

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

Site Ref: CRE.H1	Source of site suggestion: LDP	Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):	
Site name: land at Barholm Mains			
Settlement: Creetown	Current use: Greenfield		
OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): 247228, 559187		Existing LDP allocations/ designations: CRE.H1	
Site Size (ha): 7.99	Proposed use: Housing	HMA: Mid Galloway	Date completed: Oct/Nov 2016

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

Scoring Guidance

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

Legends

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

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

BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)	SACs	N	LNR	N	SPAs	N	SSSIs	N
	NNR	N	Local wildlife sites	N	Natterjack toads	N	Great Crested Newts	N
	RAMSAR	N	Geodiversity Sites	N	Other protected species	N	Marine Consultation Zones	N
	Ancient/semi-natural woodland		Y					
Comments:								
Are there any known invasive species within the site	N			GIS & SV	0		0	
Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity	N	Greenfield with Semi natural woodland adjacent so habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors may be affected.		SV	X	Careful consideration of design and planting could help create new habitats connecting to existing woodland on the edge of the site, enhancing the environment		
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Development of site should be assessed against policy NE6 to mitigate any impact on woodlands.							
SEA OVERVIEW	There are no SEA issues subject to mitigation.						SEA SCORE: 0	

POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space	MA	N		SV	0		0				
		Distance (km)	0-1								
Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them	MA or CF	Right of Way	N	Comment:							
		Core path	N								
		Cycle path	N								
What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)	CF	Community/village hall	0-1	Sports facilities	0-1	Hospitalities	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)	Primary		Secondary								
	School name:	Creetown	Douglas Ewart								
	Remaining capacity:	53	285								
	Distance:	1-5	10-20								
Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere	MA and B	N		GIS	0		0				
PLANNING OVERVIEW	This is a greenfield site on edge of settlement and located relatively close to local services but footpaths will require to be developed edge of site to provide easy access.										
SEA OVERVIEW	The site is well located to local services and development would support local facilities and services 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		Y	Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)	3.2	O	X		X
Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)		N			SV	0		0
Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site		N	No known previous use.		C	0		0
Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat	CF	N			O	0		0
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	Y	There were visible areas of wet areas on the land during site visit		SV	X	Flood risk Assessment required	0
Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere	CF and PHH		Site lies within the SEPA pluvial flood maps.		C	X	Drainage Impact Assessment required.	0
Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse)		N			C	0		0
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer	PHH	Y	Creetown WwTW has sufficient capacity for development.		C	0	Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.	0
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply	PHH	Y	Penwhirn WTW has sufficient capacity for development.		C	0	Further investigation such as Flow and Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.	0

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

PLANNING OVERVIEW	There is evidence of flooding connected to site and a Drainage Impact Assessment would be required prior to development. Although there is existing capacity for both waste water and water supply further investigation will be required to consider the impact 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	C	0		0	
What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby	PHH	Y	Woodland, business and industry, residential	SV	X	The proposal will be assessed against policy OP1a. Some pollutant and noise attenuation and structural planting for screening will be required to mitigate against any adverse impacts	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	Proposal for residential use	0	0		0	
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Site is located adjacent the business and industry and will be subject to possible emissions so proposals will be assessed against policy OP1a.							
SEA OVERVIEW	The proximity of the business and industry may have a negative SEA impact						SEA SCORE: 0	

MATERIAL ASSETS									
Is the site.....		Brownfield		Comment					
		Greenfield	Y						
Is the site vacant or derelict		N	Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey	N	O	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	Loss of greenfield	SV	X			X	
Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction		N		O	0			0	
Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation	PHH	N		O	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			Pylons N	Bord Gais Eirann pipeline N	Shell oil pipeline N	Transco pipeline N		
Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies			Air Traffic/NATS Y	MoD N	Carlisle Airport N	Coal Authority N	HSE N	
PLANNING OVERVIEW	The site is a greenfield site located within the Air Traffic Consultation Zone and consultations with these authorities will be required prior to development.							
SEA OVERVIEW	The development of a greenfield site would have 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 site should be considered alongside site CRE.H2 Barholm Croft as an individual access into that site is difficult due to the difference between the site and road levels. 2 accesses would be required for this site. A lit pedestrian link into the village would also be required. There would be pedestrian/vehicle conflict at the narrow bridge into the village as there is no existing footway over the bridge. There may be the possibility of pedestrian access through 3rd parties ground at the south of the site. The existing speed restriction would require to be extended and a village gateway incorporated into the extended speed restriction. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and any residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards.						
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Site should be considered along with CRE.H2 and 2 access points are required								

CLIMATIC FACTORS								
What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)		Gentle south facing slope			SV	+		0
Can the site make best use of solar gain		Y	South facing slope can make best use of solar gain		SV	0	The layout and siting of buildings should ensure solar gain and look to creating buildings to take into account solar orientation in line with policies OP1f and OP2.	+
Is the site protected from prevailing winds		Y	Partially protected from southern and eastern woodlands		SV	0	Sustainable design and construction techniques can incorporate energy efficiency measures in line with policies OP1f and OP2.	0
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	Positive SEA impacts could be gained through solar gain and sustainable construction techniques						SEA SCORE: +	

CULTURAL HERITAGE								
Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting	L	Listed Building N	Scheduled Monuments N	Conservation Area Y	Inventory of Historic Battlefield N	World Heritage Site N	Inventory & Non-Inventory Y	Comment: Arch - Within Non-Inventory Designed Landscape, adjacent to and overlooking the Conservation Area. Old Military Road passes through the site, and a Bronze Age cremation burial was found in an adjacent field. Any proposals should

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

		Archaeological site	Y	Garden or Designed Landscape		retain the enclosing woodland. Evaluation and/or mitigation will be required. HBE - Barholm was designed by Robert Adam including the U-shaped Category B Listed group of former Stables [Wickham Place and Larg View]. The Non-Inventory Designed Landscape gardens were associated with the house [demolished in 1960s]. The whole of this site sits within a non-inventory designed landscape and it is very difficult to envisage how the proposed 50 units might be accommodated without detriment to the landscape. The site is very open and allows views towards the sea and is on the northern boundary of the conservation area. Creetown Conservation Area is generally very linear in character but development on this site may need to differ relating more to the individual granite/ whinstone dwellings on the edge of the settlement: apartments within a small number of large footprint buildings.			
Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment	L	N		C	0		0		
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Archaeology site will require evaluation and mitigation. Site within Non-Inventory Designed Landscape overlooking Conservation Area and therefore design and layout of site development should take this into consideration as it is considered very difficult to envisage how the proposed 50 units might be accommodated without detriment to the landscape. Small number of developments such as a small number of large footprint buildings may limit impact.								
SEA OVERVIEW	Small number of buildings carefully designed may avoid negative SEA.						SEA SCORE: 0		

LANDSCAPE									
Is the site within or adjoining any of the following		NSAs	N	RSA	Y	Comment: Galloway Hills RSA			
		Wild Land	N	TPO	N				
Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level		Y	Site of archaeological interest. Within Barholm Non-Inventory Designed Landscape.	C	X	Very difficult to envisage how the proposed 50 units might be accommodated without detriment to the landscape.	X		
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement		N	Part of large field outwith existing settlement (shared with H2); separated by burn and shallow valley. Site partially contained by woodland to west/south and landform to east. Site has a strong rural character, not associated with existing settlement. Within Barholm Non-Inventory Designed Landscape.	C	X	Development is not considered suitable on landscape grounds.	X		
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		Y	Views towards the sea in the south could be impacted	C	X		X		
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Development would need to consider criteria of policy NE2 Regional Scenic Areas. Site considered unsuitable on landscape grounds. Non-Inventory Designed Landscape, strong rural character and not associated with settlement.								
SEA OVERVIEW	Site development would result in negative SEA						SEA SCORE: X		

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

PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES

Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	Y	Allocated site within the Creetown LDP settlement boundary
Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site	Y	Site is in single ownership
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips	N	
Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe	Y	Development would be expected to come forward during the plan period.
OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT		Site is allocated for housing in the LDP. Site should be developed along with site CRE.H2. The site is considered to provide a suitable extension to the north of the settlement but it will need to carefully consider the design and layout of the site due to landscape issues. Development of the site would be located close to local services but footpaths will require to be developed edge of site to provide easy access.
OVERALL SEA COMMENT		Minor negative and positive SEA issues. Negative: loss of greenfield, prime agricultural land, within Non-Inventory Designed Landscape, landscape - site has strong rural character. Positive: site is within walking distance of existing services and facilities which could encourage active travel and reduce carbon emissions from transport. The sites aspect should also enable positive benefit to be achieved from solar gain.

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

Site Ref: CRE.H2	Source of site suggestion: LDP	Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):	
Site name: Barholm Croft			
Settlement: Creetown	Current use: Greenfield	Existing LDP allocations/ designations: CRE.H2	
OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): 247440, 559162			
Site Size (ha): 1.10	Proposed use: Housing	HMA: Mid Galloway	Date completed: Oct/Nov 2016

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

Scoring Guidance

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

Legends

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

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

BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)	SACs	N	LNR	N	SPAs	N	SSSIs	N
	NNR	N	Local wildlife sites	N	Natterjack toads	N	Great Crested Newts	N
	RAMSAR	N	Geodiversity Sites	N	Other protected species	N	Marine Consultation Zones	N
	Ancient/semi-natural woodland		N					
Comments:								
Are there any known invasive species within the site	N			GIS & SV	0		0	
Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity	?	Greenfield with trees on edge of site		SV	0	Any proposal should be assessed against policy NE7 in order to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any impacts - retaining trees and securing new planting. Set back development from existing trees.		0
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Development of site should be assessed against policy NE7 to mitigate any impact on trees.							
SEA OVERVIEW	There are no SEA issues subject to mitigation.						SEA SCORE: 0	

POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space	MA	N		SV	0		0				
		Distance (km)	0-1								
Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them	MA or CF	Right of Way	N	Comment:							
		Core path	N								
		Cycle path	N								
What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)	CF	Community/village hall	0-1	Sports facilities	0-1	Hospitalities	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)	Primary		Secondary								
	School name:	Creetown				Douglas Ewart					
	Remaining capacity:	53				285					
	Distance:	1-5				10-20					
Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere	MA and B	N		GIS	0		0				
PLANNING OVERVIEW	This is a greenfield site on edge of settlement and located relatively close to local services but footpaths will require to be developed edge of site to provide easy access.										
SEA OVERVIEW	The site is well located to local services and development would support local facilities and services 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		Y	Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)	3.2	O	X		X
Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)		N			SV	0		0
Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site		N	No known previous use.		C	0		0
Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat	CF	N			O	0		0
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	No visible signs during site visit		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		C	0		0
Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse)		N			C	0		0
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer	PHH	Y	Creetown WwTW has sufficient capacity for development.		C	0		0
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply	PHH	Y	Penwhirn WTW has sufficient capacity for development.		C	0		0
PLANNING OVERVIEW	There are no water concerns affecting this site							
SEA OVERVIEW	There are no SEA issues						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	C	0		0	
What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby	PHH	Y	Greenfield, business and industry	SV	X	The proposal will be assessed against policy OP1a. Some noise attenuation and structural planting for screening will be required to mitigate against any adverse impacts	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	Proposal for residential use	0	0		0	
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Site is located adjacent the business and industry and will be subject to possible emissions so proposals will be assessed against policy OP1a.							
SEA OVERVIEW	The proximity of the business and industry may have a negative SEA impact						SEA SCORE: 0	

MATERIAL ASSETS									
Is the site.....		Brownfield		Comment					
		Greenfield	Y						
Is the site vacant or derelict		N	Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey	N	O	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	Los of greenfield	SV	X			X	
Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction		N		O	0			0	
Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation	PHH	N		O	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		Pylons	N	Bord Gais Eirann pipeline	N	Shell oil pipeline	N	Transco pipeline	N
		Comment							

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

of the site													
Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies		Air Traffic/NATS	Y	MoD	N	Carlisle Airport	N	Coal Authority	N	HSE	N		
PLANNING OVERVIEW	The site is a greenfield site located within the Air Traffic Consultation Zone and consultations with these authorities will be required prior to development.												
SEA OVERVIEW	The development of a greenfield site would have 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 site should be considered alongside site CRE.H1. Due to level differences between the road way and the site, access into this site would be difficult. A lit pedestrian link into the village would be required. There would be pedestrian/vehicle conflict at the narrow bridge into the village as there is no existing footway over this road bridge. There may be the possibility of pedestrian access through a 3rd parties ground to the south of the site. The existing speed restriction would require to be extended and a village gateway incorporated into the extended speed restriction. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and any residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards.											
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Site should be considered along with CRE.H2. 2 access points are required												

CLIMATIC FACTORS													
What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)		Gentle south facing slope				SV	+					0	
Can the site make best use of solar gain		Y	South facing slope can make best use of solar gain			SV	0	The layout and siting of buildings should ensure solar gain and look to creating buildings to take into account solar orientation in line with policies OP1f and OP2.				+	
Is the site protected from prevailing winds		Y	Partially protected from southern and eastern woodlands			SV	0	Sustainable design and construction techniques can incorporate energy efficiency measures in line with policies OP1f and OP2.				0	
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	Positive SEA impacts could be gained through solar gain and sustainable construction techniques										SEA SCORE: +		

CULTURAL HERITAGE													
Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting	L	Listed Building	N	Scheduled Monuments	N	Comment: Arch - Within non-Inventory Designed Landscape and overlooking Conservation Area. HBE - Similar comments to CRE H1 although this is a smaller site more closely related to Creetown. The site is on the northern boundary of the conservation area is very open and allows views towards the sea. It is on the edge of the settlement and the proposed number of dwellings if delivered as individual houses would be at odds with the character of the adjacent part of the conservation area. The whole of this site sits within Barholm Non-Inventory Designed Landscape gardens which were associated with the house [demolished in 1960s] designed by Robert Adam along with the							
		Conservation Area	Y	Inventory of Historic Battlefield	N								
		World Heritage Site	N	Inventory & Non-Inventory Garden or Designed Landscape	Y								
		Archaeological site	N										

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

						Category B Listed former Stables [Wickham Place and Larg View]. Creetown Conservation Area is generally very linear in character but development on this site may need to relate to the individual granite/ whinstone dwellings on the edge of the settlement: perhaps as apartments within a small number of buildings.			
Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment	L	N		C	0		0		
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Site within Non-Inventory Designed Landscape overlooking Conservation Area and therefore design and layout of site development should take this into consideration as it is considered very difficult to envisage how the proposed 50 units might be accommodated without detriment to the landscape. Small number of developments such as a small number of large footprint buildings may limit impact.								
SEA OVERVIEW	Small number of buildings carefully designed may avoid negative SEA.						SEA SCORE: 0		

LANDSCAPE											
Is the site within or adjoining any of the following		NSAs		N	RSAs		Y	Comment: Galloway Hills RSA			
		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	Within Barholm Non-Inventory Designed Landscape.			C	X		X		
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement		N	Part of large field outwith existing settlement (shared with H1); separated by burn and shallow valley. Site partially contained by landform to east but otherwise open. Site has a strong rural character, not associated with existing settlement.			C	X	Development is not considered suitable on landscape grounds.		X	
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		Y	Views of the sea to the south may be impacted by development.			C	X		X		
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Development would need to consider criteria of policy NE2 Regional Scenic Areas. Site considered unsuitable on landscape grounds. Non-Inventory Designed Landscape, strong rural character and not associated with settlement.										
SEA OVERVIEW	Site development would result in negative SEA								SEA SCORE: X		

PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES		
Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	Y	Allocated site within the Creetown LDP settlement boundary
Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site	Y	Site is in single ownership
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips	N	
Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe	Y	Development would be expected to come forward during the plan period.

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	Site is allocated for housing in the LDP. Site should be developed along with site CRE.H1. The site is considered to provide a suitable extension to the north of the settlement but it will need to carefully consider the design and layout of the site due to landscape issues. Development of the site would be located close to local services but footpaths will require to be developed edge of site to provide easy access.							
OVERALL SEA COMMENT	Minor negative and positive SEA issues. Negative: loss of greenfield, prime agricultural land, within Non-Inventory Designed Landscape, landscape - site has strong rural character. Positive: site is within walking distance of existing services and facilities which could encourage active travel and reduce carbon emissions from transport. The sites aspect should also enable positive benefit to be achieved from solar gain.							

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

Site Ref: CRE.H3	Source of site suggestion: Landowner	Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):	
Site name: Minnipool Place			
Settlement: Creetown	Current use: Greenfield		
OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): 247906, 559021		Existing LDP allocations/ designations: CRE.H3	
Site Size (ha): 1.32	Proposed use: Housing	HMA: Mid Galloway	Date completed: Oct/Nov 2016

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

Scoring Guidance

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

Legends

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

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

BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)	SACs	N	LNR	N	SPAs	N	SSSIs	N
	NNR	N	Local wildlife sites	N	Natterjack toads	N	Great Crested Newts	N
	RAMSAR	N	Geodiversity Sites	N	Other protected species	N	Marine Consultation Zones	N
	Ancient/semi-natural woodland		N					
Comments:								
Are there any known invasive species within the site	N			GIS & SV	0		0	
Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity	N	There is a line of trees within the site		SV	X	Any proposal should be assessed against policy NE7 in order to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any impacts - retaining trees and securing new planting. Set back development from existing trees.		0
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Development of site should be assessed against policy NE7 to mitigate any impact on trees.							
SEA OVERVIEW	There are no SEA issues subject to mitigation.						SEA SCORE: 0	

POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space	MA	N		SV	0		0				
		Distance (km)	0								
Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them	MA or CF	Right of Way	N	Comment:							
		Core path	N								
		Cycle path	N								
What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)	CF	Community/village hall	0-1	Sports facilities	0-1	Hospitalities	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)	Primary		Secondary								
	School name:	Creetown	Douglas Ewart								
	Remaining capacity:	53	285								
	Distance:	1-5	10-20								
Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere	MA and B	N		GIS	0		0				
PLANNING OVERVIEW	This is a greenfield site on edge of settlement and located close to local services but footpaths will require to be developed adjacent to the site to provide easy access.										
SEA OVERVIEW	The site is well located to local services and development would support local facilities and services 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		N	Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)	4.1	O	0		0
Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)		N			SV	0		0
Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site		N	No known previous use.		C	0		0
Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat	CF	N			O	0		0
PLANNING OVERVIEW	There are no soil concerns affecting this site							
SEA OVERVIEW	There are no SEA issues						SEA SCORE: 0	

WATER								
Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site	B and L	N	No visible signs		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 body of water. Possible culvert within site boundary.		C	X	Drainage Impact Assessment required in conjunction with culvert investigation.	0
Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse)		N			C	0		0
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer	PHH	Y	Creetown WwTW has sufficient capacity for development.		C	0		0
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply	PHH	Y	Penwhirn WTW has sufficient capacity for development.		C	0		0
PLANNING OVERVIEW	There is evidence of flooding connected to site and a Flood Risk Assessment would be required prior to development.							
SEA OVERVIEW	Provided all the necessary mitigation measures are implemented there should be no SEA issues						SEA SCORE: 0	

AIR QUALITY								
-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA		N	There are no AQMA at present in the region	C	0		0	
What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby	PHH	N	Greenfield, residential	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	Proposed residential use	SV	0		0	
PLANNING OVERVIEW	There are no air quality concerns affecting this site							
SEA OVERVIEW	There are no SEA issues						SEA SCORE: 0	

MATERIAL ASSETS																
Is the site.....		Brownfield		Comment												
		Greenfield	Y													
Is the site vacant or derelict		N	Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey		N	O	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	Loss of greenfield			SV	X		X							
Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction		N				O	0		0							
Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation	PHH	N				O	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		Pylons		N	Bord Gais Eirann pipeline		N	Shell oil pipeline		N	Transco pipeline		N			
Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies		Air Traffic/NATS		Y	MoD		N	Carlisle Airport		N	Coal Authority		N	HSE		N
PLANNING OVERVIEW	The site is a greenfield site located within the Air Traffic Consultation Zone and consultations with these authorities will be required prior to development.															
SEA OVERVIEW	The development of a greenfield site would have a negative SEA impact.											SEA SCORE: X				

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

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			Access to the site would be taken from Old Military Road (U256w).The existing public road will require to widened and upgraded with a lit pedestrian link into the village. The existing speed restriction will require to be extended to include any development. There is a ditch along the existing road edge this will require to be culverted or rerouted. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and any residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards.					
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Access to site should be taken from the Old Military Road (U256w).							

CLIMATIC FACTORS

What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)		Site is south west facing	SV	0		0	
Can the site make best use of solar gain	Y	Site can make use of solar gain as it south west facing	SV	0	The layout and design should ensure solar gain and look to create sustainable buildings in line with policies OP1f and OP2.	+	
Is the site protected from prevailing winds	N	Site is exposed to prevailing winds	SV	0	Sustainable design and construction techniques can incorporate energy efficiency measures in line with policies OP1f and OP2.	0	
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	Positive SEA impacts could be gained through solar gain and sustainable construction techniques					SEA SCORE: +	

CULTURAL HERITAGE

Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting	L	Listed Building	N	Scheduled Monuments	N	Comment: Arch - No historic environment issues identified for this site, as of July 2016. HBE - Outside the conservation area. No Listed Buildings in the vicinity. Development should respect the contours and valley setting of the conservation area and reinforce the local identity of Creetown rather than continue the 20th century style of development.	
		Conservation Area	N	Inventory of Historic Battlefield	N		
		World Heritage Site	N	Inventory & Non-Inventory	N		
		Archaeological site	N	Garden or Designed Landscape			
Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment	L	N		SV	0	0	
PLANNING OVERVIEW	There are no cultural heritage concerns affecting this site.						
SEA OVERVIEW	There are no SEA issues					SEA SCORE: 0	

LANDSCAPE

Is the site within or adjoining any of the		NSAs	N	RSAs	Y	Comment
--	--	------	---	------	---	---------

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

following		Wild Land	N	TPOs	N			
Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level		N				SV	0	0
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement		N	Steep sloping Greenfield site on edge of and overlooking settlement. Forms part of rural out-of-town landscape with no obvious boundaries to the east. Development would detract from setting and integrity of village.			C	X	Not suitable for development
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		N				SV	0	0
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Site considered unsuitable for development on landscape grounds							
SEA OVERVIEW	Development of site would result in negative SEA.						SEA SCORE: X	

PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES		
Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	Y	Allocated site in Creetown LDP settlement boundary
Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site	N	Site is in dual ownership but only one party is interested in development. The site is considered ineffective unless both parties can agree their intentions to develop the site.
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips	N	
Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe	N	Issues with site ownership currently makes site ineffective and there are concerns with landscape development.
OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT	Site is not recommended for inclusion with LDP. Site is in dual ownership with only one party interested in development thus making site ineffective. Landscape issues have also been raised in relation to the site.	
OVERALL SEA COMMENT	Minor negative and positive SEA issues. Negative: loss of greenfield, landscape – development would detract from setting. Positive: site is within walking distance of existing services and facilities which could encourage active travel and reduce carbon emissions from transport. The sites aspect should also enable positive benefit to be achieved from solar gain.	

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

Site Ref: CRE.H201	Source of site suggestion: Landowner	Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):	
Site name: land at Castle Cary Holiday Park			
Settlement: Creetown	Current use: Greenfield	Existing LDP allocations/ designations:	
OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): 247431, 558294			
Site Size (ha): 5.68	Proposed use: Housing	HMA: Mid Galloway	Date completed: Oct/Nov 2016

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

Scoring Guidance

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

Legends

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

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

BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA								
Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)	SACs	N	LNR	N	SPAs	N	SSSIs	N
	NNR	N	Local wildlife sites	N	Natterjack toads	N	Great Crested Newts	N
	RAMSAR	N	Geodiversity Sites	N	Other protected species	N	Marine Consultation Zones	N
	Ancient/semi-natural woodland		N		Comments: Challenging in landscape and visual terms but limited development could potentially be accommodated subject to detailed design and masterplanning, taking cognisance of existing street pattern and housing density.			
Are there any known invasive species within the site	N			GIS & SV	0		0	
Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity	Y	There are a handful of mature trees at the site. The site is on the periphery of the settlement.		SV	X	Any proposal should be assessed against policy NE7 in order to avoid/reduce/mitigate and enhance any impacts - retaining trees and securing new planting. Set back development from existing trees.	0	
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Development of site should be assessed against policy NE7 to mitigate any impact on trees. Limited development could be accommodated subject to detailed design.							
SEA OVERVIEW	There are no SEA issues subject to mitigation.						SEA SCORE: 0	

POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH											
Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space	MA	N			SV	0			0		
Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them	MA or CF	Distance (km)	0-1	Comment:							
		Right of Way	N								
		Core path	N								
		Cycle path	N								
What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)	CF	Community/village hall	0-1	Sports facilities	0-1	Hospitalities	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)	Primary		Secondary								
	School name:	Creetown				Douglas Ewart					
	Remaining capacity:	53				285					
	Distance:	1-5				10-20					
Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere	MA and B	N			GIS	0			0		
PLANNING OVERVIEW	This is a greenfield site on edge of settlement and located close to local services but footpaths will require to be developed edge of site to provide easy access.										
SEA OVERVIEW	The site is well located to local services and development would support local facilities and services 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		N	Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)	4.1	O	0		0
Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)		N			SV	0		0
Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site		N	No known previous use.		C	0		0
Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat	CF	0			0	0		0
PLANNING OVERVIEW	There are no soil concerns affecting this site							
SEA OVERVIEW	There are no SEA issues						SEA SCORE: 0	

WATER								
Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site	B and L	Y	There were signs of wetlands on site i.e. reeds		SV	X	Drainage impact assessment	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 body of water. Culvert inlet located within site boundary.		C	X	Drainage Impact Assessment required in conjunction with culvert investigation.	0
Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse)		N			C	0		0
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer	PHH	Y	Creetown WwTW has sufficient capacity for development.		C	0	Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.	0
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply	PHH	Y	Penwhirn WTW has sufficient capacity for development.		C	0	Further investigation such as Flow and Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.	0
PLANNING OVERVIEW	There is evidence of flooding connected to site and a Drainage Impact Assessment would be required prior to development. Although there is existing capacity for both							

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

SEA OVERVIEW	waste water and water supply further investigation will be required to consider the impact on the overall networks and, if necessary, mitigation measures put in place.						SEA SCORE: 0
	Provided all the necessary mitigation measures are implemented there should be no SEA issues						

AIR QUALITY								
Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA		N	There are no AQMA at present in the region	C	0		0	
What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby	PHH	Y	Greenfield and open space	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	Proposals for residential use	SV	0		0	
PLANNING OVERVIEW	There are no air quality concerns affecting this site							
SEA OVERVIEW	There are no SEA issues						SEA SCORE: 0	

MATERIAL ASSETS									
Is the site.....		Brownfield		Comment					
		Greenfield	Y						
Is the site vacant or derelict		N	Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey	N	O	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	Loss of greenfield		SV	X		X	
Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction		N			O	0		0	
Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation	PHH	N			O	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 pipeline	N

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

constraints that impact on the development of the site			Comment										
Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies			Air Traffic/NATS	Y	MoD	N	Carlisle Airport	N	Coal Authority	N	HSE	N	
PLANNING OVERVIEW	The site is a greenfield site located within the Air Traffic Consultation Zone and consultations with these authorities will be required prior to development.												
SEA OVERVIEW	The development of a greenfield site would have 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			Access to the site would appear to be via Park Crescent (C49w), a pedestrian link into the village would be required, extending from the existing footway at Ferry Bridge, along the site frontage. The existing speed restriction would require to be extended past the south-western boundary of the site. It should be noted that part of a watercourse runs through the site. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and any residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards.										
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Access to the site would appear to be via Park Crescent (C49w).												

CLIMATIC FACTORS													
What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)			Flat site				SV	0				0	
Can the site make best use of solar gain		Y	Open site on relatively flat land				SV	0	The layout and design should ensure solar gain and look to create sustainable buildings in line with policies OP1f and OP2.			+	
Is the site protected from prevailing winds		N	site relatively exposed.				SV	X	Sustainable design and construction techniques can incorporate energy efficiency measures in line with policies OP1f and OP2.			0	
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	Positive SEA impacts could be gained through solar gain and sustainable construction techniques										SEA SCORE: +		

CULTURAL HERITAGE												
Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting	L	Listed Building	N	Scheduled Monuments	N	Comment: Arch - No historic environment issues identified for this site, as of July 2016. HBE - The northern part of the site is within and along the edge of Creetown Conservation Area where there is a defined character of linear development in the 1860s planned settlement. There is tree filtered intervisibility between the street and the Category B Listed 1834 Kirkmabreck Parish Church, graveyard and boundary wall which is part of the character and retaining some of these views would be important. This site is largely level whereas parts of the conservation area slope up to the east. The frontage of any development should be based on the existing granite dwellings, which are 1 and 1½ storey s along Park Crescent and Norris Street. Development						
		Conservation Area	Y	Inventory of Historic Battlefield	N							
		World Heritage Site	N	Inventory & Non-Inventory Garden or Designed Landscape	N							
		Archaeological site	N									

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

						behind the frontage should try to replicate the parallel street arrangement similar to Crispin Street and High Road. This may ensure that new development reinforces the character of Creetown.		
Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment	L	N		SV	0		0	
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Site located in Conservation Area. Any frontage development should be based on the existing granite dwellings.							
SEA OVERVIEW	There are no SEA issues						SEA SCORE: 0	

LANDSCAPE								
Is the site within or adjoining any of the following			NSAs	N	RSA's	Y	Comment Galloway Hills RSA	
			Wild Land	N	TPOs	N		
Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level		N					SV	0
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement		Y	Large open site on level ground at edge of settlement. Contained by woodland/landform to east and road to north but with less containment to the south. Development adjacent to Park Crescent would balance existing housing to west but site could potentially be developed further.				C	X
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		N					SV	0
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Development may be acceptable. Ensure development addresses road and respects scale. Design, materials and proportion of existing dwellings. Create screening toward A75 and reinforce southern boundary also with woodland screen.							
SEA OVERVIEW	Provided all the necessary mitigation measures are implemented there should be no SEA issues						SEA SCORE: 0	

PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES		
Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	Y	Site is adjacent to Creetown LDP settlement boundary
Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site	Y	Site is in single ownership
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips	N	
Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe	Y	There are no physical constraints to prevent the development and the majority of the site would be expected to come forward for development during the plan period.
OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT	Site is located adjacent to settlement boundary. Development would result in the loss of greenfield, screening required for A75 and reinforcing of southern	

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

	boundary. As noted in the LDP1 Examination Report the site has previously been designated for over 20 years without development occurring and was considered inappropriate to allocate it. However, as there are no physical constraints to prevent the development of the site it is considered to be a alternative site for LDP2.							
OVERALL SEA COMMENT	Minor negative and positive SEA issues. Negative: loss of greenfield, Positive: site is within walking distance of existing services and facilities which could encourage active travel and reduce carbon emissions from transport. The sites aspect should also enable positive benefit to be achieved from solar gain.							