| Site Ref: THN.H2 | Source of site suggestion: LDP allocation | Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date): | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Site name: Hospital Brae | | 09/P/3/0355 – Planning perr 2013 | nission in principle granted in | | | | |
| Settlement: Thornhill | Current use: Agriculture | | | | | | |
| OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): | | Existing LDP allocations/ | designations: | | | | |
| 287561, 594910 | | Yes | _ | | | | |
| Site Size (ha): 6.08 | 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 | + | X | 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 |

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

| | | | | | BIODIVERSITY, | FAUNA | AND | FLOR. | A | | | | | | |
|---|-------|--|---|-------------|----------------------------|------------|---------|-------|---------|------------------|---|---|----------------------------|-------|---|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests | | S | SACs | N | LNR | N | | | | SPAs | N | | | SSSIs | N |
| affect or have connectivity to the site? (this | | | NNR | N | Local wildlife sites | N | | | | Natterjack toads | N | | Great Crested | Newts | N |
| includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | | RAM | ISAR | Ν | Geodiversity Sites | N | | (| Other p | rotected species | N | N | Marine Consultation | Zones | Ν |
| 1 | | | Ancient/semi-natural woodland Y | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Comments: Adjacent to ancient woodland 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 | | Y | There is ancient woodland to the north and west of the site. Potential habitat fragmentation due to the loss of a greenfield site X Any proposal should be assessed against policy NE7 and the ancient woodland should be retained. Where appropriate, measures to enhance biodiversity should be implemented, such as the use of locally native tree species in landscape schemes | | | | | | | | + | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Devel | opment | of the | site should | I not harm the surrounding | ancient wo | oodland | i. | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | ded that ssues. | ed that the ancient woodland is retained and that development does not negatively impact on it then there should be no sues. SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | POP | ULATION AND H | IUMAN | 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 | nce (km) | 0-1 | | | | SV | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them | MA or CF | Righ C | t of Way ore path cle path | Y | Comme | ent: There are footpath | hs adjace | nt to the sit | е | | | | | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | Comm | unity/villa | age hall | 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 nar | ne: W | imary allace Ha | II | | | | | Secondary Wallace Hall Academy 59 | | | | |
| catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | | Distar | , | | | | | | | 1-5 | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | N | | | | | | GIS | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | The site is well located in close proximity to local services and there are footpaths close to the site providing easy access to active travel provisions. Residential development will help to support services and facilities in the area. | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

SEA OVERVIEW

The site is well located to local services, provides options for active travel and development would also support local facilities and services resulting in positive SEA impacts

SEA Score: +

| | SOILS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|----|---|---|------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land | | Υ | Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute) | 0 | Х | The whole of the site is prime agricultural | land | X | | | | |
| 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 | PLANNING OVERVIEW Development of the site would result in the loss of prime agricultural land | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW The loss of prime agricultural land would be a negative SEA impact 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 | Y | Adjacent to fluvial flood outline and a culverted watercourse may flow through the site. | С | X | A Flood Risk Assessment, including topographic information, is required and any measures identified should be implemented. There should be no built development over the culvert. | 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 | Topography of the site may limit developable extent of site. | С | 0 | | 0 | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer | PHH | Y | There is a combined sewer north of site | С | 0 | Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing 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 | PHH | ? | | С | 0 | As Scottish Water are funded for Growth they can instigate a Growth project when the Developer meets | 0 | |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic | Yes/No | Comment | Information source | Pre mitigation score | Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| supply | | | | 1 | | their 5 Growth criteria. | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | extent There | of the | ossibility of flood risk on this site. Any flood risk will need to be flood risk, demonstrate developable part (s) of the site and id ted capacity for water supply and further investigation will be ut in place. | entify ar | ny meas | ures to be taken to ensure that flood risk issues are sat | sfactorily reso | the olved. | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Provid | ded all the necessary mitigation measures are implemented there should be 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 | PHH | N | The site is surrounded by housing, cottage hospital and 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 | The proposed use is residential. | SV | 0 | | 0 | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | There a | are no | known air quality issues in relation to the site | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | SEA OVERVIEW There are no known SEA issues SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | MATERIAL ASSETS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|------|-----------|--------------------------|--|-----|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| Is the site | | | vnfield | | Comment: This is a greenfield site in agricultural use | | | | | | | |
| | | Gree | enfield | Υ | Y | | | | | | | |
| 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 | This is a | nis is a greenfield site | | | X | | X | | | |
| Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction | | N | | | | GIS | 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 | | 0 | | | |
| Do sites for potential waste management | | n/a | | · | · | | | | | | | |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic | Yes/No | Comment | | | | Information source | Pre mitigation score | Mitigation if appropriate | | | | Post mitigation score | Consultation required | | |
|--|----------------------|--|-------------------------------|---------|--|----|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------|---|
| 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 constraints that impact on the development of the site | | Com | Pylons N ment: There are n | o servi | Bord Gais Eirann cing constraints in re | | |) | , | Shell oil pipeli | ine N | | | Transco | pipeline | N |
| Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies | | | Air Traffic/NATS | Υ | MoD | N | | | lisle Airp | | | al Authority | N | | HSE | N |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | relopment of this site would result in the loss of a greenfield land. Any development of the site is unlikely to impact on air traffic control operations. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | The lo | ss of g | reenfield land woul | d be a | negative SEA impa | ct | | | | | | | 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 (H2) for 112 no. units is landlocked and does not directly abut any public road. Access could only be achieved through the neighbouring site THN.H3. Given the number of contiguous sites being put forward for consideration in this area south of Thornhill, they should not be considered in isolation and it would be appropriate that a Transport Assessment be provided and Masterplan be developed to encompass all of the proposed sites (H2, H3, H4, H5 and MU1), that considers transport links, public transport and pedestrian/cycle provision as well as the long term goal of forming a new strategic link with the A76 Trunk Road and the future stopping up the B731 between the junctions with the C134n and the A76 at Highways corner. Any new link onto A76 Trunk Road will require permission from Transport Scotland and you may wish to consult with them at this stage. It would also be appropriate that an accompanying site development brief/area development framework be agreed including Design Codes. | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW The site would currently need to be accessed through the adjacent site at THN.H3 but due to the number of sites being considered in this part of the settlement they should not be considered in isolation and therefore a Transport Assessment covering all the sites is recommended and perhaps consultation with Transport Scotland, particularly if a new junction on the trunk road is proposed. Previous proposals have shown an access route from the north through the ancient woodland. | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | CLIMATIC FACTORS | | | | | |
|--|--|--|------------------|----|---|--|---|--|
| What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.) This is a gently undulating site. SV 0 | | | | | | | 0 | |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | | Possibly due to the nature of the site | | SV | 0 | The layout should ensure solar gain and look to create sustainable buildings to take account of solar orientation. | | |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | | Y The site is well protected from the prevailing winds by the existing tree belt. | | | + | Sustainable design and construction techniques can incorporate energy efficiency measures in line with policies Op1f and OP2 | + | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | 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 | | e positive SEA impacts gained through solar gain and sustainable construction techniques could balance out the possible gative SEA issues created as a result of a large number of traffic movements | | | | | | |

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

| | | | CULTURAL HERITAC | βE | | | | |
|--|--------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------|----------------|--|-----------------------|----------------|
| Will the development of the site affect any | | Listed Building N | Scheduled Monuments | Ν | | Borders scheduled monument of probab | | |
| of the following including their setting | | Conservation Area N | Inventory of Historic Battlefield | Ν | (possible Ro | oman Signal station). Known issues, eva | aluation and/or mitio | gation will be |
| | L | World Heritage Site N | Inventory & Non-Inventory | Ν | | sue of effect of setting of scheduled site | will need to be rais | ed with HES as |
| | | Archaeological site Y | Garden or Designed Landscape | | it would affe | ct views out from the site. | | |
| Will the development of the site result in the | | ? Possibly | | S١ | / X | Recording of any features found in inve | estigation | + |
| opportunity to enhance or improve access | L | | | | | | | • |
| to the historic environment | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Some | archaeological evaluation and | or mitigation will be required | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | tures are evaluated/mitigated and a | ny find | s recorded the | ere would be no further SEA | SEA SCORE: 0 | |
| | concer | ns | | | | | | |

| | | | | | L | ANDSCAPE | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|---|--|---|---------|--|-----------|--------|--|---|--|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | | W | NSAs N RSAs Y Comment: Located within the Thornhill Uplands Regional Scenic Area Wild Land N TPOs N | | | | | | | | |
| Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level | | Y | | | | e potential access o the north is a key | С | X | Any proposal should be assessed against policy NE7 and ancient woodland should be retained | 0 | |
| Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement | | ? | | | | I surrounded by odland to the north | SV | 0 | | 0 | |
| Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site | | Y | | here are currently pleasant rural views across the site which would be lost | | | | | Any development of the site will inevitably alter its current rural character however an effective landscaping scheme could ensure that it would not be too prominent in the wider landscape | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | This is the RS/ | is is a reasonably well integrated site being enclosed by ancient woodland and existing development. Development on the edge of the village is unlikely to impact on PSA. | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Provide no SEA | | | and effective | landsca | ping are integrated int | to any de | velopm | ent going forward then there should be SEA Score: 0 | | |

| PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement | Υ | The site is allocated for housing within the settlement boundary | | | | | | | |
| boundary within the LDP | | | | | | | | | |
| Have all landowners been identified and have they | Υ | | | | | | | | |
| agreed to disposal/development of the site | | | | | | | | | |

| 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 known restrictive covenants or strips | ransom | N | | | | | | | | |
| Can the site be delivered within the LDP time | frame | Υ | There are no known physical constraints in bringing this site forward depending on market demand | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT The site is a current allocated housing site in the LDP and is one of a number of allocated and long term sites included in the LDP to the south of Thornhill expected that despite the different timescales for development that development of these sites should be considered in combination through a masterplant exercise. Development of this site would result in the loss of a greenfield site and any layout should take into account both the ancient woodland and any impact on the ancient monument or its setting. The site is considered to be well related to existing development and close to local services and facilities. It recommended to continue to include this site in LDP2. | | | | | | | | lanning ny | | |
| OVERALL SEA COM | MENT | | Minor negative SEA issues in respect of the loss of prime agricultural land and a greenfield site and from 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.

| Site Ref: THN.H3 | Source of site suggestion: LDP allocation | Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos where applicable and approval date): | | | | | |
|--|--|---|-----------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Site name: Hospital Brae/Boat Brae | | Part of 09/P/3/0355 - Plann granted in 2013 | ing permission in principle | | | | |
| Settlement: Thornhill | Current use: Agriculture | | | | | | |
| OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): | | Existing LDP allocations/ | designations: | | | | |
| 287674, 594711 | | Yes | _ | | | | |
| Site Size (ha): 7.10 | 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 | + | X | 0 | 0 | X | +/x | 0 | X |

Scoring Guidance

| Impact | Significant positive impact | Positive impact | Neutral impact | Unknown impact | Both Positive and Negative impacts | Negative impact | Significant negative impact |
|--------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| Score Symbol | ++ | + | 0 | ? | +/x | 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 | I SE | Yes/No | Comment | Information source | Pre mitigation score | Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required | |
|--------------------------|------|--------|---------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
|--------------------------|------|--------|---------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|

| | | | | | BIODIVERSITY, | FAUNA | AND | FLOR | A | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|--------------------|--|------------------------------------|--|------------|---------|--------------------|---------|---|--|--|------------------------------------|-------|---|--|--|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests | | | SACs | N | LNR | N | | | | SPAs | N | | | SSSIs | N | | |
| affect or have connectivity to the site? (this | | | NNR | N | Local wildlife sites | N | | Natterjack toads N | | | | Great Crested | Newts | N | | | |
| includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | | RAM | ISAR | Ν | Geodiversity Sites | N | | (| Other p | rotected species | N | N | Marine Consultation | Zones | N | | |
| | | | | Ancier | Ancient/semi-natural woodland Y | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Comm | nents: A | Adjacent to ancient woodland site. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any known invasive species within the site | | N | | | | | | GIS C | 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 | Poter | | t woodland to the west of the tragmentation due to the | | | SV | X | Any proposal s and the ancien appropriate, mo be implemente species in land | t woodland easures to d, such as | d should be re enhance biod the use of loo | etained. Where diversity should | + | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Devel | opment | of the | site should | I not harm the surrounding | ancient wo | oodland | d. | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | ded that ssues. | that the ancient woodland is retained and that development does not negatively impact on it then there should be no ses. SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | POP | ULATION AND H | IUMAN | 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 Dista | ance (k | m) 0-1 | | | | SV | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| 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 pa | aý N ath N | Comme | ent: There are footpath | hs close t | o the site. | | | | | | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | Comr | munity/\ | village hall | 0-1 | Sports facilities | 1-5 | Hospita | lities | 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 na Capa | ame: | Primary Wallace Ha 45 | ıll | | | | | Seconda Wallace 59 | nry Hall Academy | | | |
| catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | | Dista | ince: | 1-5 | | | | | | 1-5 | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | N | | | | | | GIS | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | | | | to local services and t and facilities in the ar | | ootpaths cl | ose to | o the site p | providing easy access to active trave | el provisio | ons. Residentia | |

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

SEA OVERVIEW

The site is well located to local services, provides options for active travel and development would also support local facilities and services resulting in positive SEA impacts

SEA Score: +

| | | | SOILS | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----|---|---|----|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land | | Υ | Soil classification 3.2 (The James Hutton Institute) | 0 | X | The whole of the site is prime agricultural land | Х | | | | | |
| 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 | | • | of the site would result in the loss of prime agricultural land | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | 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 | Y | The site appears within close proximity of the medium likelihood fluvial SEPA flood maps. There a minor partly culverted watercourse may flow through or adjacent to the site. | С | X | A Flood Risk Assessment, including topographical information, is required and any measures identified should be implemented. There should be no built development over the culvert. | 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 | Topography of the site may limit developable extent of site. | С | 0 | | 0 | | | | | | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer | PHH | Y | There is a combined sewer north of the site. | С | 0 | | 0 | | | | | | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply | PHH | ? | | С | ? | As Scottish Water are funded for Growth they can instigate a Growth project when the Developer meets their 5 Growth criteria. | 0 | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | ascer | tain the | ssibility of flood risk on this site. Any flood risk will need to be extent of the flood risk, demonstrate developable part (s) of t ere is sufficient capacity waste water however there is only lim | he site a | nd ident | ify any measures to be taken to ensure that flood risk issue | s are sati | sfactorily | | | | | |

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

| 1 | | on the overall networks and, if necessary, mitigation measures put in place. | |
|---|--------------|--|--------------|
| | 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 | PHH | N | The site is surrounded by housing and 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 | The proposed use is residential. | SV | 0 | | 0 | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | There a | are no | known air quality issues in relation to the site | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | MATERIAL ASSETS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----|------------------|------------|---|------------|--------|--------|----------------------|--|-----------|---------|---|--|--|
| Is the site | | | nfield nfield | Υ | Comment: This is a greenfield site | e in agric | ultura | ıl use | | | | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | N | | | 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 | | Z | This is a | greenfield | d site | | SV | X | | | | X | | | |
| Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction | | Z | | | | | SIS | 0 | | | | 0 | | | |
| Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation | PHH | N | | | | C |) | 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 | | | Pylons | N | Bord Gais Eirann pipeline | N | | , | Shell oil pipeline N | | Transco p | ipeline | N | | |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic | Yes/No | | (| Comment | | Information | source | Pre mitigation score | | Mitigation if appropr | iate | | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--|----------------------|--|---|---------|------------------------|---------------|-------------|--------|-------------------------|--------|-----------------------|-------------|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| constraints that impact on the development of the site | | Co | mment: There are r | o servi | cing constraints in re | elation to th | ne sites | | | | | | | | |
| Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies | | | Air Traffic/NATS | Υ | MoD | N | | Ca | rlisle Airp | oort N | Coal Authority | N | | HSE | N |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Devel | opmer | nt of this site would result in the loss of a greenfield land. Any development of the site is unlikely to impact on air traffic control operations. | | | | | | | | | operations. | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | The lo | e loss of greenfield land would be a negative SEA impact SEA Score | | | | | | | | | 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 (H3) for 64 no. dwellinghouses shares frontage with the B731 and C134n public roads. Given the number of contiguous sites being put forward for consideration in this area south of Thornhill, they should not be considered in isolation and it would be appropriate that a Transport Assessment be provided and Masterplan be developed to encompass all of the proposed sites (H2, H3, H4, H5 and MU1), that considers transport links, public transport and pedestrian/cycle provision as well as the long term goal of forming a new strategic link with the A76 Trunk Road and the future stopping up the B731 between the junctions with the C134n and the A76 at Highways corner. Any new link onto A76 Trunk Road will require permission from Transport Scotland and you may wish to consult with them at this stage. It would also be appropriate that an accompanying site development brief/area development framework be agreed including Design Codes. | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW Due to the number of sites being considered in this part of the settlement they should not be considered in isolation and therefore a Transport Assessment covering all the sites is recommended and perhaps consultation with Transport Scotland, particularly if a new junction on the trunk road is proposed. | | | | | | | | | |

| CLIMATIC FACTORS | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|----|---|--|---|---------|--|--|
| What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.) | | This is a gently undulating site | | | | | 0 | | | |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | | ? | Possibly due to the nature of the site | SV | 0 | The layout should ensure solar gain and look to create sustainable buildings to take account of solar orientation. | + | | | |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | | Y The site is well protected from the prevailing winds by the existing tree belt. | | | + | 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 developed could generate a large number of traffic movements which is unknown at the current time | | | | | | | | at once | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | 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 HERITAGE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|---|------------------------------|---------------------|--|---------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Will the development of the site affect any | | Listed Building | Z | Scheduled Monuments | Υ | Comment: Extensive area of archaeological interest in northern portion of site, relating | | | | | | |
| of the following including their setting | L | L | L | Conservation Area | Z | Inventory of Historic Battlefield | N | to scheduled monument that is either a Roman signal station or a late prehistoric | | | | |
| | | | | L | World Heritage Site | Ν | Inventory & Non-Inventory | | settlement. Scheduled area should be avoided entirely and a large buffer of open | | | |
| | | Archaeological site | Υ | Garden or Designed Landscape | | ground left around it. Setting and views out from the monument should also be considered. In addition the public road to the east of the site is thought to be the route | | | | | | |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic | Yes/No | Comment | | | score | Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|---|----------------------|--------|--|--|-----------------|-------|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | of the vicinity | | n Roman road up Nithsdale; mitigation would be required for | works in | its |
| Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment | L | ? | | С | X | X | Recording of any features found in investigation | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | 3 | | | | sideration given to their setting which will reduce the develop | able are | a. |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Provid should | | t the area of the archaeological features is avoided and thei SEA | d in any layout and design then there SEA Score: 0 | | | | | |

| LANDSCAPE | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|---|---|--|--|--|----|--|---|---------|-------|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | _ | NSAs N RSAs Y Comment: Located within the Thornhill Uplands Regional Scenic Area Wild Land N TPOs N | | | | | | | hill Uplands Regional Scenic Area | | |
| Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level | | Υ | Ancient woodland to the western edge | | | | | X | Any proposal should be assessed against policy NE7 and ancient woodland should be retained | 0 | |
| Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement | | Z | The site does not currently appear well integrated within the settlement as the adjacent site has not yet been developed. | | | | | X | | X | |
| Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site | | Υ | There are currently pleasant rural views across the site which would be lost | | | | SV | X Any development of the site will inevitably alter its current rural character however an effective landscaping scheme could ensure that it would not be too prominent in the wider landscape | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | | | | | | | ewhat isolated position, separated from the currently built up e village is unlikely to impact on the RSA. | parts o | f the |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Issues s | ues surrounding its isolation if adjacent development does not go ahead. SEA Score: X | | | | | | | | | |

| PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement | Υ | The site is allocated for housing within the settlement boundary | | | | | | | | |
| boundary within the LDP | | | | | | | | | | |
| Have all landowners been identified and have they | Υ | | | | | | | | | |
| agreed to disposal/development of the site | | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom | N | | | | | | | | | |
| strips | | | | | | | | | | |
| Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe | Υ | There are no known physical constraints in bringing this site forward depending on market demand | | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT | The | site is a current allocated housing site in the LDP and is one of a number of allocated and long term sites included in the LDP to the south of Thornhill. It is | | | | | | | | |
| | | ected that despite the different timescales for development that development of these sites should be considered in combination through a masterplanning | | | | | | | | |
| | | cise. Development of this site would result in the loss of a greenfield site and any layout should take into account both the ancient woodland and any | | | | | | | | |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic | Yes/No | Comment | Information source | Pre mitigation score | Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| OVERALL SEA COM | MENT | exi Mir car | impact on the ancient monument or its setting. It is considered that only once the site to the north (THN.H2) is developed would the site relate well existing settlement, however it is close to local services and facilities. It is recommended to continue to include this site in LDP2. Minor negative SEA issues in respect of the loss of prime agricultural land and a greenfield site, from increased traffic movements resulting in incre carbon emissions and in terms of visual impact and isolation from other development. However, the site is within walking distance of existing service facilities and benefits could be gained through the use of solar gain and sustainable construction techniques. | | | | | | |

| Site Ref: THN.H4 | Source of site suggestion: LDP allocation (long term) | Site history/previous pla where applicable and ap | nning applications, (ref. Nos. proval date): |
|---|--|---|---|
| Site name: Queensberry Beeches | | n/a | |
| Settlement: Thornhill | Current use: Agriculture | | |
| OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): 288075, 594907 | | Existing LDP allocations Yes | designations: |
| Site Size (ha): 6.65 | Proposed use: Housing | HMA: Dumfries | 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 | + | X | 0 | 0 | X | +/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 | I SE | Yes/No | Comment | Information source | Pre mitigation score | Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required | |
|--------------------------|------|--------|---------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
|--------------------------|------|--------|---------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|

| | | | | | BIODIVERSITY, | FAUNA A | AND I | FLOR | 4 | | | | | | |
|---|-------|---|---------------------------------|---|----------------------------|------------|--------|-----------|----------|------------------|---|---|---------------------|-------|---|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests | | | SACs | N | LNR | N | | | | SPAs | Ν | | | SSSIs | N |
| affect or have connectivity to the site? (this | | | NNR | N | Local wildlife sites | N | | | 1 | Natterjack toads | N | | Great Crested | Newts | N |
| includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | | RAM | ISAR | N | Geodiversity Sites | N | | (| Other pr | otected species | N | N | larine Consultation | Zones | N |
| 1 | | | Ancient/semi-natural woodland Y | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Comments: Ancient and semi natural woodland lies adjacent to the northern boundary of the 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 | | Y | of the | There is ancient and semi-natural woodland to the north of the site. Potential habitat fragmentation due to the loss of a greenfield site X Any proposal should be assessed against policy NE7 and the ancient woodland should be retained. Where appropriate, measures to enhance biodiversity should be implemented, such as the use of locally native tree species in landscape schemes | | | | | | | | | + | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Devel | opment | of the | site should | I not harm the surrounding | ancient an | d semi | i-natural | woodla | nd. | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | ided that the ancient and semi-natural woodland is retained and that development does not negatively impact on it then there ld be no SEA issues. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | POP | ULATION AND H | IUMAN | 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 Dista | ance (k | m) 0-1 | | | | SV | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| 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 pa | ay Y ath Y | Comme | ent: There are footpath | ns adjace | nt to the sit | е | | | | | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | Comr | Community/village hall | | | Sports facilities | 1-5 | 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 na | ame: | Primary Wallace Ha | ıll | | | | | Seconda Wallace 59 | nry Hall Academy | | | |
| catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | | Dista | , | 1-5 | | | | | | 1-5 | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | N | | | | | | GIS | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | | | | to local services and t and facilities in the ar | | ootpaths cl | ose to | o the site p | providing easy access to active trave | el provisio | ons. Residentia | |

| | ທ 🐇 | Comment | Information source | Pre mitigation score | Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--|-------|---------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
|--|-------|---------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|

SEA OVERVIEW

The site is well located to local services, provides options for active travel and development would also support local facilities and services resulting in positive SEA impacts

SEA Score: +

| | | | SOILS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|----------|---|----|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land | | Υ | Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute) | 0 | X | The whole of the site is prime agricultural land | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | ANNING OVERVIEW Development of the site would result in the loss of prime agricultural land | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | The lo | ss of pr | rime agricultural land would be a negative SEA impact | | | SEA SCORE: | X | loss of prime agricultural land would be a negative SEA impact 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 | Y | The site appears in the pluvial SEPA flood maps. | С | X | A Drainage Impact Assessment required and any measures identified should be implemented. Appropriate surface water management measures should be adopted. | 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 | | С | 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 | PHH | ? | | С | ? | As Scottish Water are funded for Growth they can instigate a Growth project when the Developer meets their 5 Growth criteria. | 0 | |

| Site assessment question Xelated SEA Yes No Yes No | Information source Pre mitigation score | | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|---|---|--|-----------------------|--------------------------|
|---|---|--|-----------------------|--------------------------|

| PLANNING OVERVIEW | There is a possibility of flood risk on this site. Any flood risk will need to be fully investigated by the landowner/developer as part of t ascertain the extent of the flood risk, demonstrate developable part (s) of the site and identify any measures to be taken to ensure the resolved. There is limited capacity for both waste water and water supply and further investigation will be required to consider the innecessary, mitigation measures put in place. | nat flood risk issues are satisfactorily |
|-------------------|---|--|
| 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 | PHH | Y | The site is surrounded by housing and agricultural land and the A76 trunk road forms the eastern boundary. | SV | X | Any development would need to be assessed against policy op1a. A noise assessment and noise attenuation measures, such as structural planting, may be required to reduce noise impacts form the A76 | 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 | The proposed use is residential. | SV | 0 | | 0 | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Policy | OP1a | would be used to assess proposals and limit any impact from | emissio | าร | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | The typ | oe of u | ses envisaged for this site are not expected to raise adverse | SEA imp | acts | SEA SCORE: 0 | | | | | | |

| | MATERIAL ASSETS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|---|--|--|--|-----|--------|--|---|--|--|
| Is the site | | | rownfield Comment: This is a greenfield site in a reenfield Y | | | | | al use | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | N | Is | 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 | This is a greenfield site | | | | X | | X | | |
| Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction | | N | | | | | GIS | 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 | | 0 | | |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic | Yes/No | | C | Comment | | | Information source | Pre mitigation score | | Mitigatio | n if appropr | iate | | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--|----------------------|---------|--------------------------------|---------|--|----|----------|--------------------|-------------------------|------------------|---------------|------------------|------|----------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9) | | n/a | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site | | Cor | Pylons N nment: There are n | o servi | Bord Gais Eirann cing constraints in re | | | е | | Shell oil pipe | ine N | | | Transco | oipeline | N |
| Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies | | | Air Traffic/NATS | Υ | MoD | N | | Ca | rlisle Airp | ort N | Co | al Authority | N | | HSE | N |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | • | | | the loss of a green | | l. Any d | levelopr | nent of th | ne site is unlil | cely to impac | t on air traffic | | • | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | The lo | ss of g | reenfield land woul | d be a | negative SEA impa | ct | | | | | | | 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 (H4) for 103 no. dwellinghouses shares frontage with the C134n public road and the A76 trunk Road. Given the number of contiguous sites being put forward for consideration in this area south of Thornhill, they should not be considered in isolation and it would be appropriate that a Transport Assessment be provided and Masterplan be developed to encompass all of the proposed sites (H2, H3, H4, H5 and MU1), that considers transport links, public transport and pedestrian/cycle provision as well as the long term goal of forming a new strategic link with the A76 Trunk Road and the future stopping up the B731 between the junctions with the C134n and the A76 at Highways corner. Any new link onto A76 Trunk Road will require permission from Transport Scotland and you may wish to consult with them at this stage. It would also be appropriate that an accompanying site development brief/area development framework be agreed including Design Codes. |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Due to the number of sites being considered in this part of the settlement they should not be considered in isolation and therefore a Transport Assessment covering all the sites is recommended and perhaps consultation with Transport Scotland, particularly if a new junction on the trunk road is proposed. |

| | CLIMATIC FACTORS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--------------|-----------|--|------------|---------|--|--|--|--|--|
| What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.) | ٦ | This is a relatively flat site | SV | 0 | | 0 | | | | | | |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | 7 | Possibly due to the nature of the site | SV | 0 | The layout should ensure solar gain and look to create sustainable buildings to take account of solar orientation. | | | | | | | |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | Y The site is well protected from the prevailing winds by existing development. SV Sustainable design and construction techniques can incorporate energy efficiency measures in line with policies Op1f and OP2 | | | | + | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | developed | buildings should be built in such a way as to integrate solar of could generate a large number of traffic movements which | is unknown a | at the cu | irrent time | e site tha | at once | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | The positi negative \$ | positive SEA impacts gained through solar gain and sustainable construction techniques could balance out the possible ative SEA issues created as a result of a large number of traffic movements | | | | | | | | | | |

CULTURAL HERITAGE

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic | Yes/No | | Comment | Information source | Pre mitigation score | Mitigation if appropria | nte | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|---|----------------------|---|---|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting | L | W | Listed Building N Conservation Area N forld Heritage Site N Archaeological site Y | Scheduled Monuments Inventory of Historic Battlefield Inventory & Non-Inventory Garden or Designed Landscape | N I | Commen Roman re road. | nt: The public road on the west of the site is oad up Nithsdale. Mitigation would be requ | s thought to be the li uired for works in the | ne of the area of | the |
| Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment | L | ? | Possibly | - | SV | X | Recording of any features found in inv | estigation | + | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW SEA OVERVIEW | | me archaeological evaluation and/or mitigation will be required vided that any archaeological features are evaluated/mitigated and any finds recorded there would be no further SEA SEA SCORE: 0 Increms | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | LA | ANDSCAPE | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--------------|-----------|--------------------|----------------|--------|---|----------|-------|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | | Wild La | SAs N and N | | Y N | | ted within the | Thornh | nill Uplands Regional Scenic Area | | |
| 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 | | nere is existing ar e northern bound | | semi-natu | ural woodland to | С | X | The existing woodland should be safeguarded and extended using new planting as part of the landscaping scheme for any new development. Such a landscaping scheme should also include a substantial element of woodland belt planting to tie into the existing structure and character of the settlement | 0 | |
| Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement | Y | exi hov | ne site is reasona kisting developme owever it will form e A76. | ent and anci | ient woo | dland to the nortl | | 0 | The site should have links to the A76 and adjacent sites to avoid a cul-de-sac approach and to respond to Designing Streets in order that it fully integrates with the existing settlement | 0 | |
| Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site | Y | Y There are currently pleasant rural views across the site which would be lost, particularly from the A76 where development in this location could be visually prominent. | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | ould not adversely evelopment on the | | | | | | cheme would need to provide structural planting to assist in | screenin | g the |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | ovided that development is designed in such a way that it does not harm the exiting woodland ad structural planting is included to itigate against any adverse impacts there should be no SEA impacts. | | | | | | | | | |

| | | PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES |
|--|---|---|
| Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP | Υ | The site is allocated for housing in the long term within the settlement boundary |
| Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site | Υ | |
| Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips | N | |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic | Yes/No | Comment | Information source | Pre mitigation score | Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required | | |
|---|----------------------|-----------------|--|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| Can the site be delivered within the LDP time | frame | Τγ | There are no known physical constraints in bringing this si | te forwa | rd dener | oding on market demand | | | | |
| OVERALL PLANNING COM | MENT | The ma wo | The site is a current long term allocated housing site in the LDP and is one of a number of allocated and long term sites included in the LDP to the south of Thornhill. It is expected that despite the different timescales for development that development of these sites should be considered in combination through a masterplanning exercise. Development of this site would result in the loss of a greenfield site and any layout should take into account both the existing woodland to the northern boundary and also the need for structural planting to the eastern boundary. The site is located close to local services and facilities. It is recommended to continue to include this site for long term development in LDP2. | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL SEA COM | MENT | car | Minor negative SEA issues in respect of the loss of prime agricultural land and a greenfield site and from 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 a sustainable construction techniques. | | | | | | | |

| Site Ref: THN.H5 | Source of site suggestion: LDP allocation (long term) | Site history/previous plan where applicable and app | ning applications, (ref. Nos. roval date): |
|--|--|---|---|
| Site name: Queensberry Park | | n/a | · |
| Settlement: Thornhill | Current use: Agriculture | | |
| OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): | | Existing LDP allocations/ | designations: |
| 288046, 594616 | | Yes | |
| Site Size (ha): 5.84 | Proposed use: | HMA: Dumfries | Date completed: |
| | Housing | | Nov/Dec 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 | +/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 |

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

| | | | | | BIODIVERSITY, | FAUNA A | AND FL | .OR | Ą | | | | | | |
|---|-------|---|---|-------------|--|-------------|---------|-----|----------|--|--|--|------------------------------------|-------|---|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests | | | SACs | N | LNR | N | | | | SPAs | N | | | SSSIs | N |
| affect or have connectivity to the site? (this | | | NNR | N | Local wildlife sites | N | | | | Natterjack toads | N | | Great Crested | Newts | N |
| includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | | RAM | ISAR | N | Geodiversity Sites | N | | (| Other pi | otected species | N | N | Marine Consultation | Zones | N |
| | | | Ancient/semi-natural woodland Y | | | | | | | | | • | | | |
| | | Comn | Comments: Adjacent to ancient woodland site | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any known invasive species within the site | | N | | | | | G | SIS | 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 | Poter | | t woodland to the south of t fragmentation due to the | | S | iV | X | Any proposal si and the ancient appropriate, me be implemented species in land | t woodland easures to d, such as | should be re enhance biod the use of loo | etained. Where diversity should | + | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Devel | opment | of the s | site should | not harm the surrounding | ancient woo | odland. | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | ded that the ancient woodland is retained and that development does not negatively impact on it then there should be no issues. SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | POP | ULATION AND F | IUMAN | 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 Dista | ance (k | m) 0-1 | | | | SV | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| 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 pa | ay N ath N | Comme | ent: There are footpatl | hs close t | o the site. | | | | | | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | Comr | nunity/\ | village hall | 0-1 | Sports facilities | 1-5 | Hospita | lities | 1-5 | Local shops (convenience) | 1-5 | Bus stop | 0-1 |
| What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the | S | chool na | ame: | Primary Wallace Ha | ıll | | | | | Seconda Wallace 59 | nry Hall Academy | | | |
| catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | | Dista | , | 1-5 | | | | | | 1-5 | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | N | | | | | | GIS | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | | | | to local services and t and facilities in the ar | | ootpaths cl | ose to | o the site p | providing easy access to active trave | el provisio | ns. Residentia | |

| Yes/No Yes assessment question SEA | Pre mitigation score Score Post mitigation score Consultation |
|--|---|
|--|---|

SEA OVERVIEW

The site is well located to local services, provides options for active travel and development would also support local facilities and services resulting in positive SEA impacts

SEA SCORE: +

| | | | SOILS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|----------|---|----|---|---|-------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land | | Υ | Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute) | 0 | Х | The whole of the site is prime agricultural | land | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | PLANNING OVERVIEW Development of the site would result in the loss of prime agricultural land | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | The lo | ss of pr | rime agricultural land would be a negative SEA impact | | | S | EA SCORE: X | | of prime agricultural land would be a negative SEA impact 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 | Y | The site appears in the pluvial SEPA flood maps and lies in close proximity of the medium likelihood fluvial SEPA flood maps. | С | X | A Flood Risk Assessment, including topographical information, is required and any measures identified should be implemented. There should be no built development over the culvert. | 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 | | С | ? | 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 | PHH | ? | | С | 0 | As Scottish Water are funded for Growth they can instigate a Growth project when the Developer meets their 5 Growth criteria. | 0 | |

| Site assessment question Xelated SEA Yes No Yes No | Information source Pre mitigation score | | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|---|---|--|-----------------------|--------------------------|
|---|---|--|-----------------------|--------------------------|

| PLANNING OVERVIEW | There is a possibility of flood risk on this site. Any flood risk will need to be fully investigated by the landowner/developer as part of the ascertain the extent of the flood risk, demonstrate developable part (s) of the site and identify any measures to be taken to ensure the resolved. There is limited capacity for water supply and further investigation will be required to consider the impact on the overall nemitigation measures put in place. | nat flood risk issues are satisfactorily |
|-------------------|---|--|
| 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 | PHH | N | The site is surrounded by housing and 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 | The proposed use is residential. | SV | 0 | | 0 | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | PLANNING OVERVIEW There are no known air quality issues in relation to the site | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | There a | are no | e no known SEA issues SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | MATERIAL ASSETS | | | | |
|--|-----|-----|--------------------|--|-----------|--------|---|--|
| Is the site | | | vnfield Y | Comment: This is a greenfield site in a | gricultur | al use | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | N | | ned 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 greenfid | eld site. | SV | X | X | |
| Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction | | N | | | GIS | 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 | 0 | |
| Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria | | n/a | | | | | | |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic | Yes/No | Comment | | | | | Pre mitigation score | Mitigation if appropriate | | | | Post mitigation score | Consultation required | |
|---|----------------------|---------|-------------------------------|--|--|---|-------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-------|---|------|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|
| set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site | | Con | Pylons N nment: There were | no ser | Bord Gais Eirann p vicing constraints in re | | site. | | Shell oil pipel | ine N | | | Transco | pipeline | N |
| Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies | | | Air Traffic/NATS | Υ | | N | | ırlisle Air | | | , | N | | HSE | N |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Develo | pment | t of this site would | his site would result in the loss of a greenfield land. Any development of the site is unlikely to impact on air traffic control operations. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | The lo | ss of g | reenfield land wou | ld be a | negative SEA impact | | | | | | | 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 proposed site (H5) for 122 no. dwellinghouses shares a short frontage with the C134n public road. Given the number of contiguous sites being put forward for consideration in this area south of Thornhill, they should not be considered in isolation and it would be appropriate that a Transport Assessment be provided and Masterplan be developed to encompass all of the proposed sites (H2, H3, H4, H5 and MU1), that considers transport links, public transport and pedestrian/cycle provision as well as the long term goal of forming a new strategic link with the A76 Trunk Road and the future stopping up the B731 between the junctions with the C134n and the A76 at Highways corner. Any new link onto A76 Trunk Road will require permission from Transport Scotland and you may wish to consult with them at this stage. It would also be appropriate that an accompanying site development brief/area development framework be agreed including Design Codes. | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Due to the number of sites being considered in this part of the settlement they should not be considered in isolation and therefore a Transport Assessment covering all the sites is recommended and perhaps consultation with Transport Scotland, particularly if a new junction on the trunk road is proposed. | | | | | | | | | | |

| CLIMATIC FACTORS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|---|---|----|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.) | | This | is a relatively flat site | | 0 | | | | | | |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | | ? Possibly due to the nature of the site S | | | | The layout should ensure solar gain and look to create sustainable buildings to take account of solar orientation. | | | | | |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | | Υ | The site is well protected from the prevailing winds by the existing tree belt. | SV | + | Sustainable design and construction techniques can incorporate energy efficiency measures in line with policies Op1f and OP2 | + | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | develop | ny 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 eveloped could generate a large number of traffic movements which is unknown at the current time | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | CULTURAL HERITAGE | |
|---|---|-------------------|-----------------------|---|
| Will the development of the site affect any | Ĺ | Listed Building N | Scheduled Monuments N | Comment: The public road on the west of the site is thought to be the line of the |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic | Yes/No | Comment | Information source | Pre mitigation score | Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required | | | |
|---|----------------------|--------|---|--|----------------------|---|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| of the following including their setting | | 1 (| Conservation Area N Inventory of Historic Battlefield | N F | Roman ro | pad up Nithsdale. Mitigation would be required for works in the | area of | the | | | |
| or the following moderning their country | | V | , | | oad. | and up thinlocate. Minigation house so required for home in the | , aroa or | | | | |
| Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment | L | ? | Possibly | С | X | Recording of any features found in investigation | + | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Some | archa | eological evaluation and/or mitigation will be required | al evaluation and/or mitigation will be required | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Provid | | at any archaeological features are evaluated/mitigated and an | y finds r | recorded | there would be no further SEA SEA Score: 0 | | | | | |

| | | | | | L | ANDSCAPE | | | | | | |
|---|--------|--|--|--------------------------------|----------|-----------------------|----|---|--|----------|---|--|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | | NSAs N RSAs Y Comment: Located within the Thornhill Uplands Regional Scenic Area Wild Land N TPOs N | | | | | | | | | | |
| Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level | | Y | Ancient woodla | nd to the west | ern edge | e | С | X | Any proposal should be assessed against policy and ancient woodland should be retained | y NE7 | 0 | |
| Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement | | N | The site feels re appear well inte adjacent sites (yet been develo | egrated within, THN.H3, THN | the sett | | С | X | | | X | |
| Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site | | N | The site is high Queensberry P | | | t (noting existing | С | X | Any development of the site will inevitably alter i current rural character however an effective land scheme could ensure that it would not be too pro in the wider landscape | dscaping | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | uch time that other sites in the vicinity are developed this site appears in a somewhat isolated position, separated from the currently built up parts of the town. ea currently provides a pleasant rural aspect. Development on the edge of the village is unlikely to impact on the RSA. | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Issues | surrou | nding it's isolation | n if adjacent de | evelopm | ent does not go ahead | ł. | | SEAS | SCORE: X | | |

| | PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP | Υ | The site is allocated for long term housing within the settlement boundary | | | | | | | | | |
| Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site | Υ | | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips | N | | | | | | | | | | |
| Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe | ? | There are no known physical constraints in bringing this site forward depending on market demand | | | | | | | | | |

| 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 is a current allocated as a long term housing site in the LDP and is one of a number of allocated and long term sites included in the LDP to the south of Thornhill. It is expected that despite the different timescales for development that development of these sites should be considered in combination through a masterplanning exercise. Development of this site would result in the loss of a greenfield site and any layout should take into account the ancient woodland. It is considered that only once other sites in the vicinity are developed would the site relate well to the existing settlement, however it is close to local services and facilities. It is recommended to continue to include this site for long term development in LDP2. | | | | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT Minor negative SEA issues in respect of the loss of prime agricultural land and a greenfield site, from increased traffic movements resulting in increasing carbon emissions and in terms of visual impact and isolation from other development. 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. | | | | | | | | | | |

| Site Ref: THN.MU1 | Source of site suggestion: LDP allocation | Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date): |
|---|--|--|
| Site name: Gallows Knowe | | n/a |
| Settlement: Thornhill | Current use: Agriculture | |
| OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): 288263, 594608 | | Existing LDP allocations/ designations: Yes |
| Site Size (ha): 5.46 | Proposed use: Housing and business units | HMA: Dumfries 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 | +/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 | Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|

| | | | | | BIODIVERSITY, | FAUNA A | AND F | LOR | A | | | | | | |
|---|-------|--|----------|---------------------------------|--|------------|---------|-----|---------|---|--|---|------------------------------------|-------|---|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests | | 5 | SACs | N | LNR | N | | | | SPAs | Ν | | | SSSIs | N |
| affect or have connectivity to the site? (this | | | NNR | N | Local wildlife sites | Z | | | | Natterjack toads | Ν | | Great Crested | Newts | Ν |
| includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | | RAM | ISAR | N | Geodiversity Sites | Ν | | (| Other p | rotected species | Ν | N | Marine Consultation | Zones | Ν |
| | | | | Ancient/semi-natural woodland Y | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Comn | nents: A | djacent to | ancient woodland 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 | | Y | Poten | | t woodland to the south of t fragmentation due to the | | | SV | X | Any proposal sl and the ancient appropriate, me be implemented species in lands | t woodland easures to d, such as | should be r enhance bio the use of lo | etained. Where diversity should | + | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Devel | opment | of the s | ite should | not harm the surrounding | ancient wo | odland. | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | vided that the ancient woodland is retained and that development does not negatively impact on it then there should be no sissues. SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | POP | ULATION AND H | IUMAN | 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 (k | m) 0-1 | | | | SV | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| 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 pa | ath N | Comme | ent: There are footpath | ns close t | o the site. | | | | | | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | | , . | village hall | 1-5 | Sports facilities | 1-5 | Hospita | lities | 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 | | ame: acity: | 45 | | | | | | 59 | ry Hall Academy | | | |
| catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | | Dista | ince: | 1-5 | | | | | | 1-5 | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | N | | | | | | GIS | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | | | | | | | | | providing easy access to active trave o provide additional employment opp | | | |

SEA OVERVIEW The

The site is well located to local services, provides options for active travel and development would also support local facilities and services whilst also improving access to employment opportunities resulting in positive SEA impacts

| | | | SOILS | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--------|---|----|---|--|---------|---|--|--|--|
| Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land | | Υ | Soil classification 3.2 (The James Hutton Institute) | 0 | X | The whole of the site is prime agricultura | al land | X | | | |
| 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 | Devel | opment | t of the site would result in the loss of prime agricultural land | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | 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 | Y | The site appears in the pluvial SEPA flood maps and lies in close proximity of the medium likelihood fluvial SEPA flood maps. | С | X | A Flood Risk Assessment, including topographical information, 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 | PHH | Y | | С | 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 | PHH | ? | | С | ? | As Scottish Water are funded for Growth they can instigate a Growth project when the Developer meets | 0 | |

SEA SCORE: +

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic | Yes/No | Comment | Information source | Pre mitigation score | Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--------------------------|----------------------|---------|--|-----------------------|----------------------|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| supply | | | | | | their 5 Growth criteria. | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | ascert resolv | ain the | ossibility of flood risk on this site. Any flood risk will need to be extent of the flood risk, demonstrate developable part (s) of the ere is limited capacity water supply and further investigation water in place. | he site a | and iden | tify any measures to be taken to ensure that flood risk i | ssues are sati | isfactorily |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Provid | led all | the necessary mitigation measures are implemented there sh | ould 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 | PHH | Y | The site is surrounded by agricultural land and the A76 trunk road forms the eastern boundary. | SV | X | Any development would need to be assessed against policy op1a. A noise assessment and noise attenuation measures, such as structural planting, may be required to reduce noise impacts form the A76 | 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 | The proposed use is residential and business and commercial uses contained with Class 4 of the Use Classes (Scotland) Order | SV | 0 | Any development would need to be assessed against policy OP1a to ensure there were no adverse impacts | 0 | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Policy (| OP1a | would be used to assess proposals and limit any impact from | emission | าร | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | SEA OVERVIEW The type of uses envisaged for this site are not expected to raise adverse SEA impacts SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | | |

| MATERIAL ASSETS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------|-----------|-------------|---|----------|------------|--------|--|---|--|
| Is the site | | | vnfield | | Comment: This is a greenfield s | ite in a | gricultura | al use | | | |
| | | Gree | enfield | Υ | | | | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | N | ls | it containe | ed within the Vacant and Derelict 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 | |
| Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction | | N | | | | | GIS | 0 | | 0 | |
| Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, | PHH | N | | | | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic | Yes/No | Information source Pre mitigation score | | | | Mitigati | on if appropri | iate | | 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 Eir | ann pipeline | e N | | | Shell oil pipe | line N | | | Transco | pipeline | N |
| constraints that impact on the development of the site | | Con | nment: There are n | o servi | cing constraints | in relation t | o the sit | е | | | • | | | | | |
| Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies | | | Air Traffic/NATS | Y | Mo | DD N | | Ca | rlisle Airp | ort N | C | oal Authority | N | | HSE | N |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Develo | elopment of this site would result in the loss of a greenfield land. Any development of the site is unlikely to impact on air traffic control operations. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | The lo | ss of g | 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 47 no. units plus business use only shares frontage with the A76 Trunk Road. Given the number of contiguous sites being put forward for consideration in this area south of Thornhill, they should not be considered in isolation and it would be appropriate that a Transport Assessment be provided and Masterplan be developed to encompass all of the proposed sites (H2, H3, H4, H5 and MU1), that considers transport links, public transport and pedestrian/cycle provision as well as the long term goal of forming a new strategic link with the A76 Trunk Road and the future stopping up the B731 between the junctions with the C134n and the A76 at Highways corner. Any new link onto A76 Trunk Road will require permission from Transport Scotland and you may wish to consult with them at this stage. It would also be appropriate that an accompanying site development brief/area development framework be agreed including Design Codes. | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Due to the number of sites being considered in this part of the settlement they should not be considered in isolation and therefore a Transport Assessment covering the sites is recommended and perhaps consultation with Transport Scotland, particularly if a new junction on the trunk road is proposed. | ng all | | | | | | | |

| | | | CLIMATIC FACTORS | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|---|---------------------------|----|---|--|---|--|
| What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.) | - | This | is a relatively flat site | SV | 0 | | 0 | |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | | ? Possibly due to the nature of the site SV 0 The layout should ensure solar gain and look to create sustainable buildings to take account of solar orientation. | | | | | + | |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | | Y The site is well protected from the prevailing winds by the existing tree belt. SV Sustainable design and construction techniques can incorporate energy efficiency measures in line with policies Op1f and OP2 | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | develope | 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 leveloped could generate a large number of traffic movements which is unknown at the current time | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | The posit negative | The positive SEA impacts gained through solar gain and sustainable construction techniques could balance out the possible legative SEA issues created as a result of a large number of traffic movements | | | | | | |

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

| | | | CULTURAL HERITA | GE | | | | | |
|--|---------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|------------------|------------|--------|
| Will the development of the site affect any | | Listed Building N | Scheduled Monuments | N | | Gallows Knowe place-name allows for the | | nan remain | ıs. No |
| of the following including their setting | | Conservation Area N | Inventory of Historic Battlefield | N | overriding h | nistoric environment issues, but may req | uire mitigation. | | |
| | L | World Heritage Site N | Inventory & Non-Inventory | N | | | | | |
| | | Archaeological site Y | Garden or Designed Landscape | | | | | | |
| Will the development of the site result in the | | ? Possibly | | С |) X | Recording of any features found in inve | estigation | + | |
| opportunity to enhance or improve access | L | | | | | | | • | |
| to the historic environment | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | • | d/or mitigation will be required | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Provide | ed that any archaeological fe | atures are evaluated/mitigated and a | any fin | ds recorded the | nere would be no further SEA | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |
| | concer | ns | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | L | ANDSCAPE | | | | | |
|---|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|------------|-------|--|---|--|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | | W | NSAs Nild Land N | RSAs TPOs | | Comment: Located | within the | Thorn | hill Uplands Regional Scenic Area | | |
| 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 | Ancient woodla | and to the sout | hern edç | ge | С | X | Any proposal should be assessed against policy NE7 and ancient woodland should be retained | 0 | |
| Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement | | Z | | egrated within (THN.H3, THN oped. Develop | the sett I.H4 and ment sh | lement as the THN.H5) have not ould be pulled back | С | X | A planting buffer should be provided to the south east corner of the site and development should not extend so far south. | X | |
| Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site | | N | The site is high Queensberry F | | | t (noting existing | С | X | Any development of the site will inevitably alter its current rural character however an effective landscaping scheme could ensure that it would not be too prominent in the wider landscape | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | NG OVERVIEW Until such time that other sites in the vicinity are developed this site appears in a somewhat isolated position, separated from the currently built up parts of the town. This area currently provides a pleasant rural aspect. Development on the edge of the village is unlikely to impact on the RSA. | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Issues | es surrounding it's isolation if adjacent development does not go ahead. SEA SCORE: X | | | | | | | | | |

| | | PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES |
|---|---|--|
| Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP | Υ | The site is allocated for housing and business uses within the settlement boundary |
| Have all landowners been identified and have they | Υ | |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic | Yes/No | Comment | Information source | Pre mitigation score | Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required | |
|---|----------------------|--------------------|---|--|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | |
| agreed to disposal/development of the site | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any known restrictive covenants or | ransom | N | | | | | | | |
| strips | | | | | | | | | |
| Can the site be delivered within the LDP time | frame | Υ | There are no known physical constraints in bringing this si | te forwa | rd deper | nding on market demand | | | |
| OVERALL PLANNING COM | MENT | sou thro woo | site is a current mixed use site for housing and business use th of Thornhill. It is expected that despite the different timesca ugh a masterplanning exercise. Development of this site wou | e in the Lales for delates for delates for the Land Indiana to the | DP and developr in the loveloped | is one of a number of allocated and long term sites included ment that development of these sites should be considered in loss of a greenfield site and any layout should take into accou would the site relate well to the existing settlement, however | combinant the and | ntion cient | |
| OVERALL SEA COM | MENT | cart | Minor negative SEA issues in respect of the loss of prime agricultural land and a greenfield site, from increased traffic movements resulting in increasing arbon emissions and in terms of visual impact and isolation from other development. However, the site is within walking distance of existing services and acilities and benefits could be gained through the use of solar gain and sustainable construction techniques. | | | | | | |

| Site Ref: THN.H201 Site name: Queensberry Place | Source of site suggestion: Call For Sites | Site history/previous planning a where applicable and approval 06/P/3/0763 - | • • |
|--|--|--|-----------------|
| Settlement: Thornhill | Current use: Vacant | | |
| OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): | | Existing LDP allocations/ desig | nations: |
| 287896, 594924 | | No | |
| Site Size (ha): | Proposed use: | HMA: Dumfries | Date completed: |
| 0.12 | 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 | + | x | 0 | 0 | x | + | 0 | 0 |

Scoring Guidance

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

| Related SEA Yes/No | ource ource | Score mitigation of mitigation if appropriate Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--------------------|-------------|---|-----------------------|--------------------------|
|--------------------|-------------|---|-----------------------|--------------------------|

| | | | | BIODIVERSITY, | FAUNA A | AND FLOR | A | | | | | |
|---|-------|--|--|-----------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|------------------|---|--------------------------|-----|--|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests | | SA | Cs N | LNR | N | | | SPAs | N | SSS | s N | |
| affect or have connectivity to the site? (this | | N | NR N | Local wildlife sites | N | | ı | Natterjack toads | N | Great Crested New | s N | |
| includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | | RAMS | AR N | Geodiversity Sites | N | (| Other pr | otected species | N | Marine Consultation Zone | s N | |
| | | | Ancie | ent/semi-natural woodland | N | | | | | | | |
| | | Comme | ents: There are | no designations affecting t | his site. | | | | | | | |
| Are there any known invasive species within the site | | N | | | | GIS C | 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 Development will not result in the loss of habitat connectivity or wildlife corridor | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | There | There are no biodiversity issues in relation to this site. | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | There | There are no SEA issues 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 | tance (k | km) 0-1 | | | | SV | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them | MA or CF | | ght of W Core p Cycle p | , | Comment: The site is easily accessible and is locate | | | | d is located close to footpaths | | | | | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | Com | munity/ | village hall | 0-1 Sports facilities 1-5 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 catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | S | | name: pacity: ance: | ty: 45 | | | | | | Seconda Wallace I 59 1-5 | ry Hall Academy | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | N | | | | | | GIS | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | develo | site is well located in close proximity to local services and there are footpaths close to the site providing easy access to active travel provisions. Residential opment will help to support services and facilities in the area. | | | | | | | | | | l | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | | is well located to local services, provides options for active travel and development would also support local facilities and resulting in positive SEA impacts SEA Score: + | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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 | | Υ | Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute) 3.2 | 0 | Х | | X | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | | |
| 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 Development of the site would result in the loss of prime agricultural land. | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | The loss of prime agricultural land would be a negative SEA impact. 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 | Y | The site appears in the indicative SEPA surface water flood maps | С | Х | A Drainage Impact Assessment may be 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 north of the site | С | 0 | | 0 | | | | | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply | PHH | ? | | С | ? | Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW | 0 | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | ascert resolv | re is a possibility of flood risk on this site. Any flood risk will need to be fully investigated by the landowner/developer as part of the review to the DIA which will ertain the extent of the flood risk, demonstrate developable part (s) of the site and identify any measures to be taken to ensure that flood risk issues are satisfactorily elved. There is sufficient capacity in relation to waste water but limited capacity for water supply and further investigation will be required to consider the impact on overall networks and, if necessary, mitigation measures put in place. | | | | | | | | | | |

| Site assessment question Yes/No Yes/No | Information source Pre mitigation it score score Bright 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 | PHH | N | The site is surrounded by residential properties | 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 | The proposed use is for residential development which would be compatible with surrounding uses | SV | 0 | | 0 | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | PLANNING OVERVIEW There are no known air quality issues in relation to the site | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | There a | e are no known SEA issues SEA Score:0 | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | MATERIAL ASS | SETS | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----|-------------------|--|--|----------|-------------------------------|---|---|---------|----------|---|--|
| Is the site | | | nfield enfield | Υ | Comment: The site forms an un | ndevelop | oped area of a housing estate | | | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | Υ | ls i | Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict N Land Survey | | | | + | The site is vacant within an residential estate | • | + | | |
| 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 | | | ld site and there are no existing se on the site. | | SV | X | | | X | | |
| Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction | | N | | | | | GIS | 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 | | | 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 | | Com | Pylons ment: The | | Bord Gais Eirann pipeline electricity sub-station to the south w | _ | ner of th | | Shell oil pipeline N | Transco | pipeline | N | |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic | Yes/No | Comment | | | Information source | Pre mitigation score | 1 4 9 1 | | | Consultation required | |
|--|--|---|------------------|---|-------|--------------------|----------------------|---------|----------------|---|-----------------------|---|
| of the site | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies | | | Air Traffic/NATS | N | MoD N | Ca | rlisle Air | port N | Coal Authority | N | HSE | N |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Although the development of this site would result in the loss of greenfield land it forms a small vacant infill area within the built up part of the town. Any development of the site is unlikely to impact on air traffic control operations. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Althou use of | nough the loss of greenfield land would be a negative SEA impact bringing forward this vacant infill site would make efficient e of land within the town. | | | | | | | | | | |

| | 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 proposed site fronts Queensberry Place and planning permission in principle has previously been granted for 2 dwellings (15/P/3/0015) on this site. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and any 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.) | • | This is a flat site | | | | 0 | |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | | ? This is a small site surrounded by other properties | | 0 | The layout should ensure solar gain and look to create sustainable buildings to take account of solar orientation. | | |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | | The site is protected from the prevailing winds by other development | | + | 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. | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | There are | ere are positive SEA impacts gained through solar gain and sustainable construction techniques . SEA Score: + | | | | | |

| | CULTURAL HERITAGE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|---------------------------|-------|-----------------------------------|---|----|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Will the development of the site affect any | | Listed Building | Ν | Scheduled Monuments | N | Co | omment: No known historic environment issues | | | | | | | | |
| of the following including their setting | | Conservation Area | Ν | Inventory of Historic Battlefield | N | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | World Heritage Site | Ν | Inventory & Non-Inventory | Ν | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Archaeological site | Ν | Garden or Designed Landscape | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Will the development of the site result in the | | | | | S | SV | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | |
| opportunity to enhance or improve access | L | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| to the historic environment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | There a | are no historic environme | nt is | sues | | | | | PLANNING OVERVIEW There are no historic environment issues | | | | | | |

| Yeared SEA Yeared SEA Xelated | Pre mitigation score score Witigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score Consultation required |
|---|--|---|
|---|--|---|

| | SEA OVERVIEW | There are no SEA issues. | SEA SCORE: 0 |
|--|--------------|--------------------------|--------------|
|--|--------------|--------------------------|--------------|

| | LANDSCAPE | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|--|-----------------|---|--|--------------------------------------|---------------|---|---|---------------------------|---|--|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | | NSAs N RSAs N Comment: Located within the Thornhill Uplands Regional Scenic Area Wild Land N TPOs N | | | | | | | | | | |
| Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement | | Y | Although the si | te is well relate e centre of the using, well-coi | ed to existence of the estate, or the estate, or the estate, or the estate of the esta | by roads/paths and | SV SV C | 0 | The Council's Landscape Architect recorpossible, it is safeguarded as public open however overall development of the site be well integrated with the existing development. | n space, is considered to | + | |
| | | | | nent sites have rrently small e | e been id state; cre | dentified on three eating further | | | | | | |
| Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site | | Ζ | | | | | SV | 0 | | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | | p part of the vi | llage is ι | unlikely to impact on the | he RSA. | | | | | |
| 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 | Υ | The site is currently unallocated within the settlement boundary | | | | | | | |
| Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site | Υ | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips | N | | | | | | | | |
| Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe | Υ | | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT | Development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land and a greenfield site. This infill, vacant site is considered suitable for development and related to existing development, close to local services and facilities but is very small in scale. As a result, it is considered that development proposals site would be better considered under Policy H1 rather than through a specific site allocation. | | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | | or negative SEA issues in respect of the loss of prime agricultural land and a greenfield site. However, the site is within walking distance of existing ices and facilities and benefits could be gained through development of a vacant site, the use of solar gain and sustainable construction techniques. | | | | | | | |

| Site Ref: THN.H202 Site name: Wallace Hall Primary School | Source of site suggestion: DGC | Site history/previous planning a where applicable and approval o None | |
|--|---|---|-----------------|
| Settlement: Thornhill | Current use: Vacant former school buildings | | |
| OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): | | Existing LDP allocations/ design | nations: |
| 288069, 595671 | | No | |
| Site Size (ha): | Proposed use: | HMA: Dumfries | Date completed: |
| 0.31 | 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 | + | + | + | + |

| 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 Aelated SEA Yes/No Comment | Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score Consultation required | |
|--|---------------------------|---|--|
|--|---------------------------|---|--|

| | | | | | BIODIVERSITY, | FAUNA A | ND FLOR | Α | | | | | |
|---|-------|-------------------------------------|--|----------|--------------------------|---------|----------|---|------------------|---|---|---------------------|---|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests | | S | ACs | N | LNR | N | | | SPAs | N | | SSSIs | N |
| affect or have connectivity to the site? (this | | ١ | NR | N | Local wildlife sites | N | | | Natterjack toads | N | | Great Crested Newts | N |
| includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | | RAMS | AMSAR N Geodiversity Sites N Other protected species N Marine Consultation Zones | | | | | | | | | N | |
| | | | Ancient/semi-natural woodland N | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Comm | ments: There are no designations affecting this site | | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any known invasive species within the site | | N | | | | | GIS C | 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 | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | There | are no b | piodiversity is | ssues ir | n relation to this site. | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | There | here are no SEA issues SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | POP | ULATION AND H | UMAN | HEALTH | - | | | | | |
|---------|---|---|---|---|--|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|---------------------------|-----|
| | | | | | | | _ | | | | | |
| | N | | | | | SV | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MA | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F | Distance | km) 0-1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| ΜΔ | | | Comme | ent: The site is easily a | accessible | and is loc | ated c | lose to fo | ootnaths | | | |
| | | , | Commi | one. The one is easily t | 200000000 | 3 and 13 100 | aica o | 1000 10 10 | otpatilo | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CF | • | | 0.4 | On anta (a a 1110 a a | 0.4 | 11 | . 100 | 0.4 | | \ | D | 0.4 |
| 0.5 | Community | //viiiage naii | 0-1 | Sports facilities | 0-1 | Hospita | alities | 0-1 | Local snops (convenience |) 0-1 | Bus stop | 0-1 |
| CF | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | <u> </u> | | | | |
| | | - , | | | | | | | , | | | |
| So | chool name: | Wallace Ha | all | | | | | Wallace | Hall Academy | | | |
| | Capacity: | 45 | | | | | | 59 | | | | |
| | Distance: | 0-1 | | | | | | 0-1 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MA | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| and | N | | | | | GIS | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| В | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The sit | te is well loca | ted in close p | roximity | to local services and the | here are | ootpaths cl | lose to | the site | providing easy access to active tra | avel provision | ons. Residentia | |
| develo | pment will he | lp to support | services | and facilities in the are | ea. | | | | | | | |
| The sit | te is well loca | ted to local s | ervices, p | provides options for ac | tive trave | I and devel | opmei | nt would a | also support local facilities and | SEA SCOR | F: + | |
| service | es resulting in | positive SEA | impacts | | | | | | | OLA OCOR | | |
| | MA and B The side develor The side the | MA Distance (MA Right of N or Core p CF Cycle p Community CF School name: Capacity: Distance: MA and N B The site is well located evelopment will he The site is well located. | Distance (km) 0-1 MA Right of Way N or Core path N CF Cycle path N Community/village hall CF Primary School name: Wallace Ha Capacity: 45 Distance: 0-1 MA and N B The site is well located in close path of the site is well located to local so | Distance (km) 0-1 MA Right of Way N Or Core path N CF Cycle path N Community/village hall 0-1 CF Primary School name: Wallace Hall Capacity: 45 Distance: 0-1 MA and N B The site is well located in close proximity development will help to support services The site is well located to local services, p | MA Distance (km) 0-1 MA Right of Way N Comment: The site is easily a comment of the site is easily a community o | MA Distance (km) 0-1 MA Right of Way N Comment: The site is easily accessible Core path N Cycle path N Community/village hall 0-1 Sports facilities 0-1 Primary School name: Wallace Hall Capacity: 45 Distance: 0-1 MA and N B The site is well located in close proximity to local services and there are fedevelopment will help to support services and facilities in the area. The site is well located to local services, provides options for active trave | MA Distance (km) 0-1 | Distance (km) 0-1 MA | MA Distance (km) 0-1 MA Right of Way N Comment: The site is easily accessible and is located close to form or Core path N Cycle path N Community/village hall 0-1 Sports facilities 0-1 Hospitalities 0-1 CF Primary Secondary School name: Wallace Hall Wallace Capacity: 45 59 Distance: 0-1 O-1 MA and B N GIS 0 The site is well located in close proximity to local services and there are footpaths close to the site development will help to support services, provides options for active travel and development would | MA Distance (km) 0-1 MA Right of Way N Core path N Cycle path N Community/village hall 0-1 Sports facilities 0-1 Hospitalities 0-1 Local shops (convenience Wallace Hall Academy School name: Wallace Hall Wallace Hall Wallace Hall Sports facilities 0-1 MA and B N GIS GIS GIS O The site is well located in close proximity to local services and facilities in the area. The site is well located to local services, provides options for active travel and development would also support local facilities and | MA Distance (km) 0-1 | N |

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

| | | | SOILS | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|--|--|-----|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land | | N | Soil classification 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 | | Y | Investigations on this site have indicated that some remediation is required before development. | С | X | Any remediation identified should be implemented prior to development | 0 | | | | |
| Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat | CF | N | | O 0 | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | • | | action identified in relation to contamination should be carrie | | | · | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Provid | ded the necessary mitigation measures in relation are carried out there should be 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 | 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 | | С | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer | PHH | Υ | | С | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply | PHH | ? | C Responsible C | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | There overal | is suffic I netwo | eient capacity for waste water however there is limited capacities and, if necessary, mitigation measures put in place. | ty for wat | er suppl | ly and further investigation will be required to consider the in | mpact on | the | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Provid | led all th | ne necessary mitigation measures are implemented there sho | ould be S | EA issu | es 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 | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
|--------------------------|----------------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|

| 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 | The site is surrounded by residential development and lies close to the school. | 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 | The proposed use is residential. | SV | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | There a | are no | known air quality issues in relation to the site | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | There a | re are no known SEA issues SEA Score: 0 | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | MAT | ERIAL ASS | ETS | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------|----------------------------|----------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|---------|--------|----------------------|-----------|----------|---|
| Is the site | | | vnfield Y | | Comment: The si | te contains the | former | primary | school | ol buildings | | | |
| | | Gree | enfield | | | | | | | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | Y | Is it co | ontained | I within the Vacant | and Derelict Land Survey | N | 0 | + | | | + | , |
| Will development of the site minimise | | Υ | This is a bro | ownfield | site and includes | listed former so | chool | SV | + | | | + | |
| demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover on-site materials/resources | | | buildings wh | nich are | suitable for conve | rsion | | | | | | | |
| Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction | | N | | | | | | GIS | 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 | | | 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 1 nment: There a | | Bord Gais E ervicing constraint | irann pipeline s in relation to | |). | | Shell oil pipeline N | Transco į | oipeline | N |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic | Yes/No | | Comment | Information source | Pre mitigation score | | Post mitigation if appropriate Post | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|--------|------------------|---------|--|----------------------|------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|----------------|-----|---|
| Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies | | | Air Traffic/NATS | Υ | MoD N | Ca | ırlisle Ai | rport N | Coal Authority | N | | HSE | N |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW SEA OVERVIEW | Develo | - | | | orward a vacant, brownfield lan opment of vacant brownfield lan | | elopmer | nt of the site is | unlikely to impact on air tra | | trol operation | S. | |

| | 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 lies between Manse Road and Station Road public roads. The site is served by an existing access from an existing private way. The private way is currently utilised for bus parking and turning and any future submission should clarify access arrangements to the former school house via this route. Any residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards. |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | The access arrangements for any reuse of the site will need to be clarified as the site is currently served by a private way used for the parking of buses. |

| | CLIMATIC FACTORS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.) | | The is a slightly elevated site. | SV | 0 | | 0 | | | | | | | |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | | Possibly, the former school building does have south easterly facing windows whilst the former school house faces south westerly | SV | 0 | There is little opportunity to improve the existing situation as there is limited additional development space within the site. | | | | | | | | |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | | Y The site is protected by existing development | SV | + | | + | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | PLANNING OVERVIEW Any development on the site will involve the reuse of the existing buildings with little scope for further development. In the conversion of the building sustainable techniques should be used where possible | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | There a | re are positive SEA impacts that can be gained through including sustainable construction techniques where possible SEA SCORE: + | | | | | | | | | | | |

| CULTURAL HERITAGE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|-----|---|---|--------|--|--|--|
| Will the development of the site affect any | | | Listed Building | Υ | Scheduled Monuments | Ν | | | t: The site is close to the boundary of Thornhill Conservation Area | | | | |
| of the following including their setting | | Conservation Area | | Υ | Inventory of Historic Battlefield | N | | contains a Category B Listed group of 2 former school buildings and school house. | | | | | |
| | L | Wo | orld Heritage Site | Ν | Inventory & Non-Inventory | Ν | | | on and re-use of all of the buildings is urgently required as falling | | | | |
| | | | chaeological site | | Garden or Designed Landscape | | dis | repair. | There is also a Category C Listed Police House and Category B L | Listed | | | |
| | | | | | , | | Th | omson | monument close to the site. | | | | |
| Will the development of the site result in the | | N | | | | 5 | SV | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| opportunity to enhance or improve access | L | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| to the historic environment | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Reuse | Reuse of these prominent listed buildings would ensure their long term future. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Provided that the listed buildings are converted then this should result in positive SEA impacts in helping to preserve built heritage SEA SCORE: + | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | asseis | assets for the future. | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

| LANDSCAPE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|---|---|------------|----------|--|------------|---|---|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | | W | NSAs N ild Land N | RSAs TPOs | | Comment: The site | is located | d within | the Thornhill Uplands Regional Scenic Area | | | |
| Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level | | Υ | but are getting replaced as a c to West and So but mixed conif | close to over- condition of de outh-west of th ers should be uld be restore | maturity velopme e house cleared d by red | ent. Two large trees should be retained . The link to the ucing the size of the | С | X | Any proposal should be assessed against policy and mature trees should be retained where post a planting scheme provided where trees are to be a planting scheme provided where the planting scheme provided where t | ssible and | 0 | |
| Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement | | Y | The site is well | located within | the buil | t up part of the town. | sv | + | | | + | l |
| Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site | | Y | | ocation/direct | | he School house e from Market Cross | С | + | Sightlines and views should be retained | | + | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | PLANNING OVERVIEW The site is well integrated within the built up part of the town. There are a number of mature trees around the site which should be retained where possible. The buildings do form an important landmark feature within the townscape. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Reuse of the buildings will ensure that this important landmark is retained in the streetscene resulting in positive SEA impacts. SEA Score: + | | | | | | | | | | | |

| PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP | Υ | The site is unallocated within the settlement boundary | | | | | |
| Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site | Υ | The site is currently owned by the Council and is part of a programme for disposal. | | | | | |
| Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips | ? | ? Suitable access arrangements will be required | | | | | |
| Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe | ? | Provided that the access arrangements could be overcome then there are no other physical constraints in bringing this site forward depending on market demand | | | | | |
| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT | This is a vacant site within the built-up part of the town and is considered to be well related to existing development and close to local services and The site contains vacant listed buildings which are beginning to fall into disrepair and a sensitive conversion scheme would provide for their long to on a site that forms a landmark within the town. However, this would be a small scale development and as a result, it is considered that development proposals for the site would be better considered under Policy H1 rather than through a specific site allocation. | | | | | | |
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | Minor positive SEA effects in relation to development of this vacant, brownfield site, within walking distance of existing services and facilities an could be gained through the use of sustainable construction techniques. Reuse and conversion would provide a long term future for these liste which form a local landscape feature within the town. | | | | | | |