

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

Site Ref: GOF.H1	Source of site suggestion: LDP allocation	Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date): Planning permission in principle granted August 2012 12/P/2/0175 Current planning applications for 5 houses which has not been determined - 16/P/2/0206	
Site name: Memory Lane			
Settlement: Gatehouse of Fleet	Current use: Greenfield	Existing LDP allocations/ designations: GOF.H1	
OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): 259941, 556811			
Site Size (ha): 0.62	Proposed use: Housing	HMA: Stewartry	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	+	X	0	0	X	0	0	0	0

Scoring Guidance

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

Legends

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

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

BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)	SACs	N	LNR	N	SPAs	N	SSSIs	N	
	NNR	N	Local wildlife sites	N	Natterjack toads	N	Great Crested Newts	N	
	RAMSAR	N	Geodiversity Sites	N	Other protected species	N	Marine Consultation Zones	N	
	Ancient/semi-natural woodland		N	Comments: There are no known 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	Y	Potential habitat fragmentation due to the loss of a greenfield site on periphery of settlement which is bounded by trees on western boundary		SV	X	Retaining woodland in line with policy NE7. Where appropriate, measures to enhance biodiversity should be implemented, such as the use of locally native tree species in landscape schemes, habitat creation, and the creation of greenways and wildlife corridors along transport corridors, footpaths and cycleways, to encourage the movement of species.	0		
PLANNING OVERVIEW	The existing trees on the western boundary of the site should be retained as far as possible								
SEA OVERVIEW	Provided that biodiversity interests are fully taken into account in any development proposals and that these areas may be improved or enhanced there should be no negative SEA issues.						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	A greenfield site but not part of protected open space in adopted LDP		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								
What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)	CF	Community/village hall	Y 0 - 1	Sports facilities	Y 0 - 1	Hospitalities	Y 0 - 1	Local shops (convenience)	Y 0 - 1	Bus stop	Y 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:	Gatehouse	Kirkcudbright Academy								
	Capacity:	70	193								
	Distance:	0 - 1	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	The site is within close proximity to local services. 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 reasonably well located in relation to local services, 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		Y	Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)	3.2	O	X	No mitigation	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			SV	0		0
Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere	CF and PHH	Y	Site lies adjacent to medium likelihood fluvial SEPA flood maps. Site lies adjacent to the pluvial SEPA flood maps. There is also a watercourse adjacent to the site		C	X	Full topographical survey required. Depending on content, Flood Risk Assessment may also be 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	Gatehouse WwTW has sufficient capacity.		C	0		0
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply	PHH	Y	Glengap WTW has sufficient capacity		C	0		0
PLANNING OVERVIEW	A full topographical survey required to determine whether there is a flood risk.							
SEA OVERVIEW	Provided all the necessary mitigation measures are implemented there should be 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	N	Housing, agricultural fields, workshop units	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		SV	0		0		
PLANNING OVERVIEW	There are no known air quality issues in relation to the site								
SEA OVERVIEW	There are no known 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	Greenfield site – there are no existing structures that can be reused	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
	Comment: There are no known servicing constraints in relation to this site								

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

Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies		Air Traffic/NATS	N	MoD	N	Carlisle Airport	N	Coal Authority	N	HSE	N
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Development of this site would result in the loss of a greenfield land										
SEA OVERVIEW	The loss of greenfield land would be a negative SEA impact										SEA SCORE: X

ROADS/ACCESS												
Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated		There is currently an application for this site for the erection of 5 no. dwellings (16/P/2/0206) which shows frontage development only with each dwelling served by new individual accesses from the U604s Memory Lane public road. Appropriate visibility can be achieved. Parking for 2 no. cars should be provided within the curtilage of each plot.										
PLANNING OVERVIEW	An access can be achieved into the site											

CLIMATIC FACTORS												
What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)		North westerly facing				SV	0				0	
Can the site make best use of solar gain		?	Possibly			SV	?	The layout and design should ensure solar gain and look to create sustainable buildings in line with policies OP1f and OP2			0	
Is the site protected from prevailing winds		N	Open exposed north west boundary			SV	X	Sustainable design and construction techniques can incorporate energy efficiency measures in line with policies OP1f and OP2. Structural planting to the southern boundary may provide some protection of the site in the future			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 despite its north facing aspect.											
SEA OVERVIEW	There are positive SEA impacts that can be gained through designing for solar gain and including sustainable construction techniques										SEA SCORE: 0	

CULTURAL HERITAGE												
Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting	L	Listed Building	N	Scheduled Monuments	N	Comment: No impact on cultural heritage						
		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 issues											

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation 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	Y	RSAs	N	Comment	Fleet Valley NSA			
			Wild Land	N	TPOs	N					
Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level		Y	Greenfield site on edge of settlement adjacent to riverbank and established commercial site. Northern third of site falls away; this curving marked fall should define limit of development – beyond this development would be highly visible from wider valley (NSA). Trees between site and river are important as screening and as an amenity feature and should be protected.				SV	X	Partial development may be appropriate. Ensure potential development reflects scale/character of built forms and is set back from roadside. The trees between the site and river should be protected.	0	
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement		Y					SV	0		0	
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		N					SV	0		0	
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Development should respect landform and the scale and character of existing development. the trees that are on site should be protected from development										
SEA OVERVIEW	There are no SEA issues						SEA SCORE: 0				

PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES										
Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	Y	The site is currently allocated for residential development within the settlement boundary and is also the subject of a current planning application								
Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site	Y									
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips	N									
Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe	Y	There are no known physical constraints in bringing this site forward depending on market demand								
OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT	The site is an allocated housing site in the adopted LDP and is the subject of a current detailed planning application. Development of the site should ensure that it is well integrated with the existing settlement.									
OVERALL SEA COMMENT	Minor negative and positive SEA issues, including loss of best quality agricultural land (classification 3.2) and development of a greenfield site. However, the site is within walking distance of existing services and facilities which could encourage active travel and reduce carbon emissions from transport.									

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

Site Ref: GOF.H2	Source of site suggestion: LDP Allocation	Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date): Planning permission refused 12/P/2/0313, appeal upheld and planning permission granted 11 June 2014	
Site name: former Woodside Garage			
Settlement: Gatehouse of Fleet	Current use: Brownfield site, site of former garage	Existing LDP allocations/ designations: GOF.H2	
OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): 260261, 556509			
Site Size (ha): 0.39	Proposed use: Housing	HMA: Stewartry	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	+	0	0	0

Scoring Guidance

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

Legends

<u>Related SEA topic</u>	<u>Information source</u>	<u>Consultation required (only if answer is Yes)</u>
Population and Human Health (PHH) 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: There are no known 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		Y	Potential habitat fragmentation due to the potential loss of trees and hedgerows	SV	X	Where appropriate, measures to enhance biodiversity should be implemented, such as the use of locally native tree species in landscape schemes, habitat creation, and the creation of greenways and wildlife corridors along transport corridors, footpaths and cycleways, to encourage the movement of species.	0		
PLANNING OVERVIEW	The existing trees and hedgerows should be retained as far as possible								
SEA OVERVIEW	Provided that biodiversity interests are fully taken into account in any development proposals and that these areas may be improved or enhanced there should be no negative SEA issues						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	Former garage site			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	Y 0-1	Sports facilities	Y 0-1	Hospitalities	Y 0-1	Local shops (convenience)	Y 0-1	Bus stop	Y 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:		Gatehouse				Kirkcudbright Academy					
	Capacity:		70				193					
	Distance:		0-1				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	The site is within close proximity to local services. 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 reasonably well located in relation to local services, 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		N	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		Y	Site of former garage. Previous investigations have indicated contamination.		C	X	The contamination will require remediation before development.	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	The contamination on the site will need to be remediated before the site can be developed. 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	Small watercourse runs through the site. Culvert located within site boundary		SV	X		0
Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere	CF and PHH	Y	Small watercourse/drain flows through allocation and potential flood risk from this source should be taken cognisance of. A substantial part of the site may lie within the 1 in 200 year floodplain. No development should take place within this area. The Council and SEPA hold flood records in connection to the site. A surface water flood hazard has been identified and should be discussed with FPA and Scottish Water.		C	X	There is an existing Flood Risk Assessment approved by the Councils Flood Risk Management Team. 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			C	0		0

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required	
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer	PHH	Y	Gatehouse WwTW has sufficient capacity.	C	0		0		
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply	PHH	Y	Glengap WTW has sufficient capacity	C	0		0		
PLANNING OVERVIEW	A Flood Risk Assessment has been prepared in support of previous planning applications which has been approved by the Councils Flood Risk Management Team. There should be no development within the flood risk area.								
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	N	Housing and fields	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		SV	0		0		
PLANNING OVERVIEW	There are no known air quality issues in relation to the site								
SEA OVERVIEW	There are no known SEA issues						SEA SCORE: 0		

MATERIAL ASSETS									
Is the site.....		Brownfield	Y	Comment: Former garage site					
		Greenfield							
Is the site vacant or derelict		V	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		Y	Redevelop brownfield site which should enable existing infrastructure to be used		SV	+		+	
Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction		N			O	0		0	
Is the site in the vicinity of a waste	PHH	N			O	0		0	

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required	
management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation									
Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9)		n/a							
Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site			Pylons N Bord Gais Eirann pipeline N Shell oil pipeline N Transco pipeline N			Comment: There are no known servicing constraints in relation to this site			
Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies			Air Traffic/NATS N MoD N Carlisle Airport N Coal Authority N HSE N						
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Development of this site would result in the redevelopment of a brownfield site								
SEA OVERVIEW	The redevelopment of a brownfield site would have a positive SEA impact						SEA SCORE: +		

ROADS/ACCESS									
Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated			Access to the site would be taken from the B727, any proposed access onto the B727 should have appropriate visibility in both directions. Connectivity back onto the High Street should be considered to allow pedestrians easier access into the town centre.						
PLANNING OVERVIEW	An access can be achieved into the site								

CLIMATIC FACTORS									
What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)		North facing		SV	X	The layout and design should ensure solar gain and look to create sustainable buildings in line with policies OP1f and OP2	0		
Can the site make best use of solar gain		?	Possibly	SV	X	The layout and design should ensure solar gain and look to create sustainable buildings in line with policies OP1f and OP2	0		
Is the site protected from prevailing winds		Y	Only exposed on eastern edge	SV	0	Sustainable design and construction techniques can incorporate energy efficiency measures in line with policies OP1f and OP2. Structural planting to the southern boundary may provide some protection of the site in the future	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 despite its north facing aspect.								
SEA OVERVIEW	There are positive SEA impacts that can be gained through designing for solar gain and including sustainable construction techniques						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
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

CULTURAL HERITAGE									
Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting	L		Listed Building	Y	Scheduled Monuments	N	Comment: Bounded on three sides by the water management system for the Fleet Mills. The site is in the heart of Gatehouse Conservation Area; opposite late 18 th century, Category B Listed Toll House Cottage. Historic Mill Lade runs through the back edge of site.		
			Conservation Area	Y	Inventory of Historic Battlefield	N			
			World Heritage Site	N	Inventory & Non-Inventory	N			
			Archaeological site	N	Garden or Designed Landscape				
Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment	L	Y			SV C	0		0	
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Development proposals will need to take account of the historic environment								
SEA OVERVIEW	There are no SEA issues						SEA SCORE: 0		

LANDSCAPE									
Is the site within or adjoining any of the following			NSAs	Y	RSA's	N	Comment: Fleet valley NSA		
			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	Prominent site at entrance to settlement but development could be acceptable with mitigation			SV C	X	Development should address the road and respect the scale and mass of the listed Toll House opposite	0
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement		Y	Site previously developed			SV C	0	Development should preserve and enhance character of immediate and wider area, ideally be frontage only with a continuous curved building line and reinforce the simple designs of existing traditional buildings.	0
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		N				SV	0		0
PLANNING OVERVIEW	The layout of development should address the road and respect the scale and mass of the listed Toll House opposite								
SEA OVERVIEW	There are no SEA issues						SEA SCORE: 0		

PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES		
Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	Y	
Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site	Y	
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips	N	
Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe	Y	

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 an allocated housing site in the adopted LDP and has planning permission. Development of the site would result in the redevelopment of a brownfield site and the layout should ensure that it is well integrated with the existing settlement.							
OVERALL SEA COMMENT	Mostly neutral impact with a few positive SEA impacts and one minor negative SEA issue. The negative issue is a result of loss of best quality agricultural land (classification 3.2) The site is within walking distance of existing services and facilities which could encourage active travel and reduce carbon emissions from transport and development would result in the redevelopment of a brownfield site.							

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

Site Ref: GOF.H201	Source of site suggestion: Call for sites submission	Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date): None	
Site name: 1 Memory Lane			
Settlement: Gatehouse of Fleet	Current use: Green field covered with gorse bushes	Existing LDP allocations/ designations: None	
OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing):			
Site Size (ha):	Proposed use: Housing	HMA: Stewartry	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	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		Y	Comments: Adjacent to long-established woodland					
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	Potential habitat fragmentation due to the loss of a greenfield site on periphery of settlement and development close to existing woodland and trees on boundary of proposed site		X	Retaining woodland in line with policy NE7. Where appropriate, measures to enhance biodiversity should be implemented, such as the use of locally native tree species in landscape schemes, habitat creation, and the creation of greenways and wildlife corridors along transport corridors, footpaths and cycleways, to encourage the movement of species.	0		
PLANNING OVERVIEW	The existing trees on the boundary of the site should be retained as far as possible								
SEA OVERVIEW	Provided that biodiversity interests are fully taken into account in any development proposals and that these areas may be improved or enhanced there should be no negative SEA issues.						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	A greenfield site but not part of protected open space		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							
What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)	CF	Cycle path	N							
		Community/village hall	Y 0-1	Sports facilities	Y 0-1	Hospitalities	Y 0-1	Local shops (convenience)	Y 0-1	Bus stop
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:	Gatehouse				Kirkcudbright Academy				
	Capacity:	70				193				
	Distance:	0-1				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	The site is within close proximity to local services. 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 within close proximity to local services. Residential development will help to support services and facilities in the area.						SEA SCORE: +
---------------------	---	--	--	--	--	--	---------------------

SOILS								
Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land		N	Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)	Urban	C	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			C	0		0
PLANNING OVERVIEW	There are no known soil issues in relation to the site							
SEA OVERVIEW	There are no known SEA issues						SEA SCORE: 0	

WATER								
Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site	B and L	Y			SV	0		0
Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere	CF and PHH	Y	Site appears in medium likelihood fluvial SEPA flood maps. Small watercourse/drain flows through allocation and potential flood risk from this source should be taken cognisance of. Culvert located within site boundary.		C	X	Flood Risk 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	Gatehouse WwTW has sufficient capacity.		C	0		0
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply	PHH	Y	Glengap WTW has sufficient capacity		C	0		0
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 FRA which will ascertain 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 resolved.							

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if 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	C	0		0	
What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby	PHH	N	Housing	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		SV	0		0	
PLANNING OVERVIEW	There are no known air quality issues in relation to the site							
SEA OVERVIEW	There are no known 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	Greenfield site – there are no existing structures that can be reused	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: There are no known servicing constraints in relation to this site								

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	N	MoD	N	Carlisle Airport	N	Coal Authority	N	HSE	N	
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Development of this site would result in the loss of a greenfield land												
SEA OVERVIEW	The loss of greenfield land would be a negative SEA impact										SEA SCORE: X		

ROADS/ACCESS													
Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated			This proposed site for up to 8 no. dwellinghouses frontages the U615s Cape Road public road. This is a narrow rural public road and I would not be in favour of any development which would increase use of this road without significant improvements including widening and junction improvements. 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	Significant improvements would need to be made to the road to enable the development to take place												

CLIMATIC FACTORS													
What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)			Undulating site				SV	0				0	
Can the site make best use of solar gain		Y	Possibly				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		?	Surrounding development may provide some protection				SV	?	Sustainable design and construction techniques can incorporate energy efficiency measures in line with policies OP1f and OP2. Structural planting to the southern boundary may provide some protection of the site in the future			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	There are positive SEA impacts that can be gained through designing for solar gain and including 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: Very close to boundary of conservation area and difficult site to reinforce the existing character.							
			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		

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 are no cultural heritage issues							
SEA OVERVIEW	There are no SEA issues						SEA SCORE: 0	

LANDSCAPE								
Is the site within or adjoining any of the following		NSAs	Y	RSAs	N	Comment: Fleet Valley NSA		
		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		Development is not considered acceptable on landscape and visual grounds.	SV	X		+/-
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement		?		The open green area and Mill Lade are important back drops for the boundary of the settlement.	SV	X	Frontage development around corner of Castramont Road and lane in small number of low dwellings may be acceptable.	+/-
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		N			SV	0		0
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Development of the whole would not be acceptable in planning terms. However, a small amount of infill development may be acceptable on the part of the site that has been kept within the settlement boundary							
SEA OVERVIEW	Development of the site could have negative and positive impacts on the landscape						SEA SCORE: +/-	

PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES		
Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	Y	Adjacent to settlement boundary
Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site	Y	
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips	Y	The site is covered by a National Trust Conservation Agreement. Further discussions would need to be had with National Trust for Scotland to see if they could be relaxed.
Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe	?	
OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT	There are a number of issues that would need to be resolved if the whole site was to be developed. It is therefore proposed to keep the settlement boundary as it is in the adopted LDP which may allow a small infill development in the corner of the site adjacent to Castramont Road.	
OVERALL SEA COMMENT	Minor negative and positive SEA issues, including development of a greenfield site. However, the site is within walking distance of existing services and facilities which could encourage active travel and reduce carbon emissions from transport and the sites aspect should also enable positive benefit to be achieved from solar gain. Development of the whole site would have both positive and negative impacts on the landscape.	

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

Site Ref: GOF.H202	Source of site suggestion: Call for sites submission	Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date): None	
Site name: Fleet Farm			
Settlement: Gatehouse of Fleet	Current use: Greenfield		
OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing):		Existing LDP allocations/ designations: None	
Site Size (ha):	Proposed use: Housing	HMA: Stewartry	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	X	X	X

Scoring Guidance

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

Legends

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

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

BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)	SACs	N	LNR	N	SPAs	N	SSSIs	N	
	NNR	N	Local wildlife sites	N	Natterjack toads	N	Great Crested Newts	N	
	RAMSAR	N	Geodiversity Sites	N	Other protected species	N	Marine Consultation Zones	N	
	Ancient/semi-natural woodland		N	Comments: There are no known 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		Y	Potential habitat fragmentation due to the loss of a greenfield site on periphery of settlement	SV	X	Where appropriate, measures to enhance biodiversity should be implemented, such as the use of locally native tree species in landscape schemes, habitat creation, and the creation of greenways and wildlife corridors along transport corridors, footpaths and cycleways, to encourage the movement of species.	0		
PLANNING OVERVIEW	There are no planning issues								
SEA OVERVIEW	Provided that biodiversity interests are fully taken into account in any development proposals and that these areas may be improved or enhanced there should be no negative SEA issues.						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	Although a green field it does not form part of the protected open space	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	Y 0-1	Sports facilities	Y 0-1	Hospitalities	Y 0-1	Local shops (convenience)	Y 0-1	Bus stop	Y 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:	Gatehouse				Kirkcudbright Academy				
			Capacity:	70				193				
			Distance:	0-1				0-1				
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 within close proximity to local services. 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 reasonably well located in relation to local services, 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		Y	Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)	Part Urban and Part 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 some prime quality agricultural land.							
SEA OVERVIEW	The loss of some prime quality 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			SV	0		0
Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere	CF and PHH	Y	Site appears in pluvial SEPA flood maps. A minor watercourse flows along the site boundary which could represent a potential flood risk. The Council and SEPA hold flood records of flooding in Nov 2010 leading to flooding on the road from the pond at the War Memorial.		C	X	Flood Risk 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	Gatehouse WwTW has sufficient capacity.		C	0		0
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water	PHH	Y	Glengap WTW has sufficient capacity		C	0		0

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

supply								
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 FRA which will ascertain 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 resolved.							
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	N	Housing and fields	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		SV	0		0	
PLANNING OVERVIEW	There are no known air quality issues in relation to the site							
SEA OVERVIEW	There are no known 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	Greenfield site – there are no existing structures that can be reused		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		n/a						

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

(paragraph 4.9)									
Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site			Pylons N	Bord Gais Eirann pipeline N	Shell oil pipeline N	Transco pipeline N			
			Comment: There are no known servicing constraints in relation to this site						
Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies			Air Traffic/NATS N	MoD N	Carlisle Airport N	Coal Authority N	HSE N		
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Development of this site would result in the loss of a greenfield land								
SEA OVERVIEW	The loss of greenfield land would be a negative SEA impact						SEA SCORE: X		

ROADS/ACCESS									
Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated			This proposed site for up to 6 no. dwellinghouses lies to the south of the B727 public road. The proposed development site would appear to be land locked and any access would require land outwith the application site. There is a network of existing private access ways between the U601s Ann Street public road and the U26s Cally Avenue public road however these are not to an adoptable standard. Access may be achievable from the B747, however; 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	There are issues in trying to secure an access into the site								

CLIMATIC FACTORS								
What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)			North facing	SV	X		X	
Can the site make best use of solar gain		?	Possibly	SV	X	The layout and design should ensure solar gain and look to create sustainable buildings in line with policies OP1f and OP2	0	
Is the site protected from prevailing winds		?	Surrounding development may provide some protection	SV	0	Sustainable design and construction techniques can incorporate energy efficiency measures in line with policies OP1f and OP2. Structural planting to the southern boundary may provide some protection of the site in the future	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 despite its north facing aspect.							
SEA OVERVIEW	There are positive SEA impacts that can be gained through designing for solar gain and including sustainable construction techniques						SEA SCORE: X	

CULTURAL HERITAGE								
Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting	L	Listed Building	Y	Scheduled Monuments	N	Comment: Adjacent to Conservation Area, on rising ground overlooking it. Bounded to south by Old Military Road and to west by historic lade supplying Fleet Mills. Would have setting issues on the entry to Cally Inventory Designed Landscape.		
		Conservation Area	Y	Inventory of Historic Battlefield	N			
		World Heritage Site	N	Inventory & Non-Inventory	Y			

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

		Archaeological site	N	Garden or Designed Landscape		Difficult to envisage a layout that would preserve or enhance the character; 5 Category B Listed Buildings back onto the site and their wider setting would be impacted on. In addition the setting of the Category B Listed Cally Main Gate lodges, gates and piers would be affected. It is not clear how access would be gained for the development or how it would affect the character of the area.			
Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment	L	N	Development of the site would potentially have a negative impact on several cultural heritage assets	SV	X	Layout and design may help lessen or reduce any adverse impact	X		
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Development of the site will impact on the setting of the conservation area, the listed buildings and the inventory designed landscape. Layout and design may help lessen or reduce any adverse impact although that may be difficult to achieve								
SEA OVERVIEW	Development of the site is likely to have a negative impact on cultural heritage						SEA SCORE: X		

LANDSCAPE										
Is the site within or adjoining any of the following			NSAs	Y		RSA's	N	Comment: Fleet valley NSA		
			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	Development is not considered acceptable on landscape and visual grounds. Development would impact on the main approach into the settlement and would denigrate the distinction between the inventory designed landscape and existing settlement.				SV C	X		X
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement		N	The open ground provides a significant backdrop when seen from the west and is on the main approach down the hill from Cally gates. Site should remain open and green.				SV C	X		X
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		Y					SV C	X		X
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Development of the site will have a significant impact on the main approach into and the setting of the settlement									
SEA OVERVIEW	Development of the site would have a negative SEA impact						SEA SCORE: X			

PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES		
Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	Y	Adjacent to settlement boundary
Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site	Y	
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips	Y	The site is covered by a National Trust Conservation Agreement. Further discussions would need to be had with National Trust for Scotland to see if they could be relaxed.
Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe	?	
OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT	The site is not being recommended for development as development of the site would have a significant impact on the landscape approach into and the setting of the settlement. It would also have a significant impact on setting of the Conservation Area, the listed buildings and the inventory designed	

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

OVERALL SEA COMMENT	<p>landscape.</p> <p>Minor negative and positive SEA issues, including development of a greenfield site and a negative impact on cultural heritage and the landscape. However, the site is within walking distance of existing services and facilities which could encourage active travel and reduce carbon emissions from transport and the sites aspect should also enable positive benefit to be achieved from solar gain.</p>
----------------------------	--

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

Site Ref: GOF.H203	Source of site suggestion: Site identified as a possible housing site when current LDP was being prepared	Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date): None	
Site name: land to north of Baker's Dozen			
Settlement: Gatehouse of Fleet	Current use: Greenfield	Existing LDP allocations/ designations: N/A	
OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): 259425, 556535			
Site Size (ha): 4.14	Proposed use: Housing	HMA: Stewartry	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	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)		

0-1 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: There are no known 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	Y	Potential habitat fragmentation due to the loss of a greenfield site on edge of settlement. Development could have an impact on field boundaries and the mature trees on the western boundary		SV	X	Where appropriate, measures to enhance biodiversity should be implemented, such as the use of locally native tree species in landscape schemes, habitat creation, and the creation of greenways and wildlife corridors along transport corridors, footpaths and cycleways, to encourage the movement of species.	0	
PLANNING OVERVIEW	The existing field boundaries and mature trees should be retained as far as possible							
SEA OVERVIEW	Provided that biodiversity interests are fully taken into account in any development proposals and that these areas may be improved or enhanced there should be no negative SEA issues.						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	Open field not part of protected open space	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	Y 0-1	Sports facilities	Y 0-1	Hospitalities	Y 0-1	Local shops (convenience)	Y 0-1	Bus stop	Y 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:		Gatehouse				Kirkcudbright Academy				
	Capacity:		70				193				
	Distance:		0-1				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	The site is within close proximity to local services. Residential development will help to support services and facilities in the area.										

0-1 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 within close proximity to local services. Residential development will help to support services and facilities in the area.	SEA SCORE: +
---------------------	---	---------------------

SOILS								
Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land		N	Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)	3.2	C	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 previous known use		C	0		0
Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat	CF	N			C	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			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	A minor watercourse flows along site boundary which could represent a potential flood risk. Historical data held relating to overland flows causing flooding to properties. Information including size and condition on the culverted system along the West Boundary to be provided. A surface water flood hazard has been identified and should be discussed with FPA and Scottish Water.		C	X	Drainage Impact Assessment required. Depending on content, a Flood Risk Assessment may also be required. 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			C	0		0
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer	PHH	Y	Gatehouse WwTW has sufficient capacity.		C	0		0
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply	PHH	Y	Glengap WTW has sufficient capacity		C	0		0

0-1 Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required
------------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

PLANNING OVERVIEW	A drainage impact assessment required to help determine what appropriate surface water management measures need to be 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	N	Housing and agricultural field	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		SV	0		0		
PLANNING OVERVIEW	There are no known air quality issues in relation to the site								
SEA OVERVIEW	There are no known 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	Greenfield site – there are no existing structures that can be reused	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

0-1 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: There are no known servicing constraints in relation to this site										
Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies			Air Traffic/NATS	N	MoD	N	Carlisle Airport	N	Coal Authority	N	HSE	N	
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Development of this site would result in the loss of a greenfield land												
SEA OVERVIEW	The loss of greenfield land would be a negative SEA impact										SEA SCORE: X		

ROADS/ACCESS													
Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated			This proposed site lies to the south west of the B796, north of "Baker's Dozen". The site is partially within the current 30mph speed restricted area of Gatehouse of Fleet, however; this would require to be extended to incorporate the frontage of any proposed development. Outwith the existing 30mph speed restricted area, the public road narrows. Any development would require the public road to be widened to 5.5m with a 1.8m footway along the frontage and pedestrian crossing points to link with the footway opposite, providing links into the village. At least 2 no. accesses would be required so as not to create an overlong cul-de-sac. 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	An access can be achieved into this site												

CLIMATIC FACTORS												
What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)			Open flat field	SV	+						+	
Can the site make best use of solar gain		Y	Possibly	SV	+	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	Open exposed north west boundary	SV	X	Sustainable design and construction techniques can incorporate energy efficiency measures in line with policies OP1f and OP2. Structural planting to the southern boundary may provide some protection of the site in the future				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	There are positive SEA impacts that can be gained through designing for solar gain and including 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: No impact on cultural heritage						
		Conservation Area	N	Inventory of Historic Battlefield	N							
		World Heritage Site	N	Inventory & Non-Inventory	N							
		Archaeological site	N	Garden or Designed Landscape	N							

0-1 Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required	
Will the development of the site 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 issues								
SEA OVERVIEW	There are no SEA issues						SEA SCORE: 0		

LANDSCAPE										
Is the site within or adjoining any of the following		NSAs	Y	RSAs	N	Comment: Fleet Valley NSA				
		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	Development could be acceptable and would be consistent with existing settlement pattern.			SV	0	Retain dykes / hedges, reinforce west, east and northern boundaries with additional tree planting to provide visual screen and integrate with trees adjacent to site and beyond.	0	
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement		N	Gatehouse has a very strong pattern of development in its centre which is not reflected in the adjoining 'Baker's Dozen' development of bungalows, laid out with little opportunity for subsequent development.			SV	0	Any new development should reinforce the original pattern of the town rather than replicate the adjoining development.	0	
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		N				SV	0		0	
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Site is on a prominent approach to the settlement, careful design and landscaping will be required to reduce any adverse impact.									
SEA OVERVIEW	There are no SEA issues						SEA SCORE: 0			

PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES									
Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	Y								
Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site	N	The landowner has been identified but they have not been contacted to see if they would be willing to dispose of the site.							
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips	Y	The site is covered by a National Trust Conservation Agreement. Further discussions would need to be had with National Trust for Scotland to see if they could be relaxed.							
Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe	?								
OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT	The site is on the edge of the settlement, development will need to be carefully designed to ensure it integrates well with the existing settlement. Gatehouse of Fleet is surrounded by Conservation Agreements with the National Trust which restricts what the land can be used for. Discussions need to take place with the National Trust for Scotland to see if they would be willing for the site to be developed.								
OVERALL SEA COMMENT	Minor negative and positive SEA issues, including development of a greenfield site and loss of best quality agricultural land (classification 3.2). However, the site is within walking distance of existing services and facilities which could encourage active travel and reduce carbon emissions from transport and the sites aspect should also enable positive benefit to be achieved from solar gain.								

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

Site Ref: GOF.B&I201	Source of site suggestion: Call for sites submission	Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date): None	
Site name: Laurieston Road			
Settlement: Gatehouse of Fleet	Current use: Greenfield	Existing LDP allocations/ designations: None	
OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing):			
Site Size (ha):	Proposed use: Tourism and leisure	HMA: Stewartry	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		N		Comments: There are no known 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	Y	Potential habitat fragmentation due to the loss of a greenfield site on periphery of settlement. Trees on boundary of site		SV	X	Retaining woodland in line with Policy NE7. Where appropriate, measures to enhance biodiversity should be implemented, such as the use of locally native tree species in landscape schemes, habitat creation, and the creation of greenways and wildlife corridors along transport corridors, footpaths and cycleways, to encourage the movement of species.	0		
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Development should not impact on the trees on the periphery of the site								
SEA OVERVIEW	Provided that biodiversity interests are fully taken into account in any development proposals and that these areas may be improved or enhanced there should be no negative SEA issues						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	A greenfield site adjacent to the tennis courts and golf course. Does not form part of the protected open space			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										
What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)	CF	Cycle path	N	Community/village hall	Y 0-1	Sports facilities	Y 0-1	Hospitalities	Y 0-1	Local shops (convenience)	Y 0-1	Bus stop	Y 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	Gatehouse				Secondary	Kirkcudbright Academy			
		School name:	70				193						
		Capacity:	0-1				10-20						
		Distance:											
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 within close proximity to local services. New businesses would also provide additional employment opportunities 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 improve access to employment opportunities resulting in positive SEA impacts						SEA SCORE: +
---------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	---------------------

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	C	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			C	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 is a body of water which traverses the site.		SV	0		0
Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere	CF and PHH	Y	There is a minor watercourse which runs along the site boundary which could represent a potential flood risk. Site appears in pluvial SEPA flood maps. The Council hold records of flooding in connection to the site. A surface water flood hazard has been identified and should be discussed with FPA and Scottish Water.		C	X	Flood Risk Assessment required. 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			C	0		0
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer	PHH	Y	Gatehouse WwTW -1 around 220 meters away from WwTW zone. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.		C	?	Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.	0
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water	PHH	Y	Glengap WTW has sufficient capacity. There is a 4" and 6" water mains through middle of site		C	0		0

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

supply			that look as though go straight to WTW						
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 Flood Risk Assessment which will ascertain 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 resolved.								
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	N	Tennis courts, golf course, agricultural fields	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		SV	0		0		
PLANNING OVERVIEW	There are no known air quality issues in relation to the site								
SEA OVERVIEW	There are no known 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	Greenfield site – there are no existing structures that can be reused	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		n/a							

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

set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9)											
Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site		Pylons	N	Bord Gais Eirann pipeline	N	Shell oil pipeline	N	Transco pipeline	N		
		Comment: There are no known servicing constraints in relation to this site									
Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies		Air Traffic/NATS	N	MoD	N	Carlisle Airport	N	Coal Authority	N	HSE	N
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Development of this site would result in the loss of a greenfield land										
SEA OVERVIEW	The loss of greenfield land would be a negative SEA impact							SEA SCORE: X			

ROADS/ACCESS										
Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated		This remote site fronts onto the C13s out with the 30mph speed limit with no street lighting provision and an informal footpath. Given the remoteness of this site and poor sustainable links consideration should be given to connectivity with Gatehouse of Fleet with suitable provision for pedestrian, cyclists and public transport. It would be appropriate that a Transport Assessment be included as part of any proposal. Any development of this proposed site should be in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Councils Technical Advice Note 5 'Roads and Accesses for Industrial Developments' with parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards.								
PLANNING OVERVIEW	An access can be provided into the site. Any development proposal would need to include provision for sustainable transport									

CLIMATIC FACTORS										
What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)		Open site			SV	0		0		
Can the site make best use of solar gain		Y			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	Open site with little protection from prevailing winds		SV	X	Sustainable design and construction techniques can incorporate energy efficiency measures in line with policies OP1f and OP2. Structural planting to the southern boundary may provide some protection of the site in the future	+		
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 positive SEA impacts that can be gained through designing for solar gain and including 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: No impact on cultural heritage			
		Conservation Area	N	Inventory of Historic Battlefield	N				
		World Heritage Site	N	Inventory & Non-Inventory	N				

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

		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 issues							
SEA OVERVIEW	There are no SEA issues							SEA SCORE: 0

LANDSCAPE									
Is the site within or adjoining any of the following		NSAs	Y	RSAs	N	Comment: Fleet Valley NSA			
		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	Not considered suitable for development. Site is characterised by open fields/parkland which extend to north with ancient woodland of plantation origin to east, atop drumlin. Land rises steeply from lane with a terrace running roughly north-south. Established line of ash trees to northern section of roadside (should be retained as a landscape feature). Excluding the western corner, the site has a strong rural sense of place and is associated with open parkland to the east and north rather than the settlement. It contains several large parkland trees and includes a proportion of the established woodland; both aspects should be retained, as should the open rural character of the site (NB previous restrictions from services created an artificial edge to any potential site –this may still apply).			SV C	X	The western corner adjacent to Castramon Rd might be suitable for development. Trees should be retained and enhanced in any landscaping scheme	+/-
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement		N	Site is separate from the settlement			SV	X		X
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		N	Greenfield site separate from settlement			SV	0		0
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Development of the site would have an impact on the landscape which it may be difficult to mitigation against. Careful consideration would need to be given to design, scale and massing of any development and landscaping would need to be an integral part of any development								
SEA OVERVIEW	Development of the site would have a negative impact on the landscape							SEA SCORE: X	

PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES		
Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	N	
Have all landowners been identified and have they	Y	

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

agreed to disposal/development of the site								
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips	Y		The site is covered by a National Trust Conservation Agreement. Further discussions would need to be had with National Trust for Scotland to see if they could be relaxed.					
Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe	?							
OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT	The site has been proposed for a tourist / leisure type development. The plan does not make any specific allocations for this type of development as there are policies which would be used to assess any proposal. The site is remote from the settlement and it may be difficult to address the impact the development may have on the landscape.							
OVERALL SEA COMMENT	Minor negative and positive SEA issues, including development of a greenfield site, loss of prime quality agricultural land and integration with the existing settlement. However, the site is within walking distance of existing services and facilities which could encourage active travel and reduce carbon emissions from transport and the sites aspect should also enable positive benefit to be achieved from solar gain.							