

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

Site Ref: EGL.H1	Source of site suggestion: LDP Allocation	Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date): PIP 10/P/4/0223 Aug 2011 lapsed 16/1672/Full Application by Kerr Investments for 30 dwellings, formation of new access, alteration to existing access with B722, formation of SUDS basin, landscaping and associated works. Currently being determined	
Site name: Former Roads Depot, Burnswark			
Settlement: Eaglesfield	Current use: Vacant brownfield site – former Roads Depot		
OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): 322895, 573979		Proposed use: Housing	HMA: Annan
Site Size (ha): 1.52			

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	+	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 strategic comments from SNH				
Are there any known invasive species within the site	N			C, GIS	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			C, GIS, SV	0		0	N
PLANNING OVERVIEW	No biodiversity 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			GIS, SV	0		0	N		
			Distance (km)	0.2	Comment: close to range open space						
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								
		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:		Eaglesfield				Lockerbie				
	Capacity:		23				116				
	Distance:		1				10-20				
Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere	MA and B	N			GIS	0		0			
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Close proximity to existing community facilities and school										
SEA OVERVIEW	Close proximity to existing community facilities and school. Scope to encourage active travel						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) Former roads depot – brownfield site	4.1 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	0		0	N	
Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site			Former roads depot - potential contaminated land on site	GIS, SV	X	Investigations have indicated that some remediation is required before development.	0	Y	
Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat	CF	N		GIS, SV,O	0		0	N	
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Potential contaminated land will require remediation before development								
SEA OVERVIEW	Potential contaminated land will require remediation before development						SEA SCORE: 0		

WATER									
Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site	B and L	Y	Water course on eastern boundary of site	SV	0		0	Y	
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 connection to the site. Body of water lies adjacent to the site. Historical severe pluvial flooding issues.	C	X	Flood Risk Assessment required which would need to be agreed with SEPA	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		C	0		0	N	
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer	PHH	Y	Eaglesfield Waste water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity for development.	C	0		0	Y	
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply	PHH	Y	Winterhope Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity for development	C	0		0	Y	
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Flood Risk Assessment required which would require to be agreed with SEPA								
SEA OVERVIEW	Potential flood risk. Flood Risk Assessment required which would require to be agreed with SEPA						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	N	
What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby	PHH	N	Housing and agricultural land. M74 lies to west and noise pollution	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		O	0		0	N	
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Unlikely to decrease air quality								
SEA OVERVIEW	Unlikely to decrease air quality						SEA SCORE: 0		

MATERIAL ASSETS																
Is the site.....		Brownfield	Y	Comment Former roads depot												
		Greenfield														
Is the site vacant or derelict		D	Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey		Y	GIS, O	+	Former road depot and potential areas of contamination. Investigations have indicated that some remediation is required before development.		+						
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				GIS	0			0						
Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction		N				GIS, O	0			0						
Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation	PHH	N				GIS, SV	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 - Electricity poles and lines cross site and will require to be re-located to a more appropriate location or consolidated on site.															
Will development of the site require		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
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

consultation with any of the following bodies									
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Contaminated land remediation required before development. Electricity poles and lines cross site and will require to be re-located to a more appropriate location or consolidated on site.								
SEA OVERVIEW	Brownfield site- could utilise existing infrastructure and reduce need to use undeveloped greenfield land.						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 (30 units) which was formerly a Road Depot fronts Burnswalk View U550a with an existing private access which currently serves 4 dwellings. Given the increase in traffic utilising the junction with the B722, it would be appropriate for improvement works to be completed at this point allowing a more suitable junction arrangement. This site and general area has known flooding and drainage issues which will require careful consideration. Access for adjacent site EGL.H203 would only be achievable via this site therefore these sites should be considered as one. 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	The site fronts Burnswalk View U550a with an existing private access which currently serves 4 dwellings. Given the increase in traffic utilising the junction with the B722, it would be appropriate for improvement works to be completed at this point allowing a more suitable junction arrangement. Road access due east of the site (EGL.H203) for potential long term expansion of Eaglesfield should not be compromised.									

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	Relatively flat and open	SV	0		0		
Is the site protected from prevailing winds		Y		SV	0		0		
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Site relatively flat and open. No known climatic factors identified.								
SEA OVERVIEW	No known climatic factors identified.						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 - Line of Roman Road passes through northern portion of site; evaluation will be required Historic Built Environment - No Listed Buildings and no conservation area.			
		Conservation Area	N	Inventory of Historic Battlefield	N				
		World Heritage Site	N	Inventory & Non-Inventory	N				
		Archaeological site	Y	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		C	0		0	N	
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Line of Roman Road passes through northern portion of site; evaluation will be required								
SEA OVERVIEW	Impact on archaeology site (Roman Road) and archaeology evaluation will be required						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	N N	RSAs TPOs	N N	Comment Appropriate site for extension to the existing street frontage, with scope for an arrival point / focus within the village street. Also opportunity to extend the grid street structure. Woodland / tree planting to eastern edge. Safety issue disused quarry to east? Overhead lines etc.	
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			C, GIS, SV	0	0	N
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement		Y			C	0	Development should consider extension of existing street frontage and opportunity to extend grid street structure.	0 Y
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		N			SV, GIS, C	0	0	N
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Appropriate site for extension to the existing street frontage, with scope for an arrival point / focus within the village street. Also opportunity to extend the grid street structure. Woodland / tree planting required to define eastern edge.							
SEA OVERVIEW	Appropriate site for extension to the existing street frontage, with scope for an arrival point / focus within the village street. Also opportunity to extend the grid street structure. Woodland / tree planting required to define eastern edge.						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 and current full planning application (16/1672/FULL) for the development of 30 dwellings being determined.
Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site	Y	Potential interest by Loreburn HA for the development of 6 units with a site start in 2017/18 for completion 2017-2018. Included in the SHIP programme.
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 site in adopted LDP and current full planning application (16/1672/FULL) for the development of 30 dwellings being determined. Brownfield site- could utilise existing infrastructure and reduce need to use undeveloped greenfield land.	
OVERALL SEA COMMENT	Positive SEA impact in terms of Population and Health and Material Assets. Close proximity to existing community facilities and school. Scope to encourage active travel. Brownfield site- could utilise existing infrastructure and reduce need to use undeveloped greenfield land.	

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

Site Ref: EGL.H2	Source of site suggestion: LDP Allocation	Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date): PIP 10/P/4/0223 Aug 2011 lapsed	
Site name: Land between Ashyards Crescent and Sunnybrae			
Settlement: Eaglesfield	Current use: Vacant brownfield site and agricultural land	Existing LDP allocations/ designations: Yes	
OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): 324230, 574664			
Site Size (ha): 4.06	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	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 strategic comments from SNH				
Are there any known invasive species within the site	N			SV, GIS	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			SV, GIS, C	0		0	N
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			SV, GIS	+		+	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: well located for services and facilities and open space							
		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:		Eaglesfield				Lockerbie				
	Capacity:		23				116				
	Distance:		1				10-20				
Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere	MA and B	N			GIS	0		0			
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Located in close proximity to community facilities and school. Scope to encourage active travel.										
SEA OVERVIEW	Located in close proximity to community facilities and school. Scope to encourage active travel.						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)	C	0		0		
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	0		0		
Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site		Y	The site includes a former poultry breeding unit.	C/SV	X	Investigation has indicated that some remediation is required before development.	0		
Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat	CF	N		O	0		0		
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Potential contaminated soils. Investigation has indicated that some remediation is required before development.								
SEA OVERVIEW	Potential contaminated soils. Investigation has indicated that some remediation is required before development.						SEA SCORE: 0		

WATER								
Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site	B and L	Y	Evidence of boggy areas	SV	0		0	Y
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 connection to the site. Historical severe pluvial flooding issues. SEPA - A surface water flood hazard has been identified adjacent to the site and should be discussed with FPA and Scottish Water. Appropriate surface water management measures should be adopted.	C	X	Flood Risk Assessment required. Appropriate surface water management measures should be adopted.	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		C, SV, GIS				N
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer	PHH	Y	Eaglesfield Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity for development.	C	0	Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with Scottish Water via the Pre-Development Enquiry process is strongly recommended.	0	Y
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply	PHH	Y	Winterhope 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	0	Y

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

						recommended.			
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Potential flood risk from pluvial flooding. Flood Risk Assessment required. Appropriate surface water management measures should be adopted. 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 from pluvial flooding. Flood Risk 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 to north and west. East – trees and access to Blacket House. South – agricultural land	SV, GIS	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		O	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	Y	Comment Site partly former poultry breeding unit and remainder agricultural land - greenfield					
		Greenfield	Y						
Is the site vacant or derelict			Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey	N	O	0		0	Y
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			O	0		0	N
Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction		N			O	0		0	N
Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation	PHH				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
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

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 service constraints in relation to site							
SEA OVERVIEW	Part greenfield but benefits from proximity to existing infrastructure.						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 (78 units) currently has an existing access from the C62a serving an existing HGV yard, additional frontage access is available onto the C62a at the western side of the site. Access can also be provided from Ashyard Crescent U509a. 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. 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	Existing access from the C62a serving an existing HGV yard, additional frontage access is available onto the C62a at the western side of the site. Access can also be provided from Ashyard Crescent U509a. It would be appropriate that a Masterplan approach be adopted.								

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		GIS, SV	+	South aspect should ensure solar gain.	+	N
Is the site protected from prevailing winds		Y		GIS, SV	0		0	N
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Site is relatively flat with southerly aspect.							
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	Y	Scheduled Monuments	N	Comment Archaeology - Bounded to east by non-inventory designed landscape for Blacket House. Design should not crowd in on the driveway and its associated planting.		
		Conservation Area	N	Inventory of Historic Battlefield	N			
		World Heritage Site	N	Inventory & Non-Inventory	Y			

Site assessment question	Related SEA Topic	Yes/No	Comment	Information source	Pre mitigation score	Mitigation if appropriate	Post mitigation score	Consultation required	
			Archaeological site N Garden or Designed Landscape			Historic Built Environment - Eastern site boundary adjoins the non-inventory landscape of the Category B Listed Blacket (Blackwood) House. The eastern access road runs along the boundary of the proposed site. NB Gate-piers are Listed Cat B with house. Sensitive development to preserve character of designed landscape and access to Blacklet House required. 78 dwellings is a lot given that that the local pattern of development is individual detached houses in road frontage locations in a very linear layout.			
Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment	L	N		GIS, C	0	Account should be taken of designed landscape for Blacklet house to east.	0	Y	
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Sensitive development to preserve character of designed landscape and access to Blacket House required. Proposed development should reflect the local pattern of development which is individual detached houses in road frontage locations in a very linear layout.								
SEA OVERVIEW	Potential impact on Non – Inventory Designed Landscape and listed building (Blacket House). Development layout and design should seek to preserve character of designed landscape and access to Blacket House						SEA SCORE: 0		

LANDSCAPE									
Is the site within or adjoining any of the following			NSAs N Wild Land N	RSAs N TPOs N		Comment Contained and well defined site for housing, although poor reference to the linear village form. Set development well back from the south east boundary to protect the tree belt and the setting of the Non Inventory Designed Landscape. Appropriate site for extension to existing street frontage, with similar single storey housing type and additional parallel street set back using existing southern access. Avoid cul-de-sacs. Introduce some formal tree planting element at frontage on road bend to punctuate the approach to the long linear street, and to reference the planned character and designed landscape element to the north.			
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/woodland on south eastern boundary which form part of Non Inventory Designed Landscape.		C, GIS, SV	0	Development layout and design should seek to preserve character of designed landscape	0 Y	
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement		Y	Poor reference to the linear village form		C, GIS	0	Introduce some formal tree planting element at frontage on road bend to punctuate the approach to the long linear street, and to reference the planned character and designed landscape element to the north.	0 Y	
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		N			C, GIS, SV	0		0 N	
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Contained and well defined site for housing, although poor reference to the linear village form. Development layout and design should seek to preserve character of designed landscape. Introduce some formal tree planting element at frontage on road bend to punctuate the approach to the long linear street, and to reference the planned character and designed landscape element to the north.								
SEA OVERVIEW	Set development well back from the south east boundary to protect the tree belt and the setting of the Non Inventory Designed Landscape. Appropriate site for extension to existing street frontage, with similar single storey housing type and additional parallel street set back using existing southern access						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
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

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 does not intend to renew permission in short term. Site not submitted through Call for Sites process.
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. Landowner does not intend to renew permission in short term. Site not submitted through Call for Sites process. Further information is required on its relative effectiveness. Review site as an option for inclusion in LDP2.	
OVERALL SEA COMMENT	Positive SEA impact in terms of Population and Human Health and Climatic Factors. Located in close proximity to community facilities and school. Scope to encourage active travel. Southerly aspect should ensure solar gain.	

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

Site Ref: EGL.H201	Source of site suggestion: Call for sites	Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date): No planning history	
Site name: land south of Bower Bank			
Settlement: Eaglesfield	Current use: Vacant site	Existing LDP allocations/ designations: Not allocated in LDP1	
OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): 322816, 573802			
Site Size (ha): 0.19	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

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 – semi-maintained rough grass area								
Are there any known invasive species within the site		N		GIS, SV, 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		GIS, SV, C	0		0	N
PLANNING OVERVIEW	No biodiversity or habitat issues identified.							
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	The site is a rough area of grass which is not always maintained but may be used for informal recreation			SV, GIS	0		0		N
Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them	MA or CF	Distance (km)		<1							
		Right of Way		N	Comment: There is a children's play area directly adjoining the site and a sports field approx 1km to the north east						
		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	1-5	Hospitalities	<1	Local shops (convenience)	1-5	Bus stop	<1 [0.8]
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:		Eaglesfield Primary				Lockerbie Academy				
	Capacity:		23				116				
	Distance:		<1				10-20 [approx. 12km]				
Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere	MA and B	N				GIS	0		0		N
PLANNING OVERVIEW	The site is well located for public transport, local facilities and services.										
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) Previously quarried and infilled Urban site where soil may no longer be suitable for agriculture.	4.1 GIS, C	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	0		0	N	
Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site		Y	There is a former quarry on part of this site which appears to have been infilled.	C	X	Site investigation required into the nature and suitability of the infill material. Appropriate remediation to ensure that ground conditions are suitable for residential development.	X	Y	
Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat	CF	N		O	0		0		
PLANNING OVERVIEW	This is a small site where remediation of ground conditions and contamination may prove disproportionate to the development potential.								
SEA OVERVIEW	Negative SEA impact						SEA SCORE: X		

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	Records of flooding in proximity of the site attributed to surface water/drainage issues [DGFT] A surface water flood hazard has been identified with a number of historical flooding records and this should be discussed with FPA and Scottish Water [SEPA]. [Surface water drainage systems need to take account of potential ground contamination]	GIS, C	X	FRA required to be agreed with SEPA. Appropriate surface water management measures should be adopted.	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)		Y	There is a Combined Sewer just within the site which would need to be accommodated in a development.	C	0	Layout to include stand-off distance	0	Y
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer	PHH	Y	Eaglesfield Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity for development.	C	0	Please note there is a Combined sewers just within site. Also a Rising main just outwith site boundary	0	Y
Is there sufficient capacity for the	PHH	Y	Winterhope Water Treatment Works has sufficient	C	0		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			capacity for development						
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Some surface water flooding issues to overcome								
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	Y	The adjacent land uses are residential and agriculture. The site is 350m from the M74 and 250m from the West Coast Main Line railway. Potential for periods of noise and air pollution	GIS, SV, C	X	Mitigation for noise may be possible.	?	Y	
Does the development of the site introduce a new potentially significant air emission to the area (e.g. combined heat and power, an industrial process, large scale quarry of energy from the waste plant)		N		O	0		0	N	
PLANNING OVERVIEW	In air quality terms only there has been no concern raised								
SEA OVERVIEW	Neutral SEA impact						SEA SCORE: 0		

MATERIAL ASSETS									
Is the site.....		Brownfield		Comment: The site is greenfield although part of it is known to have been quarried in the past					
		Greenfield	Y						
Is the site vacant or derelict		Y	Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey	N	C, GIS	X		X Y	
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 buildings on site. Known to have a combined sewer running through it so some potential for using existing infrastructure		C, GIS	0		0 Y	
Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction		N			C, GIS	0		0 N	
Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation	PHH				GIS	0		0 N	
Do sites for potential waste management		n/a			C	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	
PLANNING OVERVIEW	The site is now undeveloped although part has been surface mined.							
SEA OVERVIEW	Negative SEA impact						SEA SCORE: X	

ROADS/ACCESS									
Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated			This site (6 units) sits remote from Belmont Avenue U224a with the only means of access via an existing private lane which serves a playground outwith the site boundary. It is unclear if the appropriate visibility can be achieved at the junction of the U224a or that an appropriate access can be formed to Council Standards. The private lane is restrictive in nature and is approximately 5 to 5.5 metres in width with no footway provision. Given the restrictive visibility and access geometry, we could not recommend in favour of this site						Y
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Road constraint - Given the restrictive visibility and access geometry allocation site not recommended.								

CLIMATIC FACTORS									
What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)			The site is open to agricultural fields to south-east and play area to south-west		GIS, SV	0		0	N
Can the site make best use of solar gain		Y	Subject to the design and layout		GIS, SV	+		+	N
Is the site protected from prevailing winds		N	Site open to south-west		GIS, SV	X		X	N
PLANNING OVERVIEW	There are both climate advantages and disadvantages on the site.								
SEA OVERVIEW	Neutral SEA impact						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 - No historic environment issues identified for this site, as of July 2016 Historic Built Environment - No Listed Buildings and no conservation area.			
		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	L	N			C, GI	0		0	

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

to the historic environment								
PLANNING OVERVIEW	No cultural heritage issues identified							
SEA OVERVIEW	Neutral SEA impact						SEA SCORE: 0	

LANDSCAPE									
Is the site within or adjoining any of the following			NSAs	N	RSA	N	Comment: Small infill site adjacent to play area and existing housing. Part of development should face onto the play area. Retain hedgerow to south-eastern boundary.		
			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	Hedgerow which could be retained in development.			C, SV	0	0	N
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement		Y	The site should allow some dwellings to face play area			C	0	0	N
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		Y	Long open views to south			GIS, SV	0	0	N
PLANNING OVERVIEW	There are a number of positive landscape attributes that should be incorporated in the design								
SEA OVERVIEW	Neutral SEA impact						SEA SCORE: 0		

PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES		
Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	Y	At the end of existing village
Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site	Y	Although access may require 3 rd party land
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips	?	The only means of access is via an existing private lane which serves a playground outwith the site boundary and would require the use of third party land.
Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe	?	
OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT	The site has not been included in the MIR due to roads constraints (restrictive visibility and access geometry) and it is recommended that the site is not allocated for development. There are also issues concerning the land required for access being in third party ownership. There are potentially adverse ground conditions given that there is a former quarry on part of the site which appears to have been infilled therefore investigations would be required to demonstrate that ground conditions are suitable for development. In addition there are potential noise issues due to the proximity of M74, including a junction and the West Coast Railway.	
OVERALL SEA COMMENT	There are a number of negative environmental issues associated with development of the site.	

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

Site Ref: EGL.H202	Source of site suggestion: Call for sites	Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):	
Site name: land east of Belmont Avenue			
Settlement: Eaglesfield	Current use: Agricultural land	Existing LDP allocations/ designations: White land within settlement boundary	
OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing): 322748, 573712			
Site Size (ha): 0.57	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	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

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			GIS, 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	Retain existing trees and hedgerows along boundary		C, GIS, SV	0		0	N
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	N	Open space and existing play ground immediately adjoining site to north east.			GIS, SV	0		0	N	
		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	1-5	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:		Eaglesfield				Lockerbie				
	Capacity:		23				116				
	Distance:		1				10-20				
Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere	MA and B	N			GIS	0		0			
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Well located to community facilities										
SEA OVERVIEW	Site is well located to community facilities. Scope to encourage active travel options							SEA SCORE: +			

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

SOILS									
Will development of the site result in the loss of the best quality agricultural land		N	Soil classification (The James Hutton Institute)	4.1	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	0		0	N
Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site		Y	The site includes a former quarry which has been infilled.		C, GIS	X	Investigation will be required into the nature and suitability of the infill material.	0	Y
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									
SEA OVERVIEW	Former quarry which has been infilled. Investigation will be required into the nature and suitability of the infill material.						SEA SCORE: 0		

WATER									
Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site	B and L	Y	Evidence of boggy areas and marsh land. A minor water course flows along the site boundary.		GIS, SV	0		0	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	DGC hold flood records in connection to the site. Historical severe pluvial flooding issues. SEPA - A minor watercourse flows along the site boundary which could represent a potential flood risk and various historical flooding records. A Flood Risk Assessment is required.		C	X	Flood Risk Assessment required which would require to be agreed with SEPA.	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			C	0		0	N
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer	PHH	Y	Eaglesfield Waste water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity for development.		C	0	Waste Water Network – there is a rising main just outwith site boundary	0	Y
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water supply	PHH	Y	Winterhope Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity for development		C	0		0	Y
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Flood Risk Assessment required which would require to be agreed with SEPA.								
SEA OVERVIEW	Potential flood risk. Flood Risk Assessment required which would require to be agreed with SEPA.						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	N	
What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby	PHH	Y	North – Public open space and play area, East agricultural land, South – roads B7076, railway line and M74. West – housing. Substantial noise pollution from M74 and railway line.	SV	X	Appropriate screening and noise mitigation measures would be required.	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		O	0		0	N	
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Appropriate screening and noise mitigation measures would be required given proximity of railway line and M74.								
SEA OVERVIEW	Noise pollution from adjacent uses – M74 and railway line. Appropriate screening and noise mitigation measures would be required.						SEA SCORE: 0		

MATERIAL ASSETS									
Is the site.....		Brownfield	Y	Comment					
		Greenfield							
Is the site vacant or derelict		N	Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey	N	C,O	0		0	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			O			0	N
Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction		N	The site includes a former quarry which has been infilled.		C	X	Investigation will be required into the nature and suitability of the infill material.	0	Y
Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation	PHH	N			GIS, SV	0		0	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				0		0	N
Are there any of the following servicing constraints that impact on the development		Pylons	N	Bord Gais Eirann pipeline	N	Shell oil pipeline	N	Transco pipeline	N
	Comment: No known servicing constraints								

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

of the site											
Will development of the site require consultation with any of the following bodies		Air Traffic/NATS	N	MoD	N	Carlisle Airport	N	Coal Authority	N	HSE	N
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Former quarry which has been infilled. Investigation will be required into the nature and suitability of the infill material.										
SEA OVERVIEW	Brownfield site - could utilise existing infrastructure and reduce need to use undeveloped greenfield land. Former quarry which has been infilled. Investigation will be required into the nature and suitability of the infill material.									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 (6 units) can be accessed via the B7076 and a private lane served by Belmont Avenue U224a which serves a playground outwith the site boundary. It is unclear if the appropriate visibility can be achieved at the junction of the U224a or that an appropriate access can be formed to Council Standards. The access and lane onto the B7076 would require to be upgraded to adoptable standards. It should be noted that any proposed access to more than 2 dwellings must be designed and constructed as an adoptable road and any residential development of this proposed site should include parking provision in accordance with Dumfries and Galloway Council Parking Standards.									
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Site can be accessed via the B7076 and a private lane served by Belmont Avenue U224a. It is unclear if the appropriate visibility can be achieved at the junction of the U224a or that an appropriate access can be formed to Council Standards. The access and lane onto the B7076 would require to be upgraded to adoptable standards.										

CLIMATIC FACTORS											
What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)		South west				SV, GIS	0		0		
Can the site make best use of solar gain		Y					SV, GIS	0		0	
Is the site protected from prevailing winds		N	Potentially exposed to the SW.				SV, GIS	X	Appropriate tree planting along site boundary		0
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Appropriate tree planting along site boundary										
SEA OVERVIEW	Potentially exposed to the SW. Appropriate tree planting along site boundary									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 - No historic environment issues identified for this site, as of July 2016 Historic Built Environment - No Listed Buildings and no conservation area.					
Conservation Area		N	Inventory of Historic Battlefield	N							
World Heritage Site		N	Inventory & Non-Inventory	N							
Archaeological site		N	Garden or Designed Landscape	N							
Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment	L	N					C, GIS, SV	0		0	
PLANNING OVERVIEW	No designations affecting this site										

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

SEA OVERVIEW	No designations affecting this site						SEA SCORE: 0
---------------------	-------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	---------------------

LANDSCAPE										
Is the site within or adjoining any of the following			NSAs	N	RSAs	N	Comment Retain existing trees and add new ones to south-eastern boundary. Part of development should face onto the play area.			
			Wild Land	N	TPOs	N				
Will development of the site affect features of landscape, cultural or aesthetic interest, including watercourses, landforms, trees/woodland or significant slopes/changes in level		Y	Retain existing trees and hedgerows along boundary.			C, SV,	0	Supplement existing planting along the south eastern boundary.	0	Y
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement		Y				C, SV, GIS	0	Development layout should take into account links to adjoining playground and open space to north east of site.	0	Y
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		N				SV	0		0	N
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Supplement existing planting along the south eastern boundary. Development layout should take into account links to adjoining playground and open space to north east of site.									
SEA OVERVIEW	Supplement existing planting along the south eastern boundary. Development layout should take into account links to adjoining playground and open space to north east of site.						SEA SCORE: 0			

PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES										
Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	Y	Site included within the settlement boundary of the LDP as white land but not allocated for housing.								
Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site	Y	Site owned by DGHP and submitted through the Call for Sites exercise								
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips	N									
Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe	?	Further work needs to be done to determine how the site can be accessed and investigation of ground conditions.								
OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT	Considered to have some potential as a housing site and is an option for consideration as an alternative allocation. However, further work needs to be done to determine how the site can be accessed and investigation of ground conditions.									
OVERALL SEA COMMENT	Positive SEA impact in terms of Population and Human Health. Site is well located for community facilities. Scope to encourage active travel options									

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SITE ASSESSMENT AND SEA CHECKLIST

Site Ref: EGL.H203	Source of site suggestion:	Site history/previous planning applications, (ref. Nos. where applicable and approval date):	
Site name: land adjacent to former Roads Depot (EGL.H1)	Call for sites	00/P/4/0062 – erection of 10 detached houses – Approved 27 July 2000 – expired 26 July 2005	
Settlement: Eaglesfield	Current use:	[On the adjacent site to north-west current application: 16/1672/FUL - 30 dwellings, new access, access alteration with B722, SuDS basin, landscaping at former Roads Depot, Burnswark View, Eaglesfield – DECISION AWAITED]	
OS Grid Reference (Easting, Northing):	Rough grazing agricultural land	Existing LDP allocations/ designations:	
323011, 573997		No	
Site Size (ha): 2.15	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

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: the rough grazing area has potential for habitat for a number of species; there is a band of woodland adjoining the site and a water body to the south			
Are there any known invasive species within the site		N		GIS, SV	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		GIS, SV	0		0	Y
PLANNING OVERVIEW	No known loss of habitat for protected species.							
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	Evidence that the site may be used for informal recreation but is currently agricultural.		O, GIS, SV	0		0	N			
Are there any of the following within or adjacent to the site and will development impact on them	MA or CF		Distance (km)	<1	Comment: there are playing fields and play areas within 600m of the site.							
			Right of Way									
			Core path									
			Cycle path									
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	0.3
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:		Eaglesfield Primary School				Lockerbie Academy					
	Capacity:		23				116					
	Distance:		<1				10-15 [approx. 12km]					
Is the site within or immediately adjacent to the core areas of the biosphere	MA and B	N			GIS	0		0				
PLANNING OVERVIEW	The site is well located for local services, facilities and public transport											
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) Would involve loss of rough grazing but not prime agricultural land	4.1 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	0		0	N	
Are there any contaminated soils issues on the site		N	No known previous use	C	0		0	N	
Is the site on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat	CF	N		O, SV	0		0	N	
PLANNING OVERVIEW	No soil issues noted.								
SEA OVERVIEW	Neutral SEA impact						SEA SCORE: 0		

WATER								
Are there any watercourses, wetlands, and/or boggy areas on the site	B and L	N	Water body [small loch] adjacent to southern boundary of site and a minor watercourse flows along the site boundary	SV, GIS, C	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	Flood records held in connection to the site. Historical severe pluvial flooding issues. Site within potentially vulnerable flood area with watercourse on boundary. Records held of flooding in proximity of the site attributed to surface water/drainage issues. [DGFT] A minor watercourse flows along the site boundary which could represent a potential flood risk and various historical flooding records. [SEPA]	C	X	Flood Risk Assessment required.[DGFT & SEPA] Appropriate surface water mitigation to be implemented.	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)		Y	There is a rising main within the site which needs to be accommodated in any development.	C	0		0	Y
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the public foul sewer	PHH	Y	Eaglesfield Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity for development.	C	0		0	Y
Is there sufficient capacity for the development to connect to the mains water	PHH	Y	Winterhope Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity for development	C	0		0	Y

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

supply									
PLANNING OVERVIEW	There are a number of flooding issues to be overcome in any development								
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		
What are the surrounding land uses and are there possible polluting uses nearby	PHH	N	Residential and agriculture are the surrounding uses. Site is under 1km from M74 and West Coast Mainline Railway	GIS, 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		GIS, O	0		0		
PLANNING OVERVIEW	No air quality issues noted.								
SEA OVERVIEW	Neutral SEA impact						SEA SCORE: 0		

MATERIAL ASSETS									
Is the site.....		Brownfield	N	Comment: The current use is for rough grazing					
		Greenfield	Y						
Is the site vacant or derelict		N	Is it contained within the Vacant and Derelict Land Survey	C	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	There is a rising main on the site which may be part of the infrastructure for new development	C	0		0	N	
Does the site have existing and potential mineral extraction		N		GIS, O	0		0	N	
Is the site in the vicinity of a waste management site and could, therefore, compromise the waste handling operation	PHH	N		GIS, C	0		0	N	
Do sites for potential waste management facilities comply with the locational criteria set out in annex B of the Zero Waste Plan		n/a			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
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

(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	Development would result in the loss of a greenfield site.							
SEA OVERVIEW	Negative SEA impact						SEA SCORE: X	

ROADS/ACCESS									
Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities, can a suitable road access be achieved, does the access affect a trunk road, is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated			This site is remote from any public road and the only direct means off access would require the use of third party land. There is potential for this site to be developed with the adjacent site EGL.H1 which was formerly a Road Depot and fronts Burnswark View [U550a] with an existing private access which currently serves 4 dwellings. Given that this is the sole means of access it would therefore be appropriate that these sites are considered as one. Given the increase in traffic utilising the junction with the B722, it would be appropriate for improvement works to be completed at this point allowing a more suitable junction arrangement. This site and general area has known flooding and drainage issues which will require careful consideration. 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.						Y
PLANNING OVERVIEW	Roads constraint as the site is remote from any public road and the only direct means off access would require the use of third party land.								

CLIMATIC FACTORS								
What is the site aspect (e.g. N, W, etc.)			The site is relatively flat and has an open aspect to the south, south-west and south-east	SV, GIS	+		+	N
Can the site make best use of solar gain		Y	There is some potential for a design to allow solar gain.	SV, GIS	+		+	N
Is the site protected from prevailing winds		Y	The belt of trees to the south-west boundary provides some wind protection but is not in the same ownership as the site.	GIS, SV, C, O	0		0	N
PLANNING OVERVIEW	There is some potential for solar gain and protection from prevailing wind subject to retention of woodland on adjoining site							
SEA OVERVIEW	Positive SEA impact						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: Site bisected by course of Roman road; evaluation will be required.		
Conservation Area		N	Inventory of Historic Battlefield	N				
World Heritage Site		N	Inventory & Non-Inventory	N				
Archaeological site		Y	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
--------------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Will the development of the site result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment	L	N	Breaking ground for the development would provide an opportunity for archaeological discoveries but development of the site would permanently cover the roman camp/route once evaluation was complete	C, GIS	0	Evaluation and recording of the site may be required.	0	Y
---	---	---	---	--------	---	---	---	---

PLANNING OVERVIEW	This is a known archaeological site with potential for remains/artefacts to be uncovered.								
SEA OVERVIEW	Neutral SEA impact						SEA SCORE: 0		

LANDSCAPE

Is the site within or adjoining any of the following		NSAs	N	RSAs	N	Comment: Possible site; contained by woodland/open water (former quarry) and existing housing. Retain woodland / tree planting on eastern boundary and add tree/hedgerow planting to southern boundary. Possible safety issue with disused quarry to east? Overhead lines etc.
		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	The site is close to woodland trees and a small loch on an adjoin site. There is a watercourse along part of the boundary.	C, GIS, SV	0		0	
Will development of the site be well integrated visually with the existing settlement		N	The woodland belt to the south of the site would help screen it but it is not within the control of the site owners so may not be a permanent feature		0		0	
Are there any locally attractive views that will be impacted by development of the site		Y	Development of the site would impact on open views towards the south-west from the rear of Burnswark View.		0		0	

PLANNING OVERVIEW	There is potential for the landscape to be screened by woodland and take advantage of water features subject to ownership.								
SEA OVERVIEW	Neutral SEA impact						SEA SCORE: 0		

PLANNING/EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES

Is the site situated within or adjacent to a settlement boundary within the LDP	Y	The site directly adjoins an allocated housing site on the settlement boundary.
Have all landowners been identified and have they agreed to disposal/development of the site	Y	Single owner but the land either side is in separate ownership and may affect the ability to develop.
Are there any known restrictive covenants or ransom strips	Y	Site is remote from any public road and the only direct means off access would require the use of third party land.
Can the site be delivered within the LDP timeframe	?	It is not clear whether the adjoining ownership issues would affect delivery period

OVERALL PLANNING COMMENT	The site has not been included in the MIR as development is constrained by road access and other infrastructure difficulties. The site is remote from any public road and the only direct means off access would require the use of third party land. There are a number of other sites in Eaglesfield which have been included for housing development which are considered to meet the identified housing need.
---------------------------------	---

OVERALL SEA COMMENT	This site has a number of positive aspects however it would involve the loss of greenfield land.
----------------------------	--