## LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

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

### TOPIC SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora</th>
<th>Population and Human Health</th>
<th>Soils</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Material Assets</th>
<th>Climatic Factors</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score Symbol</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scoring Guidance**

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

### Related SEA topic

- Population and Human Health (PHH)
- Climatic Factors (CF)
- Biodiversity (B)
- Landscape (L)
- Material Assets (MA)

**Information source**

- Geographic Information System (GIS)
- Site visit (SV)
- Consultee (C)
- Other (O)

**Consultation required (only if answer is Yes)**

- Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
- Transport Scotland (TS)
- Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
- Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
### BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>SACs</th>
<th>NLR</th>
<th>SPAs</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SSSIs</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Local wildlife sites</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Natterjack toads</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Great Crested Newts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAMSAR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Geodiversity Sites</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Other protected species</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Marine Consultation Zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient/semi-natural woodland</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:** No strategic comments from SNH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there any known invasive species within the site?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS &amp; SV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**
No designations affecting this site

**SEA OVERVIEW**
No designations affecting this site

### POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Distance (km)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cycle route on western edge of site providing link to Gretna Station</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Distance (km)**

| Distance to nearest area of open space | 1 |

- **Right of Way:** N
- **Core path:** N
- **Cycle path:** Y

**What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement? (Autumn 2015)**

| CF | Community/village hall | 1 |
| MA | Sports facilities | 1-5 |
| MA | Local shops (convenience) | 1-5 |
| MA | Bus stop | 0.1 |

- **Primary School name:** Springfield
- **Secondary School name:** Annan
- **Capacity (primary & secondary):** 31 & 331
- **Distance:** 1 & 10

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**
Site not within reasonable walking distance of the majority of community facilities and public open space. Close proximity to Gretna Station and could encourage active travel and use of sustainable transport.

**SEA OVERVIEW**
Site not within reasonable walking distance of the majority of community facilities and public open space. Close proximity to Gretna Station and could encourage active travel and use of sustainable transport.

**SEA Score:** +4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land</td>
<td>SOILS</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Prime quality agricultural land being actively farmed for cereal crops</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Generally flat site</td>
<td>SV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>No known previous use.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat</td>
<td></td>
<td>CF</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planning Overview**

Loss of prime agricultural land currently in production

**SEA Overview**

Loss of prime agricultural land.

**SEA Score:** X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WATER</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site</td>
<td>B and L</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>SV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>CF and PHH</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SEPA – no flood risk apparent No comment with regard to flood risk.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the requirements for this phase of the upgrade work. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site assessment question</td>
<td>Related SEA Topic</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Information source</td>
<td>Pre mitigation score</td>
<td>Mitigation if appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>There are no AQMA at present in the region</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby?</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Housing and M74 motorway, slip roads and B7076</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>M74 motorway and spur roads at height above site approx 5m embankment. Noise assessment required. Given that motorway at height mitigation measures are unlikely to be successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Overview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA Overview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site……</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site vacant or derelict</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No known previous use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore,</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site assessment question</td>
<td>Related SEA Topic</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Pre mitigation score</td>
<td>Mitigation if appropriate</td>
<td>Post mitigation score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site</td>
<td>Pylons N</td>
<td>Bord Gais Eirann pipeline N</td>
<td>Shell oil pipeline N</td>
<td>Transco pipeline N</td>
<td>Comment No servicing constraints in relation to this site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies</td>
<td>Air Traffic/NATS N</td>
<td>MoD N</td>
<td>Carlisle Airport N</td>
<td>Coal Authority N</td>
<td>HSE N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING OVERVIEW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of greenfield site. No servicing constraints in relation to this site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ROADS/ACCESS

Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated

This site (36 units) is located to the south of the C141a with access also available onto Gretna Loaning U530a. Access onto the C141a will require significant infill to achieve satisfactory access gradients. Consideration should be given to site GTN.H205 (158 units) which incorporates this site and the southern section of land to the M74. A Transport Assessment should be commissioned and a Masterplan should be provided for this site. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and a residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards

Planning Overview
Access to be provided onto Gretna Loaning U530a. Access onto the C141a will require significant infill to achieve satisfactory access gradients. A Transport Assessment should be commissioned and a Masterplan should be provided for this site. Ability to access the land to the south for potential long term expansion of Springfield should not be compromised.

CLIMATIC FACTORS

What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.) South
Can the site make best use of solar gain Y
Is the site protected from prevailing winds N Not sheltered from prevailing wind.

Planning Overview
Not sheltered from prevailing wind, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions

CULTURAL HERITAGE

Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Listed Building</th>
<th>Scheduled Monuments</th>
<th>Conservation Area</th>
<th>Inventory of Historic Battlefield</th>
<th>World Heritage Site</th>
<th>Inventory &amp; Non-Inventory Garden or Designed Landscape</th>
<th>Archaeological site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment Archaeology - Course of Roman Road thought to run through northern portion of site, evaluation will be required.

Historic Built Environment - No Listed Buildings; no conservation area. However, the Smithy on the road junction is Category B Listed and of significant social historical interest.
**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 | | | | |

**SEA OVERVIEW**
Archaeological site potentially affects part of site and evaluation will be required.

**SEA SCORE:** 0

---

**LANDSCAPE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site within or adjoining any of the following</th>
<th>NSAs</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>RSAs</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wild Land</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>TPOs</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planning Overview**
Archaeological mitigation measures to be implemented due to potential course of Roman road running through northern part of site.

---

**SEA OVERVIEW**
Archaeological site potentially affects part of site and evaluation will be required.

**SEA SCORE:** 0

---

**PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Existing housing allocation in adopted LDP. Previous consent has now expired.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Land is available for development and the landowner would like to see this land brought forward for housing development.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe | ? |

**Overall Planning Comment**
Although the site is an existing housing allocation in adopted LDP proposed housing use is not considered desirable due to proximity of M74 and associated slip road. Would require significant mitigation through bunding and tree planting to reduce dominance of M74/slip road. Landscape view is that creating a pleasant place to live would be challenging. Review site as an option for inclusion in LDP2.

**Overall SEA Comment**
Negative SEA impact due to loss of prime agricultural land and greenfield site. Distant from the majority of community facilities. Significant environmental interest. The church on the corner and the terrace of cottages on Gretna Loaning near the road junction were all built by the early 19th century and represent the core of the village. Development should reinforce the local character.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>issues due to proximity of M74 and slip roads at height. Mitigation measures considered unlikely to be successful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GTN.H1
## LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref: GTN.H2</th>
<th>Source of site suggestion: LDP allocation</th>
<th>Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date): Previous consents June 2016 – Proposal of Application Notice 16/N/4/001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site name: land north of Victory Avenue (Phase 1)</td>
<td>Source of site suggestion: LDP allocation</td>
<td>Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date): Previous consents June 2016 – Proposal of Application Notice 16/N/4/001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement: Gretna Border</td>
<td>Current use: Agricultural land</td>
<td>Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date): Previous consents June 2016 – Proposal of Application Notice 16/N/4/001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): 331687, 567641</td>
<td>Proposed use: Housing</td>
<td>Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date): Previous consents June 2016 – Proposal of Application Notice 16/N/4/001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size (ha): 15.63</td>
<td>Proposed use: Housing</td>
<td>Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date): Previous consents June 2016 – Proposal of Application Notice 16/N/4/001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora</th>
<th>Population and Human Health</th>
<th>Soils</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Material Assets</th>
<th>Climatic Factors</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scoring Guidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Significant positive impact</th>
<th>Positive impact</th>
<th>Neutral impact</th>
<th>Unknown impact</th>
<th>Both Positive and Negative impacts</th>
<th>Negative impact</th>
<th>Significant negative impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score Symbol</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+/x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Legends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related SEA topic</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Consultation required (only if answer is Yes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population and Human Health (PHH)</td>
<td>Geographic Information System (GIS)</td>
<td>Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climatic Factors (CF)</td>
<td>Site visit (SV)</td>
<td>Transport Scotland (TS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity (B)</td>
<td>Consultant (C)</td>
<td>Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape (L)</td>
<td>Other (O)</td>
<td>Historic Environment Scotland (HES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Assets (MA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>SACs</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>LNR</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SPAs</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SSSIs</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any known invasive species within the site</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Greenfield site on edge of settlement. Careful consideration of design and planting could help create new habitats within this development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLANNING OVERVIEW

No designations affecting this site. No strategic comments from SNH. Careful consideration of design and planting could help create new habitats within this development.

### SEA OVERVIEW

No designations affecting this site. SEA Score: 0

### POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance (km)</td>
<td>Community/village hall</td>
<td>Sports facilities</td>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>Local shops (convenience)</td>
<td>Bus stop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School name</td>
<td>Gretna</td>
<td>Annan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>331</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLANNING OVERVIEW

Within close walking distance to existing facilities, school and direct access to Gretna station. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.

### SEA OVERVIEW

Within close walking distance to existing facilities, school and direct access to Gretna station. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.

SEA Score: +
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relatively flat open site bounded by embankment of A75 and slip roads to north</td>
<td>SV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>No known previous use</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat</td>
<td>CF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOILS**

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

Loss of prime agricultural land currently in production

**SEA OVERVIEW**

Would involve loss of prime agricultural land

**SEA SCORE:** X

**WATER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site</th>
<th>B and L</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Evidence of some boggy areas and watercourse.</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Drainage Impact Assessment required. Depending on content, Flood Risk Assessment is required which will require to be agreed with SEPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CF and PHH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Site appears in pluvial SEPA flood maps. Body of water traverses the site. SEPA - Small watercourse flows through allocation and potential flood risk from this source should be taken cognisance of.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td></td>
<td>Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GTN.H2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Supply

alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the requirements for this phase of the upgrade work. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October 2010) refers.

A 12"trunk main is running through site and a 90mm water main. Appropriate stand off distances will have to be established with Scottish Water's Asset Impact team.

### Planning Overview

Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. A 12"trunk main is running through site and a 90mm water main. Appropriate stand off distances will have to be established with Scottish Water's Asset Impact team.

### SEA Overview

Potential flood risk. Drainage Impact Assessment required. Depending on content, Flood Risk Assessment will also be required which will require to be agreed with SEPA. Gretna – limited water network capacity subject to planned upgrading by Scottish Water which will require developer contributions.

### Air Quality

| Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA | N | There are no AQMA at present in the region | C | 0 | 0 |
| What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby | PHH | N | North – A75 and rail line. East – Business and industry South – housing, community facilities and school | SV | x | Noise assessment would be required together with any necessary mitigation will be required to address cumulative noise pollution from A75 and railway. Consideration will need to be given to appropriate landscaping and screening | 0 |
| Does the development of the site introduce a new potentially significant air emission to the area (e.g. combined heat and power, an industrial process, large scale quarry of energy from the waste plant) | N | 0 | 0 |

### Planning Overview

Noise assessment would be required together with any necessary mitigation will be required to address cumulative noise pollution from A75 and railway. Consideration will need to be given to appropriate landscaping and screening.

### SEA Overview

Noise assessment would be required together with any necessary mitigation to address cumulative noise pollution from A75 and railway. Consideration would need to be given to appropriate landscaping and screening.

SEA Score: 0
### MATERIAL ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site…..</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site vacant or derelict</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>No known previous use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>There are no existing structure for reuse on the site</td>
<td>SV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site</td>
<td>Pylons</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Bord Gais Eirann pipeline</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shell oil pipeline</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Transco pipeline</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>There are no servicing constraints in relation to this site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies</td>
<td>Air Traffic/NATS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MoD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Carlisle Airport</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Coal Authority</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HSE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLANNING OVERVIEW

Loss of greenfield site. There are no servicing constraints in relation to this site

### SEA OVERVIEW

Loss of greenfield site. SEA Score: X

### ROADS/ACCESS

This site (104 units) is situated to the west of the B7076 and Victory Avenue C68a. Sites GTN.H2, H7, H4 and H3 are all linked with multiple connections onto various public roads, this would result in an overall development of over 350 units. It would be appropriate that a development brief be provided for this site, and that any future applicant provide a Transport Assessment and that a cumulative Masterplan be provided for all of these sites. Should this site be developed in isolation, this should not prejudice the future development of adjacent sites. An appropriate junction arrangement for the B7076 and C68a should be designed and agreed in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and a residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards.

An appropriate junction arrangement for the B7076 and C68a should be designed and agreed in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. It would be appropriate that a development brief be provided for this site, and that any future applicant provide a Transport Assessment and that a cumulative Masterplan be provided for all of these sites. Should this site be developed in isolation, this should not prejudice the future development of adjacent sites.

GTN.H2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)</td>
<td>South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the site make best use of solar gain</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Open flat site.</td>
<td>The layout should ensure solar gain and look to create sustainable buildings in line with policies OP1f and OP2.</td>
<td>SV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site protected from prevailing winds</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Open relatively flat site</td>
<td></td>
<td>SV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLIMATIC FACTORS**

**PLANNING OVERVIEW** Housing design could make use of passive solar gain, reducing energy use and carbon emissions. The layout should ensure solar gain and look to create sustainable buildings in line with policies OP1f and OP2.

**SEA OVERVIEW** Site is southerly facing. Housing design could make use of passive solar gain, reducing energy use and carbon emissions. **SEA SCORE:** +

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CULTURAL HERITAGE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>Scheduled Monuments</td>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
<td>Inventory of Historic Battlefield</td>
<td>World Heritage Site</td>
<td>Inventory &amp; Non-Inventor Garden or Designed Landscape</td>
<td>Archaeological site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW** Development should reinforce the layout of the planned town of Gretna which is of national wartime interest. The design of buildings should integrate street scene along Victory Avenue and take account of nearby listed buildings.

**SEA OVERVIEW** No cultural heritage issues identified. **SEA SCORE:** 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANDSCAPE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within or adjoining any of the following</td>
<td></td>
<td>NSAs</td>
<td>Wild Land</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>TPOs</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Comment Open landscape – no trees or hedgerows.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Comments on masterplanning exercise apply. Screen from slip road/A75 with woodland planting.</td>
<td>C &amp; SV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Design in combination with H3, H4, H7 and existing residential developments to ensure permeability and sense of place.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>C &amp; SV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C &amp; SV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW** Design in combination with sites H3, H4, H7 and existing residential developments to ensure permeability and sense of place.

GTN.H2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEA OVERVIEW Screen from slip road/A75 with woodland and planting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEA SCORE: 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT**

Site allocated for housing in adopted LDP and current developer interest - Proposal of Application Notice 16/N/4/001 (June 2016). Masterplan should include: an overall road layout including access into the adjoining site GTN.H7 and a roundabout access into the site, phasing of the development, open space and footpath links integrated with the existing pedestrian/cycle path connecting to Gretna Green railway station. Should this site be developed in isolation, this should not prejudice the future development of adjacent sites. The design of buildings should integrate street-scene along Victory Avenue and especially with listed buildings. A noise assessment along with any necessary mitigation will be required to address cumulative noise pollution from the A75 and railway line to the north.

**OVERALL SEA COMMENT**

Negative SEA impact as greenfield site and loss of prime agricultural land. Proximity of site to community facilities and railway station. Potential to encourage range of sustainable transport modes.
### LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora</th>
<th>Population and Human Health</th>
<th>Soils</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Material Assets</th>
<th>Climatic Factors</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scoring Guidance**

- **Impact**
  - Significant positive impact
  - Positive impact
  - Neutral impact
  - Unknown impact
  - Both Positive and Negative impacts
  - Negative impact
  - Significant negative impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Symbol</th>
<th>++</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>+/x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>xx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Legends**

- **Related SEA topic**
  - Population and Human Health (PHH)
  - Climatic Factors (CF)
  - Biodiversity (B)
  - Landscape (L)
  - Material Assets (MA)

- **Information source**
  - Geographic Information System (GIS)
  - Site visit (SV)
  - Consultee (C)
  - Other (O)

- **Consultation required (only if answer is Yes)**
  - Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
  - Transport Scotland (TS)
  - Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
  - Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topics</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA</strong></td>
<td>Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)</td>
<td>SACs: N</td>
<td>LNR: N</td>
<td>SPA: N</td>
<td>SSSIs: N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SACs</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LNR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SPA: N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SSSIs</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NNR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Local wildlife sites</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Natterjack toads</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Great Crested Newts</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAMSAR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Geodiversity Sites</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Other protected species</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Marine Consultation Zones</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ancient/semi-natural woodland</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: No strategic comments from SNH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are there any known invasive species within the site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PLANNING OVERVIEW</strong></td>
<td>No biodiversity designations affect site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SEA OVERVIEW</strong></td>
<td>No designations affecting site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distance to nearest area of open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distance (km)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them</td>
<td>MA or CF</td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Comment: Within 1km of pedestrian cycle route to Gretna railway station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core path</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cycle path</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)</td>
<td>CF</td>
<td>Community/village hall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sports facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School name:</td>
<td>Gretna</td>
<td>Annan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity:</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>331</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distance:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere</td>
<td>MA and B</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PLANNING OVERVIEW</strong></td>
<td>Within close walking distance to existing facilities, school and Gretna railway station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SEA OVERVIEW</strong></td>
<td>Within close walking distance to existing facilities, school and Gretna railway station. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SEA SCORE:</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Soil classification</td>
<td>(The James Hutton Institute)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>known previous use</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Former caravan park</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat</td>
<td>CF</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW** No impact on soils

**SEA OVERVIEW** No impact

**SEA SCORE:** 0

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WATER</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site</td>
<td>B and L</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Watercourse adjacent to site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>CF and PHH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Site appears in pluvial SEPA flood maps. Body of water lies adjacent to the site. SEPA - A minor watercourse flows along the site boundary which could represent a potential flood risk and a potentially culverted watercourse flows through the site.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Drainage Impact Assessment required. Depending on content, Flood Risk Assessment may also be required which will require to be agreed with SEPA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site assessment question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site assessment question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLANNING OVERVIEW

Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October 2010) refers.

### SEA OVERVIEW

Potential flood risk. Drainage Impact Assessment required. Depending on content, Flood Risk Assessment may also be required which will require to be agreed with SEPA.

### AIR QUALITY

| Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA? | 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 | 0 | 0 |
| Does the development of the site introduce a new potentially significant air emission to the area (e.g. combined heat and power, an industrial process, large scale quarry of energy from the waste plant)? | N | 0 | 0 |

### PLANNING OVERVIEW

Unlikely to decrease air quality

### SEA OVERVIEW

Unlikely to decrease air quality

### MATERIAL ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site….</th>
<th>Brownfield</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Greenfield</th>
<th>Is the site vacant or derelict</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Former caravan park</th>
<th>+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore,</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Site assessment question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**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)**

- 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)?
- Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site?

  - Pylons: N
  - Bord Gais Eirann pipeline: N
  - Shell oil pipeline: N
  - Transco pipeline: N

**Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies?**

- Air Traffic/NATS: N
- MoD: N
- Carlisle Airport: N
- Coal Authority: N
- HSE: N

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

- Brownfield site and benefits from proximity to existing infrastructure

**SEA OVERVIEW**

- Brownfield site and benefits from proximity to existing infrastructure

**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?

**CLIMATIC FACTORS**

- What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)? Southerly aspect and flat.
- Can the site make best use of solar gain? Y
- Is the site protected from prevailing winds? Y

**CULTURAL HERITAGE**

- Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting?
  - Listed Building: Y
  - Conservation Area: N
  - World Heritage Site: N
  - Archaeological Site: N
  - Scheduled Monuments: N
  - Inventory of Historic Battlefield: N
  - Inventory & Non-Inventory Garden or Designed Landscape: N

**Comment Archeology**

- No historic environment issues identified for this site, as of July 2016

**Historic Built Environment**

- No conservation area. Site is within the planned town and design should reflect this and reinforce the character. On southern boundary with...
### Site assessment question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category B Listed hotel The Gables designed by Raymond Unwin as part of the Gretna new town. Development should respect proximity of the setting. Also in main view from western side of Category B Listed Church.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Design should reflect planned town of Gretna and reinforce the character and respect setting and proximity of listed building on southern boundary.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

Design should reflect planned town of Gretna and reinforce the character and respect setting and proximity of listed building on southern boundary.

**SEA OVERVIEW**

Impact on planned town of Gretna and setting of listed building on southern boundary. Design should reflect and reinforce historic character. SEA Score: 0

### LANDSCAPE

| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following |
| NSAs | N | RSAs | N | Comment |
| 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 |
| Suitable for development: No particularly strong landscape elements or views. Used as caravan park and storage. | + |
| Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement |
| Y |
| Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site |
| N |

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

Design in combination with H2, H4, H7 and existing residential developments to ensure permeability and sense of place. +

**SEA OVERVIEW**

No impact on landscape elements or views. Suitable for development. SEA Score: +

### 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 |
| Y |
| Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe |
| Y |

**OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT**

Allocated housing site in adopted LDP and current planning application 16/P/4/0212 for 46 units (Phase 5) by Hadrian Homes. Effective housing site with current developer interest.

**OVERALL SEA COMMENT**

Positive SEA impact - development of brownfield site and proximity to community facilities, school and Gretna railway station. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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## LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

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

### TOPIC SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora</th>
<th>Population and Human Health</th>
<th>Soils</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Material Assets</th>
<th>Climatic Factors</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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**
  - Population and Human Health (PHH)
  - Climatic Factors (CF)
  - Biodiversity (B)
  - Landscape (L)
  - Material Assets (MA)

- **Information source**
  - Geographic Information System (GIS)
  - Site visit (SV)
  - Consultee (C)
  - Other (O)

- **Consultation required (only if answer is Yes)**
  - Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
  - Transport Scotland (TS)
  - Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
  - Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
### BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>SACs</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>LNR</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SPAs</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SSSIs</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any known invasive species within the site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLANNING OVERVIEW
- No designations affecting site

### SEA OVERVIEW
- No designations affecting site

### POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Distance (km)</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>MA or CF</td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Comment: Within 1km of pedestrian cycle route to Gretna railway station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them</td>
<td>MA or CF</td>
<td>Core path</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle path</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)</td>
<td>CF</td>
<td>Community/village hall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local shops (convenience)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus stop</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>School name: Gretna</td>
<td>Annan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity:</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>331</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere</td>
<td>MA and B</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLANNING OVERVIEW
- Within reasonable walking distance of existing community facilities and Gretna railway station – scope to encourage variety of sustainable transport modes.

### SEA OVERVIEW
- Within reasonable walking distance of existing community facilities and Gretna railway station – scope to encourage variety of sustainable transport modes.

**SEA Score:** +
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topics</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Relatively flat site</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The site is currently in use as a dog racing track and lorry park. Some further investigation may be required.</td>
<td>SV/C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Contaminated land investigation may be required given previous uses.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat</td>
<td>CF</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANNING OVERVIEW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contaminated land investigation may be required given previous uses as a dog racing track and lorry park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEA OVERVIEW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contaminated land investigation may be required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEA Score: 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOILS**

**WATER**

Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site | B and L | N | SV | 0 | 0 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>CF and PHH</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>SEPA – no flood risk apparent</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any, this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the requirements for this phase of the upgrade work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site assessment question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Related SEA Topic**

**Yes/No**

**Pre mitigation score**

**Mitigation if appropriate**

**Post mitigation score**

**Consultation required**

---

### PLANNING OVERVIEW

Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October 2010) refers.

### SEA OVERVIEW

No known flood risk. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing waste water network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.

Gretna – limited water network capacity subject to planned upgrading by Scottish Water which will require developer contributions.

### AIR QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>There are no AQMA at present in the region</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby?</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>North – A7 and railway line. East and South – housing. West – agricultural land. Noise pollution from elevated A75 and railway line to north. SEPA noted an issue with air quality given the sites location</td>
<td>SV/C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Appropriate mitigation and landscaping against noise pollution from the A75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>SV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

Appropriate mitigation required against noise pollution and landscaping required to minimise impact from adjoining A75 and trains using railway line due north.

**SEA OVERVIEW**

Potential significant noise impact from A75 and railway line to north. Appropriate mitigation and landscaping to minimise noise pollution. Railway station in settlement: could encourage use of more sustainable transport and reduce carbon emissions from transport.

### MATERIAL ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site…..</th>
<th>Brownfield</th>
<th>Comment Dog racing park and lorry park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site vacant or derelict</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some further investigation may be required given previous uses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site assessment question</td>
<td>Related SEA Topic</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Existing buildings on site associated with racing track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site</td>
<td>Pylons</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Bord Gais Eirann pipeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>No known serving constraints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies</td>
<td>Air Traffic/NATS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MoD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**
Brownfield site in proximity to existing infrastructure. Contaminated land investigation may be required given previous uses.  

**SEA OVERVIEW**
Brownfield site in proximity to existing infrastructure. Some further investigation may be required given previous uses.  

**SEA SCORE:** +

**ROADS/ACCESS**

| Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated | This site (85 units) fronts the B721 with site GTN,H7 along the northern boundary. Sites GTN,H4, H7, H2 and H3 are all linked with multiple connections onto various public roads, this would result in an overall development of over 350 units. It would be appropriate that a development brief be provided for this site, and that any future applicant provide a Transport Assessment and that a cumulative Masterplan be provided for all of these sites. Should this site be developed in isolation, this should not prejudice the future development of adjacent sites. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and a residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards | | |
| Site fronts the B721 with site GTN,H7 along the northern boundary. Sites GTN,H4, H7, H2 and H3 are all linked with multiple connections onto various public roads. It would be appropriate that a development brief be provided for this site, and that any future applicant provide a Transport Assessment and that a cumulative Masterplan be provided for all of these sites. Should this site be developed in isolation, this should not prejudice the future development of adjacent sites. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and a residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards | | |

**CLIMATIC FACTORS**

| What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.) | South | SV | 0 | 0 |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | Y | Generally flat site | SV | 0 | 0 |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | Y | Exposed to the south and west. | SV | X | Appropriate landscaping and layout should take into account aspect and prevailing winds to the south west |

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**
Appropriate landscaping and layout should take into account aspect and prevailing winds to the south west.
## SEA Overview

Negative SEA impact in terms of exposure to south west wind. Appropriate landscaping and layout should take into account aspect and prevailing winds to the south west. **SEA Score: 0**

## Cultural Heritage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting</th>
<th>Listed Building</th>
<th>Scheduled Monuments</th>
<th>Conservation Area</th>
<th>Inventory of Historic Battlefield</th>
<th>World Heritage Site</th>
<th>Inventory &amp; Non-Inventory</th>
<th>Archaeological site</th>
<th>Garden or Designed Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:** No historic environment issues identified for this site, as of July 2016. Historic Built Environment - Not Listed not in conservation area. Note – racetrack part of social history for Gretna.

## Planning Overview

No known cultural issues identified. **SEA Score: 0**

## Landscape

Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP?

- **Y** - Allocated housing site within the adopted LDP. Effective housing site with extant planning permission in principle 12/P/4/0004 PIP Granted Feb 2014 expires Feb 2017 and subject to a concluded Section 75 agreement

## Planning/Effectiveness Issues

Site is clearly seen from the A75 and west. Western boundary needs to be strengthened by hedgerow and tree planting. Tree planting on the western and northern boundary would help mitigate impacts from the A75. **SEA Score: 0**

GTN.H4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Allocated housing site within the adopted LDP. Effective housing site with extant planning permission in principle 12/P/4/0004 PIP Granted Feb 2014 expires Feb 2017 and subject to a concluded Section 75 agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT**

Allocated housing site within the adopted LDP. Effective housing site with extant planning permission in principle 12/P/4/0004 PIP Granted Feb 2014 expires Feb 2017 and subject to a concluded Section 75 agreement.

**OVERALL SEA COMMENT**

Positive SEA impact. Reuse of brownfield site and within reasonable walking distance of existing community facilities and railway station—scope to encourage variety of sustainable transport modes and reduce carbon emissions from transport.
### LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

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

### TOPIC SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora</th>
<th>Population and Human Health</th>
<th>Soils</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Material Assets</th>
<th>Climatic Factors</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Scoring Guidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Significant positive impact</th>
<th>Positive impact</th>
<th>Neutral impact</th>
<th>Unknown impact</th>
<th>Both Positive and Negative impacts</th>
<th>Negative impact</th>
<th>Significant negative impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score Symbol</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+/x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site assessment question</td>
<td>Related SEA Topic</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Pre mitigation score</td>
<td>Mitigation if appropriate</td>
<td>Post mitigation score</td>
<td>Consultation required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)</td>
<td>SACs</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LNR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPAs</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NNR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Local wildlife sites</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Natterjack toads</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Great Crested Newts</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAMSAR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Geodiversity Sites</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Other protected species</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Marine Consultation Zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ancient/semi-natural woodland</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>No strategic comments from SNH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any known invasive species within the site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Potential habitat fragmentation due to the loss of a greenfield site.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

Measures to enhance biodiversity should be implemented, such as the use of locally native tree species in landscape schemes, habitat creation, and the creation of greenways and wildlife corridors along transport corridors, footpaths and cycleways, to encourage the movement of species.

**SEA OVERVIEW**

No designations affecting site

**SEA SCORE: 0**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH</th>
<th>SEA OVERVIEW</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>N</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them</td>
<td>MA or CF</td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core path</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cycle path</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)</td>
<td>CF</td>
<td>Community/village hall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sports facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Local shops (convenience)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bus stop</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School name</td>
<td>Gretna</td>
<td>Annan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>331</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere</td>
<td>MA and B</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

Within reasonable walking distance to community facilities and school, scope to encourage active travel

GTN.H5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

### SOILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)</th>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Relatively flat open site</td>
<td>SV</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>No known previous use.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat</td>
<td>CF</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLANNING OVERVIEW
Potential loss of prime agricultural land

### SEA OVERVIEW
Negative SEA impact as potential loss of prime agricultural land **SEA Score: X**

### WATER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site</th>
<th>B and L</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Body of water lies on western boundary of site</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>CF and PHH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Site appears in pluvial SEPA flood maps. Body of water lies adjacent to the site. Historical pluvial issues at this site.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Flood Risk Assessment required which would require to agreed with SEPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GTN.H5
### AIR QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>There are no AQMA at present in the region</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>North, east and south – existing housing. West – agricultural land. Site bounded by Old Graitney Road on southern boundary</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

Unlikely to decrease air quality.

**SEA OVERVIEW**

Unlikely to decrease air quality.  

**SEA SCORE:** 0

### MATERIAL ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site …..</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site vacant or derelict</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No known previous use</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in the vicinity of a waste</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GTN.H5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pylons</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Bord Gais Eirann pipeline</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shell oil pipeline</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Transco pipeline</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>No known service constraints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Traffic/NATS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MoD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Carlisle Airport</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Coal Authority</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>HSE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

No known service constraints. Loss of greenfield land

**SEA OVERVIEW**

Negative SEA impact as loss of greenfield site

**SEA Score:** X

**ROADS/ACCESS**

Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated

This site is situated to the north of Old Graitney Road U171a with site GTN.H207 (110 units) located along the western boundary and site GTN.H6 (20 units) located to the south of the U171a. Old Graitney Road is restrictive in nature and any development would require the widening and improvement of the carriageway to an appropriate standard. Any development on this site would trigger the relocation of the 30mph speed limit and extension of street lighting to a point west of any proposed access to the site. It would also therefore be appropriate that any development of this site include the provision of a footway along the site frontage eastwards to link with the existing footway provisions on Empire Way/Dominion Road. Any development of this site should not prejudice the adjacent sites. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and a residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

This site is situated to the north of Old Graitney Road U171a which is restrictive in nature. Any development would require the widening and improvement of the carriageway to an appropriate standard and require the relocation of the 30mph speed limit and extension of street lighting to a point west of any proposed access to the site. It would also be appropriate that any development of this site include the provision of a footway along the site frontage eastwards to link with the existing footway provisions on Empire Way/Dominion Road. The ability to access land to the west of this site should not be compromised.

**CLIMATIC FACTORS**

What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)

South and West aspect

SV

0

Can the site make best use of solar gain

Y

SV

0

Is the site protected from prevailing winds

N

Exposed to prevailing winds

SV

X

Appropriate landscaping and layout should take into account aspect and prevailing winds to the south west

0

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

Appropriate landscaping and layout should take into account aspect and prevailing winds to the south west

**SEA OVERVIEW**

Due to south west aspect the use of solar gain could be used to great effect. Exposed to prevailing winds, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions

**SEA Score:** 0

GTN.H5
### CULTURAL HERITAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Listed Building</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Scheduled Monuments</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Comment Archaeology - No historic environment issues identified for this site, as of July 2016, but borders the Inventory Battlefield for the Battle of Sark to the south. Historic Built Environment - No Listed Buildings. No conservation area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Inventory of Historic Battlefield</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Heritage Site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Inventory &amp; Non-Inventory Garden or Designed Landscape</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment | L | N | 0 | 0 |

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

- No known cultural heritage issues directly affecting site. It should be noted that the site borders the Inventory Battlefield for the Battle of Sark to the south.

**SEA OVERVIEW**

- No known cultural heritage issues directly affecting site. It should be noted that the site borders the Inventory Battlefield for the Battle of Sark to the south.

**SEA SCORE:** 0

### LANDSCAPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site within or adjoining any of the following</th>
<th>NSAs</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>RSAs</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wild Land</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>TPOs</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level | C | 0 | Trees and hedgerows should be reinforced with additional planting. | 0 |

| Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement | SV | 0 | The site forms a logical extension and is well contained | 0 |

| Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site | N | SV | 0 |

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

- The site forms a logical extension and is well contained

**SEA OVERVIEW**

- Minimal detrimental effect on landscape quality

**SEA SCORE:** 0

### PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Allocated housing site in adopted LDP. Effective housing site as planning in principle granted 28 Oct 2015 (14/P/4/0502) subject to completion of Planning Obligation. Not yet agreed as at Oct 16.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Landowner willing to release land for development, but site not been formally marketed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site assessment question</td>
<td>Related SEA Topic</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT</strong></td>
<td>Allocated housing site in adopted LDP. Effective housing site as planning in principle granted 28 Oct 2015 (14/P/4/0502) subject to completion of Planning Obligation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL SEA COMMENT</strong></td>
<td>Negative SEA impact as greenfield site and potential loss of prime agricultural land. Within reasonable walking distance to community facilities and school, scope to encourage active travel. Gretna served by railway station – could encourage use of more sustainable transport and reduce carbon emissions from transport.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Local Development Plan: Site Assessment and SEA Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref:</th>
<th>GTN.H6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site name:</td>
<td>Land south of Old Giraitney Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site suggestion:</td>
<td>LDP Allocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Gretna Border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing):</td>
<td>331450, 566681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site size (ha):</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current use:</td>
<td>Agricultural land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing LDP allocations/designations:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA:</td>
<td>Annan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date completed:</td>
<td>Oct/Nov 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Topic Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora</th>
<th>Population and Human Health</th>
<th>Soils</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Material Assets</th>
<th>Climatic Factors</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Significant positive impact</th>
<th>Positive impact</th>
<th>Neutral impact</th>
<th>Unknown impact</th>
<th>Both Positive and Negative impacts</th>
<th>Negative impact</th>
<th>Significant negative impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score Symbol</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+/x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Legends

- **Related SEA topic**
  - Population and Human Health (PHH)
  - Climatic Factors (CF)
  - Biodiversity (B)
  - Landscape (L)
  - Material Assets (MA)

- **Information source**
  - Geographic Information System (GIS)
  - Site visit (SV)
  - Consultee (C)
  - Other (O)

- **Consultation required (only if answer is Yes)**
  - Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
  - Transport Scotland (TS)
  - Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
  - Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
### BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>SACs</th>
<th>LNR</th>
<th>SPAs</th>
<th>SSSIs</th>
<th>Related SEA Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any known invasive species within the site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:** No strategic comments from SNH

**Mitigation if appropriate:** 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.

### POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>GIS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MA and B</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>GIS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>GIS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>GIS</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them</td>
<td>MA or CF</td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Core path</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Cycle path</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Community/village hall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sports facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)</td>
<td>CF</td>
<td>School name:</td>
<td>Gretna</td>
<td>Annan</td>
<td>Capacity:</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>Distance:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>MA and B</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planning Overview:** Within reasonable walking distance to community facilities and school, scope to encourage active travel.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
<th>SEA Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Loss of prime quality agricultural land currently in agricultural use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Relatively flat open site</td>
<td>SV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site</td>
<td>No known previous use.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEA OVERVIEW**

Within reasonable walking distance to community facilities and school, scope to encourage active travel. Gretna served by railway station – could encourage use of more sustainable transport and reduce carbon emissions from transport. **SEA Score: +**

**WATER**

<p>| Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site | B and L | Y | Body of water lies on western boundary of site | SV | | | | | 0 |
| Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere | CF and PHH | N | Site appears in pluvial SEPA flood maps. Body of water lies adjacent to the site. Historical pluvial issues at this site. | C X | Flood Risk Assessment required which would require to be agreed with SEPA | | 0 |
| Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse) | N | Site appears in pluvial SEPA flood maps. Body of water lies adjacent to the site. Historical pluvial issues at this site. | C X | Flood Risk Assessment required which would require to be agreed with SEPA | | 0 |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer | PHH | Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity. | C | 0 | Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the | | 0 |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply | PHH | Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity. | C | 0 | Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the | | 0 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIR QUALITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>There are no AQMA at present in the region</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>East – existing housing. West – agricultural land. Site bounded by Old Graitney Road on northern boundary</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

Unlikely to decrease air quality.

**SEA OVERVIEW**

Unlikely to decrease air quality.

**SEA OVERVIEW**

Potential flood risk. Flood Risk Assessment required which would require to be agreed with SEPA. Gretna – limited water network capacity subject to planned upgrading by Scottish Water which will require developer contributions. **SEA SCORE: 0**

**MATERIAL ASSETS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site…...</th>
<th>Brownfield</th>
<th>Comment currently in agricultural use</th>
<th>Greenfield</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey</th>
<th>No known previous use</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site vacant or derelict</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No known previous use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

requirements for this phase of the upgrade work. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October 2010) refers. 6" water main running along North of site boundary

Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. Water main running along north boundary of site will require to be protected. Flood risk assessment required which would require to be agreed with SEPA.
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### Site assessment question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site</td>
<td>Pylons N</td>
<td>Bord Gais Eirann pipeline N</td>
<td>Shell oil pipeline N</td>
<td>Transco pipeline N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies</td>
<td>Air Traffic/NATS N</td>
<td>MoD NN</td>
<td>Carlisle Airport N</td>
<td>Coal Authority N</td>
<td>HSE N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SEA Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANNING OVERVIEW</th>
<th>SEA OVERVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No known servicing constraints. Loss of greenfield land</td>
<td>Negative SEA impact as loss of greenfield site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ROADS/ACCESS

| Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated | This site (20 units) is situated to the south of Old Graitney Road U171a with site GTN.H207 (110 units) and site GTN.H5 (20 units) located to the north of the U171a. Old Graitney Road is restrictive in nature and any development would require the widening and improvement of the carriageway to an appropriate standard. Any development on this site would trigger the relocation of the 30mph speed limit and extension of street lighting to a point west of any proposed access to the site. It would also be appropriate that any development of this site include the provision of a footway along the site frontage eastwards to link with the existing footway provisions on Empire Way/Dominion Road. Any development of this site should not prejudice the adjacent sites. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and a residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards |

### CLIMATIC FACTORS

| What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.) | South and West aspect | SV | 0 |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | Y | SV | 0 |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | N Exposed to prevailing winds | SV X | Appropriate landscaping and layout should take into account aspect and prevailing winds to the south west | 0 |

### PLANNING OVERVIEW

Due to south west aspect the use of solar gain could be used to great effect. Exposed to prevailing winds, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions

### SEA OVERVIEW

Sea Score: 0
### CULTURAL HERITAGE

Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Listed Building</th>
<th>Scheduled Monuments</th>
<th>Conservation Area</th>
<th>World Heritage Site</th>
<th>Archaeological Site</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Comment: Archaeology - Lies within the Inventory Battlefield for the Battle of Sark. Historic Built Environment - No Listed Buildings. No conservation area. HES – The site is located within the Battle of Sark (Inventory Battlefield, BTL40). Sensitive development is possible on this site, subject to an assessment of potential impacts on the historic battlefield. The Council’s comments on a requirement for a historic assessment to identify mitigation measures are noted and this approach is supported.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### PLANNING OVERVIEW

Site lies within the area of the Inventory Battlefield for the Battle of Sark. Appropriate archaeological investigation would be required and appropriate mitigation measures identified where development would not have a significant adverse impact on the character, appearance, setting or key features of the battlefield.

#### SEA OVERVIEW

Site lies within the area of the Inventory Battlefield for the Battle of Sark. Appropriate archaeological investigation would be required and appropriate mitigation measures identified where development would not have a significant adverse impact on the character, appearance, setting or key features of the battlefield. SEA Score: 0

### LANDSCAPE

Is the site within or adjoining any of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Feature</th>
<th>NSAs</th>
<th>RSAs</th>
<th>TPOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wild Land</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercources, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level:

| Feature | No significant issues and contained | C | 0 | 0 |

Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement:

| Site Location | The site forms a logical extension and is well contained | 0 | 0 |

Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site:

| View Type | No | 0 | 0 |

#### PLANNING OVERVIEW

No impact on landscape quality

#### SEA OVERVIEW

No impact on landscape quality SEA Score: 0

### PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES

Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP

| Boundaries | Y | Allocated housing site within the adopted LDP. Query over effectiveness as existing landowner not confirmed development interest and site not submitted through the LDP2 Call for Sites. |

Have all landowners been identified and have they

<p>| Landowners | Y | No known interest from existing landowner and site not submitted through the LDP2 Call for Sites. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>agreed to disposal/development of the site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allocated housing site within the adopted LDP. Query over effectiveness as existing landowner not confirmed development interest and site not submitted through the LDP2 Call for Sites. Site lies within the area identified in the Inventory of Historic of Battlefields (Battle of Sark) and appropriate mitigation factors would require to be investigated. Review site as an option for inclusion in LDP2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL SEA COMMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative SEA impact as prime quality agricultural land and loss of greenfield land. Positive SEA impact in terms of population and health - within reasonable walking distance to community facilities and school, scope to encourage active travel. Gretna served by railway station – could encourage use of more sustainable transport and reduce carbon emissions from transport.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora</th>
<th>Population and Human Health</th>
<th>Soils</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Material Assets</th>
<th>Climatic Factors</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scoring Guidance**

- **Impact**  
  - Significant positive impact  
  - Positive impact  
  - Neutral impact  
  - Unknown impact  
  - Both Positive and Negative impacts  
  - Negative impact  
  - Significant negative impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Symbol</th>
<th>++</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>+/x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>xx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Legends**

- **Related SEA topic**  
  - Population and Human Health (PHH)  
  - Climatic Factors (CF)  
  - Biodiversity (B)  
  - Landscape (L)  
  - Material Assets (MA)

- **Information source**  
  - Geographic Information System (GIS)  
  - Site visit (SV)  
  - Consultee (C)  
  - Other (O)

- **Consultation required (only if answer is Yes)**  
  - Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)  
  - Transport Scotland (TS)  
  - Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)  
  - Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
### BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>SACs</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>LNR</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SPAs</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SSSIs</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any known invasive species within the site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Greenfield site on edge of settlement. Careful consideration of design and planting could help create new habitats within this development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Comments: No strategic comments from SNH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>MA or CF</th>
<th>MA or CF</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>Community/village hall</th>
<th>Sports facilities</th>
<th>Hospitals</th>
<th>Local shops (convenience)</th>
<th>Bus stop</th>
<th>Distance (km)</th>
<th>0.2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Distance (km)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: Footpath and cycle route traverses site giving direct link to Gretna Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)</td>
<td>MA or CF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>MA and B</td>
<td>School name: Gretna</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Gretna</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SEA OVERVIEW

No biodiversity designations affecting site | SEA Score: 0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topics</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Site gently slopes with land rising towards A75 trunk road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>No known previous use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat</td>
<td></td>
<td>CF</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLANNING OVERVIEW

Would involve loss of prime agricultural land

### SEA OVERVIEW

Would involve loss of prime agricultural land

### WATER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site</th>
<th>B and L</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Evidence of boggy areas and watercourse runs north south through site</th>
<th></th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Appropriate SUDs drainage to be provided</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>CF and PHH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Site appears in pluvial SEPA flood maps. Body of water traverses the site. SEPA - A minor partly culverted watercourse flows along the site boundary which could represent a potential flood risk. A Flood Risk Assessment is required.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Drainage Impact Assessment required. Depending on content, Flood Risk Assessment may also be required to be agreed with SEPA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>There is an existing sewer infrastructure within site. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td></td>
<td>Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site assessment question</td>
<td>Related SEA Topics</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Information source</td>
<td>Pre mitigation score</td>
<td>Mitigation if appropriate</td>
<td>Post mitigation score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AIR QUALITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>There are no AQMA at present in the region</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>North – A75 and rail line. East – site allocated for housing GTN.H2 South – housing, community facilities and school. West – existing greyhound stadium (Halcrow Stadium) allocated for housing development (GTN: H4) SEPA noted an issue with air quality given the sites location</td>
<td>SV/C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Noise assessment would be required together with any necessary mitigation will be required to address cumulative noise pollution from A75 and railway. Consideration will need to be given to appropriate landscaping and screening</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANNING OVERVIEW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise assessment would be required together with any necessary mitigation will be required to address cumulative noise pollution from A75 and railway. Consideration will need to be given to appropriate landscaping and screening</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEA OVERVIEW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential flood risk. Drainage Impact Assessment required. Depending on content, Flood Risk Assessment may also be required to be agreed with SEPA. Gretna – limited water network capacity subject to planned upgrading by Scottish Water which will require developer contributions.</td>
<td>SEA Score: 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site brownfield?</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Comment: Greenfield site currently in agricultural use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site vacant or derelict?</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>No known previous use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation?</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site?</td>
<td>Pylons</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Bord Gais Eirann pipeline</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shell oil pipeline</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Transco pipeline</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies?</td>
<td>Air Traffic/NATS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MoD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Carlisle Airport</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Coal Authority</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**
Loss of greenfield land currently in agricultural use.

**SEA OVERVIEW**
Negative SEA impact as involves loss of greenfield land.  

**ROADS/ACCESS**

This site (160 units) can potentially take access from Mackies Drive U569a, Burnside Road U173a and The Hawthorns U188a. This site is also bordered by GTN.H2,3 and 4. Sites GTN.H3, H7, H4 and H2 are all linked with multiple connections onto various public roads, this would result in an overall development of over 350 units. It would be appropriate that a development brief be provided for this site, and that any future applicant provide a Transport Assessment and that a cumulative Masterplan be provided for all of these sites. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and a residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards.

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**
Can potentially take access from Mackies Drive U569a, Burnside Road U173a and The Hawthorns U188a. Sites GTN.H3, H7, H4 and H2 are all linked with multiple connections onto various public roads, this would result in an overall development of over 350 units. It would be appropriate that a development brief be provided for this site, and that any future applicant provide a Transport Assessment and that a cumulative Masterplan be provided for all of these sites.
### CLIMATIC FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the site make best use of solar gain</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Open slightly sloping site with land rising towards north and A75 trunk road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The layout should ensure solar gain and look to create sustainable buildings in line with policies OP11 and OP2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site protected from prevailing winds</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

Housing design could make use of passive solar gain, reducing energy use and carbon emissions.

**SEA OVERVIEW**

Site is southerly facing. Housing design could make use of passive solar gain, reducing energy use and carbon emissions.  

**SEA SCORE:** +

### CULTURAL HERITAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting</th>
<th>Listed Building</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Scheduled Monuments</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Conservation Area</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Inventory of Historic Battlefield</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>World Heritage Site</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Inventory &amp; Non-inventory Garden or Designed Landscape</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Archaeological site</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Comment Archaeology - No historic environment issues identified for this site, as of July 2016. Historic Built Environment - No Listed Buildings; no conservation area. However this wraps around the planned town with GTN H2 and should be developed using the same successful design principles in a modern interpretation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

Development should reinforce the layout of the planned town of Gretna which is of national wartime interest. The design of buildings should integrate street scene along Victory Avenue and take account of nearby listed buildings.

**SEA OVERVIEW**

No cultural heritage issues identified.

**SEA SCORE:** 0

### LANDSCAPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site within or adjoining any of the following</th>
<th>NSAs</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>RSAs</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Wild Land</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TPOs</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Comment Site gently slopes with land rising towards north and A75 trunk road. Hedgerows and trees along field boundaries.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments on masterplanning exercise apply. Screen from slip road/A75 with woodland planting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site provides northern extension to Gretna located between existing housing and A75 trunk road to north.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

Consideration will need to be given to appropriate landscaping and screening along northern boundary

**SEA OVERVIEW**

Design in combination with H2, H3, H4, and existing residential developments to ensure permeability and sense of place. Screen from slip road/A75 with woodland and planting.

**SEA SCORE:** 0

GTN.H7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Related SEA Topic</td>
<td>Information source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Allocated long term housing site (beyond 2024) in adopted LDP. Further information is required on its relative effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Land in multiple ownership. One landowner has indicated that the land is available for development and there are current negotiations with various regional housebuilders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Allocated long term housing site (beyond 2024)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT**

Allocated long term housing site (beyond 2024) in adopted LDP. Further information is required on its relative effectiveness given that the site is in multiple ownerships. Review site as an option for inclusion in LDP2.

**OVERALL SEA COMMENT**

Negative SEA impact as greenfield site and loss of prime agricultural land. Positive SEA impact as proximity of site to community facilities and railway station. Potential to encourage range of sustainable transport modes.
# LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora</th>
<th>Population and Human Health</th>
<th>Soils</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Material Assets</th>
<th>Climatic Factors</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scoring Guidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Significant positive impact</th>
<th>Positive impact</th>
<th>Neutral impact</th>
<th>Unknown impact</th>
<th>Both Positive and Negative impacts</th>
<th>Negative impact</th>
<th>Significant negative impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score Symbol</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Related SEA topic

- Population and Human Health (PHH)
- Climatic Factors (CF)
- Biodiversity (B)
- Landscape (L)
- Material Assets (MA)

### Information source

- Geographic Information System (GIS)
- Site visit (SV)
- Consultee (C)
- Other (O)

### Consultation required (only if answer is Yes)

- Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
- Transport Scotland (TS)
- Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
- Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
**BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA**

| Site assessment question                                                                 | SACs | LNR | SPA | N | RAMSAR | Geodiversity Sites | Other protected species | Marine Consultation Zones | SACs | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N |
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site?  |      |     |     |   |        |                     |                        |                          |      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)                                                |      |     |     |   |        |                     |                        |                          |      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Are there any known invasive species within the site                                      | N    | 0   |     |   | 0      | 0                  | 0                      |                          | N    | 0 | 0 |
| Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site | N    | 0   |     |   | 0      | 0                  | 0                      |                          | N    | 0 | 0 |
| – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity                         |      |     |     |   |        |                     |                        |                          |      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**
Mature trees and the network of hedgerows should be retained and enhanced for biodiversity value.

**SEA OVERVIEW**
No designations affecting site. Mature trees and the network of hedgerows should be retained and enhanced for biodiversity value.  

**POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Distance (km)</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Right of Way</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Core path</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Cycle path</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1 Community/village hall</th>
<th>1 Sports facilities</th>
<th>1 Hospitals</th>
<th>1 Local shops (convenience)</th>
<th>1 Bus stop</th>
<th>0.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**
Within reasonable walking distance to existing facilities, school and Gretna station. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.

**SEA OVERVIEW**
Within reasonable walking distance to existing facilities, school and Gretna station. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.
### SOILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Currently in agricultural use for cattle grazing. Former use golf course.</td>
<td>(The James Hutton Institute)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Site gently undulates</td>
<td>SV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consideration should be given to removing this waste material in those areas with a garden end use and to tracing and remedi...</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat</td>
<td>CF</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

Would involve loss of prime agricultural land. There is evidence of waste material and consideration should be given to removing this waste material in those areas with a garden end use and to tracing and remediing the source of sewage odour during development.

**SEA OVERVIEW**

Would involve loss of prime agricultural land  

**SEA SCORE:** X

### WATER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site</td>
<td>B and L</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Small drains and watercourses within site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>CF and PHH</td>
<td></td>
<td>Potential sources of flooding including from two drains within the site and a burn which runs to the eastern corner and from surface water.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Flood Risk Assessment was submitted following a SEPA objection. The FRA concludes that only a small part of the south-eastern corner of the site is predicted to lie within the 1 in 200 year floodplain of the Mill Burn. No significant risk of surface water flooding from adjacent land was predicted. SEPA objection removed following submission of additional information.

Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended. There is an existing sewer infrastructure.
**Site assessment question**  | **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 mains water supply | | Y | Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity. | C | 0 | Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the requirements for this phase of the upgrade work. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October 2010) refers. | | | PLANNING OVERVIEW | Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended. Appropriate SUDs drainage to be provided. There is an existing sewer infrastructure within the site. | | SEA OVERVIEW | Potential flood risk identified and objection from SEPA. SEPA objection subsequently removed following submission of additional information. | 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 | | | | PHH | N | North – housing at Malor Park. East – woodland that surrounds Raydale House (Masonic Lodge) and Raydale Park football ground and car park. South – land is mainly in use for small holdings/agriculture. West/southwest – Loanworth Rd. Beyond Loanworth Rd to the west, the land is predominantly open agricultural land. | SV | 0 | | | 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 | | O | 0 | | | PLANNING OVERVIEW | Unlikely to decrease air quality. | | SEA OVERVIEW | Unlikely to decrease air quality. | SEA SCORE: 0 | MATERIAL ASSETS
Is the site….. | Brownfield | Comment Former golf course and now agricultural land in grazing

GTN.MU1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site vacant or derelict</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Two areas of the site are noted to contain some made up ground and waste material and a sewage odour was reported to the east of the site. Consideration should be given to removing this waste material in those areas with a garden end use and to tracing and remedieng the source of sewage odour during development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment No known service constraints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

Greenfield site but benefits from proximity to existing infrastructure. No known service constraints

**SEA OVERVIEW**

Negative SEA impact as greenfield site but benefits from proximity to existing infrastructure

**SEA SCORE: X**

**ROADS/ACCESS**

Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?

Transport Scotland – no objections subject to the requirement for a travel plan to be submitted and agreed with respect to the employment land which shall set out proposals for reducing dependency on the private car. (Committee report 24/5/16)

Council Roads Authority - No objections subject to conditions

a) Access – The site frontage on the B721 Annan road has potential for two fully complaint residential points of access. There is potential and it would be desirable for commercial and residential access to be separated with two distinct points of access from Loanworth Road. There is potential for a significant number of vehicle movements which could come into conflict with the residential properties and pedestrian movements should access be shared. Revised indicative site layout drawing no. 14071 (PL) 001A now shows a pedestrian link between the residential and commercial areas within the site.

b) As the proposed access is outwith the existing Gretna 30mph speed limit; this along with street lighting should be extended westwards on the B721 to a point west of the proposed access to the site and on the C67a Loanworth Road to the junction of the B721. This will require a Traffic Regulation Order to be promoted and implemented at the developer’s expense.

c) The C67a Loanworth Road is nominally 2-3.5m in width between a point north of the property “Timaru” to the 30mph speed limit east of GTN.MU1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the site frontage with informal passing opportunities along its length. Given the increase in traffic movements associated with both residential and commercial development, it would be appropriate that a scheme of widening and footway provision be submitted and agreed with the Roads Authority, from the B721 junction to an agreed point east of the proposed accesses to facilitate the free and safe movement of pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles. (Committee report 24/5/16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING OVERVIEW</td>
<td>Ref No 15/P/4/0277 Transport Scotland – no objections subject to the requirement for a travel plan to be submitted and agreed with respect to the employment land which shall set out proposals for reducing dependency on the private car. Council Roads Authority - No objections subject to conditions (Committee report 24/5/16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLIMATIC FACTORS</td>
<td>What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)</td>
<td>South and west</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can the site make best use of solar gain</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Housing design could make best use of passive solar gain, reducing energy use and carbon emissions.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the site protected from prevailing winds</td>
<td>N Potentially exposed to the west</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>PIP indicates a reinforced woodland strip to the west and north west with further woodland planting through the site.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING OVERVIEW</td>
<td>Potentially exposed to the west however this will be partially mitigated by a reinforced woodland strip to the west and north west.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA OVERVIEW</td>
<td>Potentially exposed to the west however this will be partially mitigated by a reinforced woodland strip to the west and north west.</td>
<td>SEA Score: 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL HERITAGE</td>
<td>Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting</td>
<td>L Listed Building N</td>
<td>Scheduled Monuments N</td>
<td>Comment Archaeology - The site landscape situation lends itself to the potential for the presence of unknown archaeological material. No objections subject to a condition requiring the submission of a scheme of archaeological investigation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conservation Area N</td>
<td>Inventory of Historic Battlefield N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Heritage Site N</td>
<td>Inventory &amp; Non-Inventory N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeological site N</td>
<td>Garden or Designed Landscape N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING OVERVIEW</td>
<td>Scheme of archaeological investigation required. Refer condition in committee report 25/4/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA OVERVIEW</td>
<td>No designations affecting site. Scheme of archaeological investigation required.</td>
<td>SEA Score: 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDSCAPE</td>
<td>Is the site within or adjoining any of the following</td>
<td>NSAs N</td>
<td>RSAs N</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wild Land N</td>
<td>TPOs N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant</td>
<td>The site undulates, but there is a general drop in levels between the B721 (Annan Road) and Loanworth Road. Hedgerows and trees bound the site being associated with its former golf course use.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mature trees and the network of hedgerows should be retained and enhanced for biodiversity value.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTN.MU1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site assessment question</td>
<td>Related SEA Topic</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Information source</td>
<td>Pre mitigation score</td>
<td>Mitigation if appropriate</td>
<td>Post mitigation score</td>
<td>Consultation required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slopes/changes in level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANNING OVERVIEW</strong></td>
<td>Mature trees and the network of hedgerows should be retained and enhanced for biodiversity value.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEA OVERVIEW</strong></td>
<td>Mature trees and the network of hedgerows should be retained and enhanced for biodiversity value.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES**

- **Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP?**
  - Y: Allocated mixed use site in adopted LDP. Planning in Principle (15/P/4/0277) for residential and business development approved subject to successful completion of S75 Planning Obligation and conditions within 6 month period of 05/16. Refer committee decision of 24/05/2016.

- **Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site?**
  - Y: Allocated mixed use site in adopted LDP with the benefit of Planning in Principle subject to successful completion of S75 Planning Obligation and conditions within 6 month period of 05/16.

- **Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips?**
  - N: Allocated mixed use site in adopted LDP with the benefit of Planning in Principle subject to successful completion of S75 Planning Obligation and conditions within 6 month period of 05/16.

- **Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe?**
  - Y: Allocated mixed use site in adopted LDP with the benefit of Planning in Principle subject to successful completion of S75 Planning Obligation and conditions within 6 month period of 05/16.

**OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT**

- Allocated mixed use site in adopted LDP with the benefit of Planning in Principle subject to successful completion of S75 Planning Obligation and conditions within 6 month period of 05/16.

**OVERALL SEA COMMENT**

- Negative SEA impact as would involve loss of prime agricultural land and greenfield site. Positive in terms of population and human health as within reasonable walking distance to existing community facilities. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.
### LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

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

#### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TOPIC</strong></th>
<th>Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora</th>
<th>Population and Human Health</th>
<th>Soils</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Material Assets</th>
<th>Climatic Factors</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCORE</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X/+]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Information source**
- Geographic Information System (GIS)
- Site visit (SV)
- Consultee (C)
- Other (O)

**Consultation required (only if answer is Yes)**
- Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
- Transport Scotland (TS)
- Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
- Historic Environment Scotland (HES)

**Legends**
- Related SEA topic
- Population and Human Health (PHH)
- Climatic Factors (CF)
- Biodiversity (B)
- Landscape (L)
- Material Assets (MA)
### 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 | LNR | SPAs | NNR | Local wildlife sites | Natterjack toads | RAMSAR | Geodiversity Sites | Other protected species | Marine Consultation Zones | SSSIs | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N |

**Comments:** No comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there any known invasive species within the site</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance (km)</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them?**

- MA
- Right of Way N
- Core path N
- Cycle path Y

**Comment:** Cycle route on western edge of site providing link to Gretna Station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>Community/village hall</th>
<th>Sports facilities</th>
<th>Hospitals</th>
<th>Local shops (convenience)</th>
<th>Bus stop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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)</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School name: Springfield</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Annan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity: 31</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### PLANNING OVERVIEW

- **No impact on biodiversity designations**

### SEA OVERVIEW

- **No impact on biodiversity designations**

**SEA Score:** 0

---

### PLANNING OVERVIEW

- **Site not within reasonable walking distance of the majority of community facilities and public open space. Close proximity to Gretna Station and could encourage active travel and use of sustainable transport.**

### SEA OVERVIEW

- **Site not within reasonable walking distance of the majority of community facilities and public open space. Close proximity to Gretna Station and could encourage active travel and use of sustainable transport.**

**SEA Score:** +/-X

---

GTN.H201
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)</td>
<td>3.2 O</td>
<td>Loss of prime quality agricultural land being actively farmed for cereal crops</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Generally flat site with M74 embankment to north west</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>No known previous use</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat</td>
<td>CF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

Loss of prime agricultural land currently in production

**SEA OVERVIEW**

Negative SEA impact as loss of prime agricultural land.

SEA SCORE: X

---

**WATER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site</th>
<th>B and L</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>CF and PHH</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SEPA - No flood risk apparent.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GTN.H201
**Site assessment question** | **Related SEA Topic** | **Yes/No** | **Comment** | **Information source** | **Pre mitigation score** | **Mitigation if appropriate** | **Post mitigation score** | **Consultation required**
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---

**Planning Overview**

Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October 2010) refers. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing waste water network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.

**SEA Overview**

No known flood risk. Gretna – limited water network capacity subject to planned upgrading by Scottish Water which will require developer contributions.  | **SEA score:** 0

---

**Planning Overview**

Significant environmental issues due to proximity of M74 at height and railway line. Noise assessment required. Mitigation measures considered unlikely to be successful.

**SEA Overview**

Significant environmental issues due to proximity of M74 and slip roads at height. Noise assessment required. Mitigation measures considered unlikely to be successful. | **SEA score:** X

---

**Air Quality**

Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA?

- **N**
  - There are no AQMA at present in the region
  - C
  - 0

What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby?

- **Y**
  - SEPA question the air quality? Site is surrounded by the M74 motorway and the railway line to the south
  - X
  - M74 motorway at height above site approx 5m embankment. Noise assessment required. Given that motorway at height mitigation measures are unlikely to be successful
  - X

Does the development of the site introduce a new potentially significant air emission to the area (e.g. combined heat and power, an industrial process, large scale quarry of energy from the waste plant)?

**Planning Overview**

Significant environmental issues due to proximity of M74 at height and railway line. Noise assessment required. Mitigation measures considered unlikely to be successful.

**SEA Overview**

Significant environmental issues due to proximity of M74 and slip roads at height. Noise assessment required. Mitigation measures considered unlikely to be successful.

**SEA score:** X

---

**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

Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover on-site?

- **N**
  - O
  - O

**GTN.H201**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>materials/resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site</td>
<td>Pylons</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bord Gais Eirann pipeline</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shell oil pipeline</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transco pipeline</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies</td>
<td>Air Traffic/NATS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MoD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carlisle Airport</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coal Authority</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HSE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

No servicing constraints in relation to this site

**SEA OVERVIEW**

Negative SEA impact as loss of greenfield site

**SEA SCORE:** X

**ROADS/ACCESS**

Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated

This site (69 units) can take access from the B7076 with potential links onto Sarkside U545a via a section of private road. Vehicular access cannot be taken from the private road on the U545a given the restrictive layout, therefore the site should take access from the B7076 only. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and a residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

The site should take access from the B7076 only with potential links onto Sarkside U545a via a section of private road

**CLIMATIC FACTORS**

What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)

Southerly aspect

Can the site make best use of solar gain

Y

Is the site protected from prevailing winds

Y

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

No impact on climatic factors.

**SEA OVERVIEW**

No impact on climatic factors.

**SEA SCORE:**

**CULTURAL HERITAGE**

Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting

Listed Building | N

Scheduled Monuments | N

Conservation Area | N

Inventory of Historic Battlefield | N

Comment Archaeology - No historic environment issues identified for this site, as of July 2016. Opposite non-Inventory designed landscape for Gretna Hall
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## Site assessment question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Heritage Site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Inventory &amp; Non-Inventory Garden or Designed Landscape</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Historic Built Environment - Nearest Listed Buildings are Gretna Hall Hotel, Blacksmith’s Shop and Gretna Old Church and churchyard features. No conservation area. The landscape around Gretna Hall is a 19th century designed landscape. The dwellings along the front of the site are large detached and care will be needed not to jar with this character.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLANNING OVERVIEW

The landscape around Gretna Hall is a 19th century designed landscape (non inventory designed landscape). The dwellings along the front of the site are large detached and care will be needed that development does not impact on its character.

### SEA OVERVIEW

Appropriate mitigation measures will require to ensure that development does not impact on the non Inventory Designed landscape around Gretna Hall. **SEA Score: O**

## LANDSCAPE

### Is the site within or adjoining any of the following

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSAs</th>
<th>RSA</th>
<th>TPOs</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wild Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wild Land</th>
<th>RSA</th>
<th>TPOs</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not suitable for housing: Dominated by M74, A75 and railway line which abut the site. Impacts from the M74 which is overlooking the site are particularly significant. Very little scope to mitigate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RSA</th>
<th>TPOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLANNING OVERVIEW

Not suitable for housing development due to significant adverse landscape reasons.

### SEA OVERVIEW

Significant negative impact as site dominated by M74, A75 and railway line which abut the site. Impacts from the M74 which is overlooking the site are particularly significant and very little scope to mitigate impact. **SEA Score: XX**

## PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES

### Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT

The site has not been included in the MIR for development as development of the site would have significant adverse environmental and landscape impacts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topics</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A number of other sites have been included for development in the settlement that are considered to meet the identified housing strategy.</td>
<td>Site not within reasonable walking distance of the majority of community facilities and public open space. Close proximity to Gretna Station and could encourage active travel and use of sustainable transport. Negative SEA impact as loss of prime agricultural land. Significant environmental issues due to proximity of M74 and slip roads at height. Mitigation measures considered unlikely to be successful. Negative SEA impact as loss of greenfield site. Significant negative impact in terms of landscape as poor environment as site dominated by M74, A75 and railway line. Impacts from the M74 which is overlooking the site are particularly significant and very little scope to mitigate impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL SEA COMMENT**
# LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC SCORE</th>
<th>Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora</th>
<th>Population and Human Health</th>
<th>Soils</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Material Assets</th>
<th>Climatic Factors</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scoring Guidance**

Impact:  
- Significant positive impact  
- Positive impact  
- Neutral impact  
- Unknown impact  
- Both Positive and Negative impacts  
- Negative impact  
- Significant negative impact

**Score Symbol**  
- ++  
- +  
- 0  
- ?  
- +/x  
- x  
- xx

**Related SEA topic**
- Population and Human Health (PHH)
- Climatic Factors (CF)
- Biodiversity (B)
- Landscape (L)
- Material Assets (MA)

**Information source**
- Geographic Information System (GIS)
- Site visit (SV)
- Consultee (C)
- Other (O)

**Consultation required (only if answer is Yes)**
- Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
- Transport Scotland (TS)
- Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
- Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
## BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biodiversity Interests</th>
<th>SACs</th>
<th>LNR</th>
<th>SPAs</th>
<th>SSSIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SACs**
- NNR: N
- Local wildlife sites
- N

**SPAs**
- N
- Natterjack toads
- Great Crested Newts
- Other protected species
- Y

**SSSIs**
- N

Comments: Much of this site appears to be woodland/parkland, which it would be preferential to retain; extensive development may not be possible if this is the case. Habitat very likely to support bats, a European Protected Species – assessment and/or mitigation required.

The trees which surround the original lodge/house are a key landscape feature. This site includes the more mature trees on the northern, roadside boundary with those toward the front of the site being particularly prominent in views along the main route through the village. Tree cover on the eastern boundary is less mature. The amenity value coupled with potential habitat and green infrastructure assets warrant the protection of the trees on both the northern and eastern parts of the site. Development within existing open areas of the site may be appropriate provided there is sufficient offset from larger trees and the woodland resource can be protected and retained.

SNH – good landscape structure comprising mature trees and hedgerows that should be retained.

**Are there any known invasive species within the site?**
- N

**Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?**
- Y
  - Habitat very likely to support bats, a European Protected Species
- X
  - Habitat assessment and/or mitigation required.
  - The amenity value coupled with potential habitat and green infrastructure assets warrant the protection of the trees on both the northern and eastern parts of the site.

### SEA OVERVIEW
Potential presence of bats, a European Protected Species. Habitat assessment and/or mitigation required. Mature specimen trees on the northern and eastern boundary require protection. **SEA Score: 0**

## POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance from site (km)</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA or CF</td>
<td>Gretna</td>
<td>Annan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planning Overview**
The need to retain the mature specimen trees would significantly limit the scale of development and number of units that could be developed on site.

**SEA Overview**
Potential presence of bats, a European Protected Species. Habitat assessment and/or mitigation required. Mature specimen trees on the northern and eastern boundary require protection. **SEA Score: 0**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere</td>
<td>MA and B</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>GIS 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**
Within reasonable walking distance to existing facilities, school and Gretna station. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.

**SEA OVERVIEW**
Within reasonable walking distance to existing facilities, school and Gretna station. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.

**SOILS**

| Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land | N | Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute) | Urban | 0 | 0 |
| Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes) | N | 0 | 0 |
| Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site | N | No known previous contaminative use. | 0 | 0 |
| Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat | CF | Unknown | 0 | 0 |

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**
Not applicable

**SEA OVERVIEW**
Not applicable

**WATER**

| Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site | B and L | Body of water adjacent to the site – on the eastern boundary | SV |
| Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere | CF and PHH | DGC hold records of flooding in connection to the site. SEPA - hold various records of flooding in proximity of the site attributed to surface water/drainage issues. A minor watercourse flows along the site boundary which could represent a potential flood risk. | C X | Flood Risk Assessment required which would require to be agreed with SEPA. | 0 |

| Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse) | N |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the | PHH | Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient | C | 0 | Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>development to connect to the public foul sewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended. There is a Combined sewer running through site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the requirements for this phase of the upgrade work. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October 2010) refers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**
Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Flood risk assessment require to be agreed with SEPA. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.

**SEA OVERVIEW**
Potential flood risk associated with site. Flood Risk Assessment required. **SEA Score: 0**

**AIR QUALITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>There are no AQMA at present in the region</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>North – hotel and housing. East – Gretna football and social club. South – agricultural land, allocated as site GTN. MU1. West – Raydale Masonic Lodge and housing beyond.</td>
<td>SV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**
Site development unlikely to reduce air quality.

**SEA OVERVIEW**
Site development unlikely to reduce air quality. **SEA Score: 0**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site…...</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Comment Site consists of residential properties associated garden ground and mature specimen trees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site vacant or derelict</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No known previous contaminative use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The three smaller buildings on site (including the gate lodge) seem to originate with the hospital for the designed munition workers’ town.</td>
<td>SV/C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Any development proposal should seek to incorporate the existing buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site</td>
<td>Pylons</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Bord Gais Eirann pipeline</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shell oil pipeline</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Transco pipeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>No known servicing constraints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies</td>
<td>Air Traffic/NATS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MoD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Carlisle Airport</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Coal Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Part greenfield/brownfield. Any development proposal should seek to incorporate the existing buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Overview</td>
<td>Part greenfield/brownfield. Any development proposal should seek to incorporate the existing buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Overview</td>
<td>Part greenfield/brownfield. Any development proposal should seek to incorporate the existing buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA Score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MATERIAL ASSETS**

**ROADS/ACCESS**

**CLIMATIC FACTORS**

**GTN.H202**
### CULTURAL HERITAGE

| Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting | Listed Building | Listed Building | Scheduled Monuments | Scheduled Monuments | Conservation Area | Conservation Area | Inventory of Historic Battlefield | Inventory of Historic Battlefield | World Heritage Site | World Heritage Site | Inventory & Non-Inventory Garden or Designed Landscape | Inventory & Non-Inventory Garden or Designed Landscape | Archaeological site | Archaeological site |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Y | N | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

- **Comment** Archaeology - The three smaller buildings on site (including the gate lodge) seem to originate with the hospital for the designed munition workers’ town. If so, then any proposal should try to incorporate them as they have strong stylistic links to the other architecture of the period, including the listed building opposite the site. If preservation of the existing buildings is not possible then a mitigation scheme of archaeological building recording will be required.

- **Historic Built Environment** - No Listed Buildings; no conservation area. However “Gretna was planned as a complete entity, with houses, shops, school, hospital, police station, churches, cinema and other recreational facilities” and “…Gretna which housed the workers is the surviving legacy of this munitions project. Almost nothing remains of the factory but, in Gretna, many of the original buildings remain.” Elizabeth McCrone, by Historic Environment Scotland. Mapping information shows this to the site of the former hospital perhaps the buildings too. The site is a beautifully mature landscape and as this is not a common feature in Gretna it would be a shame to lose it. Individual dwellings would not be appropriate in the setting but flats within a large footprint building/s even conversion of the existing, which preserve the woodland could be accommodated. Comment on amended boundary: the new boundary excludes the Masonic Lodge building and the western side of the whole site. The three smaller buildings and the gateway are included. It is not clear how many units are proposed but as the main building and the clear part of the site are excluded the 45-55 or even a proportion of it is not realistic as the character of the site would be totally spoiled. Up to 5 modest dwellings might be incorporated among the trees subject to methods which do not damage or put the tree root systems under unnecessary pressure.

### PLANNING OVERVIEW

- **Potential impact on buildings of local historical importance which should be retained if possible.** Given the mature landscape setting up to 5 modest dwellings might be incorporated among the trees subject to methods which do not damage or put the tree root systems under unnecessary pressure.

### SEA OVERVIEW

- **Potential impact on buildings of local historical importance which should be retained if possible.** If preservation of the existing buildings is not possible then a mitigation scheme of archaeological building recording will be required. Given the mature landscape setting up to 5 modest dwellings might be incorporated among the trees subject to methods which do not damage or put the tree root systems under unnecessary pressure.

- **SEA Score:** 0
### LANDSCAPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within or adjoining any of the following</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Land</td>
<td>NSAs</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Comment: The trees which surround the original lodge/house are a key landscape feature. This site includes the more mature trees on the northern, roadside boundary with those toward the front of the site being particularly prominent in views along the main route through the village. Tree cover on the eastern boundary is less mature. The amenity value coupled with potential habitat and green infrastructure assets warrant the protection of the trees on both the northern and eastern parts of the site. Development within existing open areas of the site may be appropriate provided there is sufficient offset from larger trees and the woodland resource can be protected and retained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level</td>
<td>TPOs</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y: Mature specimen trees which are a key landscape feature.</td>
<td>SV/C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Development within existing open areas of the site may be appropriate provided there is sufficient offset from larger trees and the woodland resource can be protected and retained. Impact on the number of units that can be developed on the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N: Site contained by mature trees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PLANNING OVERVIEW

Development within existing open areas of the site may be appropriate provided there is sufficient offset from larger trees and the woodland resource can be protected and retained. Given the mature landscape setting up to 5 modest dwellings might be incorporated among the trees subject to methods which do not damage or put the tree root systems under unnecessary pressure.

#### SEA OVERVIEW

Potential negative impact on mature specimen trees. Development within existing open areas of the site may be appropriate provided there is sufficient offset from larger trees and the woodland resource can be protected and retained. Given the mature landscape setting up to 5 modest dwellings might be incorporated among the trees subject to methods which do not damage or put the tree root systems under unnecessary pressure. SEA Score: 0

### PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Site within the Gretna Border settlement boundary identified as white land.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Site submitted through the Call for Sites exercise and the landowner has confirmed interest in disposal of site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Potential brownfield development site within settlement boundary subject to retaining mature trees. Potential impact on buildings of local historical importance which should be retained if possible. Landscape and mature trees will limit the number of dwellings that can be accommodated on the site. Given the mature landscape setting up to 5 modest dwellings might be incorporated among the trees subject to methods which do not damage or put the tree root systems under unnecessary pressure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT

Potential brownfield development site within settlement boundary subject to retaining mature trees. Potential impact on buildings of local historical importance which should be retained if possible. Landscape and mature trees will limit the number of dwellings that can be accommodated on the site. Given the mature landscape setting up to 5 modest dwellings might be incorporated among the trees subject to methods which do not damage or put the tree root systems under unnecessary pressure.

#### OVERALL SEA COMMENT

Positive SEA impact in terms of Population and Health and Climatic Factors - Within reasonable walking distance to existing facilities, school and Gretna station. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport. Site can make best use of solar gain and protected by mature landscape.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>trees from prevailing wind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST**

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

### Topic Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora</th>
<th>Population and Human Health</th>
<th>Soils</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Material Assets</th>
<th>Climatic Factors</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/-x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Scoring Guidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Significant positive impact</th>
<th>Positive impact</th>
<th>Neutral impact</th>
<th>Unknown impact</th>
<th>Both Positive and Negative impacts</th>
<th>Negative impact</th>
<th>Significant negative impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score Symbol</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+/-x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Legends

- **Related SEA topic**
  - Population and Human Health (PHH)
  - Climatic Factors (CF)
  - Biodiversity (B)
  - Landscape (L)
  - Material Assets (MA)

- **Information source**
  - Geographic Information System (GIS)
  - Site visit (SV)
  - Consultee (C)
  - Other (O)

- **Consultation required (only if answer is Yes)**
  - Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
  - Transport Scotland (TS)
  - Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
  - Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
# BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topics</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACs</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LNR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SSSls</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Local wildlife sites</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Other protected species</td>
<td></td>
<td>Great Crested Newts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAMSAR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Geodiversity Sites</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient/semi-natural woodland</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments: No strategic comments from SNH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any known invasive species within the site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>GIS &amp; SV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Greenfield site on edge of settlement. Careful consideration of design and planting could help create new habitats within this development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PLANNING OVERVIEW
No designations affecting this site

## SEA OVERVIEW
No designations affecting this site  
**SEA SCORE:** 0

# POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topics</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance (km)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them</td>
<td>MA or CF</td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Comment: Cycle route on western edge of site providing link to Gretna Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core path</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle path</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)</td>
<td>CF</td>
<td>Community/village hall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sports facilities</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Local shops (convenience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School name:</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>Annan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity:</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>331</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere</td>
<td>MA and B</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments: Site not within reasonable walking distance of the majority of community facilities and public open space. Close proximity to Gretna Station could encourage active travel and use of sustainable transport.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PLANNING OVERVIEW
Site not within reasonable walking distance of the majority of community facilities and public open space. Close proximity to Gretna Station could encourage active travel and use of sustainable transport.  
**SEA SCORE:** +/-

## SEA OVERVIEW
Site not within reasonable walking distance of the majority of community facilities and public open space. Close proximity to Gretna Station could encourage active travel and use of sustainable transport.  
**SEA SCORE:** +/-
### SOILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Prime quality agricultural land being actively farmed for cereal crops</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Generally flat site</td>
<td>SV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>No known previous use.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat</td>
<td>CF</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLANNING OVERVIEW
- Loss of prime agricultural land currently in production

### SEA OVERVIEW
- Loss of prime agricultural land.

### WATER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site</td>
<td>B and L</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>CF and PHH</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>No comment with regard to flood risk.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the requirements for this phase of the upgrade work. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October

GTN.H205
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GTN.H205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**
Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers.

**SEA OVERVIEW**
No known flood risk. Gretna – limited water capacity subject to planned upgrading by Scottish Water which will require developer contributions.

**AIR QUALITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>There are no AQMA at present in the region</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Housing and M74 motorway, slip roads and B7076 SEPA noted an issue with air quality given the sites location</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**
Significant environmental issues due to proximity of M74 and slip roads at height. Noise assessment required. Mitigation measures considered unlikely to be successful

**SEA OVERVIEW**
Significant environmental issues due to proximity of M74 and slip roads at height. Noise assessment required. Mitigation measures considered unlikely to be successful

**MATERIAL ASSETS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site……</th>
<th>Brownfield</th>
<th>Greenfield</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey</th>
<th>Is the site vacant or derelict</th>
<th>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</th>
<th>Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction</th>
<th>Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GTN.H205
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>Pylons</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Comment No servicing constraints in relation to this site</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site</td>
<td>Bord Gais Eirann pipeline</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shell oil pipeline</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>Air Traffic/NATS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>MoD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies</td>
<td>Carlisle Airport</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coal Authority</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies</td>
<td>HSE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**
Loss of greenfield site. No servicing constraints in relation to this site.

**SEA OVERVIEW**
Loss of greenfield site

**ROADS/ACCESS**
This site (158 units) is located to the south of the C141a with access also available onto Gretna Loaning U530a. Access onto the C141a will require significant infill to achieve satisfactory access gradients. This site incorporates site GTN.H1 (36 units). A Transport Assessment should be commissioned and a Masterplan should be provided for this site. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and a residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**
Access to be provided onto Gretna Loaning U530a. Access onto the C141a will require significant infill to achieve satisfactory access gradients. A Transport Assessment should be commissioned and a Masterplan should be provided for this site. Ability to access the land to the south for potential long term expansion of Springfield should not be compromised.

**CLIMATIC FACTORS**
What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.) | South | SV | 0 | 0 | 0 |
Can the site make best use of solar gain | Y | SV | 0 | 0 | 0 |
Is the site protected from prevailing winds | N | Not sheltered from prevailing wind. | SV | X | May require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions | X |

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**
Not sheltered from prevailing wind, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions

**SEA OVERVIEW**
Not sheltered from prevailing wind, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Site assessment question:**

- **Site assessment question:** Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment?

**Response:** L (No)  

**Comment:**  

- Development should reinforce local character evident at Gretna Loaning.

**Planning Overview:** Archaeological mitigation measures to be implemented due to potential course of Roman road running through northern part of site. Development should reinforce local character evident at Gretna Loaning.

**SEA Overview:** Archaeological site potentially affects part of site and evaluation will be required.

**SEA Score:** 0

### LANDSCAPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site within or adjoining any of the following</th>
<th>NSAs</th>
<th>RSA</th>
<th>TPOs</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wild Land</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Really poor ambience/sense of place – unlikely to make an attractive place to live: dominated by traffic noise and influence of M74/slip road which are raised above the site. Possible scope for limited development to eastern edge of site with landscaping and woodland planting to remainder as mitigation (but planting would take many years to attain sufficient height!)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planning Overview:** Requires significant mitigation through bunding and tree planting to reduce dominance of M74/slip road. Even then creating a pleasant place to live would be challenging.

**SEA Overview:** Significant environmental issues due to proximity of M74 and slip roads at height. Mitigation measures considered unlikely to be successful.

**SEA Score:** X

### PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Northern part of site relates to existing housing allocation in adopted LDP – GTN.H1 and southern part of site lies outwith settlement boundary. Previous consent has now expired.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Land is available for development and the landowner would like to see this land brought forward for housing development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Planning Comment:** Although the northern part of the site is an existing housing allocation in adopted LDP (GTN.H1) and southern part of site lies outwith settlement boundary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>proposed housing use is not considered desirable due to proximity of M74 and associated slip road. Would require significant mitigation through bunding and tree planting to reduce dominance of M74/slip roads. Landscape view is that creating a pleasant place to live would be challenging. A Transport Assessment should be commissioned and a Masterplan should be provided for this site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL SEA COMMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative SEA impact due to loss of prime agricultural land and greenfield site. Distant from the majority of community facilities. Significant environmental issues due to proximity of M74 and slip roads at height. Mitigation measures considered unlikely to be successful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

Site Ref: GTN.H206

Site name: Stormont Crescent

Settlement: Gretna Border

OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing):

Current use: Agricultural land

Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):

Existing LDP allocations/ designations: None

Site Size (ha): 1.3

Proposed use: Housing

HMA: Annan

Date completed: Oct/Nov 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC SCORE</th>
<th>Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora</th>
<th>Population and Human Health</th>
<th>Soils</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Material Assets</th>
<th>Climatic Factors</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring Guidance

Impact

Significant positive impact
Positive impact
Neutral impact
Unknown impact
Both Positive and Negative impacts
Negative impact
Significant negative impact

Score Symbol

++
+
0
?
+/x
x
xx

Related SEA topic

Population and Human Health (PHH)
Climatic Factors (CF)
Biodiversity (B)
Landscape (L)
Material Assets (MA)

Information source

Geographic Information System (GIS)
Site visit (SV)
Consultee (C)
Other (O)

Consultation required (only if answer is Yes)

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
Transport Scotland (TS)
Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)

Legends

Information source

Understanding the context

- Geographic Information System (GIS)
- Site visit (SV)
- Consultee (C)
- Other (O)

Consultation required (only if answer is Yes)

- Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
- Transport Scotland (TS)
- Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
- Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACs</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LNR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SPAs</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SSSIs</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Local wildlife sites</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Natterjack toads</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Great Crested Newts</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAMSAR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Geodiversity Sites</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Other protected species</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Marine Consultation Zones</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient/semi-natural woodland</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments: No comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any known invasive species within the site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANNING OVERVIEW</strong></td>
<td>No impact on diversity designations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEA OVERVIEW</strong></td>
<td>No impact on diversity designations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance (km)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them</td>
<td>MA or CF</td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Comment: On road national cycle route 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core path</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle path</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)</td>
<td>CF</td>
<td>Community/village hall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sports facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Local shops (convenience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School name:</td>
<td>Gretna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity:</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>331</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere</td>
<td>MA and B</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANNING OVERVIEW</strong></td>
<td>Within reasonable walking distance to community facilities and school, scope to encourage active travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEA OVERVIEW</strong></td>
<td>Within reasonable walking distance to community facilities and school, scope to encourage active travel. Gretna served by railway station – could encourage use of more sustainable transport and reduce carbon emissions from transport.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### SOILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Site low lying contained within a bowl adjacent to river embankment of River Esk</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site</td>
<td></td>
<td>No known previous use. Boundary is adjacent to railway. Garden ground adjacent to railway may require soil testing to make sure soil is suitable for use.</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat</td>
<td>CF</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLANNING OVERVIEW

**SEA OVERVIEW**

Unknown impact re peatland.  
**SEA Score:** ?

### WATER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site</td>
<td>B and L</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Evidence of boggy areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>CF and PHH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>SEPA - A substantial part of the site may lie within the 1 in 200 year floodplain of the River Esk. The site is potentially at medium to high risk of coastal flooding. No development should take place within this area. Flood Risk Assessment required. Site appears in medium likelihood coastal SEPA flood maps. Full topographical survey required. Depending on content, Flood Risk Assessment may also be required.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>The site is potentially at medium to high risk of coastal flooding. No development should take place within this area</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Please note there is a Surface water sewer running along east of site. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient capacity for the</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Scottish Water advise that there are water network</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GTN.H206**
**Site assessment question**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>development to connect to the mains water supply</td>
<td>capacity.</td>
<td>issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the requirements for this phase of the upgrade work. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October 2010) refers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. Water main running along north boundary of site will require to be protected. Flood risk assessment required which would require to be agreed with SEPA.

**SEA OVERVIEW**

Significant negative impact on the water environment as site within 1 in 200 year flood plain of the River Esk. The site is potentially at medium to high risk of coastal flooding. No development should take place within this area. **SEA SCORE: XX**

**AIR QUALITY**

| Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA | N | There are no AQMA at present in the region | C | 0 | 0 |
|-------------------|--------|---------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby | PHH N | North – housing. East – agricultural land. south – line of former railway line. West - housing | O | | O |
| 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 | | O | | O |

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

Unlikely to decrease air quality

**SEA OVERVIEW**

Unlikely to decrease air quality **SEA SCORE: 0**

**MATERIAL ASSETS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site.....</th>
<th>Brownfield</th>
<th>Comment Currently in agricultural use</th>
<th>Greenfield</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site vacant or derelict</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GTN.H206**
### Site assessment question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>recycle or recover on-site materials/resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>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)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site</td>
<td>Pylons</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies</td>
<td>Air Traffic/NATS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planning Overview**

No known servicing constraints. Loss of greenfield land.

**SEA Overview**

Negative SEA impact as loss of greenfield site.

**SEA Score:** X

### Roads/Access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>This site (16 units) can take access from Stormont Crescent U45a. There may be potential to take access via Rosomund Crescent (private) though this would require to be brought up to an adoptable standard. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and a residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Planning Overview</td>
<td>This site (16 units) can take access from Stormont Crescent U45a. There may be potential to take access via Rosomund Crescent (private) though this would require to be brought up to an adoptable standard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Climatic Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>SV</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Due to south west aspect the use of solar gain could be used to great effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Can the site make best use of solar gain</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>SV</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Is the site protected from prevailing winds</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Exposed to prevailing winds to the south west.</td>
<td>SV</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Appropriate landscaping and layout should take into account aspect and prevailing winds to the south west</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planning Overview**

Appropriate landscaping and layout should take into account aspect and prevailing winds to the south west.

**SEA Overview**

Exposed to prevailing winds, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions.

**SEA Score:** 0
### CULTURAL HERITAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Scheduled Monuments</td>
<td>Comment Archaeology - Bounded to south by line of former railway. Lies within the boundary of the Inventory Battlefield for the Battle of Sark.</td>
<td>Historic Environment - No Listed Buildings; no conservation area. HES - This site is located within the Battle of Sark (Inventory Battlefield, BTL40). Sensitive development is possible on this site, subject to an assessment of potential impacts on the historic battlefield. In line with this, we note the Council’s comments that a historic assessment is required to identify mitigation measures, and support this approach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inventory of Historic Battlefield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Heritage Site</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inventory &amp; Non-Inventory Garden or Designed Landscape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeological site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLANNING OVERVIEW

Site lies within the area of the Inventory Battlefield for the Battle of Sark. Appropriate archaeological investigation would be required and appropriate mitigation measures identified where development would not have a significant adverse impact on the character, appearance, setting or key features of the battlefield.

### SEA OVERVIEW

Site lies within the area of the Inventory Battlefield for the Battle of Sark. Appropriate archaeological investigation would be required and appropriate mitigation measures identified where development would not have a significant adverse impact on the character, appearance, setting or key features of the battlefield. **SEA Score: 0**

### LANDSCAPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site within or adjoining any of the following</th>
<th>NSAs</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>RSAs</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Near to /on floodplain but some containment / protection by disused railway line. Potential to enhance existing poor built edge.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wild Land</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>TPOs</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Near to /on floodplain but some containment / protection by disused railway line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Potential to enhance existing poor built edge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES

| Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP | Y | Site outwith but immediately adjacent settlement boundary for Gretna Border |

**GTN.H206**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT**

The site has not been included in the MIR for development because of significant flood risk issues. It would also involve the loss of greenfield land. A number of other sites have been included for development in the settlement that are considered to meet the identified housing strategy.

**OVERALL SEA COMMENT**

Significant negative impact on the water environment as site within 1 in 200 year flood plain of the River Esk and potentially at medium to high risk of coastal flooding. Negative SEA impact as greenfield land. Positive SEA impact in terms of population and health - within reasonable walking distance to community facilities and school, scope to encourage active travel. Gretna served by railway station – could encourage use of more sustainable transport and reduce carbon emissions from transport.
**LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref:</th>
<th>GTN.H207</th>
<th>Source of site suggestion:</th>
<th>Call for Sites</th>
<th>Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site name:</td>
<td>Old Graitney</td>
<td>Current use:</td>
<td>Agricultural land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Gretna Border</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size (ha):</td>
<td>3.9ha</td>
<td>Proposed use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA:</td>
<td>Annan</td>
<td>Date completed:</td>
<td>Oct/Nov 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora</th>
<th>Population and Human Health</th>
<th>Soils</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Material Assets</th>
<th>Climatic Factors</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scoring Guidance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Significant positive impact</th>
<th>Positive impact</th>
<th>Neutral impact</th>
<th>Unknown impact</th>
<th>Both Positive and Negative impacts</th>
<th>Negative impact</th>
<th>Significant negative impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score Symbol</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+/x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legends**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>SACs</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>LNR</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SPA</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SSSIs</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAIs)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any known invasive species within the site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Potential habitat fragmentation due to the loss of a greenfield site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning Overview

Measures to enhance biodiversity should be implemented, such as the use of locally native tree species in landscape schemes, habitat creation, and the creation of greenways and wildlife corridors along transport corridors, footpaths and cycleways, to encourage the movement of species.

### SEA overview

No designations affecting site

### Planning Overview

Within reasonable walking distance to community facilities and school, scope to encourage active travel

---

### Population and Human Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>N</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them</td>
<td>MA or CF</td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Core path</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cycle path</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)</td>
<td>CF</td>
<td>Community/village hall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sports facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Caffs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>School name:</td>
<td>Gretna</td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Annan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere</td>
<td>MA and B</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning Overview

Within reasonable walking distance to community facilities and school, scope to encourage active travel.

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Loss of prime agricultural land currently in grazing.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relatively flat open site</td>
<td>SV</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No known previous use.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat</td>
<td>CF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No known previous use.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEA OVERVIEW**

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

**SOILS**

**WATER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site</th>
<th>B and L</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Body of water lies on eastern boundary of site</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>CF and PHH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>SEPA advise that a minor watercourse flows along the site boundary which could represent a potential flood risk. Body of water lies adjacent to the site. Drainage Impact Assessment required. Depending on content, Flood Risk Assessment may also be required.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>A Flood Risk Assessment is required which would require to be agreed with SEPA</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient capacity for the Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish Water advise that there are water network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site assessment question</td>
<td>Related SEA Topic</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Information source</td>
<td>Pre mitigation score</td>
<td>Mitigation if appropriate</td>
<td>Post mitigation score</td>
<td>Consultation required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development to connect to the mains water supply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the requirements for this phase of the upgrade work. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October 2010) refers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**
Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. Flood risk assessment required. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing waste water network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.

**SEA OVERVIEW**
Potential flood risk. Flood Risk Assessment required which would require to be agreed with SEPA

**AIR QUALITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>There are no AQMA at present in the region</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>Surrounded by agricultural land.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**
Unlikely to decrease air quality.

**SEA OVERVIEW**
Unlikely to decrease air quality.

**MATERIAL ASSETS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site…..</th>
<th>Brownfield</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Greenfield</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site vacant or derelict</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GTN.H207
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recycle or recover on-site materials/resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site</td>
<td>Pylons</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Bord Gais Eirann pipeline</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shell oil pipeline</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Transco pipeline</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies</td>
<td>Air Traffic/NATS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MoD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Carlisle Airport</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Coal Authority</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Overview</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEA Overview</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roads/Access</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>This site (110 units) is situated to the north and east of Old Graitney Road U171a with site GTN.H5 located along the eastern boundary and site GTN.H6 (20 units) located to the south of the U171a. Old Graitney Road is restrictive in nature and any development would require the widening and improvement of the carriageway to an appropriate standard. Any development on this site would trigger the relocation of the 30mph speed limit and extension of street lighting along the U171a to Loanwarth Road. It would also therefore be appropriate that any development of this site include the provision of a footway along the site frontage to link with the existing footway provisions on Empire Way/Dominion Road and Loanwarth Road. Any development of this site should not prejudice the adjacent sites. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and a residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Planning Overview</strong></td>
<td>This site is situated to the north and east of Old Graitney Road U171a with site GTN.H5 located along the eastern boundary and site GTN.H6 (20 units) located to the south of the U171a. Old Graitney Road is restrictive in nature and any development would require the widening and improvement of the carriageway to an appropriate standard. Any development on this site would trigger the relocation of the 30mph speed limit and extension of street lighting along the U171a to Loanwarth Road. It would also therefore be appropriate that any development of this site include the provision of a footway along the site frontage to link with the existing footway provisions on Empire Way/Dominion Road and Loanwarth Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climatic Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)</td>
<td>South and west aspect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the site make best use of solar gain</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site protected from prevailing winds</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Exposed to prevailing winds</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANNING OVERVIEW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEA OVERVIEW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate landscaping and layout should take into account aspect and prevailing winds to the south west</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to south west aspect the use of solar gain could be used to great effect. Exposed to prevailing winds, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CULTURAL HERITAGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Scheduled Monuments</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Inventory of Historic Battlefield</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANNING OVERVIEW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEA OVERVIEW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No known cultural heritage issues directly affecting site. It should be noted that the site borders the Inventory Battlefield for the Battle of Sark to the south</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No known cultural heritage issues directly affecting site. It should be noted that the site borders the Inventory Battlefield for the Battle of Sark to the south</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANDSCAPE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within or adjoining any of the following</td>
<td>NSAs</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>RSAs</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Comment Development regrettable given historic small holding fields, which form an attractive rural setting to Gretna. However, otherwise the site forms a logical extension and is well contained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Land</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>TPOs</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Site is relatively flat with trees and hedgerows along field boundaries.</td>
<td>SV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Trees and hedgerows should be reinforced with additional planting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Development regrettable given historic small holding fields, which form an attractive rural setting to Gretna</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Otherwise the site forms a logical extension and is well contained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANNING OVERVIEW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEA OVERVIEW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees and hedgerows should be reinforced with additional planting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal detrimental effect on landscape quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Site is outwith Gretna Border settlement boundary in adopted LDP but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boundary within the LDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>immediately adjacent to it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>to disposal/development of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreed to disposal/development of the site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT**  
The site has not been included in the MIR as development would involve the loss of prime agricultural land and greenfield land. Although it may be technically possible to develop this site it is not required to meet housing land requirements at this time. A number of other sites have been included for development that are considered to meet the identified housing strategy.

**OVERALL SEA COMMENT**  
Negative SEA impact as greenfield site and potential loss of prime agricultural land. Positive impact in terms of Population and Health as within reasonable walking distance to community facilities and school, scope to encourage active travel. Gretna served by railway station – could encourage use of more sustainable transport and reduce carbon emissions from transport.
**LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref: GTN.H208</th>
<th>Source of site suggestion: Call for Sites</th>
<th>Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site name: land to south of Braemar, Main Street</td>
<td>Current use: Agricultural land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement: Gretna Border</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size (ha): 1.3ha</td>
<td>Proposed use: Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HMA: Annan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date completed: Oct/Nov 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scoring Guidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora</th>
<th>Population and Human Health</th>
<th>Soils</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Material Assets</th>
<th>Climatic Factors</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X/+</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact**

- **Significant positive impact**
- **Positive impact**
- **Neutral impact**
- **Unknown impact**
- **Both Positive and Negative impacts**
- **Negative impact**
- **Significant negative impact**

**Score Symbol**

- **++**
- **+**
- **0**
- **?**
- **+/x**
- **x**
- **xx**

**Related SEA topic**

- Population and Human Health (PHH)
- Climatic Factors (CF)
- Biodiversity (B)
- Landscape (L)
- Material Assets (MA)

**Information source**

- Geographic Information System (GIS)
- Site visit (SV)
- Consultee (C)
- Other (O)

**Consultation required (only if answer is Yes)**

- Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
- Transport Scotland (TS)
- Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
- Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
### BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)</td>
<td>SACs</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LNR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SSSls</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Local wildlife sites</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Natterjack toads</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Great Crested Newts</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAMSAR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Geodiversity Sites</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Other protected species</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Marine Consultation Zones</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient/semi-natural woodland</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments: No comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Are there any known invasive species within the site | N |
| Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity | N |

### PLANNING OVERVIEW

**No impact on biodiversity designations**

### SEA OVERVIEW

**No impact on biodiversity designations**

### POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance (km)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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 323 – Springfield to Gretna. Also heritage trail | | |
| Core path | N | | Cycle path | Y |

| What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | Community/village hall | 1 | Sports facilities | 1-5 | Hospitals | 1 | Local shops (convenience) | 1-5 | Bus stop | 0.1 |
| What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | MA and B | | Primary | | School name: Springfield | Annan | |
| Capacity | 31 | 331 |
| Distance | 1 | 10 |

| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | N | GIS | 0 | | | |

### PLANNING OVERVIEW

**Not within reasonable walking distance of the majority of community facilities, less likely to encourage active travel. Proximity to Gretna Station could encourage active travel and use of sustainable transport.**

### SEA OVERVIEW

**Not within reasonable walking distance of the majority of community facilities, less likely to encourage active travel. Proximity to Gretna Station which could encourage active travel and use of sustainable transport.**

**SEA Score: X*/+**
### SOILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Site slopes steeply to east and south.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site</td>
<td>CF</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>No known previous use.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

Would involve loss of prime agricultural land

**SEA OVERVIEW**

Negative SEA impact as would involve the loss of prime agricultural land

**SEA SCORE:** X

### WATER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site</td>
<td>B and L</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>CF and PHH</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SEPA advise that no flood risk apparent</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended. Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING OVERVIEW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October 2010) refers. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing waste water network. Early engagement with Scottish Water via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA OVERVIEW</td>
<td>No known flood risk. Gretna – limited water capacity subject to planned upgrading by Scottish Water which will require developer contributions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 | North – housing. Site bounded by steeply sloping road embankments. | SEPA have noted a potential issue with air quality. | 0 |
| Does the development of the site introduce a new potentially significant air emission to the area (e.g. combined heat and power, an industrial process, large scale quarry of energy from the waste plant) | N | | | 0 |

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

Potential issue with air quality.

**SEA OVERVIEW**

SEPA have noted a potential issue with air quality. SEA Score: ?

**MATERIAL ASSETS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site.....</th>
<th>Brownfield</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Greenfield</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site vacant or derelict</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>No existing structure for reuse on site</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site assessment question</td>
<td>Pre mitigation score</td>
<td>Mitigation if appropriate</td>
<td>Consultation required</td>
<td>Post mitigation score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation</td>
<td>PHH O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site</td>
<td>Pylons N Bord Gais Eirann pipeline N Shell oil pipeline N Transco pipeline N</td>
<td>Comment No known service constraints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies</td>
<td>Air Traffic/NATS N MoD N Carlisle Airport N Coal Authority N HSE N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**  No known servicing constraints

**SEA OVERVIEW**  Negative SEA impact as would involve loss of greenfield land  **SEA SCORE:** X

**ROADS/ACCESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This site has potential to be accessed from an existing private lane located to the east of the site off U42a Main Street that presently serves two dwellings. A second point of access appears to exist via a private lane beside 10 Main Street that also serves 2 dwellings and a former engineering business. These potential points of access may require either significant engineering works or challenges in providing an adoptable access and may require third party land. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and a residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**  This site has potential to be accessed from an existing private lane located to the east of the site off U42a Main Street that presently serves two dwellings. A second point of access appears to exist via a private lane beside 10 Main Street that also serves 2 dwellings and a former engineering business. These potential points of access may require either significant engineering works or challenges in providing an adoptable access and may require third party land.

**CLIMATIC FACTORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the site make best use of solar gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site protected from prevailing winds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposed to prevailing wind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**  Exposed to prevailing wind, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions

**SEA OVERVIEW**  Exposed to prevailing wind, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions  **SEA SCORE:** O

**CULTURAL HERITAGE**
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### Site assessment question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Listed Building N</td>
<td>Scheduled Monuments N</td>
<td>Comment Archaeology - Course of Roman road passes through the majority of the site, evaluation will be required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conservation Area N</td>
<td>Inventory of Historic Battlefield N</td>
<td>Historic Built Environment - No Listed Buildings, no conservation area. Backs onto former railway line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>World Heritage Site N</td>
<td>Inventory &amp; Non-Inventory Garden or Designed Landscape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLANNING OVERVIEW
- Archaeological mitigation measures to be implemented due to course of Roman Road running through site.

### SEA OVERVIEW
- Impact on archaeological feature which would be mitigated subject to archaeological evaluation.
- **SEA Score:** 0

### LANDSCAPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSAs</th>
<th>RSAs</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wild Land N</td>
<td>TPOs N</td>
<td>Trees and hedgerows should be retained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Land N</td>
<td>TPOs N</td>
<td>Significant issues raised in landscape advice s. Slopes steeply to east and south and bounded by roads.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Site lies outwith settlement boundary for Gretna Border, but immediately adjacent to it.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLANNING OVERVIEW
- For landscape reasons the site should not be allocated for housing.

### SEA OVERVIEW
- Negative SEA impact in terms of landscape. Site slopes to the east and is visually prominent from that direction with no physical containment.
- **SEA Score:** X

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT**  
The site has not been included in the MIR as development would have a negative impact on the landscape. It would also involve the loss of prime agricultural land and greenfield land. There are issues regarding access to the site and it is distant from the majority of community facilities. A number of other sites have been included for development that are considered to meet the identified housing strategy.

**OVERALL SEA COMMENT**  
Negative SEA impact in terms of Soils as would involves prime agricultural land, material assets as greenfield site and adverse impact on landscape. Negative SEA impact in terms of Population and Health as distant from the majority of community facilities, but also positive as offset by proximity to Gretna Station and could encourage active travel and use of sustainable transport.
### LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref: GTN.H209</th>
<th>Source of site suggestion: Call for Sites</th>
<th>Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site name: Greenfield, Loanwarth Road</td>
<td>Current use: Agricultural land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement: Gretna Border</td>
<td>OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing):</td>
<td>Existing LDP allocations/ designations: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size Reference:</td>
<td>Proposed use: Leisure and Holiday Homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size (ha): 4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>HMA: Annan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date completed: Oct/Nov 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC SCORE</th>
<th>Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora</th>
<th>Population and Human Health</th>
<th>Soils</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Material Assets</th>
<th>Climatic Factors</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scoring Guidance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Significant positive impact</th>
<th>Positive impact</th>
<th>Neutral impact</th>
<th>Unknown impact</th>
<th>Both Positive and Negative impacts</th>
<th>Negative impact</th>
<th>Significant negative impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score Symbol</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+/x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legends**

- **Related SEA topic**
  - Population and Human Health (PHH)
  - Climatic Factors (CF)
  - Biodiversity (B)
  - Landscape (L)
  - Material Assets (MA)

- **Information source**
  - Geographic Information System (GIS)
  - Site visit (SV)
  - Consultee (C)
  - Other (O)

- **Consultation required (only if answer is Yes)**
  - Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
  - Transport Scotland (TS)
  - Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
  - Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
### BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topics</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACs N</td>
<td>LNR N</td>
<td>SPAs N</td>
<td>SSSIs N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNR N</td>
<td>Local wildlife sites N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAMSAR N</td>
<td>Geodiversity Sites N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Other protected species N</td>
<td>Marine Consultation Zones N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient/semi-natural woodland N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments: No comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any known invasive species within the site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Trees and the network of hedgerows should be retained and enhanced for biodiversity value.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**
Trees and the network of hedgerows should be retained and enhanced for biodiversity value.

**SEA OVERVIEW**
No biodiversity designations affecting site.

### POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topics</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>MA N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Distance (km) 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them</td>
<td>MA or CF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)</td>
<td>CF</td>
<td>Community/village hall 5</td>
<td>Sports facilities 5</td>
<td>Hospitalsities 5</td>
<td>Local shops (convenience) 5</td>
<td>Bus stop 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School name: Gretna</td>
<td>Annan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity: 76</td>
<td>331</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance: 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere</td>
<td>MA and B N</td>
<td>GIS 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**
Site distant from community facilities

**SEA OVERVIEW**
Negative SEA impact as site distant from community facilities

SEA SCORE: X
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Loss of prime agricultural land currently in grazing</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Relatively flat open site. A very open site for this type of development without any natural topography to screen it.</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No known previous use.</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat</td>
<td></td>
<td>CF</td>
<td>No known previous use.</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

Would involve loss of prime agricultural land

**SEA OVERVIEW**

Negative impact as would involve loss of prime agricultural land

**WATER**

<p>| Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site | B and L | Y | Watercourse flows through the site | | | | | |
| Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere | CF and PHH | Y | SEPA - A minor watercourse with potentially culverted sections flows through the site which could represent a potential flood risk. Body of water traverses the site. Drainage Impact Assessment required. Depending on content, Flood Risk Assessment may also be required. | | C | X | A Flood Risk Assessment is required which would require to be agreed with SEPA | 0 |
| Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse) | | N | | | | | | C | 0 |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer | PHH | Y | Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity. | | C | X | SEPA advise that site remote from public sewer - provision of private foul drainage may be restricted which could constrain development aspirations. | x |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply | PHH | Y | Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity. | | C | 0 | | | Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network issues here. Scottish Water is currently examining the requirements for this phase of the upgrade work. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October 2010) refers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING OVERVIEW</td>
<td>SEPA advise that site remote from public sewer - provision of private foul drainage may be restricted which could constrain development aspirations. Gretna capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. Potential flood risk identified which would require a Flood Risk Assessment to be agreed with SEPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA OVERVIEW</td>
<td>Negative Sea impact as site remote from public sewer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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 | O | 0 |
| PHH | Small business units, house and stables immediately adjacent. Surrounded by countryside and agricultural land. Mixed use site GTN.MU1 lies to the north. | SV | O | |

What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby?  

| N | | | | |

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 | | | | |

### PLANNING OVERVIEW

Unlikely to decrease air quality.  

### SEA OVERVIEW

Unlikely to decrease air quality.  

### MATERIAL ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site……</th>
<th>Brownfield</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Greenfield</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site vacant or derelict</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Site assessment question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site assessment question</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Information source</td>
<td>Pre mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site</td>
<td>Pylons</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Bord Gais Eirann pipeline</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>No known service constraints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies</td>
<td>Air Traffic/NATS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MoD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

No known service constraints

**SEA OVERVIEW**

Negative SEA impact as greenfield site.

### ROADS/ACCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Overview</th>
<th>SEA Score</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Planning Overview**

This site is situated to the south of Loanwath Road C67a adjacent to an existing business/equestrian centre. The C67a is restrictive in nature, therefore the carriageway to the B721 would require to be widened and a footway provided along it from the B721 to a point east of the site boundary. Provision of suitable pedestrian connectivity with Gretna would require improvements from the site frontage and east to the U171a, this would require further discussion and potentially third party land. Any development on this site would trigger the relocation of the 30mph speed limit and extension of street lighting. A Transport Assessment should be commissioned and a Masterplan should be provided. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and a residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards.

### CLIMATIC FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Overview</th>
<th>SEA Overview</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Planning Overview**

Potentially exposed to the west however this will be partially mitigated by a reinforced woodland strip to the west.

### CULTURAL HERITAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANNING OVERVIEW</th>
<th>SEA Overview</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Planning Overview**

Potentially exposed to the west however this will be partially mitigated by a reinforced woodland strip to the west.

**SEA Overview**

Potentially exposed to the west however this will be partially mitigated by a reinforced woodland strip to the west.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of the following including their setting</td>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Heritage Site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory of Historic Battlefield</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory &amp; Non-Inventory Garden or Designed Landscape</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Built Environment - No Listed Buildings; no conservation area. A very open site for this type of development without any natural topography to screen it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment?

L

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**
- No cultural designations affecting site

**SEA OVERVIEW**
- No cultural designations affecting site

---

**LANDSCAPE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site within or adjoining any of the following</th>
<th>NSAs</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>RSA</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Unlikely to be suitable: Greenfield site within open flat landscape. Remote from settlement though adjacent to small business units and stables. Site associates with wider countryside and holiday home development would be highly visible and incongruous with setting.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wild Land</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>TPOs</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SV/C</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SVC</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**
- Development of site would not be supported due to adverse impact on landscape setting.

**SEA OVERVIEW**
- Significant negative SEA impact as site would be highly visible and incongruous in the wider landscape setting.

**SEA SCORE: XX**

---

**PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES**

| Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP | Y | Outwith settlement boundary for Gretna Border, but adjacent to settlement boundary in part. Site is in the main remote from the settlement. |
| Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site | Y | |
| Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips | ? | Improvements to pedestrian connectivity with Gretna would require improvements from the site frontage and east to the U171a which would potentially require third party land. |
| Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe | ? | The site has been proposed for a tourist / leisure type development. The plan does not make any specific allocations for this type of development as there are policies which would be used to assess any proposal. Development of the site would have an adverse impact on the landscape. It would also involve the loss of prime agricultural land and greenfield land. The site is remote from the settlement and the majority of community facilities. There are issues regarding |

**OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT**
- The site has been proposed for a tourist / leisure type development. The plan does not make any specific allocations for this type of development as there are policies which would be used to assess any proposal. Development of the site would have an adverse impact on the landscape. It would also involve the loss of prime agricultural land and greenfield land. The site is remote from the settlement and the majority of community facilities. There are issues regarding |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>appropriate pedestrian access from the site to Gretna.</td>
<td>Overall SEA Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant negative SEA impact in terms of adverse landscape impact and negative impact in terms of Soils and Material Assets as would loss of prime agricultural land and greenfield site. Negative SEA impact in terms of Population and Health as site distant from community facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref:</th>
<th>GTN.H210</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of site suggestion:</td>
<td>Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site name:</td>
<td>land adj to School Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Gretna Border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current use:</td>
<td>Agricultural land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing LDP allocations/ designations:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size (ha):</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA:</td>
<td>Annan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date completed:</td>
<td>Oct/Nov 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TOPIC</strong></th>
<th>Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora</th>
<th>Population and Human Health</th>
<th>Soils</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Material Assets</th>
<th>Climatic Factors</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCORE</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X/+</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scoring Guidance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Significant positive impact</th>
<th>Positive impact</th>
<th>Neutral impact</th>
<th>Unknown impact</th>
<th>Both Positive and Negative impacts</th>
<th>Negative impact</th>
<th>Significant negative impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score Symbol</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+/-x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legends**

**Related SEA topic**
- Population and Human Health (PHH)
- Climatic Factors (CF)
- Biodiversity (B)
- Landscape (L)
- Material Assets (MA)

**Information source**
- Geographic Information System (GIS)
- Site visit (SV)
- Consultee (C)
- Other (O)

**Consultation required (only if answer is Yes)**
- Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
- Transport Scotland (TS)
- Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
- Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
## BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)</td>
<td>SACs</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LNR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NNR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Local wildlife sites</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Natterjack toads</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Great Crested Newts</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAMSAR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Geodiversity Sites</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Other protected species</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Marine Consultation Zones</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Sustainable woodland</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Natterjack toads</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Great Crested Newts</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments: No comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any known invasive species within the site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLANNING OVERVIEW

No biodiversity designations apply

### SEA OVERVIEW

No biodiversity designations apply

---

## POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

### PLANNING OVERVIEW

Site immediately adjacent to primary school, but on edge of settlement

### SEA OVERVIEW

Both negative and positive SEA impact. Not within reasonable walking distance of the majority of community facilities, less likely to encourage active travel. Immediately adjacent to Springfield PS and relative proximity to Gretna Station which could encourage active travel and use of sustainable transport.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Flat open site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No known previous use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat</td>
<td>CF</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOILS**

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

Would involve loss of prime agricultural land

**SEA OVERVIEW**

Negative SEA impact as would involve the loss of prime agricultural land

**WATER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site</th>
<th>B and L</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>CF and PHH</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SEPA – No flood risk apparent</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GTN.H210
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Overview</td>
<td>Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA Overview</td>
<td>No known flood risk. Gretna – limited water capacity subject to planned upgrading by Scottish Water which will require developer contributions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEA Score: 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 | Largely surrounded by agricultural land. To west housing, protected area of open space and Springfield PS. | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Does the development of the site introduce a new potentially significant air emission to the area (e.g. combined heat and power, an industrial process, large scale quarry of energy from the waste plant) | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

Unlikely to decrease air quality

**SEA OVERVIEW**

Unlikely to decrease air quality

**SEA OVERVIEW**

SEA Score: 0

**MATERIAL ASSETS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site…..</th>
<th>Brownfield</th>
<th>Greenfield</th>
<th>Comment Greenfield site currently in agricultural use.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site vacant or derelict</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GTN.H210
set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Relevant SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site</td>
<td>Pylons</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bord Gais Eirann pipeline</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shell oil pipeline</td>
<td>NN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transco pipeline</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>No known servicing constraints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related Bodies</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Traffic/NATS</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle Airport</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal Authority</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSE</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planning Overview**
No known servicing constraints

**SEA Overview**
Negative SEA impact as would involve the loss of greenfield land.  
SEA Score: X

---

### Roads/Access

Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?

This site has the U234a along its western border, the U233a along its northern and a link on its south east boundary to an existing private lane. The U233a and U234a are both restrictive in nature with existing drainage adjacent to the carriageway edge, any development of this site would require upgrading of both roads to allow suitable vehicle and pedestrian access incorporating pedestrian links along the U234a back to Main Street U42a. Should access be taken onto the U233a, this site would trigger the relocation of the 30mph speed limit and extension of street lighting. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and a residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards.

**Planning Overview**
The U233a and U234a are both restrictive in nature with existing drainage adjacent to the carriageway edge. Development of this site would require upgrading of both roads to allow suitable vehicle and pedestrian access incorporating pedestrian links along the U234a back to Main Street U42a.

---

### Climatic Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can the site make best use of solar gain</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>SV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site protected from prevailing winds</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Exposed to prevailing wind.</td>
<td>SV</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planning Overview**
Exposed to prevailing wind, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions

**SEA Overview**
Exposed to prevailing wind, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions  
SEA Score: 0

---

### Cultural Heritage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting</th>
<th>Listed Building</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Scheduled Monuments</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Inventory of Historic Battlefield</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Heritage Site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Inventory &amp; Non-Inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Garden or Designed Landscape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Archaeology - No historic environment issues identified for this site, as of July 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Built Environment - No Listed Buildings; no conservation area. Potential for sensitive development in relation to the existing layout of Springfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment | L | Y | Potential for sensitive development in relation to the existing layout of Springfield | C | 0 |

GTN.H210
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential for sensitive development in relation to the existing layout of Springfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impact on cultural heritage designations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LANDSCAPE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site within or adjoining any of the following</th>
<th>NSAs</th>
<th>RSAs</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wild Land</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Possible site: Greenfield site with overlooking farmland to East and north. Would enclose school playing field (positive) but no real defensible boundary to the east. May be possible to mitigate with hedgerow/tree planting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Site open to east and due to nature of topography and landscape no real defensible boundary to the east.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

Site open to east and due to nature of topography and landscape no real defensible boundary to the east. Limited scope to mitigate in part with landscaping and planting with hedgerow/tree planting.

**SEA OVERVIEW**

Negative SEA impact in terms of landscape.

**PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES**

| Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP | Y | Site not allocated for housing development in adopted LDP. Site adjacent to settlement boundary for Gretna Border. |
| Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site | Y | |
| Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips | N | |
| Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe | Y | |

**OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT**

The site has not been included in the MIR as development would involve the loss of prime agricultural land and greenfield land. Development would have an adverse impact on the landscape. There is limited scope to mitigate in part with landscaping and planting, the site is open to the east and there is no defensible boundary given topography. A number of other sites have been included for development that are considered to meet the identified housing strategy.

**OVERALL SEA COMMENT**

Negative SEA impact in terms of Soils as would involve the loss of prime agricultural land and material assets as greenfield site. Negative SEA impact in terms of Population and Health as distant from the majority of community facilities, but offset by proximity to Springfield Primary School. Negative SEA impact in terms of landscape, some limited scope to mitigate in part with landscaping and planting with hedgerow/tree planting.
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### LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref:</th>
<th>GTN.H211</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of site suggestion:</td>
<td>Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site name:</td>
<td>land to south of Braemar, Main Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Gretna Border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current use:</td>
<td>Agricultural land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size (ha):</td>
<td>1.3ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed use:</td>
<td>Site for Nursing Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA:</td>
<td>Annan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date completed:</td>
<td>Oct/Nov 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora</th>
<th>Population and Human Health</th>
<th>Soils</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Material Assets</th>
<th>Climatic Factors</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X/+</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scoring Guidance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Significant positive impact</th>
<th>Positive impact</th>
<th>Neutral impact</th>
<th>Unknown impact</th>
<th>Both Positive and Negative impacts</th>
<th>Negative impact</th>
<th>Significant negative impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score Symbol</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+/+x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legends**

- **Related SEA topic**
  - Population and Human Health (PHH)
  - Climatic Factors (CF)
  - Biodiversity (B)
  - Landscape (L)
  - Material Assets (MA)

- **Information source**
  - Geographic Information System (GIS)
  - Site visit (SV)
  - Consultee (C)
  - Other (O)

- **Consultation required (only if answer is Yes)**
  - Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
  - Transport Scotland (TS)
  - Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
  - Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
### BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>SACs</th>
<th>LNR</th>
<th>NNR</th>
<th>RAMSAR</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SPAs</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SSSIs</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACs</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local wildlife sites</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natterjack toads</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Crested Newts</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geodiversity Sites</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other protected species</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Consultation Zones</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient/semi-natural woodland</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: No comments

- **PLANNING OVERVIEW**: No impact on biodiversity designations
- **SEA OVERVIEW**: No impact on biodiversity designations

**SEA SCORE**: 0

### POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance (km)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **PLANNING OVERVIEW**: Not within reasonable walking distance of the majority of community facilities, less likely to encourage active travel. Proximity to Gretna Station and could encourage active travel and use of sustainable transport.
- **SEA OVERVIEW**: Not within reasonable walking distance of the majority of community facilities, less likely to encourage active travel. Proximity to Gretna Station and could encourage active travel and use of sustainable transport.

**SEA SCORE**: X/+
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)</td>
<td>3.2 X Agricultural land currently in grazing.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Site slopes steeply to east and south.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site</td>
<td>CF</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

Would involve loss of prime agricultural land

**SEA OVERVIEW**

Negative SEA impact as would involve the loss of prime agricultural land

**SEASORE: X**

---

**WATER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site</th>
<th>B and L</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>CF and PHH</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SEPA advise that no flood risk apparent</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Planning Overview**

Gretana – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October 2010) refers. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing waste water network. Early engagement with Scottish Water via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.

**SEA Overview**

No known flood risk. Gretana – limited water capacity subject to planned upgrading by Scottish Water which will require developer contributions. SEA Score: 0

---

**AIR QUALITY**

| Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA? | N | There are no AQMA at present in the region | C | 0 | 0 |
| What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby? | PHH | North – housing. Site bounded by steeply sloping road embankments. | SEPA have noted a potential issue with air quality. | ? |
| Does the development of the site introduce a new potentially significant air emission to the area (e.g. combined heat and power, an industrial process, large scale quarry of energy from the waste plant)? | N | 0 |

**Planning Overview**

Potential issue with air quality.

**SEA Overview**

SEPA have noted a potential issue with air quality. SEA Score: ?

---

**Material Assets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site…..</th>
<th>Brownfield</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site vacant or derelict</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>No existing structure for reuse on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site assessment question</td>
<td>Related SEA Topic</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site</td>
<td>Pylons</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies</td>
<td>Air Traffic/NATS</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLANNING OVERVIEW
- No known servicing constraints

### SEA OVERVIEW
- Negative SEA impact as would involve loss of greenfield land

### ROADS/ACCESS
- This site has potential to be accessed from an existing private lane located to the east of the site off U42a Main Street that presently serves two dwellings. A second point of access appears to exist via a private lane beside 10 Main Street that also serves 2 dwellings and a former engineering business. These potential points of access may require either significant engineering works or challenges in providing an adoptable access and may require third party land. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and a residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards.

### PLANNING OVERVIEW
- This site has potential to be accessed from an existing private lane located to the east of the site off U42a Main Street that presently serves two dwellings. A second point of access appears to exist via a private lane beside 10 Main Street that also serves 2 dwellings and a former engineering business. These potential points of access may require either significant engineering works or challenges in providing an adoptable access and may require third party land.

### CLIMATIC FACTORS

| What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.) | South | SV | 0 | 0 |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | Y | SV | 0 | 0 |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | N | Not sheltered from prevailing wind. | SV | X | May require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions |

### PLANNING OVERVIEW
- Not sheltered from prevailing wind, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions

### SEA OVERVIEW
- Not sheltered from prevailing wind, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions

### CULTURAL HERITAGE

GTN.H211
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Scheduled Monuments</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Comment Archaeology - Course of Roman road passes through the majority of the site, evaluation will be required. Historic Built Environment - No Listed Buildings, no conservation area. Backs onto former railway line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

Archaeological mitigation measures to be implemented due to course of Roman Road running through site.

**SEA OVERVIEW**

Impact on archaeological feature which would be mitigated subject to archaeological evaluation.

**SEA SCORE:** 0

**LANDSCAPE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site within or adjoining any of the following</th>
<th>NSAs</th>
<th>RSAs</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wild Land</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ILA OVERVIEW**

Trees and hedgerows should be retained.

**SEA OVERVIEW**

Existing trees and hedgerows should be reinforced with additional planting.

**SEA SCORE:** 0

**PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Site lies outwith settlement boundary for Gretna Border, but immediately adjacent to it.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Potential points of road access may require third party land outwith the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT**
The site has been proposed for a nursing home. The plan does not make any specific allocations for this type of development as there are policies which would be used to assess any proposal. Development of the site would have a negative impact on the landscape. It would also involve the loss of prime agricultural land and greenfield land. There are issues regarding access to the site and it is distant from the majority of community facilities Policy H6 requires that such facilities are well located in relation to local services and facilities and are integrated with the local community.

**OVERALL SEA COMMENT**
Negative SEA impact in terms of Soils as would involves prime agricultural land, material assets as greenfield site and adverse impact on landscape. Negative SEA impact in terms of Population and Health as distant from the majority of community facilities, but also positive as offset by proximity to Gretna Station and could encourage active travel and use of sustainable transport.
### LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref: GTN.MU201</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of site suggestion: Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement: Gretna Border</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current use: Agricultural land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing LDP allocations/ designations: None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Size (ha): 2.0ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed use: Mixed use – retail, industrial/commercial and tourist recreation / leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA: Annan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date completed: Oct/Nov 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TOPIC</strong></th>
<th>Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora</th>
<th>Population and Human Health</th>
<th>Soils</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Material Assets</th>
<th>Climatic Factors</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCORE</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scoring Guidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Significant positive impact</th>
<th>Positive impact</th>
<th>Neutral impact</th>
<th>Unknown impact</th>
<th>Both Positive and Negative impacts</th>
<th>Negative impact</th>
<th>Significant negative impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score Symbol</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+/x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Legends

- **Related SEA topic**
  - Population and Human Health (PHH)
  - Climatic Factors (CF)
  - Biodiversity (B)
  - Landscape (L)
  - Material Assets (MA)

- **Information source**
  - Geographic Information System (GIS)
  - Site visit (SV)
  - Consultee (C)
  - Other (O)

- **Consultation required [ only if answer is Yes]**
  - Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
  - Transport Scotland (TS)
  - Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
  - Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
### 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)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SACs</th>
<th>LNR</th>
<th>SPAs</th>
<th>NNR</th>
<th>Local wildlife sites</th>
<th>Natterjack toads</th>
<th>RAMSAR</th>
<th>Geodiversity Sites</th>
<th>Other protected species</th>
<th>Marine Consultation Zones</th>
<th>SSSIs</th>
<th>Ancient/semi-natural woodland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

- No comments

**Are there any known invasive species within the site?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Pre mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Pre mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

- No biodiversity designations apply

**SEA OVERVIEW**

- No biodiversity designations apply

**SEA SCORE:** O

### POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

**Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MA</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Distance (km)**

- 1

**Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MA or CF</th>
<th>Right of Way</th>
<th>Core path</th>
<th>Cycle path</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**

- Core path 252 along River Sark

**What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CF</th>
<th>Distance (km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community/village hall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local shops (convenience)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus stop</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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)?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School name</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MA and B</th>
<th>GIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

- Within close walking distance to existing facilities, school and access to Gretna station. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.

**SEA OVERVIEW**

- Within close walking distance to existing community facilities, and access to Gretna station. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.

**SEA SCORE:** +
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topics</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)</td>
<td>O X</td>
<td>Would involve loss of prime agricultural land</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No known previous use.</td>
<td>C O</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat</td>
<td>CF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O O</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**
Loss of prime agricultural land.

**SEA OVERVIEW**
Negative SEA impact as would involve loss of prime agricultural land.

**WATER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topics</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site</td>
<td>B and L</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>CF and PHH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.</td>
<td>C 0</td>
<td>Please note there Surface water sewer running along east of site. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.</td>
<td>C 0</td>
<td>Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed. Phase 2 works will require developer contributions to further alleviate the water network</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GTN.MU201
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topics</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING OVERVIEW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of this site is unacceptable due to flood risk - within potentially vulnerable area of fluvial and coastal flooding. Fully within the 1 in 200 year floodplain of River Esk. Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border (October 2010) refers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA OVERVIEW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant negative SEA impact as site within an identified flood risk area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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? | N | PHH | North – hotel and car park serving Gretna Outlet Centre. East bounded by B7076 South – River Sark and embankments. West – agricultural land | SV | O | 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 | | | | | | | |

**PLANNING OVERVIEW** Unlikely to decrease air quality.

**SEA OVERVIEW** Unlikely to decrease air quality.

**MATERIAL ASSETS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site……</th>
<th>Brownfield</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Greenfield</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site vacant or derelict</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site assessment question</td>
<td>Related SEA Topic</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Information source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site</td>
<td>Pylons</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies</td>
<td>Air Traffic/NATS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bord Gais Eirann pipeline</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shell oil pipeline</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transco pipeline</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Overview</td>
<td></td>
<td>No known servicing constraints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA Overview</td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative SEA impact as would involve loss of greenfield land.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ROADS/ACCESS**

**Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?**

This site located to the south of the B7076 at the national boundary, adjacent to the southern overflow car park for the Gretna Gateway Outlet and the Garden House Hotel. Access can be taken from either the existing hotel/carpark access or via the B7076. Development of this site will trigger the relocation of the 30mph speed limit. Any development of this proposed site should include access designed in accordance with the appropriate Dumfries and Galloway Council standard for the proposed type of development, with parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council parking standards.

**Planning Overview**

Access can be taken from either the existing hotel/carpark access or via the B7076. Development of this site will trigger the relocation of the 30mph speed limit.

**CLIMATIC FACTORS**

**What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)**

South and West aspect

**Can the site make best use of solar gain**

Y

**Is the site protected from prevailing winds**

N Exposed to prevailing winds

**Planning Overview**

Due to south west aspect the use of solar gain could be used to great effect. Exposed to prevailing winds, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions.

**SEA Overview**

Due to south west aspect the use of solar gain could be used to great effect. Exposed to prevailing winds, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions

**CULTURAL HERITAGE**
### Site assessment question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment Archaeology - No historic environment issues identified for this site, as of July 2016 Historic Built Environment - Two Category B Listed structures – Sark Bridge and the Old Toll House both of which should be carefully considered in respect of access to the site and their setting. No conservation area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The setting of the listed structures Sark Bridge (category B) and the Old Toll House (category B) should be carefully considered in respect of access to the site.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**
The setting of the listed structures Sark Bridge (category B) and the Old Toll House (category B) should be carefully considered in respect of access to the site.

**SEA OVERVIEW**
Potential impact on setting of adjacent listed structures which will require to be carefully considered in respect of access to the site.

---

### LANDSCAPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site within or adjoining any of the following</th>
<th>NSAs</th>
<th>RSAs</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wild Land</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Possible option depending on nature of development: Borders onto levee by River Sark whereas existing village boundary is set back from the river. Development would be seen on entrance to the village and would impact on existing hotel which looks out onto site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**
High quality of design would be required at this important prominent site at the entrance to Gretna and national boundary to Scotland

**SEA OVERVIEW**
Potential impact on landscape and mitigation measures identified should be implemented.

**SEA Score:** 0

---

### PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**
Site lies immediately outside settlement inset boundary for Gretna Border

**SEA OVERVIEW**
Site being promoted as a gateway site to Scotland. Promoted for tourist recreation/leisure uses, retail and high quality office accommodation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been included in the MIR due to significant flood risk and SEPA advise that the site should not be allocated for development. The site has been proposed for tourist recreation / leisure uses, retail and office development. The plan does not make any specific allocations for this type of development as there are policies which would be used to assess any proposal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL SEA COMMENT**

Significant negative SEA impact in terms of water issues as significant flood risk. Negative SEA impact in terms of soils and material assets as prime agricultural land and greenfield site. Positive SEA impact in terms of Population and Human Health as within close walking distance to existing facilities, school and access to Gretna station. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.
**LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST**

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

**TOPIC SCORE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora</th>
<th>Population and Human Health</th>
<th>Soils</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Material Assets</th>
<th>Climatic Factors</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scoring Guidance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Significant positive impact</th>
<th>Positive impact</th>
<th>Neutral impact</th>
<th>Unknown impact</th>
<th>Both Positive and Negative impacts</th>
<th>Negative impact</th>
<th>Significant negative impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score Symbol</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+/x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legends**

- **Related SEA topic**
  - Population and Human Health (PHH)
  - Climatic Factors (CF)
  - Biodiversity (B)
  - Landscape (L)
  - Material Assets (MA)

- **Information source**
  - Geographic Information System (GIS)
  - Site visit (SV)
  - Consultee (C)
  - Other (O)

- **Consultation required (only if answer is Yes)**
  - Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
  - Transport Scotland (TS)
  - Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
  - Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
### 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SACs</th>
<th>LNR</th>
<th>SPAs</th>
<th>NNR</th>
<th>Local wildlife sites</th>
<th>Natterjack toads</th>
<th>Great Crested Newts</th>
<th>RAMSAR</th>
<th>Geodiversity Sites</th>
<th>Other protected species</th>
<th>Marine Consultation Zones</th>
<th>Ancient/semi-natural woodland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:** No comments

Are there any known invasive species within the site?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

No biodiversity designations apply

**SEA OVERVIEW**

No biodiversity designations apply

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance to nearest area of open space</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance (km)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>MA or CF</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core path</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle path</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community/village hall</td>
<td>MA and BF</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports facilities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local shops (convenience)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus stop</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School name:</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capacity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Distance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

Within close walking distance to existing facilities, school and access to Gretna station. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.

**SEA OVERVIEW**

Within close walking distance to existing community facilities, and access to Gretna station. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.

**SEA SCORE:** +
### SOILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute) 3.1</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Low lying site bounded by embankment of River Sark</td>
<td>SV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>No known previous use.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat</td>
<td>CF</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### PLANNING OVERVIEW

Would involve loss of prime agricultural land

### SEA OVERVIEW

Negative SEA impact as would involve loss of prime agricultural land  

SEA SCORE: X

---

### WATER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>B and L</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site</td>
<td></td>
<td>Site bounds River Sark and river embankments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>CF and PHH</td>
<td>SEPA – potentially at medium to high risk of Fluival flooding. Aware of a FRA having been undertaken at the site in support of a previous development enquiry. Existing private FRA in development.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Flood management measures would require to formalise embankment to provide 200 year standard of protection. A FRA would be required to be agreed with SEPA.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Potential development of site could increase probability of flooding elsewhere. Adequate buffer to River Sark which is adjacent to the site. If development adheres to good practice this should not result in further deterioration of the waterbody.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Please note there is Combined sewer running through top of site. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>Gretna Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Please note there is Combined sewer running through top of site. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Scottish Water advise that there are water network issues within Gretna at present. Phase 1 of the works to alleviate this and permit new connections has been completed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site assessment question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

- Flood management measures would require to formalise river embankment to provide 200 year standard of protection. A FRA would be required to be agreed with SEPA.
- Gretna – limited capacity in mains water network subject to planned upgrading which will require developer contributions. Supplementary Guidance Developer Contributions to Upgrade the Water Supply at Gretna Border refers. Flood risk assessment required.

**SEA OVERVIEW**

- Negative SEA impact as high risk of fluvial flooding. Flood management measures would require to formalise embankment to provide 200 year standard of protection. A FRA would be required to be agreed with SEPA.

**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?
- There are no AQMA at present in the region.

- What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby?

- Does the development of the site introduce a new potentially significant air emission to the area (e.g., combined heat and power, an industrial process, large scale quarry of energy from the waste plant)?

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

- Unlikely to decrease air quality.

**SEA OVERVIEW**

- Unlikely to decrease air quality.

**MATERIAL ASSETS**

- Is the site….. Brownfield Y Comment Site of former caravan park, currently disused
- Greenfield
- Is the site vacant or derelict V Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey
- Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or Y Some structures remain on site also disused services.

GTN.MU202
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>recycle or recover on-site materials/resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation</td>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site</td>
<td>Pylons</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Bord Gais Eirann pipeline</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shell oil pipeline</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Transco pipeline</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies</td>
<td>Air Traffic/NATS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MoD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Carlisle Airport</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Coal Authority</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANNING OVERVIEW</strong></td>
<td>No known servicing constraints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **SEA OVERVIEW**                                                                      | No impact as would result in development of brownfield site. | | | | | | | | **SEA SCORE: 0**

### ROADS/ACCESS

Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated?

This site located to the north of the B7076 at the national boundary incorporates part of a site currently subject to a planning application for a class 1 foodstore under 15/P/4/0232. Access to this site should utilise the access design proposed for this development. Consideration should also be given to core path 253 which enters the northern boundary of the site. Development of this site will trigger the relocation of the 30mph speed limit. Any development of this proposed site should be in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Councils Technical Advice Note 5 ‘Roads and Accesses for Industrial Developments’ with parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards.

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

This site incorporates part of a site currently subject to a planning application for a class 1 foodstore under 15/P/4/0232. Access to this site should utilise the access design proposed for this development.

### CLIMATIC FACTORS

| What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.) | South and west aspect | SV | O |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | Y | SV | X | O |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | N | Exposed to the prevailing winds | SV | X | O |

**PLANNING OVERVIEW**

Exposed to prevailing winds, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions

**SEA OVERVIEW**

Due to south west aspect the use of solar gain could be used to great effect. Exposed to prevailing winds, may require greater energy use for heating increasing carbon emissions

**SEA SCORE: 0**
### CULTURAL HERITAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Scheduled Monuments</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Comment: Archaeology - No historic environment issues identified for this site, as of July 2016, but setting of historic tollbooth and bridge should be taken into account.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Inventory of Historic Battlefield</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Historic Built Environment - No conservation area. Category B Listed structures – Old Toll House and Sark Bridge which should be very carefully considered both in terms of access to the site and setting around them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Heritage Site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Inventory &amp; Non-Inventory Garden or Designed Landscape</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeological site</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>The setting of the listed structures Sark Bridge (category B) and the Old Toll House (category B) should be carefully considered in respect of access to the site.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLANNING OVERVIEW
The setting of the listed structures Sark Bridge (category B) and the Old Toll House (category B) should be carefully considered in respect of access to the site.

### SEA OVERVIEW
Potential impact on setting of adjacent listed structures which will require to be carefully considered in respect of access to the site.

### LANDSCAPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Relevant NSAs</th>
<th>Relevant RSAs</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following
Wild Land | Y | TPOs | Possible depending on nature of development:
Former caravan site surrounding ‘iconic’ Old Toll House. Borders onto levee by River Sark whereas existing village boundary is set back from the river. Development would be seen on entrance to the village in the context of the Toll house and would be affected by the M74. [nb includes site of ‘Hands Across the Border’ cairn constructed during referendum debate 2015] | | | | |
| Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level | Y | | Development would be seen on entrance to the village and would impact on existing hotel which looks out onto site. Important site at entrance to Gretna and national boundary to Scotland | | 0 | High quality of design would be required at this important site | 0 | |
| Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement | Y | | | | | | |
| Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site | N | | | | | | |

### PLANNING OVERVIEW
High quality of design would be required at this important prominent site at the entrance to Gretna and national boundary to Scotland

### SEA OVERVIEW
Potential impact on landscape and mitigation measures identified should be implemented.

### PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site assessment question</th>
<th>Related SEA Topic</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Pre mitigation score</th>
<th>Mitigation if appropriate</th>
<th>Post mitigation score</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Site lies immediately outside settlement inset boundary for Gretna Border</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site assessment question</td>
<td>Related SEA Topic</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Site being promoted as a gateway site to Scotland. Promoted for tourist recreation/leisure uses, retail and high quality office accommodation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The site has not been included in the MIR due to high risk of flooding. Any development proposal would require to demonstrate that flood management measures could formalise the existing flood embankment at River Sark providing the required 200 year standard of protection. A Flood Risk Assessment would be required to be agreed with SEPA. The site has been proposed for tourist recreation/leisure uses, retail and office development. The plan does not make any specific allocations for this type of development as there are policies which would be used to assess any proposal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL SEA COMMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative SEA impact in terms of water issues as significant flood risk. Negative SEA impact in terms of soils as would involve the loss of prime agricultural land. Positive SEA impact in terms of Population and Human Health as within close walking distance to existing facilities and Gretna station. Could encourage walking and cycling and reduce carbon emissions from transport.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>