|--|---|-----------------|
| Site name: Greystone Avenue | | n/a | |
| Settlement: Kirkconnel/Kelloholm | Current use: Vacant/amenity open space | | |
| OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): | | Existing LDP allocations/ de | signations: |
| 273452, 611800 | | Yes | |
| Site Size (ha): 0.59 | Proposed use: | HMA: Dumfries | Date completed: |
| | Business and Industry | | 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 | X | X | +/x | 0 | 0 |

Scoring Guidance

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

Legends

| 2080.000 | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 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 | FLOR | A | | | | | | |
|---|-------|-----------|----------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|-------|------|----------|------------------|----------|-------------|--|-------|---|
| 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 | N | | | 1 | Natterjack toads | N | | Great Crested | Newts | Ν |
| includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | | RAMS | SAR | N | Geodiversity Sites | N | | (| Other pr | rotected species | N | | Marine Consultation | Zones | Ν |
| | | | | Ancien | t/semi-natural woodland | Ν | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Comme | ents: Th | nere are r | no designations affecting t | his site. | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any known invasive species within the site | | N | | | | | | GIS | 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 | | | | ial habita ield site | t fragmentation due to the | loss of a | | SV | X | | emented, | such as the | ance biodiversity use of locally native | + | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | There | are no ki | nown b | oiodiversit | y issue affecting the site. | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | There | are no ki | nown S | SEA issue | S. | | | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| | | | | | POPL | 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 | wou ame | ld resulenity are | llt in the lo ea | | pen Space developm n area used as an inf | | SV | X | relativ space | urrent site includes no landscape rely nondescript. Improvements to to compensate for the loss of thi eliorate its loss. | the wider of | open | |
| 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 Core Cycle | Way path | | Commei | nt: The site is easily a | accessibl | e and is loc | ated o | close to fo | otpaths and cycleways | | | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | Communit | | | D-1 | Sports facilities | 0-1 | Hospita | alities | | Local shops (convenience | •) 0-1 | Bus stop | 0-1 |
| What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and | S | chool name: | Prim n/a | lary | | | | | | Seconda n/a | ary | | | |
| what is the remaining capacity within the | | Capacity: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| catchment. (October 2015). Distance from 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 | | | | | | | | | | | ose to the site providing easy acc ompensate for the loss of open s | | e travel provisio | ons. |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | | | | | ovides options for active SEA impacts | tive trave | l and devel | lopme | ent would a | also improve access to | SEA SCOP | RE: + | |

| 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 | | Ν | Soil classification urban (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 | | SV | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site | | Ν | No previous known 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 | There | are no | known soils issues | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | There | are no SEA issues 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 | SEPA hold flood records in relation to this site. | С | X | A Flood Risk Assessment is required and any measures identified should be implemented | 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 | There is a Combined sewer within the site. | C | 0 | Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. As Scottish Water are funded for Growth they can instigate a Growth project when the Developer meets their 5 Growth criteria. | 0 | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply | РНН | Y | Please note there is a 4" water main within site | С | 0 | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | extent | of the | flood risk, demonstrate developable part (s) of the site an | nd identify any | / measu | d by the landowner/developer as part of the FRA which will a ures to be taken to ensure that flood risk issues are satisfactor mpact on the overall networks and, if necessary, mitigation | orily resolv | ved. |

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

SEA OVERVIEW Provided all the necessary mitigation measures are implemented there should be no SEA issues

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 | The site is located adjacent to properties in business and industrial use and there are residential properties to the north east. | SV | X | Any development would need to be assessed against policy OP1a to ensure there were no adverse impacts but impacts from existing uses may be difficult to mitigate agaianst | 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) | | Y | Development of the site is likely to be for business and industry purposes which could potentially add to emissions in the area. | SV | X | Any proposal would be assessed against policy OP1a in relation to the likely detrimental impacts of any development particularly in relation to the residential area to the north. A Noise assessment may be required and any measures identified should be implemented. | 0 | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | | | | | | | | | |

| MATERIAL ASSETS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----|-----------------------|---|--|-----|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Is the site | | | nfield nfield | × | | | | t currently forms part of a wider area of open space | | | | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | N | lsi | Is it contained 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 | This is a | greenfield | d site. | SV | X | | X | | | | | | |
| Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction | | | Possibly unlikely. | | it's location within the town makes it | GIS | 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 | | 0 | | | | | | |
| Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan | | n/a | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

| (paragraph 4.9) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--------|---|--|
| Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site | | , | Pylons N Bord Gais Eirann pipeline N Shell oil pipeline N Transco pipeline N omment: There are no servicing constraints in relation to this site. Image: Constraint of the site. Image: Conste site. | | | | | | | | | N | |
| Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies | | Air Traffic/NA | Air Traffic/NATS Y MoD N Carlisle Airport N Coal Authority Y HSE N | | | | | | | | | N | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | Development of this site would result in the loss of greenfield land. Although any development of the site is unlikely to impact on air traffic control operations there ar the possibility of mineral reserves in the area. | | | | | | | | | re are | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | The los | The loss of greenfield land would be a negative SEA impact 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 proposed site for Business and Industrial use, is located north of the junction of the C33n Greystone Avenue and U449n Greystone Branch public roads, and close to existing industrial and commercial premises. There is scope to form a new adoptable road around the periphery of this site to link Glenwhargen Avenue to Greystone Avenue and to stop-up the existing Greystone Branch which would then be solely an access serving commercial development. This would separate industrial/commercial traffic from residential traffic. Any development of this proposed site should be in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council's Technical Advice Note 5 'Roads and Accesses for Industrial developments' with parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards. | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Access to the site is achievable. There may be opportunities to form a new road to provide separation between commercial/industrial traffic and residential. | | | | | | | | |

| CLIMATIC FACTORS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|----|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.) | - | This is a generally flat area | | | | | 0 | | | | |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | Ì | Y | Possibly due to the generally open nature of the site | SV | 0 | The layout and design 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 The site is well protected by existing topography in the area | | | | Sustainable design and construction techniques can incorporate energy efficiency measures in line with policies OP1f and OP2. | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Any new buildings should be built in such a way as to integrate solar gain and sustainability measures into their design and construction. This is a large site that once developed could generate a large number of traffic movements which is unknown at the current time | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | The posit negative | he positive SEA impacts gained through solar gain and sustainable construction techniques could balance out the possible egative SEA issues created as a result of a large number of traffic movements SEA Score: +/x | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | CULTURAL HERITAGI | E | |
|---|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| Will the development of the site affect any | | Listed Building | Ν | Scheduled Monuments | Z | Comment: No known historic environment issues |
| of the following including their setting | L | Conservation Area | Ν | Inventory of Historic Battlefield | Ν | |
| | | World Heritage Site | Ν | Inventory & Non-Inventory | Ν | |

| Site assessment question | Information source Pre mitigation score Post mitigation score Consultation |
|--------------------------|--|
|--------------------------|--|

| | | Ar | Archaeological site N Garden or Designed Landscape | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|--|--|---------|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access | 1 | Ν | | SV C | 0 | | | 0 | | |
| to the historic environment | - | | | U | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Therea | ere are no historic environment issues | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | There a | ere are no SEA issues. SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | |

| LANDSCAPE | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|---|----------|-----------|--------------|----------|-------|--------------------|----------|----------|-------------------------------|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the | | | NSAs | N | RSA | | | Comment: There are | e no des | ignation | ons in relation to this site. |
| following | | | ild Land | Ν | TPO | 5 N | | | <u></u> | | |
| Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, | | N | | | | | | | SV | U | U |
| including watercourses, landforms, | | | | | | | | | | | |
| trees/woodland or significant | | | | | | | | | | | |
| slopes/changes in level | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Will development of the site be well | | Y | | | | | | space it lies | SV | 0 | 0 |
| integrated visually with the existing | | | | | | ndustria | al pr | remises and would | | | |
| settlement | | | be view | /ed in th | nis context. | | | | | | |
| Are there any locally attractive views that | | Ν | | | | | | | SV | 0 | 0 |
| will be impacted by development of the site | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | The site is located within the town and is adjacent to an area used for industrial and business purposes. Development in this location would not adversely impact on the vider landscape. | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | There a | are no | SEA issu | ies | | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 |

| PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP | Y | The site is allocated for business and industry purposes within the settlement boundary | | | | | | |
| Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site | Y | The site is currently in the ownership of the council | | | | | | |
| Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips | Ν | | | | | | | |
| Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe | Y | There are no physical constraints to prevent the development and the site would be expected to come forward for development during the plan period. | | | | | | |
| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT | impa mitig | The site is currently allocated for business and industry and well related to other business uses in the locality. There are concerns regarding possible adverse impacts of business uses adjacent to residential properties, such as noise and emissions, but the relevant assessments would need to be carried out and ar mitigation measures implemented. It is recommended to continue to include this site in LDP2. | | | | | | |
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | and | or negative SEA issues in respect of the loss of greenfield land and possible emissions from both existing and proposed uses within the industrial estate from increased traffic movements resulting in increasing carbon emissions. However, site within walking distance of existing services and facilities and efits could be gained through the use of solar gain and sustainable construction techniques. | | | | | | |

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

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

| Site Ref: KCN.B&I201 | Source of site suggestion: DGC | Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date): |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| Site name: land south of Kellobank | | n/a |
| Settlement: Kelloholm | Current use: Public open space | |
| OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): | | Existing LDP allocations/ designations: |
| 273422, 611811 | | Yes – Protected Open Space |
| Site Size (ha): 1.30 | Proposed use: | HMA: Dumfries Date completed: |
| | Business and Industry | 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 | X | X | +/x | 0 | 0 |

Scoring Guidance

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

Legends

| 20001100 | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 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 | FLOR | A | | | | | | |
|---|-------|----------|---------|-------------|-----------------------------|--------------|-----|------|----------|------------------|-----------|-----------|----------------------|-------|---|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests | | SA | ACs | Ν | LNR | N | | | | SPAs | N | | | SSSIs | Ν |
| affect or have connectivity to the site? (this | | N | INR | Ν | Local wildlife sites | N | | | 1 | Natterjack toads | N | | Great Crested | Newts | Ν |
| includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | | RAMS | SAR | Ν | Geodiversity Sites | N | | C | Other pr | otected species | N | N | Marine Consultation | Zones | Ν |
| | | | | Ancien | nt/semi-natural woodland | Ν | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Comme | ents: T | There are r | no designations in relation | to this site | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any known invasive species | | Ν | | | | | | GIS | 0 | | | | | 0 | |
| within the site | | | | | | | | С | | | | | | | |
| Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors | | | | | t fragmentation due to the | loss of a | | SV | X | | | | nce biodiversity | + | |
| be affected by the development of the site - | | | green | nfield site | | | | | | | | | se of locally native | | |
| will it result in habitat fragmentation or | | | | | | | | | | tree species in | landscape | e schemes | | | |
| greater connectivity | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | There | are no k | nown l | biodiversit | y issue affecting the site. | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | There | are no k | nown | SEA issue | es. | | | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| | | | | | 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 | Т | nis is a | arge gra | rrently forms part of an area of open space. rge grassed area with few features. SV X The current site includes no landscape f relatively nondescript. Improvements to space to compensate for the loss of this to ameliorate its loss. | | | | | | nts to the wider open | | | |
| 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 | Co | e (km) of Way e path e path | 0-1 N N N | Comme | Comment: The site is easily accessible and is located close to footpaths and cycleways | | | | | | | | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | Commu | - | • | 0-1 | Sports facilities | 0-1 | Hospita | alities | 0-1 | Local shops (convenience) | 0-1 | 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 nam Capacit | e: n/a | mary | | | | | | Seconda n/a | ry | | | |
| catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) Is the site within or immediately adjacent to | МА | Distanc | e: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| the core areas of the biosphere | and B | Ν | | | | | | GIS | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | New b | ousinesses | would a | lso prov | vide additi | onal employment opp | ortunities | in the area | a whic | h would c | close to the site providing easy a ompensate for the loss of open sp | ace. | | isions. |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | | | | | | | | • | | also improve access to d result in the loss of open | SEA SCOR | E: + | |

| Site assessment question | Post mitigation Post mitigation Post mitigation | Consultation required |
|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|
|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|

space provision if improvements to the remaining area could form part of the development this may compensate for its loss.

| | | | SOILS | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|----------------------------------|---|----|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land | | N | Soil classification urban (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 | | SV | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site | | N | No known previous use other than playing fields. | 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 | There | are no | known soils issues | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | There | re are no SEA issues 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 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) | | | | | | | | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer | РНН | Y | There is a Combined sewer within the site. | 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. As Scottish Water are funded for Growth they can instigate a Growth project when the Developer meets their 5 Growth criteria. | 0 | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply | PHH | Y | | С | 0 | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | There | is suffi | cient capacity for both waste water and water supply. | | | | | |

| Site assessment question Kes/No Yes/No | Comment of comment | Pre mitigation Witigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--|--------------------|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|--|--------------------|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|

SEA OVERVIEW There are no SEA issue

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 | The site is located adjacent to properties in business and industrial use and there are residential properties to the north east. | SV | X | | 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) | | Y | Development of the site is likely to be for business and industry purposes which could potentially add to emissions in the area. | SV | X | Any proposal would be assessed against policy OP1a in relation to the likely detrimental impacts of any development particularly in relation to the residential area to the north. A Noise assessment may be required and any measures identified should be implemented. | 0 | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | The site is adjacent to an area used for industrial and business purposes and development is likely to be for similar uses. Although Policy OP1a would be used to assess proposals and limit any emissions, including noise, that would adversely affect neighbouring residential properties. | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | There a | e are some minor SEA issues in relation to impacts from existing and any possibly new uses within this industrial area. SEA Score: X | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | MATERIAL ASSETS | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| Is the site | | - | nfield Comment: This is a greenfield site that nfield Y | at currently forms part of a wider area of open space | | | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | N | Is it contained 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 | This is a greenfield site. | SV | x | | X | | | |
| Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction | | ? | Possibly although it's location within the town makes it unlikely. | GIS | 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 | | 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 | | | | | | | | |

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

| Are there any of the following servicing | | Pylons N | | Bord Gais Eirann | pipelin | e N | She | l oil pipel | ine N | | | Transco pipeline | Ν |
|--|---------|---|---|------------------|---------|-----|------------------|-------------|-------|----------------|---|------------------|---|
| constraints that impact on the development of the site | | Comment: There are | ent: There are no servicing constraints in relation to this site. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies | | Air Traffic/NATS | S Y | MoD | N | | Carlisle Airport | N | | Coal Authority | Y | HSE | Ν |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | Development of this site would result in the loss of greenfield land. Although any development of the site is unlikely to impact on air traffic control operations there are the possibility of mineral reserves in the area. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | The los | loss of greenfield land would be a negative SEA impact 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 | The area of land for Business & Industrial use lies to the west of the U449n Greystone Branch and north of C33n Greystone Avenue, Kelloholm. Greystone Branch currently provides direct access to Industrial /Commercial premises and is also an adopted link to Greystone Avenue via Glenwhargen Avenue. If this area of land is to be developed commercially it would be appropriate that a new adoptable road be developed around its northern and western periphery to maintain the residential Glenwhargen link to Greystone Avenue and the Greystone Branch be stopped up so as to become a private access serving only the commercial development. This would separate industrial/commercial traffic from residential traffic whilst maintaining network functionality. Any development of this proposed site should be in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council's Technical Advice Note 5 'Roads and Accesses for Industrial developments' with parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards. It would be appropriate that the Road Authority be consulted about a new adoptable residential link which would be subject to Road Construction Consent. | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | | | | | | |

| CLIMATIC FACTORS | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--------------------------|----|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.) | | This | is a generally flat area | SV | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | | ? Possibly due t the generally open nature of the site | | SV | 0 | The layout and design 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 The site is well protected by existing topography in the area SV + Sustainable design and construction techniques can incorporate energy efficiency measures in line with policies OP1f and OP2. | | + | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW Any new buildings should be built in such a way as to integrate solar gain and sustainability measures into their design and construction. This is a large site that once developed could generate a large number of traffic movements which is unknown at the current time | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | The positive SEA impacts gained through solar gain and sustainable construction techniques could balance out the possible negative SEA issues created as a result of a large number of traffic movements SEA score: +/x | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | CULTURAL HERITAC | θE | |
|---|---|-------------------|---|-----------------------------------|----|---|
| Will the development of the site affect any | 1 | Listed Building | Ν | Scheduled Monuments | Ν | Comment: No historic environment issues |
| of the following including their setting | L | Conservation Area | Ν | Inventory of Historic Battlefield | Ν | |

| Site assessment question | Post mitigation Score Bost mitigation Consultation For Entigation For Entigation For Entigation For Entigation For Entigation For Entigation For Entigation |
|--------------------------|--|
|--------------------------|--|

| | | World Heritage Site N Inventory & Non-Inventory N Archaeological site N Garden or Designed Landscape N | 1 | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|--|---------|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment | L | N | SV C | 0 | | 0 | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Therea | There are no historic environment issues | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | There a | re are no SEA issues. SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | L | ANDSCAPE | | | | | |
|---|---------|-------|---|--|----------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|---------|--|----------|------------|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | | W | NSAs N Id Land N | RSAs TPOs | N N | Comment: There ar | e no desi | gnation | is in relation to this site. | | |
| Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level | | ? | allocation at K0 greenspace, or | CN.B&I 1I into ccupying the co objections to t | open an entral sp | | С | 0 | The site should be screened from the greenspace, pedestrian link on north-eastern side and housing with tree planting within the site boundary or fenced off to allow establishment. Noting comments from roads regarding the creation of a new road around the site, this would further denude the greenspace and could lead to pressure for development within areas 'outside' the new road. If this approach is taken, then additional tree planting to outside of the road should be incorporated to help soften and screen the development. Careful consideration should be given to the massing, height and scale of development to reduce landscape and visual impacts. | 0 | |
| Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement | | Y | Although seen adjacent to oth be viewed in th | er business/in | | n space it lies premises and would | SV | 0 | | 0 | |
| Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site | | Ν | | | | | SV | 0 | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | ated within the to pe provided that | | | | strial and | busine | ess purposes. Development in this location would not advers | ely impa | act on the |
| SEA OVERVIEW | There a | re no | SEA issues | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP | Y | This site is unallocated but within the settlement boundary | | | | | |
| Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site | Y | The site is currently in the ownership of the council | | | | | |
| Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom | Ν | | | | | | |

| strips | | | | | | | | |
|--|------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe | Υ | There are no physical constraints to prevent the development and the site would be expected to come forward for development during the plan period. | | | | | | |
| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT | | The site is well related to other business uses in the locality. There are concerns regarding possible adverse impacts of business uses adjacent to residential | | | | | | |
| | | erties, such as noise and emissions, but the relevant assessments would need to be carried out and any mitigation measures implemented. Development | | | | | | |
| | woul | d result in the loss of open space however this is not of the greatest quality. | | | | | | |
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | | r negative SEA issues in respect of the loss of greenfield land and possible emissions from both existing and proposed uses within the industrial estate | | | | | | |
| | | rom increased traffic movements resulting in increasing carbon emissions. However, site within walking distance of existing services and facilities and | | | | | | |
| | bene | fits could be gained through the use of solar gain and sustainable construction techniques. | | | | | | |