

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| Site Ref: ANN:H1 | Source of site suggestion: LDP Allocation | Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date): Master Plan has been agreed with Council and is now to be implemented. Phases 3, 5 and 7 of the Master Plan are within ANN:H1. Supplementary Guidance – Windermere Road, Annan Masterplan applies (1 December 2014) | |
| Site name: Land north of Windermere Road | | | |
| Settlement: Annan | Current use: Agricultural land | Existing LDP allocations/ designations: | |
| OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): 320813, 567276 | | | |
| Site Size (ha): 5.23 | Proposed use: Housing | HMA: Annan | Date completed: Oct/Nov 2016 |

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

Scoring Guidance

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

Legends

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

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

BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|---|----------------------|---|-------------------------|---|---------------------------|---|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | SACs | N | LNR | N | SPAs | N | SSSIs | N |
| | NNR | N | Local wildlife sites | N | Natterjack toads | | Great Crested Newts | |
| | RAMSAR | N | Geodiversity Sites | N | Other protected species | | Marine Consultation Zones | |
| | Ancient/semi-natural woodland | | N | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any known invasive species within the site | N | | | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity | N | | | | 0 | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No designations affecting site | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No designations affecting site | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | |

POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|------------------------|-----------|--|-----|--|-----------|---------------------------|---|----------|-----|
| Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space | MA | N | | | 0 | Development presents opportunities to enhance the greenspace network and to link the site with Annan and the wider countryside | | 0 | | | |
| | | Distance (km) | 0.5 | | | | | | | | |
| 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: Opportunities to enhance walking and cycle route networks | | | | | | | |
| | | Core path | N | | | | | | | | |
| | | Cycle path | N | | | | | | | | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | Community/village hall | 1 | Sports facilities | 1 | Hospitalities | 1 | Local shops (convenience) | 1 | Bus stop | 0.1 |
| What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | | | Primary | | | | Secondary | | | | |
| | School name: | | Newington | | | | Annan | | | | |
| | Capacity: | | 1 | | | | 331 | | | | |
| | Distance: | | 1 | | | | 2 | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | N | | | GIS | 0 | | | 0 | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Limited capacity within Newington primary school which is the catchment primary school for this site and developer contribution required –refer SG. | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Within reasonable walking distance to existing facilities: scope to encourage active travel. And reduce carbon emissions from transport. Annan served by rail and railway station in settlement – could encourage use of more sustainable transport and reduce carbon emissions from transport. | | | | | | | SEA SCORE: + | | | |

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

| SOILS | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land | | N | Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute) | | 0 | Loss of previously undeveloped soil | 0 | | |
| Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes) | | N | | | | | | | |
| Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site | | N | | | | | | | |
| Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat | CF | N | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No impact on prime quality agricultural land | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No impact on prime quality agricultural land | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| WATER | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|---|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site | B and L | N | | | | | | |
| 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 | ? | No consultation record. | | | | | |
| 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 development to connect to the public foul sewer | PHH | | Annan Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity for development. | C | 0 | Waste network - 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. Supplementary Guidance – Windermere Road, Annan Masterplan applies (1 December 2014) – A detailed Drainage Impact Assessment is required together with a Surface Water Drainage Strategy for the whole site. | 0 | |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic | Yes/No | Comment | Information source | Pre mitigation score | Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required | |
|---|--|--------|--|--------------------|----------------------|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply | PHH | | Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity for development. | C | | Water network - Further investigation such as Flow and Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended. | 0 | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Supplementary Guidance – Windermere Road, Annan Masterplan applies (1 December 2014) – A detailed Drainage Impact Assessment is required together with a Surface Water Drainage Strategy for the whole site. | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No known flood risk issues | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| AIR QUALITY | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|---------------------|--|--|
| Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA | | N | There are no AQMA at present in the region | C | 0 | | 0 | | |
| What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby | PHH | N | Housing and Stapleton Business Park currently being developed for business and industrial use. There may be some noise from the business park. | | | There may be some noise from the business park and mitigation measures in the form of a bund are required as part of the Masterplan in phases 4.5 and 7. | 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 | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| MATERIAL ASSETS | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------|--|---------|--|-----------------------|--|--|
| Is the site..... | | Brownfield | | Comment | | | | |
| | | Greenfield | G | | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | | Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey | N | | No known previous use | | |
| Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover on-site materials/resources | | N | No existing structures to reuse on this site | | | | | |
| Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction | | N | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----|---|---|---------------------------|---|--------------------|---|------------------|---------------------|-----|---|
| Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation | PHH | N | | | | | | | | | | |
| Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9) | | n/a | | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site | | | Pylons | Y | Bord Gais Eirann pipeline | N | Shell oil pipeline | N | Transco pipeline | N | | |
| | | | Comment - Electricity pylons and overhead power lines and associated way leave run along the northern most edge between the site and the business park which is currently under construction. There is a pylon directly on the site boundary. | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | Large greenfield site but benefits from proximity to existing infrastructure. Electricity pylons and overhead power lines and associated way leave run along the northern most edge between the site and the business park which is currently under construction. There is a pylon directly on the site boundary. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Large 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 | | Supplementary Guidance – Windermere Road, Annan Masterplan applies (1 December 2014) A Transport Assessment has been carried out to determine the cumulative impact of the whole development on the local road and trunk road networks. This found that the increase in traffic as a result of the development can be accommodated within the existing road network, subject to the upgrading of Windermere road, without a need for improvement of local junctions. The upgrading of Windermere Road has been completed. | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Supplementary Guidance – Windermere Road, Annan Masterplan applies (1 December 2014) A Transport Assessment has been carried out to determine the cumulative impact of the whole development on the local road and trunk road networks. This found that the increase in traffic as a result of the development can be accommodated within the existing road network, subject to the upgrading of Windermere road, without a need for improvement of local junctions. The upgrading of Windermere Road has been completed. | | | | | | | | | | |

CLIMATIC FACTORS

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|------------|----------------------------|--|--|----|----|---|---------------------|
| What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.) | | South west | | | | SV | 0 | | 0 |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | | Y | Generally a flat open site | | | | SV | 0 | + |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | | Y | | | | | SV | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Supplementary Guidance – Windermere Road, Annan Masterplan applies (1 December 2014) sets out development principles and principles for development form | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Due to south west aspect solar gain could be used to great effect. | | | | | | | | SEA SCORE: + |

CULTURAL HERITAGE

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|---|---------|
| Will the development of the site affect any | L | Listed Building | N | Scheduled Monuments | N | Comment |
|---|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|---|---------|

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

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|------------------------|--|--|
| of the following including their setting | | | Conservation Area | N | Inventory of Historic Battlefield | N | No consultation record | | |
| | | | World Heritage Site | N | Inventory & Non-Inventory | N | | | |
| | | | Archaeological site | N | Garden or Designed Landscape | | | | |
| Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment | L | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No archaeology or historic built environment designations affecting this site | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No designations affecting this site | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| LANDSCAPE | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|--------------------------------|---|---|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | | | NSAs | 0 | RSA's | 0 | Comment No consultation record | | |
| | | | Wild Land | 0 | TPOs | 0 | | | |
| Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level | | N | Existing trees and hedgerows throughout the site. | | | | 0 | The former field boundary hedgerows, bushes and small tress together with the 2 prominent trees within the hedgerow linking Windermere road and the north end of Craignair Park will be retained and incorporated within the new development. Supplementary Guidance – Windermere Road, Annan Masterplan applies (1 December 2014) sets out landscape principles. | 0 |
| Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement | | Y | On edge of settlement. | | | | | Development and design would ensure development integrated within existing settlement. | |
| Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site | | N | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | The former field boundary hedgerows, bushes and small tress together with the 2 prominent trees within the hedgerow linking Windermere road and the north end of Craignair Park will be retained and incorporated within the new development. Supplementary Guidance – Windermere Road, Annan Masterplan applies (1 December 2014) sets out landscape principles. | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No designations affect this site. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP | Y | Allocated housing in adopted LDP and Supplementary Guidance – Windermere Road, Annan Masterplan applies (1 December 2014). | | | | | | | |
| 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 | Allocated housing in adopted LDP and Supplementary Guidance – Windermere Road, Annan Masterplan applies (1 December 2014). | | | | | | | | |

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

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | Negative SEA impact as large greenfield site. Positive impact given proximity to community facilities and rail station. |
|----------------------------|---|

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| Site Ref: ANN.H5 | Source of site suggestion: LDP Allocation | Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date): Annan Regeneration Master Plan | |
| Site name: land between Scott Street and Seaforth Park | | | |
| Settlement: Annan | Current use: Agricultural land | | |
| OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): 319965, 566356 | | Existing LDP allocations/ designations: Yes | |
| Site Size (ha): 2.94 | Proposed use: Housing | HMA: Annan | Date completed: Oct/Nov 2016 |

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

Scoring Guidance

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

Legends

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

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

BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|---|----------------------|---|-------------------------|---|---------------------------|---|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | SACs | N | LNR | N | SPAs | N | SSSIs | N |
| | NNR | N | Local wildlife sites | N | Natterjack toads | | Great Crested Newts | |
| | RAMSAR | N | Geodiversity Sites | N | Other protected species | | Marine Consultation Zones | N |
| | Ancient/semi-natural woodland | | N | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any known invasive species within the site | N | | | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity | N | | | | 0 | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No designations affecting site | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No designations affecting site | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | |

POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------------|-------------|--|---|---------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---|----------|---|
| Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space | MA | N | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Distance (km) | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them | MA or CF | Right of Way | N | Comment: National cycle route 7 – B721 | | | | | | | |
| | | 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 | Hospitalities | 1 | Local shops (convenience) | 1 | Bus stop | 1 |
| What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | | | Primary | | | | Secondary | | | | |
| | School name: | | Hecklegirth | | | | Annan | | | | |
| | Capacity: | | 177 | | | | 331 | | | | |
| | Distance: | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | N | | GIS | 0 | | | 0 | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Scope to encourage sustainable modes of travel including walking and cycling. Development presents opportunities to enhance the greenspace network and to link the site with Annan and the wider countryside | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Positive SEA impact as within close walking distance of existing facilities, schools and railway station. Scope to encourage sustainable modes of travel including walking and cycling. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: + | | | | |

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

| SOILS | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|--------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land | | Y | Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute) | | | Prime quality land | X | | |
| Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes) | | N | | | | | | | |
| Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site | | | No known previous use. | | | | | | |
| Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat | CF | ? | Unknown | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Loss of prime quality agricultural land | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Loss of prime quality agricultural land | | | | | | SEA SCORE: X | | |

| WATER | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site | B and L | | Records suggest the presence of a culvert/drainage system within this 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 | | DGC hold flood records in relation to this site. Records suggest the presence of a culvert/drainage system within this site. Site appears in SEPA pluvial floodmap. | C | | Drainage Impact Assessment required in conjunction with culvert investigation. | 0 | |
| Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse) | | N | | | | | | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer | PHH | Y | Annan Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity for development. | C | | Waste network - Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended. | 0 | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply | PHH | Y | Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity for development. Water network - There is a 6"Water main running through top of site. | C | | Water main running through part of site would require to be safeguarded | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Drainage Impact Assessment required in conjunction with culvert investigation. Water main running through part of site would require to be safeguarded. | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|---------------------|
| SEA OVERVIEW | Potential flood risk. Site appears in SEPA pluvial floodmap. Drainage Impact Assessment required in conjunction with culvert investigation. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 |
|---------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|---------------------|

| AIR QUALITY | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|----|---|---|---------------------|--|
| Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA | | N | There are no AQMA at present in the region | C | 0 | | 0 | |
| What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby | PHH | Y | Adjoining existing scrap yard – potential noise, dust and significant visual impact | SV | X | Noise assessment required to determine noise and required mitigation from adjacent scrap yard. Given scale of operation limited scope to screen scrap yard. | 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) | | N | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Adjoining landuse incompatible with housing development. Noise assessment required to determine noise and required mitigation from adjacent scrap yard. Given scale of operation limited scope to screen scrap yard and develop successful mitigation measures. Development of site would create very poor housing environment | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negative SEA impact as potential noise, dust and visual impact from adjoining use. Given scale of scrapyard operation limited scope to develop mitigation measures. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: X | |

| MATERIAL ASSETS | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------------|--|---------|--|------------------------|--|--|
| Is the site..... | | Brownfield | | Comment | | | | |
| | | Greenfield | G | | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | N | Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey | | | No known previous use. | | |
| Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover on-site materials/resources | | N | No existing structure for reuse on the site | | | | | |
| Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction | | N | | | | | | |
| Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation | PHH | N | | | | | | |
| Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria | | n/a | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---------------------------|---|--------------------|---|---------------------|---|-----|---|
| set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site | | Pylons | N | Bord Gais Eirann pipeline | N | Shell oil pipeline | N | Transco pipeline | N | | |
| | | Comment There are no servicing constraints in relation to the site. | | | | | | | | | |
| Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies | | Air Traffic/NATS | N | MoD | N | Carlisle Airport | N | Coal Authority | N | HSE | N |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Greenfield but proximity to existing infrastructure | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negative SEA impact as would involve 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 | | Access to this site (20 units) can be taken from the Scott's Street and Seaforth Avenue. Consideration should be given to the access design from Scott Street given the shared access with the adjacent scrap metal site. Consideration should be given to pedestrian connectivity in particular via Seaforth Avenue to allow suitable connections to the Primary School, Academy and community facilities. Particular consideration should be given to drainage design and surface water flows from the South East that travel beneath the former railway line. A full drainage impact assessment is required that identifies the sources, catchment size and outfalls associated with this site along with proposals for addressing the drainage issues. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and any residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards. | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Access issues to site require to be resolved. Consideration should be given to the access design from Scott Street given the shared access with the adjacent scrap metal site. Consideration should be given to pedestrian connectivity in particular via Seaforth Avenue to allow suitable connections to the Primary School, Academy and community facilities. A full drainage impact assessment is required that identifies the sources, catchment size and outfalls associated with this site along with proposals for addressing the drainage issues. | | | | | | | | | |

CLIMATIC FACTORS

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-------|---|--|--|--|--|---------------------|--|---|--|
| What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.) | | South | | | | | | | | | |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | | Y | Housing design could make use of passive solar gain reducing energy use and carbon emissions. | | | | | | | + | |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | | Y | | | | | | | | + | |
| 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

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting | L | Listed Building | N | Scheduled Monuments | N | Comment Archaeology - No historic environment issues identified for this site, as of July 2016 Historic Built Environment The site is close to a small number of Listed Buildings, the closest being the Category B late 19 th century sandstone Seafood House accessed |
| | | Conservation Area | N | Inventory of Historic Battlefield | N | |
| | | World Heritage Site | N | Inventory & Non-Inventory | N | |
| | | Archaeological site | N | Garden or Designed Landscape | N | |

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

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|---------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | from Solway Street. The building would not be directly affected by development but sympathetic layout and treatment of the boundaries of the development site. The development should preserve the setting of the LB and provide privacy for new houses without relying on modern fencing and by having particular care for the long term survival and succession planting of large scale trees. | | | |
| Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment | L | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Consideration should be given to sympathetic layout and treatment of the boundaries of the development site given the adjacent Seaforth House(Category B) Listed Building. | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No cultural heritage issues identified. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| LANDSCAPE | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|-------|---------------------|---|--|---|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | | | NSAs | N | | RSA's | N | Comment Sloping site; avoid excessive cut and fill. Screen around scrap metal site and retain planting on embankment to east of site. | | |
| | | | 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 | | | Sloping site; avoid excessive cut and fill. Screen around scrap metal site and retain planting on embankment to east of site. | | | | C | X | Excessive cut and fill should be avoided. Layout and design would require to factor in sloping site. | X |
| Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement | | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Layout and design would require to consider sloping site. | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negative SEA impact in terms of landscape as sloping site; avoid excessive cut and fill. Screen around scrap metal site and retain planting on embankment to east of site. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: X | | | |

| PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES | | |
|--|---|--|
| Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP | Y | Allocated housing site within LDP. |
| 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 | It is understood there is a ransom strip in relation to achieving road access to this site which the landowner is currently looking to resolve. |
| Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe | ? | Issues of access to the site, the environmental impact of the adjacent scrap yard, and drainage and surface water issues in the area which impact on the relative effectiveness of the site and the delivery timescale |
| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT | Review site as an option for inclusion in LDP2. Issues of access to the site, the environmental impact of the adjacent scrap yard, and drainage and surface | |

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

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | water issues in the area which impact on the relative effectiveness of the site. | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | Negative SEA impact as potential loss of prime agricultural land and greenfield site. Potential noise, dust and visual impact from adjoining bad neighbour use. Given scale of scrapyard operation limited scope to develop mitigation measures. Adjoining landuse incompatible with housing development on this site. | | | | | | | |

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| Site Ref: ANN.H6 | Source of site suggestion: LDP Allocation | Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date): | |
| Site name: Land at Watchall Road | | | |
| Settlement: Annan | Current use: Agricultural land | Existing LDP allocations/ designations: | |
| OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): 320223, 566256 | | | |
| Site Size (ha): 2.87 | Proposed use: Housing | HMA: Annan | Date completed: Oct/Nov 2016 |

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

Scoring Guidance

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

Legends

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

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

BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|----------------------|--|-------------------------|---|---------------------------|---|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | SACs | N | LNR | N | SPAs | N | SSSIs | N |
| | NNR | N | Local wildlife sites | N | Natterjack toads | | Great Crested Newts | |
| | RAMSAR | N | Geodiversity Sites | N | Other protected species | | Marine Consultation Zones | N |
| | Ancient/semi-natural woodland | | N | Comments: SNH have not identified any natural heritage interest at the strategic level | | | | |
| 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 | | | | 0 | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No designations affecting this site | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No designations affecting this site | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | |

POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|------------------------|--|---|-----|---------------|--|---------------------------|---|----------|---|
| Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space | MA | | Adjacent to site's western boundary - line of former railway and Chalpercross pipeline . Protected area of open space. and | | GIS | 0 | Opportunity to link to adjacent public open space and core path network. | | 0 | | |
| | | Distance (km) | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them | MA or CF | Right of Way | N | Comment: National cycle route 7 – B721 and Core Path – 314 Annan Causeway | | | | | | | |
| | | Core path | Y | | | | | | | | |
| | | 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 | Hospitalities | 1 | Local shops (convenience) | 1 | Bus stop | 1 |
| What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | | | Primary | | | | Secondary | | | | |
| | School name: | | Hecklegirth | | | | Annan | | | | |
| | Capacity: | | 177 | | | | 331 | | | | |
| | Distance: | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | N | | | GIS | 0 | | | 0 | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Scope to encourage sustainable modes of travel including walking and cycling. Development presents opportunities to enhance the greenspace network and to link the site with Annan and the wider countryside. No capacity at primary school. | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Positive SEA impact as within close walking distance of existing facilities, schools and railway station. Scope to encourage sustainable modes of travel including walking and cycling. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: + | | | | |

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

| SOILS | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|---------------------|--|--|
| Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land | | Y | Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute) | | | | | | |
| Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes) | | N | | | | | | | |
| Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site | | N | No known previous use. | | | | | | |
| Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat | CF | ? | Unknown | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Involves loss of prime agricultural land | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Involves loss of prime agricultural land | | | | | | SEA SCORE: X | | |

| WATER | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|---|--|---|---|--|---|--|
| Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site | B and L | N | No evidence | | | | | |
| Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere | CF and PHH | Y | Site appears in SEPA pluvial floodmap. | C | X | Drainage Impact Assessment required. | 0 | |
| Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse) | | N | | | | | | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer | PHH | Y | Annan Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity for development. | C | 0 | Waste network - Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended. | 0 | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply | PHH | Y | Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity for development. | C | 0 | Water network - Please note there is a 90mm MDPE running along East of site. Further investigation such as Flow and Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry | 0 | |

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

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|----------------------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | process is strongly recommended. | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | 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. Please note there is a 90mm MDPE running along East of site. Further investigation such as Flow and Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended. | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Potential flood risk. Drainage impact assessment required | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| AIR QUALITY | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|--------------------|--|--|
| Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA | | N | There are no AQMA at present in the region | C | 0 | | 0 | | |
| What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby | PHH | Y | North – super market. West – scrap yard. Potential noise and dust impact. SEPA state that site adjacent to licenced End of Life Vehicles (ELV) site – potential source of nuisance e.g noise issues | | X | Noise assessment required to determine noise and required mitigation from adjoining scrap yard. | 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 required to determine noise from adjoining scrap yard and required mitigation | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Potential noise and dust impact from adjoining use (scrap yard). Noise assessment required to determine noise and required mitigation from adjoining scrap yard. | | | | | | SEA SCORE:0 | | |

| MATERIAL ASSETS | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------|--|--|---|------------------------|---|--|
| Is the site..... | | Brownfield | | Comment – Proximity to existing infrastructure | | | | |
| | | Greenfield | G | | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | | Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey | | 0 | No known previous use. | 0 | |
| Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover on-site materials/resources | | N | | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction | | N | | | 0 | | 0 | |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic | Yes/No | Comment | Information source | Pre mitigation score | Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required | |
|--|-------------------|--------|--|--------------------|----------------------|---|---|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation | PHH | N | | | 0 | | 0 | | |
| Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9) | | n/a | | | 0 | | 0 | | |
| Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site | | | Pylons N Bord Gais Eirann pipeline N Shell oil pipeline N Transco pipeline N | | | Comment there are no servicing constraints in relation to this site | | | |
| Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies | | | Air Traffic/NATS N MoD N Carlisle Airport N Coal Authority N HSE N | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | | | | | | Loss of greenfield land but could benefit 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 | | | Access to this site would be taken from Watchhall Road U140a which has been widened and improved with the development of the adjacent site, it would be appropriate that the widening is extended up to and along the site frontage to allow for vehicles to pass on Watchhall Road. It should be noted that development of this site would trigger the relocation of the 30 mph speed limit on Watchhall Road (including street lighting and the construction of a 1.8m wide public footway along the entire site frontage) to a point south of the site boundary. Consideration should be given to drainage design and surface water flows from the South that travel beneath the former railway line into Site ANN.H5. Full drainage impact assessment required that identifies the sources, catchment size and outfalls associated with this site along with proposals for addressing the drainage issues. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and any residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards. It is noted that there is another site under consideration to the south and east of this sites boundary (ANN.H204), and it would be appropriate that a Masterplan approach be adopted so that future development potential not be prejudiced and that the potential impact is considered in respect of traffic volumes, desire lines, public transport and pedestrian/cycle provision. | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Access to the site should be taken from Watchhall Road U140a and the widening should be extended up to and along the site frontage to allow for vehicles to pass on Watchhall Road. The construction of a 1.8m wide public footway along the entire site frontage to a point south of the site boundary would be required. Full drainage impact assessment required that identifies the sources, catchment size and outfalls associated with this site along with proposals for addressing the drainage issues. Ability to access land due south from within the site and to widen Watchhall Road southwards from site access for potential long term expansion of Annan should not be compromised. | | | | | | | |

| CLIMATIC FACTORS | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-------|--|--|----|---|---|---|
| What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.) | | North | | | | | | |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | | N | Northerly facing and could not make best use of solar gain | | SV | X | Likely to require greater energy use increasing carbon emissions. Sustainable design and construction techniques should incorporate energy efficiency | 0 |

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

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|----|---|-----------|---------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | measures. | | | |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | | Y | Site protected from the south west due to the slope of the land | SV | 0 | | 0 | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Sustainable design and construction techniques should incorporate energy efficiency measures. | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Northerly facing and could not make best use of solar gain. Sustainable design and construction techniques should incorporate energy efficiency measures. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| CULTURAL HERITAGE | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|---------------------|--|--|
| Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting | L | Listed Building | N | Scheduled Monuments | N | Comment Archaeology - Nearby sites indicate the possibility of prehistoric remains, evaluation would be required. Historic Built Environment - The site is opposite the Category C Listed Watchhill House. As there has been a significant amount of development around the site there is a risk that development too close to it on the opposite side of the road would spoil its setting completely. Therefore creating a space in the development site with large scale trees would enhance and preserve some of the remaining rural character of the setting of Watchhill House. There is a risk that highways access requirements will have a detrimental impact on existing hedges of the rural character lane therefore this aspect of any development should be considered early. | | | |
| | | Conservation Area | N | Inventory of Historic Battlefield | N | | | | |
| | | World Heritage Site | N | Inventory & Non-Inventory | N | | | | |
| | | Archaeological site | N | Garden or Designed Landscape | | | | | |
| Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment | L | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Archaeology evaluation required. Design of development should take into account setting of nearby listed building. | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Potential archaeology remains in area and archaeology evaluation required. Design of development should take into account setting of nearby listed building. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| LANDSCAPE | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------|---|------|---|--|---|--|--|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | | NSAs | N | RSAs | N | Comment Existing hedges and trees at site boundary should be retained | | | |
| | | 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 | | | Existing hedges and trees at site boundary should be retained . Awkward landform; | C | X | Consider restorative earthworks to help integrate bunding south of adjacent store. | 0 | | |
| Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Existing tree and hedge boundary should be retained subject to access points. | | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|---------------------|
| SEA OVERVIEW | Awkward landform; consider restorative earthworks to help integrate bunding south of adjacent store. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 |
|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|---------------------|

| PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES | | |
|--|---|---|
| Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP | Y | Allocated housing site in adopted LDP. |
| Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site | Y | Landowner has advised that land is still available for development but not being actively marketed. |
| Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips | N | |
| Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe | ? | |
| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT | Allocated housing site in adopted LDP. Noise assessment of impact from adjacent scrap yard, appropriate landscape mitigation with retention of tree and hedge boundary and road widening required along Watchhall Road together with construction of public footway along the entire site frontage. Full drainage impact assessment required that identifies the sources, catchment size and outfalls associated with this site along with proposals for addressing the drainage issues. Ability to access land due south from within the site and to widen Watchall Road southwards from site access for potential long term expansion of Annan should not be compromised. Review site as an option for inclusion in LDP2. | |
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | Negative SEA impact as potential loss of agricultural land and greenfield site. | |

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

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Site Ref: ANN.H7 | Source of site suggestion: Call for sites | Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date): No post 2008 planning applications |
| Site name: land adjoining Elm's Road and Lovers Walk | | |
| Settlement: Annan | Current use: Green field | Existing LDP allocations/ designations: Allocated housing site in LDP1 |
| OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): 319413, 565775 | | |
| Site Size (ha): 3.95 | Proposed use: Housing | HMA: Annan Date completed: Dec 2016 |

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

Scoring – two columns have been added for planning authorities to quickly identify environmental effects from a proposal on a site. Where adverse effects have been identified, it may then also be useful to consider any obvious mitigation measures that might reduce these adverse effects. The second scoring column then allows at a quick glance to see what residual effects might remain following mitigation

| Impact | Significant positive impact | Positive impact | Neutral impact | Unknown impact | Both Positive and Negative impacts | Negative impact | Significant negative impact |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| Score Symbol | ++ | + | 0 | ? | +/- | x | xx |
| LDP 1 | +3 +2 | +2 +1 | 0 | ! | +/- | -1 -2 | -2 -3 |

Some sense checking will be required where + or – 2 has been used as to whether it is considered to be significant or not

Legends

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

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

BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|--|---------------------------|---|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | SACs | N | LNR | N | SPAs | N | SSSIs | N |
| | NNR | N | Local wildlife sites | N | Natterjack toads | N | Great Crested Newts | N |
| | RAMSAR | N | Geodiversity Sites | N | Other protected species | N | Marine Consultation Zones | N |
| | Ancient/semi-natural woodland | | N | Comments: No comments | | | | |
| Are there any known invasive species within the site | N | | | C | 0 | | 0 | 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 | However there are mature trees and other vegetation which provide habitat for a range of fauna. | | SV, C, O | 0 | Landscape scheme and tree management plan. | 0 | Y |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No biodiversity issues have been identified but there is scope to retain existing tree and hedge vegetation | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Neutral SEA impact | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | |

POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------------|-----------|--|---|---|---------------------|---------------------------|---|----------|---|
| Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space | MA | N | | SV, GIS | 0 | Opportunity to enhance green space and improve access to countryside areas. | 0 | Y | | | |
| 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: the site is on the edge of Annan but all services are within walking distance | | | | | | | |
| | | Core path | N | | | | | | | | |
| | | Cycle path | N | | | | | | | | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | Community/village hall | 1 | Sports facilities | 1 | Hospitalities | 1 | Local shops (convenience) | 1 | Bus stop | 1 |
| What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | Primary | | Secondary | | | | | | | | |
| | School name: | Elmvale | | Annan | | | | | | | |
| | Capacity: | 47 | | 331 | | | | | | | |
| | Distance: | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | N | | GIS | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | The site would allow sustainable and active travel and has access to open space both formal and countryside. | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Positive SEA impact | | | | | | SEA SCORE: + | | | | |

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

| SOILS | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--------------|---|--|---------------------|---|--|
| Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land | | N | Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute) Very small triangular portion in SW corner is 3.1 | Urban GIS | 0 | | 0 | N | |
| Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes) | | N | | GIS, SV, C | 0 | | 0 | N | |
| Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site | | N | | C | 0 | | 0 | N | |
| Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat | CF | N | | SV, C | 0 | | 0 | N | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | A very small triangle of land which is capable of agriculture would be lost but it is an impractical size and shape between two roads, therefore there are not considered to be any issues in respect of loss of agricultural land or soil erosion. | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Neutral SEA impact | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| WATER | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|---|---|--------|---|--|---|---|
| Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site | B and L | | Known localised surface ponding in this location [SEPA] | C | | | | |
| 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 | DGC hold flood records in this area. Site appears in SEPA pluvial flood map. Surface water flood hazard identified which should be discussed with FPA and Scottish Water. Any drainage strategy should consider this along with adjacent site [SEPA]. | C, GIS | X | Drainage Impact Assessment required. Appropriate surface water management measures should be adopted. Standard SuDS and foul to sewer. | 0 | Y |
| 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 | | GIS | 0 | | 0 | N |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer | PHH | Y | No recent comments on this site from SW but nearby site ANN.H8 comments were that Annan Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity for development. Foul sewer within site - | C | 0 | Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish on the existing network.[SW] | 0 | Y |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the | PHH | | | C | 0 | Further investigation such as Flow and Pressure test or | 0 | Y |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic | Yes/No | Comment | Information source | Pre mitigation score | Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required | |
|--|--|--------|---|--------------------|----------------------|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| development to connect to the mains water supply | | Y | No recent comments on this site from SW but nearby site ANN. H8 comments were that Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity for development. | | | Water Impact Assessment may be required to establish impact on the existing network. [SW] | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | There are a number of investigations and measures to be carried out to ensure no impact on water environment | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Neutral SEA impact subject to mitigation. | | | | | | 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 | N | |
| What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby | PHH | N | Residential and open fields. | SV, GIS | 0 | | 0 | 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 | | C | 0 | | 0 | N | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No air quality issues identified | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Neutral SEA impact | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| MATERIAL ASSETS | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------------|--|---------|------------|---|--|-----|
| Is the site..... | | Brownfield | N | Comment | | | | |
| | | Greenfield | Y | | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | Y | Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey | N | C, SV, GIS | X | | X N |
| Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover on-site materials/resources | | N | The site is open green fields but within the settlement boundary | | GIS, C, SV | X | | X N |
| Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction | | N | | | C | 0 | | 0 N |
| Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation | PHH | N | | | C, GIS | 0 | | 0 N |
| Do sites for potential waste management | | n/a | | | O | 0 | | 0 N |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic | Yes/No | Comment | Information source | Pre mitigation score | Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--|--|--------|--------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9) | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site | | | Pylons N | Bord Gais Eirann pipeline N | Shell oil pipeline N | Transco pipeline N | | |
| Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies | | | Air Traffic/NATS N | MoD N | Carlisle Airport N | Coal Authority N | HSE N | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Loss of greenfield site within settlement boundary | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negative SEA impact through 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 for housing (72 units) is located to the east of Elm Road C38a with potential vehicular and pedestrian links onto Lover Walk U974a, Summergate Road U977a and Scroggies Meadow U984a. There is potential to provide access on all sides. Development of this site would require Elm Road to be upgraded (widened, frontage and linking footways and street lighting provision, etc.) along the site frontage up to the existing widening at Wood Avenue, however to achieve this would require land outwith the site boundary but falling within the adjacent site ANN.H8 on the west side of Elm Road. Given the cumulative size of both sites it would be appropriate that a Transport Assessment be commissioned and a Masterplan should be provided for this site and incorporating the site to the west of Elm Road ANN.H8 (108 units). 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 parking standards | | | | | | Y |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Transport Assessment and Masterplan should be provided for this site and site ANN:H8 | | | | | | | | |

| CLIMATIC FACTORS | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---------|---|--|---------------------|---|
| What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.) | | | south | SV, GIS | 0 | | 0 | N |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | | Y | Open site has potential to be designed for passive solar gain | SV, GIS | 0 | Layout and design to maximise solar gain | + | N |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | | Y | Ground rises to south affording some protection | SV, GIS | 0 | | 0 | N |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Southerly aspect should ensure maximum solar gain subject to design | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Potential positive SEA impact | | | | | | SEA SCORE: + | |

| CULTURAL HERITAGE | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-------------------|-----------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Will the development of the site affect any | L | Listed Building N | Scheduled Monuments N | Comment: Proximity of site to Roman fort means that evaluation would be required. | | | | |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic | Yes/No | Comment | Information source | Pre mitigation score | Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|---|---|--------|---|--------------------|--|---|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| of the following including their setting | | | Conservation Area World Heritage Site Archaeological site | N N N | Inventory of Historic Battlefield Inventory & Non-Inventory Garden or Designed Landscape | N N | No other heritage issues identified. | |
| Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment | L | Y | Roman fort nearby – requires evaluation and investigations | C, GIS | X | Desk top evaluation and potential watching brief during development | 0 | Y |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | The site is close to known archaeology where an evaluation and potential investigation would be required. | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Neutral SEA impact | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | |

| LANDSCAPE | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|-------------|---|--|--------|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | | | NSAs Wild Land | | RSA TPOs | | Comment: Previous comments (100/ANN/06) Site is contained by existing development to north, and roads to west and south. Retain specimen and hedgerow trees. | |
| 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 | Hedges and trees should be retained. Road improvements with site ANN.H8 should ensure retention of stone wall. | | C, SV | X | Tree retention strategy and detailed landscape plan to a high standard | 0 Y |
| Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement | | Y | With appropriate design | | SV, C | 0 | High design standards required | 0 Y |
| Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site | | Y | Out to countryside which can be incorporated in design | | SV, C | 0 | Incorporate into design | 0 Y |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Potential to protect existing parkland specimen trees, hedgerows and stone boundary walls on adjacent site and to incorporate views. | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Subject to design, neutral SEA impact | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | |

| PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP | Y | Allocated as a long term housing site (beyond 2024) in LDP1. | | | | | | |
| Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site | Y | Landowner has advised that although the land was previously available for development they wish to withdraw it. | | | | | | |
| Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips | N | | | | | | | |
| Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe | N | WITHDRAWN BY OWNER | | | | | | |
| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT | Allocated as a long term housing site (beyond 2024) in the adopted LDP. Masterplan and Transport Assessment would be required. | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | Negative SEA impact as potential loss of prime agricultural land and greenfield site. Positive impact in terms of Population and Human Health and Climatic Factors given proximity to community facilities and rail station. Southerly aspect should ensure maximum solar gain. | | | | | | | |

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| Site Ref: ANN.H8 Northern | Source of site suggestion: LDP Allocation | Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date): n/a | |
| Site name: Land at Longmeadow House, Elm Road | Current use: House, garden ground and agricultural land | Existing LDP allocations/ designations: Part - Yes & White land | |
| Settlement: Annan | | | |
| OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): 319154, 565790 | Proposed use: Housing | HMA: Annan | Date completed: Oct/Nov 2016 |
| Site Size (ha): 5.64 | | | |

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

Scoring Guidance

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

Legends

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

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

BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|----------------------|----|-------------------------|---|---------------------------|---|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | SACs | N | LNR | N | SPAs | N | SSSIs | N |
| | NNR | N | Local wildlife sites | N | Natterjack toads | N | Great Crested Newts | N |
| | RAMSAR | N | Geodiversity Sites | N | Other protected species | N | Marine Consultation Zones | N |
| | Ancient/semi-natural woodland | | N | | | | | |
| Comments: No comments | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any known invasive species within the site | N | | | SV | 0 | | 0 | |
| Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity | N | | | SV | 0 | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No biodiversity designations affecting the site | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No designations affecting site | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | |

POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------------|---------|-------------------|---|--|---------------------|---------------------------|---|----------|---|
| Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space | MA | N | | | | Development presents opportunities to enhance the greenspace network and to link the site with Annan and the wider countryside | | | | | |
| | | Distance (km) | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them | MA or CF | Right of Way | N | Comment: | | | | | | | |
| | | Core path | N | | | | | | | | |
| | | Cycle path | N | | | | | | | | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | Community/village hall | 1 | Sports facilities | 1 | Hospitalities | 1 | Local shops (convenience) | 1 | Bus stop | 1 |
| What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | | | Primary | | | | Secondary | | | | |
| | School name: | | Elmvale | | | | Annan | | | | |
| | Capacity: | | 47 | | | | 331 | | | | |
| | Distance: | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | N | | GIS | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Scope to encourage sustainable modes of travel including walking and cycling. Development presents opportunities to enhance the greenspace network and to link the site with Annan and the wider countryside | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Within close walking distance of existing facilities, schools and railway station. Scope to encourage sustainable modes of travel including walking and cycling. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: + | | | | |

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

| SOILS | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|-----|----|---|--------------------|---|
| Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land | | Y | Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute) | 3.1 | O | | | X |
| Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes) | | N | Site is relatively flat | | SV | | | |
| Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site | | | No known previous use. | | C | 0 | | 0 |
| Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat | CF | ? | Unknown | | O | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Would involve loss of prime agricultural land | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Would involve loss of prime agricultural land | | | | | | SEA SCORE:X | |

| WATER | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|----|---|--|---|
| Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site | B and L | N | | | 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 | Y | DGC hold flood resords in relation to this site. Site appears in SEPA pluvial floodmap. | | C | X | Drainage Impact Assessment required. | + |
| 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 development to connect to the public foul sewer | PHH | Y | Annan Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity for development. | | C | | | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply | PHH | Y | Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity for development. | | C | | Water network - Further investigation such as Flow and Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended. | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Drainage Impact Assessment required. Water network - Further investigation such as Flow and Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended. | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|---------------------|
| SEA OVERVIEW | Potential flood risk. Drainage Impact Assessment required | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 |
|---------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|---------------------|

| AIR QUALITY | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|--|----|---|--|---------------------|--|
| Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA | | N | There are no AQMA at present in the region | C | 0 | | 0 | |
| What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby | PHH | N | Housing and agricultural land | SV | 0 | | 0 | |
| Does the development of the site introduce a new potentially significant air emission to the area (e.g. combined heat and power, an industrial process, large scale quarry of energy from the waste plant) | | N | | SV | 0 | | 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 Garden ground associated with Longmeadow House and agricultural land | | | | | |
| | | Greenfield | G | | | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | | Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey | N | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover on-site materials/resources | | Y | Substantial scope to retain existing Longmeadow House and create sustainable new use safeguarding listed building. | | | X | | 0 | |
| Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction | | N | | | | | | | |
| Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation | PHH | N | | | | | | | |
| Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9) | | n/a | | | | | | | |
| Are there any of the following servicing | | Pylons | N | Bord Gais Eirann pipeline | N | Shell oil pipeline | N | Transco pipeline | N |

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

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|-----|---|--|------------------|---|--|-----------------------|---|--|-----|---|
| constraints that impact on the development of the site | | | Comment No servicing constraints in relation to this site | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies | | | Air Traffic/NATS | N | | MoD | N | | Carlisle Airport | N | | Coal Authority | N | | HSE | N |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Substantial scope to retain existing Longmeadow House and create sustainable new use safeguarding listed building. Layout and design of houses to complement Longmeadow House (category C) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Potential loss of greenfield land. Substantial scope to retain existing Longmeadow House and create sustainable new use safeguarding listed building. | | | | | | | | | | | 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 | | | Comments apply to totality of Site H8 - This site for housing (107 units) is located to the west of Elm Road C38a with potential vehicular and pedestrian links onto Hallmeadow Place U966a. It should be noted that development of this site would require Elm Road to be upgraded (widened, frontage and linking footways and street lighting provision, etc) along the site frontage upto the existing widening at Wood Avenue,. Given the cumulative size of both this site and the adjacent ANN.H7 (72 units) it would be appropriate that a Transport Assessment be commissioned and a Masterplan should be provided for this site and incorporating the site to the east of Elm Road ANN.H7. 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 | Site located to the west of Elm Road C38a. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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 | Southerly aspect should ensure maximum solar gain. | | | | SV | 0 | | | | | 0 | | |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | | Y | | | | | SV | 0 | | | | | 0 | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Southerly aspect should ensure maximum solar gain. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Southerly aspect should ensure maximum solar gain. | | | | | | | | | | | SEA SCORE: + | | | |

| CULTURAL HERITAGE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting | L | Listed Building | Y | Scheduled Monuments | | N | Comment Archaeology - Proximity of site to Roman Fort means that evaluation would be required. Historic Built Environment - Longmeadow House is Category C Listed and is a very elegant dwelling. The design of development around it should take up a form which could be read as outbuildings; there should be sufficient garden area retained around the dwelling along with mature trees to preserve the setting and the full restoration and re-use of Longmeadow House should be required and tied in to any planning permission for development on any part of the adjoining land whether this comes in as one or more applications. | | | | | | |
| | | Conservation Area | N | Inventory of Historic Battlefield | | N | | | | | | | |
| | | World Heritage Site | N | Inventory & Non-Inventory Garden or Designed Landscape | | Y | | | | | | | |
| | | Archaeological site | Y | | | | | | | | | | |
| Will the development of the site result in the | L | | | | | | | | | | | | |

ANN.H8 (Northern)

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

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|---------------------|--|--|
| opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | The design of development around Longmeadow House should take up a form which could be read as outbuildings; there should be sufficient garden area retained around the dwelling along with mature trees to preserve the setting and the full restoration and re-use of Longmeadow House should be required and tied in to any planning permission for development on any part of the adjoining land. High design standards required. | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Impact on listed building Longmeadow House. Design requires to preserve the setting and full restoration and re-use of the Longmeadow House. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| LANDSCAPE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------|---|------|---|---|----|---|---------------------|--|---|--|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | | NSAs | | RSAs | | Comment Existing specimen trees in vicinity of Longmeadow House. | | | | | | |
| | | Wild Land | N | TPOs | N | | | | | | | |
| Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level | | Y | | | | Avoid north of site – designed landscape. Existing specimen trees and hedgerows. Retain drystone dykes. | C | X | | Protect existing parkland specimen trees with sufficient offset to avoid future problems. Retain drystone dykes. Otherwise scope in southern field. High design standard would be required | 0 | |
| Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement | | Y | | | | | SV | | | High design standard would be required | 0 | |
| Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site | | N | | | | | SV | | | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | High design standard required at Longmeadow House. Protect existing parkland specimen trees, hedgerows and stone boundary walls. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Impact on designed landscape & specimen trees. Protect existing trees and retain landscape features | | | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | | |

| PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP | Y | Eastern area of site allocated as housing site ANN.H8 (beyond 2024) in adopted LDP and part White Land within settlement boundary. | | | | | | | | |
| Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site | Y | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips | N | | | | | | | | | |
| Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe | Y | | | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT | Eastern area of site allocated as housing site ANN.H8 (beyond 2024) in adopted LDP and part White Land within settlement boundary. Design of housing development would require to preserve the setting and full restoration and re-use of the Longmeadow House. | | | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | Negative SEA impact as potential loss of agricultural land and greenfield site. Proximity of site to town centre facilities, school and station. Design requires to preserve the setting and full restoration and re-use of the Longmeadow House. Southerly aspect should ensure maximum solar gain. | | | | | | | | | |

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| Site Ref: ANN.H8 Southern | Source of site suggestion: LDP Allocation | Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date): n/a | |
| Site name: land between Hallmeadow Place and Elm Road | | | |
| Settlement: Annan | Current use: Agricultural land | Existing LDP allocations/ designations: Yes | |
| OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): 319159, 565826 | | | |
| Site Size (ha): 7.49 | Proposed use: Housing | HMA: Annan | Date completed: Oct/Nov 2016 |

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

Scoring Guidance

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

Legends

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

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

BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|-------|-------------------------|---|---------------------------|---|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | SACs | N | LNR | N | SPAs | N | SSSIs | N |
| | NNR | N | Local wildlife sites | N | Natterjack toads | | Great Crested Newts | |
| | RAMSAR | N | Geodiversity Sites | N | Other protected species | | Marine Consultation Zones | N |
| | Ancient/semi-natural woodland | | Comments: SNH – site would benefit from a site design brief. | | | | | |
| Are there any known invasive species within the site | N | | | GIS/C | 0 | | 0 | |
| Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity | N | | | | 0 | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No biodiversity designations affecting site. SNH advises that the site would benefit from a site design brief. | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No biodiversity designations affecting site | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | |

POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------------|---------|-------------------|-----|--|---------------------|---------------------------|---|----------|---|
| Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space | MA | N | | | | Development presents opportunities to enhance the greenspace network and to link the site with Annan and the wider countryside | 0 | | | | |
| | | Distance (km) | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them | MA or CF | Right of Way | N | Comment: | | | | | | | |
| | | Core path | N | | | | | | | | |
| | | Cycle path | N | | | | | | | | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | Community/village hall | 1 | Sports facilities | 1 | Hospitalities | 1 | Local shops (convenience) | 1 | Bus stop | 1 |
| What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | | | Primary | | | | Secondary | | | | |
| | School name: | | Elmvale | | | | Annan | | | | |
| | Capacity: | | 47 | | | | 331 | | | | |
| | Distance: | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | N | | | GIS | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Scope to encourage sustainable modes of travel including walking and cycling. Development presents opportunities to enhance the greenspace network and to link the site with Annan and the wider countryside | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Within close walking distance of existing facilities, schools and railway station. Scope to encourage sustainable modes of travel including walking and cycling. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: + | | | | |

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

| SOILS | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|------------|---|--|--------------------|--|
| Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land | | Y | Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute) | 3.1/ Urban | | Prime agricultural land identified in south east corner of site. Majority of site classified as "urban". | x | |
| Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes) | | N | Site is relatively flat | | | | | |
| Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site | | | No known previous use. | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat | CF | ? | Unknown | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Would involve loss of prime agricultural land (in part) | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Would involve loss of prime agricultural land (in part) | | | | | | SEA SCORE:X | |

| WATER | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site | B and L | N | No evidence of boggy areas | | | | | |
| 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 | DGC hold flood resords in relation to this site. Site appears in SEPA pluvial floodmap. | C | X | Drainage Impact Assessment required. | + | |
| 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 development to connect to the public foul sewer | PHH | Y | Annan Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity for development. | C | 0 | Waste network - Foul sewer within site. Foul 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. | 0 | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply | PHH | Y | Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity for development. | C | 0 | Water network - Further investigation such as Flow and Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry | 0 | |

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

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|----------------------------------|---------------------|--|
| | | | | | | process is strongly recommended. | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Drainage Impact Assessment required. Water network - Further investigation such as Flow and Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended. | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Potential flood risk. Drainage Impact Assessment required | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | |

| AIR QUALITY | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|--|----|---|--|---------------------|--|
| Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA | | N | There are no AQMA at present in the region | C | 0 | | 0 | |
| What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby | PHH | N | Housing and agricultural land | SV | 0 | | 0 | |
| Does the development of the site introduce a new potentially significant air emission to the area (e.g. combined heat and power, an industrial process, large scale quarry of energy from the waste plant) | | N | | SV | 0 | | 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 Agricultural land | | | | |
| | | Greenfield | G | | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | N | Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey | N | | 0 | | 0 |
| Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover on-site materials/resources | | Y | No existing structures to reuse on the site | | | 0 | | 0 |
| Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction | | N | | | | | | |
| Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation | PHH | N | | | | | | |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic | Yes/No | Comment | Information source | Pre mitigation score | Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required | |
|--|-----------------------------------|--------|--------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9) | | n/a | | | | | | | |
| Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site | | | 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 | Potential loss of greenfield site | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Potential 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 for housing (107 units) is located to the west of Elm Road C38a with potential vehicular and pedestrian links onto Hallmeadow Place U966a. It should be noted that development of this site would require Elm Road to be upgraded (widened, frontage and linking footways and street lighting provision, etc) along the site frontage upto the existing widening at Wood Avenue. Given the cumulative size of both this site and the adjacent ANN.H7 (72 units) it would be appropriate that a Transport Assessment be commissioned and a Masterplan should be provided for this site and incorporating the site to the east of Elm Road ANN.H7. 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 | Located to the west of Elm Road C38a with potential vehicular and pedestrian links onto Hallmeadow Place U966a. Development of this site would require Elm Road to be upgraded (widened, frontage and linking footways and street lighting provision, etc) along the site frontage upto the existing widening at Wood Avenue. Transport Assessment and Masterplan should be provided for this site. | | | | | | | | |

| CLIMATIC FACTORS | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|---|---------------------|--|
| What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.) | | South | | | 0 | | 0 | | |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | Y | Southerly aspect should ensure maximum solar gain. | | | 0 | | + | | |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | Y | Higher ground to south | | | 0 | | 0 | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Southerly aspect should ensure maximum solar gain. | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Southerly aspect should ensure maximum solar gain. | | | | | | | SEA SCORE: + | |

| CULTURAL HERITAGE | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting | L | Listed Building Y | Scheduled Monuments N | | | | | |
| | | Conservation Area N | Inventory of Historic Battlefield N | | | | | |
| | | World Heritage Site N | Inventory & Non-Inventory N | | | | | |
| | | Archaeological site Y | Garden or Designed Landscape N | | | | | |
| Comment Archaeology - Proximity of site to Roman Fort means that evaluation would be required. Historic Built Environment - Longmeadow House is Category C Listed located to the north of the site and its setting should be preserved. | | | | | | | | |

ANN.H8 (Southern)

| 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 | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Archaeology evaluation required given proximity of site to Roman Fort and development requires to preserve the setting of Longmeadow House. | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Archaeology evaluation required given proximity of site to Roman Fort and development requires to preserve the setting of Longmeadow House. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | |

| LANDSCAPE | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|------|---|--|---|--|---|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | | | NSAs | N | RSAs | N | Comment Retain boundary trees and hedgerows. | | | |
| | | | Wild Land | N | TPOs | N | | | | |
| Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level | | Y | Avoid north of site – designed landscape. Existing specimen trees. Retain drystone dykes. | | | | C | X | Protect existing parkland specimen trees with sufficient offset to avoid future problems. Retain drystone dykes. Otherwise scope in southern field. High design standard would be required | 0 |
| Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement | | Y | | | | | SV | 0 | High design standard would be required | 0 |
| Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site | | N | | | | | SV | 0 | | 0 |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Protect existing parkland specimen trees, hedgerows and stone boundary walls. | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Protect existing parkland trees and retain landscape features | | | | | | SEA SCORE:0 | | | |

| PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP | Y | Allocated as a long term housing site (beyond 2024) in the adopted LDP. | | | | | | | |
| Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site | Y | Landowner has advised that land is available for development. | | | | | | | |
| Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips | N | | | | | | | | |
| Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe | Y | | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT | Allocated as a long term housing site (beyond 2024) in the adopted LDP. Masterplan and Transport Assessment would be required. | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negative SEA impact as potential loss of prime agricultural land and greenfield site. Positive impact in terms of Population and Human Health and Climatic Factors given proximity to community facilities and rail station. Southerly aspect should ensure maximum solar gain. | | | | | | | | |

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| Site Ref: ANN.H201 | Source of site suggestion: Call for Sites | Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date): n/a | |
| Site name: land at Heallmeadow Place | | | |
| Settlement: Annan | Current use: Play area – Public open space | Existing LDP allocations/ designations: Public Open Space | |
| OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): | | | |
| Site Size (ha): 0.12 | Proposed use: Housing | HMA: Annan | Date completed: Oct/Nov 2016 |

| TOPIC | Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora | Population and Human Health | Soils | Water | Air Quality | Material Assets | Climatic Factors | Cultural Heritage | Landscape |
|-------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| SCORE | 0 | +/x | 0 | XX | 0 | + | + | 0 | XX |

Scoring Guidance

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

Legends

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

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

BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|---|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---|---------------------------|---|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | SACs | N | LNR | N | SPAs | N | SSSIs | N |
| | NNR | N | Local wildlife sites | N | Natterjack toads | | Great Crested Newts | |
| | RAMSAR | N | Geodiversity Sites | N | Other protected species | | Marine Consultation Zones | N |
| | Ancient/semi-natural woodland | | | Comments: No comments | | | | |
| Are there any known invasive species within the site | | | | | | | | |
| Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No designations affecting site | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No designations affecting site | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | |

POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------------|---|-------------------|-----|---------------|---|---------------------------|---|----------|---|
| Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space | MA | Y | Currently public open space – children's play area. | | | x | Development would result in loss of public open space. Playing fields and public open space immediately to south. | | x | | |
| Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them | MA or CF | Distance (km) | Y | Comment: | | | | | | | |
| | | Right of Way | N | | | | | | | | |
| | | Core path | N | | | | | | | | |
| | | Cycle path | N | | | | | | | | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | Community/village hall | 1-5 | Sports facilities | 1-5 | Hospitalities | 1-5 | Local shops (convenience) | 1 | Bus stop | 1 |
| What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | Primary | | Secondary | | | | | | | | |
| | School name: | Elmvale | | Annan | | | | | | | |
| | Capacity: | 47 | | 331 | | | | | | | |
| | Distance: | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | N | | GIS | 0 | | | 0 | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Development would result in loss of public open space designated in LDP. Currently used as a childrens play area | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negative SEA impact as would involve loss of allocated public open space. However site within reasonable walking distance of community facilities. Could encourage sustainable travel. | | | | | | | SEA SCORE: X/+ | | | |

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

| SOILS | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|---------------------|--|--|
| Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land | | N | Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute) | | O | | O | | |
| Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes) | | N | Low lying site in a hollow. | | O | | O | | |
| Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site | | N | No known previous use. | | O | | O | | |
| Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat | CF | ? | Unknown | | O | | O | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No known impact on soils. | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No known impact | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| WATER | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|---|--|---|---|---|----|--|
| Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site | B and L | N | | | | | | |
| Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere | CF and PHH | Y | Site within SEPA Coastal medium likelihood floodmap. Site within SEPA pluvial hazard floodmap. Site within area thought to contain historic unmapped culvert system. Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment would be required in conjunction with culvert investigation. SEPA - Fully within the 1 in 200 year floodplain of River Annan. New development within this area is therefore viewed as un-acceptable. | C | X | SEPA recommend that development within this site is unacceptable due to flood risk as site is fully within 1 in 200 year floodplain of River Annan. New development within this area is therefore viewed as un-acceptable. | XX | |
| Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse) | | | | | | | | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer | PHH | Y | Annan Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity for development. | C | O | Foul 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. | O | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water | PHH | Y | Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity for development. | C | O | Further investigation such as Flow and Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment may be required to establish | O | |

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

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|---|----------------------|--|
| supply | | | | | | what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended. | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | SEPA recommend that development within this site is unacceptable due to flood risk as site is fully within 1 in 200 year floodplain of River Annan. New development within this area is therefore viewed as un-acceptable | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Significant negative SEA impact in terms of water as SEPA recommend that development within this site is unacceptable due to flood risk as site is fully within 1 in 200 year floodplain of River Annan. New development within this area is therefore viewed as un-acceptable | | | | | | 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 | Housing and public open space | | 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 | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Unlikely to decrease air quality. | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Unlikely to decrease air quality. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | |

| MATERIAL ASSETS | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------|--|---------|--|------------------------|--|--|
| Is the site..... | | Brownfield | | Comment | | | | |
| | | Greenfield | G | | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | N | Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey | N | | No known previous use. | | |
| Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover on-site materials/resources | | N | | | | | | |
| Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction | | N | | | | | | |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic | Yes/No | Comment | Information source | Pre mitigation score | Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required |
|--|--|--------|--------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation | PHH | N | | | | | | |
| Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9) | | n/a | | | | | | |
| Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site | | | Pylons N | Bord Gais Eirann pipeline N | Shell oil pipeline N | Transco pipeline N | | |
| Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies | | | Air Traffic/NATS N | MoD N | Carlisle Airport N | Coal Authority N | HSE N | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No known servicing constraints | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Benefit from proximity to infrastructure | | | | | | 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 (4 units) is adjacent to Hallmeadow Place with parking provision for its current use as a playground. It is envisaged that the dwellings will be located along the site frontage. As the site sits lower than the public road, consideration should be given to the gradient of any vehicular access. Development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards. | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Site can be accessed from Hallmeadow Place and consideration should be given to the gradient of any vehicular access. | | | | | | | | |

| 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 | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Southerly aspect should ensure solar gain. | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Southerly aspect should ensure solar gain. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: + | |

| CULTURAL HERITAGE | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting | L | Listed Building | N | Scheduled Monuments | N | Comment Archaeology - No historic environment issues identified for this site, as of July 2016 Historic Built Environment - This site is outside the Conservation Area or the setting of a Listed Building. However, a short distance from it, in the Annan Harbour Area, [Waterfoot Road, Port Road and Nicholson Street] is a group of Category B Listed | | |
| | | Conservation Area | N | Inventory of Historic Battlefield | N | | | |
| | | World Heritage Site | N | Inventory & Non-Inventory | N | | | |
| | | Archaeological site | N | Garden or Designed Landscape | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|---|---------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | sandstone buildings some of which are former dwellings and derelict. The group is on the Buildings at Risk Register for Scotland under the entry Welldale Mill. If there is an identified demand for housing in this part of town could residential development be provided at, or tied in with, the restoration of the Listed buildings. | | | |
| Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment | L | Y | Proximity to buildings at Annan Harbour identified as Buildings at Risk. | | | If there is an identified demand for housing in this part of town residential development could be provided at, or tied in with, the restoration of the Listed buildings. | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Examine scope to tie in residential development to Buildings at Risk at Annan Harbour. | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No direct impact, but opportunity to tie in residential development to Buildings at Risk at Annan Harbour. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| LANDSCAPE | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------|---|---|------|---|---------|---|--|---|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | | Wild Land | NSAs | N | RSAs | N | Comment | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level | | | Relatively good location for equipped POS, overlooked by adjacent housing and accessible with adjacent sports pitch. Only other space (around primary school) is fenced off – retain as such. | | | | | X | Retain public open space and equipped play area. | X |
| Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement | | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site | | N | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Contrary to adopted LDP and policy CF3 as would result in loss of public open space identified for protection in the LDP. | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Significant negative SEA impact as would involve loss of public open space and equipped play area. | | | | | | | | SEA SCORE: XX | |

| PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP | Y | Site included within settlement boundary for Annan, identified as protected area of open space. Development would result in loss of public open space contrary to Policy CF3 which presumes against development of open space identified for protection in the LDP inset maps. | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | N | | | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT | The site has not been included in the MIR due to significant flood risk and loss of protected area of public open space. SEPA advise that development is unacceptable due to flood risk as the site is fully within 1 in 200 year floodplain of River Annan. Development would result in loss of public open space contrary to Policy CF3 which presumes against development of open space identified for protection in the LDP inset maps. | | | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | Significant negative impact due to water and landscape issues. SEPA recommend that development within this site is unacceptable due to flood risk as site | | | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | is fully within 1 in 200 year floodplain of River Annan. New development within this area is therefore viewed as un-acceptable. Would also result in the loss of protected public open space which is contrary to the LDP. | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| Site Ref: ANN.H202 | Source of site suggestion: Call for Sites | Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date): n/a | |
| Site name: land at Shawhill Road | | | |
| Settlement: Annan | Current use: Open space | | |
| OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): 320423, 566893 | | Existing LDP allocations/ designations: No | |
| Site Size (ha): 0.07 | Proposed use: Housing | HMA: Annan | Date completed: Oct/Nov 2016 |

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

Scoring Guidance

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

Legends

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

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

BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|----------------------|---------|-------------------------|---|---------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | SACs | N | LNR | N | SPAs | N | SSSIs | N | |
| | NNR | N | Local wildlife sites | N | Natterjack toads | N | Great Crested Newts | N | |
| | RAMSAR | N | Geodiversity Sites | N | Other protected species | N | Marine Consultation Zones | N | |
| | Ancient/semi-natural woodland | | N | | | | | | |
| Comments: No comments | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any known invasive species within the site | | | | GIS & C | 0 | | 0 | | |
| Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity | | | | | 0 | | 0 | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | There are no designations affecting this site. | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | There are no designations affecting this site. | | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | |

POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------|-------------------|----------|---------------|-----------|---------------------------|---|----------|-----|
| Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space | MA | Amenity open space but not designated as public open space. Adjoins open space area at St Columba's PS | | | | X | | | | | |
| | | Distance (km) | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them | MA or CF | Right of Way | N | | Comment: | | | | | | |
| | | Core path | N | | | | | | | | |
| | | Cycle path | N | | | | | | | | |
| What is the distance (km) to the following services where they exist in the settlement (Autumn 2015) | CF | Community/village hall | 1 | Sports facilities | 1 | Hospitalities | 1 | Local shops (convenience) | 1 | Bus stop | 0.2 |
| What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | | | Primary | | | | Secondary | | | | |
| | School name: | | Newington | | | | Annan | | | | |
| | Capacity: | | 1 | | | | 331 | | | | |
| | Distance: | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | N | | GIS | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Limited capacity within Newington primary school which is the catchment primary school for this site | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Within reasonable walking distance to existing community facilities, scope to encourage active travel. Annan served by rail and railway station in settlement – could encourage use of more sustainable transport and reduce carbon emissions from transport. Would result in the loss of amenity open space immediately adjacent to St Columba's School. | | | | | | | SEA SCORE: X/+ | | | |

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

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

| WATER | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|----|--|--|---|---------------------|--|
| Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site | B and L | N | | 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 | No Flood Risk Comments | C | | | 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 | | | | | 0 | | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer | PHH | Y | Annan Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity for development. | C | | Waste network - there is a Surface water sewer running along west of site. | 0 | | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply | PHH | Y | Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity for development. | C | | | 0 | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Waste network - there is a Surface water sewer running along west of site which would require to be protected | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No impact | | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | |

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

| AIR QUALITY | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|---------------------|--|
| Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA | | N | There are no AQMA at present in the region | C | 0 | | 0 | |
| What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby | PHH | N | Housing and school | | 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 | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | |

| MATERIAL ASSETS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|------------------|--|---------------------------|---|--------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---|-----|---|
| Is the site..... | | Brownfield | | Comment | | | | | | | |
| | | Greenfield | G | | | | | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | N | Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey | N | | 0 | No known previous use | 0 | | | |
| Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover on-site materials/resources | | N | | | | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction | | N | | | | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation | PHH | N | | | | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9) | | n/a | | | | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site | | Pylons | N | Bord Gais Eirann pipeline | N | Shell oil pipeline | N | Transco pipeline | N | | |
| | Comment No servicing constraints in relation to this site | | | | | | | | | | |
| Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies | | Air Traffic/NATS | N | MoD | N | Carlisle Airport | N | Coal Authority | N | HSE | N |

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

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|---------------------|--|--|
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Small greenfield site which would involve the loss of amenity open space | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No impact on material assets. | | | | | | 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 (2 units) is adjacent to Shawhill Road with an existing layby located in front of the proposed site. Appropriate access can be provided onto Shawhill Road | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Appropriate access can be provided onto Shawhill Road | | | | | | | | |

| CLIMATIC FACTORS | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|------------|---------------------------------|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.) | | South east | | | | 0 | | | |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | | Y | Aspect should ensure solar gain | | | + | Housing design could make best use of passive solar gain, reducing energy use and carbon emissions. | + | |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | | Y | | | | 0 | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Site has south east aspect. Housing design could make best use of passive solar gain, reducing energy use and carbon emissions. | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Site has south east aspect. Housing design could make best use of passive solar gain, reducing energy use and carbon emissions. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: + | | |

| CULTURAL HERITAGE | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|---------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|---------------------|--|--|
| Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting | L | Listed Building | N | Scheduled Monuments | N | Comment Archaeology - No historic environment issues identified for this site, as of July 2016 Historic Built Environment - Not within Annan Conservation Area, no Listed Buildings in the vicinity and in an area where there are no traditional buildings. | | | |
| | | Conservation Area | N | Inventory of Historic Battlefield | N | | | | |
| | | World Heritage Site | N | Inventory & Non-Inventory | N | | | | |
| | | Archaeological site | N | Garden or Designed Landscape | | | | | |
| Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment | L | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No impact on cultural heritage | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No impact on cultural heritage. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| LANDSCAPE | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|-----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | | NSAs | | RSAs | | 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 | | N | | | | No features on site | SV | 0 | | 0 | | |
| Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement | | Y | | | | Adjacent to School site entrance | SV | 0 | | 0 | | |
| Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site | | N | | | | | SV | 0 | | 0 | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | | | | | | | | | | Negative impact re school site entrance and line of site. | | SEA SCORE: 0 |

| PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES | | |
|--|---|---|
| Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP | Y | Site identified as White Land within Annan settlement boundary in adopted LDP |
| 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 | | Site identified as White Land within Annan settlement boundary in adopted LDP. Development of site at entrance to school may not be desirable. |
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | | Negative SEA impact as it would result in the loss of amenity open space. Positive impact on population and human health - Within reasonable walking distance to existing community facilities, scope to encourage active travel. |

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| Site Ref: ANN.H203 | Source of site suggestion: Call for Sites | Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date): | |
| Site name: north of Murray Park | | | |
| Settlement: Annan | Current use: Agricultural land | | |
| OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): | | Existing LDP allocations/ designations: None | |
| Site Size (ha): 1.3ha | Proposed use: | HMA: Annan | Date completed: Oct/Nov 2016 |

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

Scoring Guidance

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

Legends

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

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

| BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|---|----------------------|---|-------------------------|---|---------------------------|---|--|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | SACs | N | LNR | N | SPAs | N | SSSIs | N | |
| | NNR | N | Local wildlife sites | N | Natterjack toads | N | Great Crested Newts | N | |
| | RAMSAR | N | Geodiversity Sites | N | Other protected species | N | Marine Consultation Zones | N | |
| | Ancient/semi-natural woodland | | N | | | | | | |
| Comments: No comments | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 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. Distance to nearest area of open space | MA | N | | | | Adjacent to protected area of open space and path to the west – former pipeline to Chapelcross nuclear power station | | | | |
| | | Distance (km) | O | | | | | | | |
| 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 lies adjacent to western boundary of site and scope to enhance walking route network. Nearby footpath link to Stapleton Business Park to the east | | | | | | |
| | | Core path | Y | | | | | | | |
| | | Cycle path | N | | | | | | | |
| 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 | Hospitalities | 1 | Local shops (convenience) | 1 | Bus stop |
| What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | | | Primary | | | Secondary | | | | |
| | School name: | Newington | | | Annan | | | | | |
| | Capacity: | 1 | | | 331 | | | | | |
| | Distance: | 1 | | | 2 | | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | N | | GIS | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Limited capacity within Newington primary school which is the catchment primary school for this site and developer contributions required –refer Supplementary Guidance on Developer Contributions. | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Within reasonable walking distance to existing facilities: scope to encourage active travel. And reduce carbon emissions from transport. Annan served by rail and railway station in settlement – could encourage use of more sustainable transport and reduce carbon emissions from transport. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: + | | | |

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

| SOILS | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|-----|---|---|---|---|--|
| Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land | | Y | Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute) | 3.2 | O | X | Loss of prime quality agricultural land | X | |
| Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes) | | N | Relatively flat site. Northern boundary is A75 with embankment in cutting | | | | | | |
| Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site | | | No known previous use. | | | | Adjacent to Chapelcross pipeline. | | |
| Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat | CF | N | | | O | O | | O | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Involves loss of prime quality agricultural land | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negative SEA impact as would involve loss of prime quality agricultural land | | | | | | SEA SCORE:X | | |

| WATER | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|----|---|--|---|--|
| Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site | B and L | N | | | SV | 0 | | 0 | |
| Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere | CF and PHH | Y | SEPA – site within potentially vulnerable area as adjacent to surface water. | | C | X | A surface water flood hazard has been identified and should be discussed with FPA and Scottish Water. Appropriate surface water management measures should be adopted. | 0 | |
| Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse) | | N | | | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer | PHH | Y | Annan Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity for development. | | C | 0 | | 0 | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply | PHH | Y | Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity for development. | | C | 0 | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | A surface water flood hazard has been identified and should be discussed with FPA and Scottish Water. Appropriate surface water management measures should be adopted. | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No negative impact on water environment subject to appropriate surface water management measures should be adopted. | | | | | | SEA SCORE:0 | | |

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

| AIR QUALITY | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|---------------------|--|--|
| Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA | | N | There are no AQMA at present in the region | C | 0 | | 0 | | |
| What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby | PHH | N | No known previous use. Adjacent to former pipeline to Chapelcross nuclear power station to west. North – A75 trunk road. East – development site Stapleton Business Park under construction. South - housing | C | 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 | No impact on air quality | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No impact on air quality | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| MATERIAL ASSETS | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------|--|---------------------------------|---|--------------------|---|------------------|---|
| Is the site..... | | Brownfield | | Comment Loss of greenfield site | | | | | |
| | | Greenfield | Y | | | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | | Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey | | | | 0 | | |
| Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover on-site materials/resources | | N | | | 0 | | 0 | | |
| Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction | | N | | | 0 | | 0 | | |
| Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation | PHH | N | | | 0 | | 0 | | |
| Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9) | | n/a | | | 0 | | 0 | | |
| Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site | | Pylons | Y | Bord Gais Eirann pipeline | N | Shell oil pipeline | N | Transco pipeline | N |
| | Comment High voltage electricity pylons and lines traverse site from east to west. Size of site and requirement for service corridor results in development site being unviable as a result of HV route. | | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|------------------|---|-----|---|------------------|---|----------------|---|----------------------|---|--|
| Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies | | Air Traffic/NATS | N | MoD | N | Carlisle Airport | N | Coal Authority | N | HSE | N | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Development of site unviable due to high voltage electricity pylons and lines traversing site. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Significant negative SEA impact as loss of greenfield land and major servicing constraint as high voltage electricity pylons and lines traverse site. | | | | | | | | | SEA SCORE: XX | | |

| 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 (12 units) sits remote from Windermere Road and could be accessed via an existing private road (Murray Park) constructed without Construction Consent which is served by Windermere Road. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road, this will also require the private road to be upgraded to an adoptable standard. Any residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | This site could be accessed via an existing private road (Murray Park) constructed without Construction Consent which is served by Windermere Road. This would require the existing private road to be upgraded to an adoptable standard. | | | | | | | | | | | |

| CLIMATIC FACTORS | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--------------------|--|---|---|
| What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.) | | Southerly aspect. | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | | Y | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | | Y | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No impact on climatic factors | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No impact on climatic factors | | | | | | | | | SEA SCORE:0 | | | |

| CULTURAL HERITAGE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|---------------------|---|---|---|
| Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting | L | Listed Building | N | Scheduled Monuments | N | Comment Archaeology - Site bounded to west by course of former railway. No historic environment issues identified for this site, as of July 2016 Historic Built Environment - No issues | | | | | | 0 | 0 |
| | | Conservation Area | N | Inventory of Historic Battlefield | N | | | | | | | | |
| | | World Heritage Site | N | Inventory & Non-Inventory | N | | | | | | | | |
| | | Archaeological site | N | Garden or Designed Landscape | | | | | | | | | |
| Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment | L | N | | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No impact on cultural heritage issues. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No impact on cultural heritage issues. | | | | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | | |

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

| LANDSCAPE | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--------------|------|--|---|---|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | | | NSAs Wild Land | | RSAs TPOs | | Comment Site south of A75 and west of recently developed business and Industry site at ANN:B&I1 Stapleton Business Park. Existing boundary trees and hedgerows on eastern boundary which would require to be enhanced with additional planting to screen site. | | |
| Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level | | N | Existing boundary trees and hedgerows on eastern boundary. | | | C/SV | X | Existing boundary trees and hedgerows on eastern boundary which would require to be enhanced with additional planting to screen site from adjacent business and Industry site at ANN:B&I1 Stapleton Business Park | O |
| Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement | | N | | | | | | | |
| Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site | | N | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Existing boundary trees and hedgerows on eastern boundary which would require to be enhanced with additional planting to screen site from adjacent business and Industry site at ANN:B&I1 Stapleton Business Park | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No impact on landscape. | | | | | | SEA SCORE:0 | | |

| PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES | | |
|--|--|--|
| Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP | Y | Site is outwith Annan settlement boundary, but immediately adjacent to boundary in adopted LDP. Reporters findings on the final draft plan did not recommend inclusion of the site in the current LDP due to the high voltage electricity route resulting in issues of development viability and significant adverse planning issues. These issues remain relevant |
| 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 | N | |
| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT | The site has not been included in the MIR for development due to the high voltage electricity route and pylons traversing the site resulting in significant issues of development viability and adverse planning issues. Would also involve loss of prime agricultural land and greenfield site. | |
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | Significant negative SEA impact as major servicing constraint as high voltage electricity pylons and lines traverse site. Negative SEA impact as prime agricultural land and greenfield site. | |

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

| | | | |
|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| Site Ref: ANN.H204 | Source of site suggestion: Call for sites | Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date): | |
| Site name: land south of Watchhall | | | |
| Settlement: Annan | Current use: Agricultural land | Existing LDP allocations/ designations: np | |
| OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): | | | |
| Site Size (ha): 200 units | Proposed use: Housing | HMA: Annan | Date completed: Oct/Nov 2016 |

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

Scoring Guidance

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

Legends

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

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

BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|----------------------|---|-------------------------|---|---------------------------|---|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | SACs | N | LNR | N | SPAs | N | SSSIs | N |
| | NNR | N | Local wildlife sites | N | Natterjack toads | N | Great Crested Newts | N |
| | RAMSAR | N | Geodiversity Sites | N | Other protected species | N | Marine Consultation Zones | N |
| | Ancient/semi-natural woodland | | N | | | | | |
| Comments: No comment | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any known invasive species within the site | N | | | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity | N | | | | 0 | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No impact on biodiversity interests. | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No impact on biodiversity interests. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | |

POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|-------------|-------------------|---|---------------|--|---------------------------|---|----------|---|
| Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space | MA | Adjacent to site's western boundary - line of former railway and Chalpercross pipeline . Protected area of open space. | | | GIS | 0 | Opportunity to link to adjacent public open space and core path network. | | 0 | | |
| | | Distance (km) | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them | MA or CF | Right of Way | N | | Comment: National cycle route 7 – B721 and Core Path – 314 Annan Causeway | | | | | | |
| | | Core path | Y | | | | | | | | |
| | | 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 | Hospitalities | 1 | Local shops (convenience) | 1 | Bus stop | 1 |
| What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | | | Primary | | | | Secondary | | | | |
| | School name: | | Hecklegirth | | | | Annan | | | | |
| | Capacity: | | 177 | | | | 331 | | | | |
| | Distance: | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | N | | | GIS | 0 | | | 0 | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Scope to encourage sustainable modes of travel including walking and cycling. Development presents opportunities to enhance the greenspace network and to link the site with Annan and the wider countryside. No capacity at primary school. | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Positive SEA impact as within close walking distance of existing facilities, schools and railway station. Scope to encourage sustainable modes of travel including walking and cycling. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: + | | | | |

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

| SOILS | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|-------|----|---|---|---|--|
| Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land | | N | Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute) | Urban | O | 0 | Agricultural land in grazing, but not prime land. | 0 | |
| Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes) | | N | Sloping site to the south | | SV | | | | |
| Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site | | | No known previous use. Adjacent to railway line. | | | x | Garden ground adjacent to railway may require soil testing to make sure suitable for use. | 0 | |
| Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat | CF | ? | Uknown | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Sloping site to the south. Potential garden ground adjacent to railway requiring soil testing to make sure suitable for use. | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No impact on soils subject to potential garden ground adjacent to railway requiring soil testing to make sure suitable for use. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| WATER | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|---|---|--|----|---|--|---|--|
| Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site | B and L | Y | Some evidence of boggy ground | | 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 | Y | SEPA advise that site within potentially vulnerable area. Record held of flooding in proximity of the site in November 2012, leading to flooding of fields in the area. | | C | X | A surface water flood hazard has been identified and should be discussed with FPA and Scottish Water. Appropriate surface water management measures should be adopted. | 0 | |
| Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse) | | N | | | | | | | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer | PHH | Y | Annan Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity for development. | | C | O | Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended. | 0 | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply | PHH | Y | Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity for development. | | C | O | Further investigation such as Flow and Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended. | 0 | |

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

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|---------------------|--|--|
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | A surface water flood hazard has been identified and should be discussed with FPA and Scottish Water. 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. Further investigation such as Flow and Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with Scottish Water via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended. | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Potential flood risk. Drainage impact assessment required | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| AIR QUALITY | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|---|---------------------|--|--|
| Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA | | N | There are no AQMA at present in the region | C | 0 | | 0 | | |
| What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby | PHH | Y | SEPA state that site adjacent to licenced End of Life Vehicles (ELV) site – potential source of nuisance e.g noise issues. Site is bounded to the south by railway line and to the west a sawmill. | C | X | Noise assessment required to determine noise and required mitigation from adjoining scrap yard, sawmill and railway line to the south | 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) | | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Noise assessment required to determine noise from adjoining scrap yard and railway line and required mitigation | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Potential noise and dust impact from adjoining use (scrap yard and sawmill) and railway line to the south. Noise assessment required to determine noise and required mitigation from adjoining scrap yard and railway line. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| MATERIAL ASSETS | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------------|--|-------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| Is the site..... | | Brownfield | | Comment Large greenfield site | | | | |
| | | Greenfield | Y | | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | N | Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey | N | | 0 | 0 | |
| Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover on-site materials/resources | | | | | | 0 | 0 | |
| Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction | | N | | | | 0 | 0 | |
| Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, | PHH | N | | | | 0 | 0 | |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic | Yes/No | Comment | Information source | Pre mitigation score | Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required | |
|--|---|--------|--|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| compromise the waste handling operation | | | | | | | | | |
| Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan0(paragraph 4.9) | | n/a | | | 0 | | 0 | | |
| 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 | No known servicing constraints | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negative SEA impact as would result in 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 | | | Access to this site (200 units) would be taken from Watchhall Road U140a and the B721. Watchhall Road has been widened and improved from the roundabout to the boundary of ANN.H6, it would be appropriate that the widening is extended upto and along the site frontage to allow for vehicles to pass on Watchhall Road, this however would require private land. It should be noted that development of this site would trigger the relocation of the 30 mph speed limit on Watchhall Road (including street lighting and the construction of a 1.8m wide public footway along the entire site frontage) to a point south of the site boundary The access onto the B721 would be taken from within the 30mph limit. It is noted that there is another site under consideration to the north of this sites boundary (ANN.H6) on the east side of Watchhall Road, and it would be appropriate that a Transport Assessment be commissioned and a Masterplan approach be adopted so that future development potential not be prejudiced and that the potential impact is considered in respect of traffic volumes, desire lines, public transport and pedestrian/cycle provision, Particular consideration should be given to drainage design and surface water flows from the South that travel into ANN.H6 then beneath the former railway line into Site ANN.H6. Given the history I would not be in favour of inclusion of this site unless supported by a full drainage impact assessment that categorically identifies the sources, catchment size and outfalls associated with this site along with proposals for addressing the drainage issues. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and any residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards. | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Access to this site should be taken from Watchhall Road U140a and the B721. Watchhall Road has been widened and improved from the roundabout to the boundary of ANN.H6, it would be appropriate that the widening is extended upto and along the site frontage to allow for vehicles to pass on Watchhall Road, this however would require private land. The access onto the B721 would be taken from within the 30mph limit. A Transport Assessment would require to be commissioned and a Masterplan approach be adopted so that future development potential not be prejudiced and that the potential impact is considered in respect of traffic volumes, desire lines, public transport and pedestrian/cycle provision. Full drainage impact assessment required that identifies the sources, catchment size and outfalls associated with this site along with proposals for addressing the drainage issues | | | | | | | | | |

| CLIMATIC FACTORS | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|------------------------|---|----|---|--|---|--|--|
| What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.) | | Sloping southerly site | | | | | | | |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | | Y | | | | | | | |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | | N | The site is exposed to prevailing winds to the south west | SV | X | High quality of construction will be required given exposed nature of site to the south west which may | o | | |

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

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|---|--------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | result in higher levels of energy consumption | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Sloping southerly aspect but site is exposed to prevailing winds to the south west | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | High quality of construction will be required given exposed nature of site to the south west which may result in higher levels of energy consumption | | | | | | SEA SCORE:0 | | |

| CULTURAL HERITAGE | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|---|--|---|--|---------------------|--|--|
| Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting | L | Listed Building | Y | Scheduled Monuments | N | Comment Archaeology Extensive area of significant archaeology in central southern portion of site that should be avoided by any development. The rest of the site would require pre-determination evaluation. Bounded to west by course of former railway. Historic Built Environment - The site is close to the Category C Listed Watchhill House. As there has been a significant amount of development around the Listed Building and there is an allocated site directly opposite it, there is a risk that development too close to it will spoil its setting completely. Therefore creating space in the development for large scale trees and to preserve some of the rural character of the lane would help the setting of Watchhill House. There is a risk that highways access requirements will have a detrimental impact on existing hedges of the rural character lane therefore this aspect of any development should be considered early. [relevant to ANN.H6] | | | |
| | | Conservation Area | N | Inventory of Historic Battlefield | N | | | | |
| | | World Heritage Site | N | Inventory & Non-Inventory Garden or Designed Landscape | N | | | | |
| | | Archaeological site | Y | | | | | | |
| Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment | L | | | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Extensive area of significant archaeology in central southern portion of site that should be avoided by any development. The rest of the site would require pre-determination evaluation. Design of development should take into account setting of nearby listed building. | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negative SEA impact in terms of cultural heritage as extensive area of significant archaeology in central southern portion of site that should be avoided by any development. The rest of the site would require pre-determination evaluation. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: X | | |

| LANDSCAPE | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------|--|------|---|---|----|--|----|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | | NSAs | N | RSAs | N | Comment Watch Hill has a role in containing Annan within defining topography in wider landscape views from Solway and west. Avoid developing upper slopes. East of road: Inappropriate: complex visual and landscape character issues. West of road - Potential at slope base. Avoid engineered slopes. | | | |
| | | Wild Land | N | TPOs | N | | | | |
| Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level | | Y | Existing trees and hedgerows along road and field boundaries. The site slopes reasonably steeply to the railway line to the south. | | | | x | | x |
| Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement | | N | In the wider landscape views from the Solway and the west the existing topography in the area is important to visually containing Annan. | | | | xx | | xx |
| Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site | | Y | As above | | | | x | | x |

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

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|----------------------|--|
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | The development of the site would not be appropriate due to a variety of complex landscape issues and the hill contains the development of Annan within the existing topography. | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Significant negative SEA impact in terms of landscape as topography defines Annan within wider landscape setting and development east of road is inappropriate due to complex visual and landscape character issues. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: XX | |

| PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES | | |
|--|--|---|
| Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP | Y | The site is adjacent to Annan settlement boundary within the adopted LDP. |
| 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 | N | |
| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT | The site has not been included in the MIR as development of the whole site would have a significant negative impact on the landscape. It would also involve loss of greenfield land and there is an extensive area of significant archaeology in central southern portion of site that should be safeguarded avoided by any development. It is not required to meet the housing land requirement at this time. A number of other sites have been included that are considered to meet the identified housing strategy. | |
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | Significant negative impact in terms of landscape as topography defines Annan within wider landscape setting and development east of road is inappropriate due to complex visual and landscape character issues. Negative SEA impact in terms of material assets as would involve loss of greenfield site and cultural heritage as extensive area of significant archaeology in central southern portion of site that should be avoided by any development. | |

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| Site Ref: ANN.H205 | Source of site suggestion: Call for Sites | Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date): | |
| Site name: land south of Dachel Manor, Annerley Road | | | |
| Settlement: Annan | Current use: Agricultural use | Existing LDP allocations/ designations: No Outwith settlement boundary | |
| OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): | | | |
| Site Size (ha): 3.8ha | Proposed use: Housing | HMA: Annan | Date completed: Oct/Nov 2016 |

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

Scoring Guidance

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

Legends

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

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

| BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|---|----------------------|---|-------------------------|---|---------------------------|---|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | SACs | N | LNR | N | SPAs | N | SSSIs | N |
| | NNR | N | Local wildlife sites | N | Natterjack toads | N | Great Crested Newts | N |
| | RAMSAR | N | Geodiversity Sites | N | Other protected species | N | Marine Consultation Zones | N |
| | Ancient/semi-natural woodland | | N | | Comments: No comments | | | |
| Are there any known invasive species within the site | N | | | 0 | | | 0 | |
| Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity | N | | | 0 | | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No biodiversity designations | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No biodiversity designations | | | | | | SEA SCORE:0 | |

| POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|------------------------|--|---|---|--|---------------------|---------------------------|---|----------|---|
| Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space | MA | N | Adjacent to site's eastern boundary - line of former railway and Chalpercross pipeline . Protected area of open space and Core Path – 314 Annan Causeway | GIS | 0 | Opportunity to link to adjacent public open space and core path network. | 0 | | | | |
| Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them | MA or CF | Distance (km) | O | Comment: Core path 314 – Annan Causeway | | | | | | | |
| | | Right of Way | O | | | | | | | | |
| | | Core path | Y | | | | | | | | |
| | | 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 | Hospitalities | 1 | Local shops (convenience) | 1 | Bus stop | 1 |
| What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | Primary | | Secondary | | | | | | | | |
| | School name: | Elmvale | Annan | | | | | | | | |
| | Capacity: | 47 | 331 | | | | | | | | |
| | | Distance: | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | N | | GIS | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Scope to encourage sustainable modes of travel including walking and cycling. Development presents opportunities to enhance the greenspace network and to link the site with Annan and the wider countryside | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Positive SEA impact as within close walking distance of existing facilities, schools and railway station. Scope to encourage sustainable modes of travel including walking and cycling. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: + | | | | |

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

| SOILS | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|-----|---|---|--|---|--|
| Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land | | Y | Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute) | 3.1 | 0 | X | Currently in agricultural use - grazing | X | |
| Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes) | | N | Relatively flat open site | | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site | | C | No known previous use. The former railway runs along eastern boundary. | | | X | Garden ground adjacent to railway land may require soil sampling to ensure it is suitable for use. | 0 | |
| Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat | CF | N | | | 0 | | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Development of site would involve loss of prime quality agricultural land. Potential contaminated land issues as former railway line adjoins site on eastern boundary. Garden ground adjacent to railway land may require soil sampling to ensure it is suitable for use. | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negative SEA impact as would involve loss of prime quality agricultural land | | | | | | SEA SCORE: X | | |

| WATER | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|------|---|--|---|--|
| Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site | B and L | N | None | | SC/V | 0 | | 0 | |
| Is the site within an identified flood risk area? Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere | CF and PHH | N | SEPA – No flood risk apparent | | C | 0 | | 0 | |
| Will the development of the site have a direct impact on the water environment (e.g. result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow de-culverting of a watercourse) | | Y | SEPA advise that site remote from sewer. Private drainage not supported in principle. | | C | X | Development of site not supported in principle as remote from sewer and private drainage not supported in principle. | X | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer | PHH | Y | Annan Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity for development. | | C | 0 | | 0 | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply | PHH | Y | Black Esk Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity for development. | | C | 0 | 90mm MPDE water main running through middle of site. | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Development of site not supported in principle as remote from sewer and private drainage not supported in principle. | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negative SEA Impact as SEPA advise that site remote from sewer. Private drainage not supported in principle. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: X | | |

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

| AIR QUALITY | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|------|----|--|----------------------|--|
| Could the development of the site lead to Local Air Quality Management thresholds being breached in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or result in the designation of a new AQMA | | N | There are no AQMA at present in the region | C | 0 | | 0 | |
| What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby | PHH | Y | SEPA advise that site adjacent to existing sawmill site. Potential for odour and noise issues. Sawmill site adjoins site on eastern boundary, land form is embanked and operates at height approx 5m above site. | C/SV | XX | Potential noise, dust and visual impact from adjoining sawmill use. Noise assessment required to determine noise and required mitigation from adjacent sawmill. Given scale of sawmill operation limited or no scope to develop successful mitigation measures and create appropriate environment for new housing development. | XX | |
| 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 | Adjoining landuse incompatible with housing development. Noise assessment required to determine noise and required mitigation from adjacent sawmill. Given scale of operation limited or no scope to screen sawmill and develop successful mitigation measures. Development of site would create very poor housing environment. | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negative SEA impact as potential noise, dust and visual impact from adjoining use. Given scale of sawmill operation limited or no scope to develop successful mitigation measures. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: XX | |

| MATERIAL ASSETS | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------------|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| Is the site..... | | Brownfield | | Comment Greenfield site currently in agricultural use. | | | | |
| | | Greenfield | Y | | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | N | Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover on-site materials/resources | | N | | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction | | N | | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation | PHH | N | | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9) | | n/a | | | 0 | | 0 | |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA Topic | Yes/No | Comment | Information source | Pre mitigation score | Mitigation if appropriate | Post mitigation score | Consultation required | |
|---|---|--------|---|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site | | | Pylons N Bord Gais Eirann pipeline N Shell oil pipeline N Transco pipeline N | | | | | | |
| | | | Comment No known servicing constraints in relation to these constraints. But development of site not supported in principle as remote from sewer and private drainage not supported in principle. | | | | | | |
| 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 | No known servicing constraint. But development of site not supported in principle as remote from sewer and private drainage not supported in principle. | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negative SEA impact as would involve 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 | | | Access to the site could be taken from an existing private lane from C39a Annerley Road. There may be scope to upgrade this private lane 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 any residential development of this proposal should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards at the appropriate rate for the type of development proposed. | | | | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Access to the site could be taken from an existing private lane from C39a Annerley Road. There may be scope to upgrade this private lane to an adoptable standard. It should be noted that private lane is outwith the boundary of the development site and likely to be separate ownership. The issue of satisfactory road access would require to be determined. | | | | | | | | |

| CLIMATIC FACTORS | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|------------------|---|----|---|--|---------------------|--|--|
| What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.) | | Southerly aspect | | | | | | | |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | | Y | | | 0 | | 0 | | |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | | N | The site is exposed to prevailing winds to the south west | SV | X | High quality of construction will be required given exposed nature of site to the south west which may result in higher levels of energy consumption | 0 | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Southerly aspect, but site is exposed to prevailing winds to the south west | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | High quality of construction will be required given exposed nature of site to the south west which may result in higher levels of energy consumption | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| CULTURAL HERITAGE | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|--|
| Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting | L | Listed Building N | Scheduled Monuments N | Comment Archaeology - Bounded on east by course of former railway. Historic Built Environment – No comment | | | | |
| | | Conservation Area N | Inventory of Historic Battlefield N | | | | | |
| | | World Heritage Site N | Inventory & Non-Inventory N | | | | | |
| | | Archaeological site N | Garden or Designed Landscape | | | | | |
| Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment | L | | | | 0 | | 0 | |

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

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|---------------------|--|--|
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No cultural heritage designations apply but it should be noted that site is bounded on the east by course of former railway line. | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No cultural heritage designations apply. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | | |

| LANDSCAPE | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|------|---|---|---|----|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | | | NSAs | N | RSAs | N | Comment Site is contained by embankment, landform and existing development. These limit views of site. Development would be consistent with existing pattern but is influenced by the adjacent sawmill and would require screening. | | |
| | | | Wild Land | N | TPOs | N | | | |
| Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level | | Y | Trees and hedgerows along field boundaries | | | | O | Retain trees and hedgerows along field boundaries. | O |
| Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement | | N | Site disjointed from Annan settlement and would not be well integrated visually within the existing settlement. Development of site would create very poor housing environment. | | | | XX | Site disjointed from Annan settlement and would not be well integrated visually within the existing settlement. | XX |
| Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site | | N | | | | | O | | O |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Site disjointed from Annan settlement and would not be well integrated visually within the existing settlement. Given scale of adjacent sawmill operation and nature of site no scope to develop successful mitigation measures. | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Significant negative SEA impact as site disjointed from Annan settlement and would not be well integrated visually within the existing settlement. Development of site would create very poor housing environment. Given scale of adjacent sawmill operation and nature of site no scope to develop successful mitigation measures. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: XX | | |

| PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP | Y | Site lies outwith settlement boundary for Annan, but lies immediately adjacent to settlement boundary. | | | | | | | |
| Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site | Y | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips | ? | Access to the site could be taken from an existing private lane from C39a Annerley Road. There may be scope to upgrade this private lane to an adoptable standard. It should be noted that the private lane is outwith the boundary of the development site and likely to be separate ownership. The landowner has advised that existing provision for road access has been maintained by the site owners to accommodate access to this site. The issue of satisfactory road access would require to be determined. | | | | | | | |
| Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe | ? | Landowner advises that site could be developed in next 5 year period, but road access issues would require to be determined. | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT | The site has not been included in the MIR for development as significant adverse planning and environmental issues. The site is disjointed from the Annan settlement and would not be well integrated visually within the existing settlement. Development of the site would create a very poor housing environment. Given scale of adjacent sawmill operation and nature of site, there is no scope to develop successful mitigation measures. Road access constraints and SEPA advise that development of site not supported in principle as remote from sewer and private drainage not supported in principle. | | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | Significant negative SEA impact in terms of Air Quality and Landscape matters and negative SEA impact in terms of Soils, Water and Material Assets. | | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>Significant negative SEA impact in term of Air Quality as potential noise, dust and visual impact from adjoining use. Given scale and proximity of sawmill operation - limited or no scope to develop successful mitigation measures. Significant negative SEA impact in terms of landscape as site disjointed from Annan settlement and would not be well integrated visually within the existing settlement. Development of site would create very poor housing environment. Given scale of adjacent sawmill operation and nature of site no scope to develop successful mitigation measures. Negative SEA impact in terms of Soils and Material Assets as would involve loss of prime quality agricultural land and greenfield land. Negative SEA Impact in terms of Water as SEPA advise that site remote from sewer. Private drainage not supported in principle. Positive SEA impact in terms of Population and Health as within close walking distance of existing facilities, schools and railway station. Scope to encourage sustainable modes of travel including walking and cycling.</p> | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| Site Ref: ANN.MU201 | Source of site suggestion: Call for Sites | Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date): n/a | |
| Site name: land between Violetbank and River Annan | | | |
| Settlement: Annan | Current use: Agricultural land in grazing | Existing LDP allocations/ designations: Yes – Protected Area of Open Space | |
| OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): | | | |
| Site Size (ha): 3.8ha | Proposed use: Mixed use development including tourist/leisure/commercial type development and 4 housing plots – coach parking and car parking, tourist information office, public toilets, restaurant, shops and pedestrian bridges across River Annan. | HMA: Annan | Date completed: Oct/Nov 2016 |

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

Scoring Guidance

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

Legends

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

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

| BIODIVERSITY, FAUNA AND FLORA | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|----------------------|----|-------------------------|---|---------------------------|---|
| Do any of the following biodiversity interests affect or have connectivity to the site? (this includes any potential SACs and SPAs) | SACs | N | LNR | N | SPAs | N | SSSIs | N |
| | NNR | N | Local wildlife sites | N | Natterjack toads | N | Great Crested Newts | N |
| | RAMSAR | N | Geodiversity Sites | N | Other protected species | N | Marine Consultation Zones | N |
| | Ancient/semi-natural woodland | | N | | | | | |
| Comments: No comments | | | | | | | | |
| Are there any known invasive species within the site | | N | | | O | | O | |
| Will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the development of the site – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity | | Y | | SV | O | | O | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No impact on biodiversity designations | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No impact on biodiversity designations. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | |

| POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|------------------------|--|--|---|---|------------------------|---------------------------|----------|---|
| Will the development of the site affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space or result in a loss of open space. Distance to nearest area of open space | MA | Y | Site is allocated as protected open space in the adopted LDP important to the setting of Annan | | X | Protected Area of Open Space in adopted LDP. Policy CF3: Open Space presumes against development of open space identified for protection in the LDP inset maps. | | X | | |
| | | | Distance (km) | 0 | | | | | | |
| Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them | MA or CF | Right of Way | N | Comment: Core path – 492 Newbie Mill to Milnefield. B721 - National cycle route 7. | | | | | | |
| | | Core path | Y | | | | | | | |
| | | 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 | Hospitalities | 1 | Local shops (convenience) | Bus stop | 0 |
| What is the education catchment area (primary and secondary) for the site and what is the remaining capacity within the catchment. (October 2015). Distance from site (km) | | | Primary | | | Secondary | | | | |
| | School name: | | Elmvale | | | Annan | | | | |
| | Capacity: | | 47 | | | 331 | | | | |
| | Distance: | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | |
| Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere | MA and B | N | | GIS | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Site is allocated as Protected Area of Open Space in the adopted LDP important to the setting of Annan. Policy CF3: Open Space presumes against development of open space identified for protection in the LDP inset maps. | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Positive SEA impact as within close walking distance of existing facilities, schools and railway station. Scope to encourage sustainable modes of travel including walking and cycling. Negative SEA impact as would involve the loss of protected area of open space contrary to Policy CF3. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: +/XX | | | |

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

| SOILS | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|-------|---|---|---|---|--|
| Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land | | N | Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute) | Urban | O | O | Agricultural land currently in grazing. | O | |
| Would the development of the site result in soil or coastal erosion (adjacent to the coast or includes steep slopes) | | N | | | | | | | |
| Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site | | | No known previous use. | | C | 0 | | 0 | |
| Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat | CF | ? | Unknown | | O | 0 | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Would involve loss of agricultural land but not prime land | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Would involve loss of agricultural land . | | | | | | SEA SCORE:0 | | |

| WATER | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|----|----|--|----|--|
| Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site | B and L | Y | Low lying areas next to River Annan. Evidence of boggy areas | | 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 | Y | SEPA advise that a substantial part of the site may lie within the 1 in 200 year floodplain of the River Annan. No development should take place within this area. Flood Risk Assessment required. | | C | XX | SEPA advise that no development should take place in flood risk area. Flood Risk Assessment required which would require to be agreed with SEPA in order to identify potential area for development | XX | |
| 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) | | Y | Site remote from public sewer - further info would be needed to assess drainage options for both foul and surface water. Site also adjacent to River Annan appropriate buffer will be required. | | C | X | | X | |
| Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer | PHH | N | Site outwith Annan waste water treatment zone | | C | X | | 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 for development. | | C | 0 | Further investigation such as Flow and Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with SW via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended. | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | SEPA advise that no development should take place within the flood risk area 1:200 year flood plain of the River Annan. Site remote from public sewer - further info would be needed to assess drainage options for both foul and surface water. Site also adjacent to River Annan appropriate buffer will be required. | | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|----------------------|
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negative SEA impact as substantial part of the site may lie within the flood risk area 1:200 year flood plain of the River Annan. No development should take place within the flood risk 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 | The site is bounded by open space to the north, River Annan to the east, B721 to the south and west, and housing to the west. | SV | 0 | | 0 | |
| Does the development of the site introduce a new potentially significant air emission to the area (e.g. combined heat and power, an industrial process, large scale quarry of energy from the waste plant) | | N | | | 0 | | 0 | |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No impact on air quality. | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No impact on air quality. | | | | | | SEA SCORE: 0 | |

| MATERIAL ASSETS | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------------|--|---------|---|--|---|--|
| Is the site..... | | Brownfield | | Comment | | | | |
| | | Greenfield | Y | | | | | |
| Is the site vacant or derelict | | N | Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey | N | 0 | | 0 | |
| Will development of the site minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does the development re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover on-site materials/resources | | | There are no existing structures for reuse on site. | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction | | N | | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation | PHH | N | | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan (paragraph 4.9) | | n/a | | | 0 | | 0 | |

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

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---------------------------|---|--------------------|---|------------------|---------------------|-----|---|
| Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development of the site | | Pylons | N | Bord Gais Eirann pipeline | N | Shell oil pipeline | N | Transco pipeline | N | | |
| | | Comment No known servicing constraints | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | No known servicing constraints | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Negative SEA impact as would involve the development 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 fronts both the C50a and the B721, Consideration should be given to appropriate junction spacing between any potential site access and the existing junctions (C50a/B721 and River Park). Given the variation in site levels along the site frontage with the public roads, access should be designed to standards appropriate to the site use class in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Standards. 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 fronts both the C50a and the B721, Consideration should be given to appropriate junction spacing between any potential site access and the existing junctions (C50a/B721 and River Park). | | | | | | | | | |

| CLIMATIC FACTORS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--------------------|---|---|
| What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.) | | South east aspect | | | | | | | | | |
| Can the site make best use of solar gain | | Y | | | | | | | | O | |
| Is the site protected from prevailing winds | | Y | The site is low lying and would be protected | | | | | | | | O |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | No impact on climatic factors | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | No impact on climatic factors | | | | | | | | SEA SCORE:O | | |

| CULTURAL HERITAGE | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Will the development of the site affect any of the following including their setting | L | Listed Building | Y | Scheduled Monuments | Y | Comment Archaeology - Setting issue for view of scheduled Annan Motte from western approach to the town. HES advise - This site is located in the vicinity of the Motte of Annan (Scheduled Monument, Index no. 702) and Annan Bridge (Category A Listed Building, LB21061). Development within this allocation could have a significant impact of the setting of the Mote of Annan (Scheduled Monument, Index no. 702) and we consider that this should be taken into account in determining whether or not to bring this allocation forward. We agree that this site should not be recommended for inclusion within LDP2. | | | | |
| | | Conservation Area | N | Inventory of Historic Battlefield | N | | | | | |
| | | World Heritage Site | N | Inventory & Non-Inventory | N | | | | | |
| | | Archaeological site | N | Garden or Designed Landscape | | | | | | |
| Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment | L | | | | | Significant impact on setting of scheduled monument Mote of Annan and Annan Bridge (Category A Listed Building) | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|----------------------|--|
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | HES advise that site should not be allocated for development as a consequence of the significant impact the development of the site would have on scheduled monument Mote of Annan. It would also impact on the category A listed Annan Bridge | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Significant negative SEA impact as development would have a significant adverse impact on the scheduled monument Mote of Annan (Scheduled Monument, Index no. 702) and HES are of the view that the site should allocated for development. Would also impact on Annan Bridge (Category A Listed Building, LB21061). | | | | | | SEA SCORE: XX | |

| LANDSCAPE | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|-------------|----------------------|---|
| Is the site within or adjoining any of the following | | | NSAs Wild Land | | | RSA TPOs | | Comment Not suitable for built development: Open greenfield riverside site, highly visible in approach to settlement and historic core of town, balanced by open space to south of road. Development would destroy the strong sense of arrival experienced when crossing the floodplain and bridge. Howes is experienced as distinct 'hamlet' with different building styles, layout, etc; development of this site would blur this distinction by bridging the gap. |
| 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 | Open greenfield riverside site, highly visible in approach to settlement and historic core of town, balanced by open space to south of road. | | | | XX | XX |
| Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement | | N | Site is within river corridor and separates existing settlement from Howes. Development would detract from approach and setting to Annan. Development would destroy the strong sense of arrival experienced when crossing the floodplain and bridge. It would not be well integrated visually with the existing settlement. | | | | XX | XX |
| Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site | | Y | Site important to the historic setting of Annan and the Mote of Annan. | | | | XX | XX |
| PLANNING OVERVIEW | Site not recommended for development. Site is within river corridor and separates existing settlement from Howes. River creates clear boundary to settlement. Development would detract from approach and setting to Annan. | | | | | | | |
| SEA OVERVIEW | Significant negative SEA impact as development would have a significant adverse impact on the historic landscape setting of Annan | | | | | | SEA SCORE: XX | |

| PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES | | |
|--|--|---|
| Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP | Y | Site within the settlement boundary for Annan and identified as Protected Area of Open Space in adopted LDP. Policy CF3: Open Space presumes against development of open space identified for protection in the LDP inset maps. |
| 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 been proposed for a tourist / leisure / commercial type development and for the development of 4 housing plots. 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. Significant adverse planning and | |

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

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | environmental issues as it is a prominent site on the western approach to Annan with significant adverse impact on landscape setting, loss of protected area of public open space, significant flood risk which would mitigate against development and significant impact on setting of scheduled ancient Monument (Motte of Annan) and listed River Annan bridge. | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL SEA COMMENT | Positive SEA impact in term of Population and Health as within close walking distance of existing facilities, schools and railway station. Scope to encourage sustainable modes of travel including walking and cycling. Also negative SEA impact as would involve the loss of protected area of open space contrary to Policy CF3. Significant Negative SEA impact in term of water as substantial part of the site subject to flood risk. Negative SEA impact as would involve the development of greenfield land. Significant negative SEA impact as development would have a significant adverse impact on the historic environment. Significant negative SEA impact in terms of landscape as development would have a significant adverse impact on the historic landscape setting of Annan | | | | | | | |