Aberdeenshire
COUNCIL

ABERDEENSHIRE

Strategic Environmental Assessment

Assessment of sites – Kincardine and Mearns

January 2023

Strategic Environmental Assessment of New Allocated Sites and Alternative Bid Sites – Kincardine and Mearns

Contents

AUCHENBLAE

Preferred Sites

None that are new sites.

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: KN095 Smaller Site, East of Glenfarquhar Road, Auchenblae		**Proposal: 75 homes and 1ha employment land**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**-**	○ Laurencekirk Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW) has capacity for current allocations, which includes this site that was allocated in the LDP 2017. ○ Whitehillocks WTW (Water Treatment Works) has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required. This issue will be identified in the development requirements for the site. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The site is adjacent to Burnie Shag and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the Burnie Shag and should be integrated as a positive feature of the development."	0
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions, however the inclusion of 1Ha of employment land within the site could provide employment within the town, thus minimising travel to work.	-/0
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-
Biodiversity	**+**	○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat.	+

		○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to the Burnie Shag to the east would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities.	
Landscape	**0**	○ Significant scale development that would further alter the character of the area. However, the site is relatively flat and would appear to be a logical extension to the settlement. The impact could be mitigated by strategic landscaping, and if allocated, this will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site or designated as protected land. ○ Further, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	0
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely education provision at Auchenblae Primary and Mearns Academy, and a lack of community assets and services within the town. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	-/?
Population	**+**	○ A mix of house types is proposed resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population. ○ The development could allow integration of the people where they live and work. Employment opportunity in the village.	+
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ Development site includes a potential ring ditch. ○ The impact could be mitigated by undertaking an archaeological assessment, which would identify further actions. This will be stated in the development requirements for the site.	?
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN096 Larger Site, East of Glenfarquhar Road, Auchenblae	**Proposal: 75 homes and 1ha employment land**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**-**	○ Laurencekirk WWTW has capacity for current allocations, which includes this site that was allocated in the LDP 2017. ○ Whitehillocks WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required. This issue will be identified in the development requirements for the site. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	0

		○ The site is adjacent to Burnie Shag and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the Burnie Shag and should be integrated as a positive feature of the development. A Flood Risk Assessment may be required."	
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions, however the inclusion of 1Ha of employment land within the site could provide employment within the town, thus minimising travel to work. ○ Part of the site found to be at risk from fluvial flooding will not be included within an allocation and could form part of the open space provision. This could be further mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), and if allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA may or will be required.	-/0
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-
Biodiversity	**+**	○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to the Burnie Shag to the east would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities.	+
Landscape	**-/0**	○ Significant scale development that would further alter the character of the area. The site is relatively flat and would appear to be a logical extension to the settlement, but it would double the size of the settlement, elongating it further into the countryside. The impact could be mitigated by strategic landscaping to the north of the site, and if allocated, this will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site or designated as protected land. ○ Further, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	0/-
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely education provision at Auchenblae Primary and Mearns Academy, and a lack of community assets and services within the town. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	-/?
Population	**+**	○ A mix of house types is proposed resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population. ○ The development could allow integration of the people where they live and work. Employment opportunity in the village.	+
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ Development site includes a potential ring ditch. ○ The impact could be mitigated by undertaking an archaeological assessment, which would identify further actions. This will be stated in the development requirements for the site.	-
	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect		

Key	- = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect

BLAIRS

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP1 (KN110) Blairs College Estate	Proposal: 325 homes (enabling development)	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0/-**	○ In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality, although it is not in or near towns where air quality is approaching the EU objective. ○ It has poor links to other services, although a footpath is proposed across the River Dee. ○ Infrequent bus service to Banchory/Strachan and Aberdeen (twice a day – morning and night). Uncertain if proposal will increase this frequency.	0/-
Water	**--**	○ Nigg WWTW has sufficient capacity for this proposal. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, site water budgets, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The site is adjacent to the River Dee, which is classed as bad at this point. Part of site already has planning permission for the uses proposed (APP/2006/4973, APP/2013/1292 and APP/2017/0216) that shows the location of the SUDS ponds. ○ The site is bisected by minor watercourse (ditches) and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as a positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required."	0
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. ○ Infrequent bus service to Banchory/Strachan and Aberdeen (twice a day – morning and night). Uncertain if proposal will increase this frequency. ○ The site includes a few small areas at risk from surface water flooding and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. This would have been considered at the planning application stage. SUDS ponds are also proposed. A Flood Risk Assessment may be required.	-/0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0

Biodiversity	**--**	○ River Dee SAC is set directly to the north. The site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and the qualifying features are likely to be affected through tourism/visits by residents and drainage. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the River Dee SAC. A Habitats Regulations Appraisal will be required to assess impacts on River Dee SAC. ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity and given the existing use of the land the proposal could lead to improvements through increased semi natural space, woodland and potentially habitat corridors. ○ The site already has extant planning permission. The ALDP will protect the existing tree belts and proposed strategic landscaping.	0/+
Landscape	-	○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ However, the houses are proposed between the tree belts, which will break up the visual impact of this site. New tree planting is also proposed alongside the B9077 (South Deeside Road). ○ Part of the site is situated within the Aberdeen Greenbelt. Only the large enabling housing development is excluded from the green belt. The proposer seeks to include the whole bid site as a settlement. However, this would allow for infill development and could further affect the landscape character. As such, remainder of the site will not be identified, and it is proposed that only the two enabling housing areas will be allocated. The non-housing uses can be delivered through the approved 2006 planning application.	0/-
Material Assets	**-/+**	○ It will use up all available capacity at Lairhillock Primary School. This will have a long-term negative effect across North Kincardine. The scale of development does not justify a new school in the area. ○ Proposes no community facilities. ○ A footpath across the River Dee will provide links to services in Aberdeen.	-/+
Population	**+**	○ Planning permission has already been granted for this site. It includes 25% affordable housing.	+
Human Health	**0/+**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Provision of new housing and open space with new green networks has the potential to improve human health.	0/+
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ Affects setting of listed buildings within the Blairs College Estate. However, planning permission has already been provided and would have considered likely impacts. ○ Additional measures required to keep the buildings wind and watertight and stem further decay, while the feasibility of restoration and reuse is further explored. Liaise with HES's Building's casework team to discussions on this, in liaison with the Council's conservation officers. ○ Positive effects as the enabling development will allow repairs to be made to the listed buildings, especially those on the At Risk Register. ○ New developments that deviate from existing designs, layouts and materials could adversely affect the setting of historic settlements in the long-term.	+
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative Sites

None.

CHAPELTON

Preferred Sites

None that are new sites.

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: KN055 Chapelton		**Proposal: 8000 homes, Commercial, Retail, Care home, Leisure and Community Facilities**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**-**	○ A proposal of this scale will lead to a significant decrease in air quality (i.e. through increases in concentrations of air pollutants). Effects are likely to be medium/long-term. ○ Impact can be mitigated through use of public transport, good pedestrian linkages and the mix of uses proposed. ○ Good access off the A90 will be necessary to avoid congestion and increase air pollution.	-/0
Water	**+/--**	○ Proposal is within the Nigg WWTW catchment. The proposal will have a long-term positive effect as it will be served by a public waste water connection with adequate capacity and will provide a buffer strip and enhancement measures for a watercourse within the site. Such measures will be stated on the Settlement Statement. ○ Proposal is served by the Invercannie and Mannofield WTW. A new reservoir accommodates up to 802 units (phase 1A). After that further network upgrades are required. ○ Burn of Elrick classified as bad. This proposal could improve it.	+
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The site is within an area identified as low flood risk. Impacts are likely to be localised and medium/long-term. ○ Part of the site found to be at risk from flooding will form part of the open space provision, and/or, mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). If allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA will be required. ○ The proposal has the potential to cause a significant increase in CO_2 emissions through increased car travel. This will be mitigated by local employment opportunities. Effects are likely to be medium/long-term	0/-
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases	0

Biodiversity	**+/-**	○ Red Moss of Netherley SAC is set to the west. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and there is a potential to have an impact on the qualifying species through tourism/visits by residents. ○ The site has planning permission. Proposals restrict the rate of development. Drainage into the Red Moss of Netherly has been assessed and approved. Recreational impacts are unlikely due to the nature of the SAC habitat. ○ The development of this greenfield site is likely to have long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. However existing habitats will be significantly enhanced by open space provision and other biodiversity measures ○ The development is likely to enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links. ○ The development will result in the loss of existing trees, woodland and hedges. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to areas of woodland and watercourses will reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities.	+/-
Landscape	**-**	○ The scale and location are unlikely to have a negative impact on the landscape character. Change will occur within the landscape but the principles of the character of the area will remain unchanged except in this local area. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects. If necessary, a landscape and visual impact assessment will be required and will be stated in the development requirements for the site.	-/0
Material Assets	**++**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access and education provision at both Primary and Secondary schools, which will have a temporary effect. ○ Significant new assets, will be provided by this development including social Infrastructure (schools, housing, healthcare facilities); transport infrastructure (road, paths); water-delivery infrastructure; sewerage infrastructure; natural environment enhancements; telecommunication infrastructure and waste management infrastructure.	++
Population	**+**	○ The mix of house types proposed will resulting in housing choice for all groups of the population. ○ The development would allow integration of the people where they live and work. Employment opportunity in the village.	+
Human Health	**+**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths and would enhance these networks. ○ Poor air quality is likely to have a long-term effect on human health. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	+
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ Site contains numerous archaeological sites and several listed buildings. ○ Invariably the allocation will adversely affect the built features, their context, pattern of past historic use, and the setting in which they sit, in landscapes and within the soil (archaeology), and also in our towns, villages and streets. ○ Half of this site already has planning permission (APP/2011/3100), which contains most of the historic interests. They were assessed as part of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).	0/-

		○ In addition, given the current design pallet used for Chapelton and existing tree coverage, effects can be mitigated. If the whole site is allocated, the proposed mitigation measure(s) (e.g. archaeological assessment as part of an EIA) would be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

DRUMLITHIE

Preferred Sites

None that are new sites.

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: KN001 Land at Burnside Croft, Drumlithie		**Proposal: 3 Homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect - post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**-**	○ Drumlithie WWTW has capacity for LDP 2017 allocated sites, and a growth project is underway. Whitehillocks WTW has capacity. ○ Water quality classification described as bad. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ Site is adjacent to a Drumlithie Burn and a buffer strip would be required, but the indicative layout shows private gardens running along the back of the burn. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. “A buffer strip will be required adjacent to Drumlithie Burn and should be integrated as a positive feature of the development.”	-/?
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ There would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel.	-

		○ The centre of the site is at risk from surface water flooding risk and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. Development on this site may not be appropriate. Nonetheless, it could be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), and if allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA may or will be required.	
Soil	**+**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases ○ The proposed development would result in potential remediation of contaminated soil.	+
Biodiversity	**-**	○ The development could result in the loss of existing trees. There is no room for compensatory planting if removed. ○ The development is not likely to conserve, protect and enhance the diversity of species and habitats and the natural heritage of the area. ○ The development will result in the loss of existing trees with no room for compensatory planting. ○ The development may enhance biodiversity through redevelopment of brownfield land if the site has contamination.	-/0
Landscape	**-**	○ The loss of trees, except those with a Tree Preservation Order, will have a negative impact on the landscape character, and the effect is likely to be long-term. While this could be mitigated through replanting or retention of some trees, they will be in a private garden and could be removed. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations.	-
Material Assets	**0**	○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure.	0
Population	**0**	○ A proposal of this scale would have limited impact on the population.	-
Human Health	**-**	○ Would result in loss of part of the woodland corridor and amenity area for the village. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	-
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

DRUMOAK

Preferred Sites

None that are new sites.

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: KN034 Site A East of Drumoak		**Proposal: 178 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**-**	○ Drumoak WWTW is not available for this area and will require to be upgraded. This is a reversible short-term impact. If the site is allocated, the need for a WWTW growth project will be specified in the Settlement Statement. Invercannie and Mannofield WTW is being upgraded. ○ The site includes a watercourse and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should/will be integrated as a positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting." ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	0
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. ○ However, the site is next to a frequent bus route, but the lack of employment, means it will still be a commuter village.	-
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**-**	○ River Dee SAC is set to the south. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species through drainage and tourism/visits by the residents. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the River Dee SAC. ○ Woodland on the site is to be retained. As such, the development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation. However, it could cause disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat.	+

		○ Improvements to existing corridors may minimise any negative impacts and a buffer strip next to the areas of woodland and watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. If the site is allocated, the need for buffer strips will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	
Landscape	**-**	○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed but the overall field pattern will remain and is defined by mature trees given the development a landscape context. However, landscape impacts are unlikely to be significant as it breaks the natural tree belt that forms a boundary treatment for the settlement. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects and effects could be mitigated by new strategic landscaping along the eastern edge.	-/0
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely education provision waste water treatment and gas pipeline infrastructure. Material improvements will be required. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	-/0
Population	**+**	○ A mix of house types is proposed resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population.	+
Human Health	**--**	○ The proposal provides open space that could be proportionate with the scale of allocation. ○ The site is within a pipeline consultation zone, and reinforcing the pipe, rather than relocating it would impact on human safety. Options for either are proposed, but not confirmed.	--
Cultural Heritage	**?**	○ Is situated near Drum Castle and could affect its setting. A landscape and visual impact assessment would be required to ascertain impacts because of the northern part of the site. If the site is allocated, this would be stated in the development of the site.	?
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN035 Site B South of Drumoak	**Proposal: 123 homes**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**--**	○ Drumoak WWTW is not available for this area and will require to be upgraded. This is a reversible short-term impact. If the site is allocated, the need for a WWTW growth project will be specified in the Settlement Statement. Invercannie and Mannofield WTW is being upgraded.	0

		○ The site is bisected by a watercourse and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should/will be integrated as a positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting." ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, site water budgets, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. ○ However, the site is next to a frequent bus route, but the lack of employment, means it will still be a commuter village. ○ The south boundary of the site is in an area identified at risk from surface water flooding and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. Part of the site found to be at risk from flooding will not be included within an allocation and could form part of the open space provision. A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) may be required. If allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA may or will be required.	-
Soil	**0/-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land that is contained in the northeast corner, although this is currently overgrown. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	0/-
Biodiversity	**-**	○ River Dee SAC is set to the south. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species through drainage and tourism/visits by the residents. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the River Dee SAC. ○ The development is on a greenfield site that includes an area of scrubland that may have some biodiversity benefit. This area would be lost to development. ○ It could cause disturbance to species in the adjacent woodland at Keith's Muir. ○ Mitigation measures, such as compensatory planting or a buffer strip next to the area of woodland and watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. If the site is allocated, the need for compensatory planting and/or a buffer strips will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	-/+
Landscape	**--**	○ The site is located within the Dee Valley Special Landscape Area. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed but the overall field pattern will remain and is defined by mature trees given the development a landscape context. However, the scale and location of the proposal will have a negative impact on the landscape character, which is more rural in character, and the effect is likely to be long-term. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects and effects could be mitigated by open space throughout the development.	--
Material Assets	**--**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely secondary road access, education provision waste water treatment, and this proposal may limit expansion of the existing WWTW. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	-/?
Population	**+**	○ Proposes a mix of house types resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population.	+

		○ The development would not provide for integration of the people where they live and work. Employment opportunity in the village is limited.	
Human Health	**+/-**	○ The proposal provides open space proportionate with the scale of the allocation, but the quality and location around the periphery does not create a welcoming environment, as required in the LDP's policy on open space.	+
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN036 Site C West of Drumoak	**Proposal: 345 Homes, Retail and Commercial**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0/-**	○ There are currently limited employment opportunities within Drumoak and the proposal is therefore likely to result in an increase in car usage. This is likely to have a detrimental effect on air quality, but will not affect places with air quality issues in Aberdeenshire, but possible in Aberdeen.	0/-
Water	**-**	○ Drumoak WWTW is not available for this area and will require to be upgraded. This is a reversible short-term impact. If the site is allocated, the need for a WWTW growth project will be specified in the Settlement Statement. Invercannie and Mannofield WTW is being upgraded. ○ The site is adjacent to a watercourse and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should/will be integrated as a positive feature of the development." ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	0
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. ○ However, the site is next to a frequent bus route, but the lack of employment, means it will still be a commuter village.	-
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. There would be significant loss of agricultural land although this is not prime.	0
Biodiversity	**--**	○ River Dee SAC is set to the south. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species through drainage and tourism/visits by the residents. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the River Dee SAC.	0/+

		○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have long-term adverse impact on biodiversity and given the existing use of the land the proposal could lead to improvements through increased semi natural space, woodland and potentially habitat corridors. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to a watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. If the site is allocated, the need for a buffer strip will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	
Landscape	**-**	○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects and effects could be mitigated by new strategic landscaping to break up the development.	-/?
Material Assets	**-**	○ There is potential to facilitate better community facilities including a larger school site. ○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely education provision, waste water treatment and gas pipeline infrastructure. Material improvements will be required. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	-/0
Population	**+**	○ A mix of house types is proposed resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population. ○ The development could provide for a significant number of affordable units.	+
Human Health	**--/+**	○ The proposal provides open space proportionate with the scale of the allocation, but the steep area to the north may not be functional. ○ Provision of new housing and open space with new green networks has the potential to improve human health. ○ The inclusion of mixed use/retail could benefit the population as could an improved park in the centre of Drumoak, although not proposed in the indicative layout. ○ The site is within a pipeline consultation zone. It is proposed to be relocated to the edge of the site, but the site would still be within the consultation zone and potentially put people at risk.	--/+
Cultural Heritage	**?**	○ Is situated near Drum Castle, but the indicative design has the houses set back form the skyline. A landscape and visual impact assessment would be required to ascertain impacts because of the northern part of the site. If the site is allocated, this would be stated in the development of the site.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN037 Land West of Mains of Drum Garden Centre, Drumoak		**Proposal: Leisure and Recreational Uses in conjunction with housing for the elderly being proposed on the adjacent site to the west**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effects – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ Unlikely to have a significant effect on air quality	0
Water	**?/--**	○ The site is bisected by a watercourse and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as a positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting."	0
Climatic Factors	**?**	○ Unclear as to whether it impacts on travel movements, but no onsite concerns.	?
Soil	**0**	○ Unclear as to whether there would be any impact on soils.	0
Biodiversity	**?**	○ Unclear as to what impacts the proposal may have. Land is currently fields. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities.	+
Landscape	**?**	○ Proposal could have positive benefit in reinforcing landscape features, but insufficient detail provided.	?
Material Assets	**0**	○ Insufficient detail provided to conclude any wider benefit.	0
Population	**0**	○ Insufficient detail provided to conclude any wider benefit.	0
Human Health	**0**	○ Although there is insufficient detail on the proposal, the nature of the uses would suggest a positive impact.	+
Cultural Heritage	**?**	○ It is situated in close proximity to Drum Castle and is within its designed landscape. Effects are unknown as the proposal is unclear.	?
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN038 Land North of Mains of Steading, Drumoak		**Proposal: 50 Homes (for the Elderly)**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ No significant impact.	0
Water	**--**	○ Drumoak WWTW is not available for this area and will require to be upgraded. This is a reversible short-term impact. If the site is allocated, the need for a WWTW growth project will be specified in the Settlement Statement. Invercannie and Mannofield WTW is being upgraded. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The site is adjacent to and is bisected by watercourses and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "Buffer strips will be required adjacent to the watercourses should be integrated as a positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required."	0
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions but given the size of the development is unlikely to be significant. However, the site is next to a busy bus route, which could reduce commuter traffic. ○ A small part of the development is in an area identified at risk from surface water flooding and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. This could be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), and if allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA may or will be required.	-/0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**-**	○ River Dee SAC is set to the south. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species through drainage and tourism/visits by the residents. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the River Dee SAC. ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ The development is not likely to conserve, protect and enhance the diversity of species and habitats and the natural heritage of the area. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to the watercourses would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities.	0/+
Landscape	**-**	○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. This is unlikely to be significant and the impact could be mitigated by strategic landscaping.	-/0

Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site WWTW upgrade required, poor local services mean pressure on local healthcare. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	0
Population	**+**	○ Proposal provides land specifically for homes for the elderly. However, the site is remote from services.	+
Human Health	**0**	○ Unlikely to be significant impacts on human health.	0
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ It is situated 700m from Drum Castle and its designed landscape and could affect its setting. ○ The impact could be mitigated by strategic landscaping along its western boundary and if the site is allocated, the proposed mitigation measure would be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	0/-
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN064 Land at Park Quarry, Drumoak	**Proposal: 600 homes, employment land 11,350m2, retail**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**-**	○ The existing site is a quarry with associated dust, pollution and transport movements. This will be replaced by a mixed use development where emissions will largely be from private car use and heating. There is an infrequent bus service (twice a day that services the B9077).	-
Water	**--**	○ Drumoak WWTW is not available for this area and will require to be upgraded, but given its location across the river, a new WWTW may be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. If the site is allocated, this will be specified in the Settlement Statement. Invercannie and Mannofield WTW is being upgraded. ○ The site includes ponds and abuts the River Dee Special Area of Conservation and buffer strips would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "Buffer strips will be required adjacent to all waterbodies, including the River Dee and these will be integrated as a positive feature of the development. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required." ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	?
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. The B9077 is on a bus route, but it is very infrequent. ○ The development is close to an area at risk of flooding. Given climate change, flooding may become more extreme and could affect the site in the long-term – noted this is addressed.	-

Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development could result in remediation of contaminated soil, but quarries are not classed as brownfield land. ○ Any development on land not quarried, the proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**+/--**	○ River Dee SAC is set to the north and qualifying features are likely to be affected through tourism/visits by residents and drainage. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the River Dee SAC. ○ The development of a quarry is likely to improve the biodiversity of the site, such as buffer strips next to an area of woodland or watercourse, and would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities.	+/-
Landscape	**-**	○ The site is within the Dee Valley Special Landscape Area. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change but the restoration of the former quarry and associated planting is likely to have an overall improvement in landscape character by restoring former landscape features. ○ On the other hand, the introduction of a new settlement along the river valley will affect the landscape character unless the site is contained and screen by existing and new tree belts. There are few settlements on the southern side of the River Dee. Development adjacent to the B9077 would be visible and have a negative landscape impact. As such, it should be contained within the existing tree belt.	-
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access and education provision and waste water however with the possible exception of road access to Drumoak the proposal could deliver new community facilities in line with the scale of the bid. Park Bridge could be closed to vehicular traffic and upgrades along the A93 would be required. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	?
Population	**+**	○ The development would allow for a mix of house types and integration of the people where they meet and work and provide additional community facilities.	+
Human Health	**+**	○ New recreational opportunities and improvement to access in the local area.	+
Cultural Heritage	**--**	○ Potential adverse impact on the setting of Category B listed building Keith's Tower that has a key relationship with Category A listed Park Bridge. EIA would be required to assess potential impacts.	?
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN128 Land South of Deeview Gardens, Drumoak		**Proposal: 35 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect - post mitigation**
Air	0	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	-	○ Drumoak WWTW is not available for this area and will require to be upgraded. This is a reversible short-term impact. If the site is allocated, the need for a WWTW growth project will be specified in the Settlement Statement. Invercannie and Mannofield WTW is being upgraded. It is expected that a site of this size would not compromise the ability of the WWTW to expand. ○ The site is adjacent to a watercourse and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and will be integrated as a positive feature of the development". Due to the watercourse being a tributary of the River Dee a wider buffer strip will be required than is proposed to the south, and this need would also be stated in the development requirements of the site. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. There is a small standing water body on site (pond) which could be affected by the development and the site is close to the River Dee SAC. ○ Any new proposals should investigate the potential for watercourse realignment/restoration along straightened sections of the watercourse and implement these measures where viable.	0
Climatic Factors	-	○ A proposal on this scale is unlikely to have any effect on CO_2 emissions. ○ The south boundary of the site is in an area identified at risk from surface water flooding and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. Part of the site found to be at risk from flooding will not be included within an allocation and could form part of the open space provision, within a buffer strip. A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) may be required. If allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA will be required together with a buffer strip.	0
Soil	0	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases	0
Biodiversity	-	○ River Dee SAC is set to the southeast. The site is set at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and has a potential to disturb the qualifying features through tourism/visits by residents and drainage. Part of the site is semi-natural habitat and could impact on the Dee SAC. Recreational impacts on the River Dee are considered inconsequential. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the River Dee SAC. ○ The development may have an effect on adjacent ancient (semi-natural) woodland, native woodland on site, risking disturbance to species associated with the woodlands, pond and adjacent watercourse. ○ Through appropriate design the development has potential to avoid habitat fragmentation and improve connectivity through provision of buffer strip along south and western boundary, and protect existing native woodland within the site.	0

		○ Mitigation measures comprising a buffer strip next to existing woodland and watercourse, and protection of native woodland on site would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. If the site is allocated, these mitigation measures will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site, and highlighted as positive features of the site.	
Landscape	--	○ The site is located within the Dee Valley Special Landscape Area and lies within an area designated to protect and conserve the woodland setting for the village. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ However, landscape impact will be minimal as the site is contained by existing woodland and built residential area. ○ Landscape planting is proposed along the eastern boundary to mitigate any impact. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects. ○ If allocated, the mitigation measure of landscape planting will be stated as part of the development requirements of the site.	-/0
Material Assets	0	○ The scale of development would require a WWTW upgrade, but this is likely to be acceptable ○ The site connects well with the existing settlement with potential for increased provision of accessible open space (through access to existing woodland), enhancing existing path network and new linkages to existing roads. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers (notably WWTW) will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ The scale and nature of development overall provides a sustainable level of growth for the settlement, supporting local services and facilities.	0/+
Population	0	○ The development proposes a mix of housing types resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population.	+
Human Health	0	○ Unlikely to have an impact on human health. ○ The proposal has potential to provide open space proportionate with the scale of the allocation including potential for improved path network with links to existing core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	+
Cultural Heritage	0	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

DURRIS FOREST

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: R1 (KN129) Land at Durris Forest		**Proposal: Outdoor recreation facilities associated with a sport/adventure centre**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect - post mitigation**
Air	0	For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	-	○ The WWTW/WTW capacity is not available for this area and it is not clear at this stage how significant any private drainage will be. However, it is expected that this will be achievable. WWTW for ancillary development would need to be carefully managed. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses could occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, site water budgets, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term and mitigated	0/?
Climatic Factors	0	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions however this is likely to be mitigated by reduced travel to centres outwith the northeast of Scotland. ○ The site has a small watercourse running through it and a Flood Risk Assessment may be required depending on the nature and location of the development.	0
Soil	-	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. Given the nature of the development this may or may not be significant ○ Half of site has Type 5 Peat - a Phase 1 Habitat Survey will be required (this is both a soil and biodiversity impact). If allocated, this mitigation measure will be stated as part of the developer obligations of the site.	0
Biodiversity	-	○ The development may cause some disturbance of protected species however management of the woodland for recreation and biodiversity would mitigate this impact and could help improve biodiversity in the long-term. ○ Approximately half of the site has Type 5 peat and a Phase 1 Habitat Survey would be required. This would be stated in the development requirements for the site. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to existing watercourses and around existing pockets of native woodland on site amongst the commercial forestry, would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. If allocated, these mitigations will be highlighted in the Settlement Statement.	0
Landscape	0	○ The nature of land use in the area will not be changed, some features such as a chairlift may have minor negative visual impacts but in the context of the commercial forest setting they are unlikely to be significant.	0

Material Assets	++	○ The quality of the new asset, created through the development of this site, is of regional recreational importance and could have substantial benefits given the lack of this type of development in the wider area.	++
Population	+	○ Provision would be beneficial to the wider population.	0
Human Health	+	○ Increase recreational opportunities at a regional scale with improved access to open space for all.	+
Cultural Heritage	0/-	○ The development may have some impact on the setting of the Scheduled Monument at Carn Mon Earn burial cairn next to the site, but given the presence of masts in this location and uses proposed, it is unlikely any impacts would be significant. ○ Nonetheless, any impacts on the adjacent scheduled monument, Cairn-mon-earn, cairn, will need to be investigated and mitigated.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative Sites

None.

EDZELL WOODS AND NEWESK

Preferred Site

Site Ref: OP2 (NEW) Edzell Business Base		**Proposal: 53ha employment land**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect - post mitigation**
Air	0/-	○ A proposal of this scale will lead to a decrease in air quality, but Edzell Woods does not have air quality issues. Effects are likely to be medium/long-term. ○ Opportunities to enhance and encourage active transport would lessen carbon emissions related to vehicle use and would help offset any negative air quality impact.	0/-
Water	-	○ The WWTW capacity is not available for this area and it is not clear at this stage how significant any private drainage will be. However, it is expected that this will be achievable. Private sewage works owned by Edzell Woods Owners Group are nearby. The nearest public WWTW is in Edzell, approx. 2km away. Edzell is a SEPA Waste Water Drainage Consultation Area and private septic tanks are not supported. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Whitehillocks WTW has capacity at the service reservoir for residential development. Additional storage capacity may be required, as well as mains reinforcement. If allocated, this will be stated in the settlement statement. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses could occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term and mitigate.	0/?
Climatic Factors	-	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. ○ A proposal on this scale has potential to cause an increase in concentrations of CO_2 emissions through increased car travel. Effects are likely to be medium-term and will be lessened given the site is adjacent to Edzell Woods. ○ Part of the site is at risk from flooding and a Flood Risk Assessment may be required depending on the nature and location of the development.	-
Soil	--	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land, and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	--
Biodiversity	0/+	○ The site is currently farmland and is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity. ○ No measures to enhance biodiversity have been identified, but LDP policy requires all development to include open space and biodiversity enhancement.	0/+

Landscape	0	○ Significant scale development that would further alter the character of the area. However, the site is relatively flat and would appear to be a logical extension to the settlement.	0
Material Assets	+/--	○ The development is could impact on waste water infrastructure, but this would need to be resolved. Given its scale the site could provide biodiversity enhancement (e.g. trees).	+
Population	+/0	○ Provide employment land near where people live in Edzell Woods and south of Kincardine and Mearns.	+/0
Human Health	0	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Poor air quality is likely to have long-term effect on human health. ○ Promotion of sustainable transport modes would have a positive impact on human health.	0
Cultural Heritage	0	○ Impacts on historic environment (former WW1 and WW2 airfield) will need to be investigated and mitigated.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative sites

None.

FETTERCAIRN

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP1 (KN048) Land to the Northwest of Fettercairn		**Proposal: 60 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**0/-**	○ Whitehillocks WTW has capacity, but there is limited capacity at Fettercairn WWTW, but a growth project is proposed post 2021. Once infrastructure is installed there should be no adverse impact on water quality. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ It is proposed by Officers that the site is extended to Crichie Burn. A buffer strip would therefore be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the Crichie Burn and should be integrated as a positive feature of the development. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required."	0
Climatic Factors	**0/-**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel to services) and increased emissions. ○ However, there are local amenities in the village, which will reduce effects. ○ SUDS proposed along Crichie Burn, but this land floods, so land within the site will be required for SUDS, and land outwith the settlement and the site can be designated as protected land for open space/amenity.	0
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases ○ Will result in the loss of prime agricultural land. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ However, the site is a logical extension to the settlement in terms of proximity from services and meeting housing need.	-
Biodiversity	**0**	○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities.	0

Landscape	**0**	○ The site will not have an adverse impact on the settlement. It is contained by houses and trees on three sides, and given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects. ○ Strategic landscaping is proposed along the western boundary to mitigate effects. ○ However, active frontages are preferred along the periphery where they would form the settlement boundary.	0
Material Assets	**-/+**	○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure once the water and waste water works have been upgraded. ○ Indicative layout prevents any future westward expansion, should the need arise, and shows little open space. ○ Road access to Garrol Place should also be provided. ○ Modest provision of affordable housing (10-15 units).	+
Population	**0**	○ Limited mix of house types proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population (i.e. only 3+ bedrooms proposed). ○ However, 12 affordable units are proposed and LDP policy requires a mix of houses types.	+
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to negatively affect the historic environment (namely Fasque Design Landscape and Fettercairn Conservation Area) given the location of the site and the site being partially screen by houses and woodland. ○ However, new developments that deviate from existing designs, layouts and materials could adversely affect the setting of historic settlements in the long-term.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative sites

Site Ref: KN061 Land at Cauldcots, Fettercairn	**Proposal: 10 homes**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**-**	○ Whitehillocks WTW has capacity, but it is uncertain if there is sufficient capacity for WTWW for this area. The site is just under 1km from Fettercairn. However, it is not clear how sewage will be disposed of – the bid form states, “No connection required”. This is a reversible short-medium term impact.	?

		○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of ground water is poor. ○ The site is adjacent to a ditch and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as a positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required." ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure.	
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, the scale of the proposal will not result in negative effects.	0
Soil	**+/-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in remediation of contaminated soil. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land, but all of this site is brownfield (farm stead).	+
Biodiversity	**0/+**	○ The development is not likely to maintain or enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed. ○ The development will enhance biodiversity through redevelopment of brownfield land. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to the watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities.	0/+
Landscape	**-/0**	○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed, and while clusters of houses in the countryside are not a character of this area, given that this site is currently developed (a vacant farm), redeveloping the site will not adversely affect the landscape character of the area providing active frontage are used (i.e. no back garden fences). ○ Furthermore, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	0/?
Material Assets	**0/-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely waste water infrastructure, road access and education provision at Mearns Academy, which will have a temporary affect. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	?
Population	**0**	○ Moderate mix of house types is proposed resulting in some housing choice for all groups of the population.	0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. A local communal area of open space is proposed and a play area. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment (Fasque Designed Landscape and Fettercairn Conservation Area) due to the proximity, tree coverage screening the site and gently undulating topography. ○ New developments that deviate from existing designs, layouts and materials could adversely affect the setting of historic settlements in the long-term.	0

Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect

FINDON

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP1 (KN084) Land South of Earnsheugh Terrace		**Proposal: 11 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**0**	○ Nigg WWTW and Invercannie and Mannofield WTW have capacity. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	0
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, due to its scale, impacts would be very low.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**0**	○ The development of the greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity.	0
Landscape	**0**	○ Within the Coastal Zone. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ However, this is a logical location for development, as the site is partially enclosed by existing houses.	0
Material Assets	**0**	○ Number of homes is reduced as road is not wide enough to support the number of homes proposed. Widening the road would require private garden grounds.	0
Population	**-**	○ No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. ○ However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types. Would provide only 2 affordable homes.	0/+
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths.	0

		○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: KN085 Land West of Findon Place, Findon	**Proposal: 30 homes**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**0**	○ Nigg WWTW and Invercannie and Mannofield WTW have capacity. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	0
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, due to its scale, impacts would be very low.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**0**	○ The development of the greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity.	0
Landscape	**-**	○ Within the Coastal Zone. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ Proposal would result in overdevelopment and coalescence between the Findon and Blackhill Industrial Estate, and change the character of the village. ○ There are no mitigation measures that could lessen the negative impact.	-
Material Assets	**-**	○ It would increase the number of traffic on this C-class road and increase pressure on the Findon A90(T) junction, which is at capacity. The number of houses proposes are unlikely to be sufficient to mitigate the impact on the road network.	-
Population	**-**	○ No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types. Would provide 7 affordable homes.	+/0

		○ The development would allow integration of the people where they live and work. Employment opportunity next to the village.	
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

FORDOUN

Preferred Sites

None that are new sites.

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: KN105 Land West of Toch-Hill Road, Fordoun		**Proposal: 45 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ The scale of the development is unlikely to have any significant effects on air quality.	0
Water	**-**	○ The WWTW capacity at Laurencekirk is sufficient, as is the capacity at Whitehillocks WTW, but local mains reinforcement may be required. This will be highlighted in the settlement statement, if allocated. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse that leads to the Bervie Water where the quality of water bodies (ground, coastal, transitional or loch) is bad. ○ The site is adjacent to a minor watercourse (ditch) and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. “A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as a positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required.”	0
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The development is in an area identified at fluvial and surface water flood risk and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. ○ Part of the site found to be at risk from flooding will not be included within an allocation and could form part of the open space provision. The development requirements for the site would state that a FRA may or will be required. ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, the site is near a local bus route and its scale is not likely to have a significant effect.	0
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	-

		○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term.	
Biodiversity	**0/+**	○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities.	0/+
Landscape	**0**	○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. Large scale development that would result in overdevelopment. ○ However, the site is relatively flat and would appear to be a logical extension to the settlement. The visual impact could be mitigated by strategic landscaping.	0
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access and education provision which will have a temporary effect. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	0
Population	**+/0**	○ A mix of house types are proposed resulting in a housing choice for groups of the population.	+/0
Human Health	**-**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ Development is within Health and Safety Executive outer and middle pipeline consultation zones. Housing would not be within the Inner consultation zone.	-
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

GOURDON

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP1 (amended KN135) Land at Brae Road, South of Linton Business Park, Gourdon		**Proposal: 49 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ The scale of the development is unlikely to have any significant effects on air quality.	0
Water	**?**	○ Connects to Nether Know WWTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment may be required, depending on the nature and volume of discharge, to establish if the Sewage Pumping Station can cope with additional flows to storage capacity etc. As such, this will be stated in the development requirements for the settlement. ○ There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW. Local mains reinforcement may be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure.	0
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, the site is near a local bus route and its scale is not likely to have a significant effect. ○ The site does not lie in an area of flood risk.	0
Soil	**--**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the significant loss of prime agricultural land and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	--
Biodiversity	**-**	○ The revised bid is set back from Todhead Point to Johnshaven Coast Local Nature Conservation Site. If it is necessary to mitigate any effects, it could be requested that a buffer strip should be provided. This will be stated in the development requirements for the site.	0/-
Landscape	**-**	○ The site is located within the Coastal Zone and Southeast Coast Special Landscape Area.	-

		○ The scale and location of the proposal will have a negative impact on the landscape character, and the effect is likely to be long-term. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations. ○ Given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects. ○ The exposed coastal location of the site will present a significant challenge in terms of screening the development, or using landscaping to incorporate the development into the wider settlement. The use of inappropriate landscaping would exacerbate the negative elements of the scheme. ○ To mitigate its visual impact, development should be set back at least the width of the cemetery.	
Material Assets	**+**	○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure – it is noted that both the primary and secondary schools are forecast to be under capacity in 2022. ○ The development is of a scale that would contribute towards community infrastructure (>50 dwellinghouses, including affordable housing).	+
Population	**+/0**	○ A mix of house types are proposed resulting in a housing choice for groups of the population.	+/0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Poor air quality is likely to have a long-term effect on human health. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative Sites

None.

INVERBERVIE

Preferred Sites

None that are new sites.

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: KN130 Land at Bridgefield, North of Inverbervie		**Proposal: Housing (undisclosed)**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect - post mitigation**
Air	0	○ Bid does not include number of homes to be built – however given the scale of the site this is likely to be less than 50 homes (i.e. not a major development). ○ The site is disjointed from the rest of the settlement and residents would therefore be more likely to rely on private transport. ○ However, the scale of development is unlikely to have any effects on air quality.	0
Water	**?**	○ Connects to Nether Know WWTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment may be required, depending on the nature and volume of discharge, to establish if the Sewage Pumping Station can cope with additional flows to storage capacity etc. As such, this will be stated in the development requirements for the settlement. ○ There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW. Local mains reinforcement may be required. Developments above the 55m contour can only be accommodated by being served from the Knoxhill Water Supply Zone. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The site does not contain or lie immediately adjacent to a watercourse, nor is it in an area known to be at risk of fluvial flooding.	?
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. ○ However, the anticipated scale of the site is not likely to have any effect on CO_2 emissions. ○ The Council's Flood Prevention Unit state further investigation is required. Open drains are present north and south of this sloping site. The need for a Flood Risk Assessment would be stated in the development requirements for the site if it is allocated.	?/0
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	-

		○ The proposed development would result in the significant loss of prime agricultural land (class 3.1) and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	
Biodiversity	0	○ The development, including any new planting and open space provision, of this agricultural land is likely to lead to an improvement in the existing biodiversity of the site ○ However, biodiversity enhancements are unknown (not proposed). The development site may present opportunities to enhance biodiversity through design which would have a positive impact, however if these opportunities are not seized or utilised, the scheme is likely to have a neutral impact on biodiversity. ○ Mitigation measures such as new planting and other biodiversity enhancements through design would be stated as part of the development requirements of the site. ○ The site lies within the buffer zone of a LNCS, however provided that a connection to the public sewer is secured the scheme is unlikely to impact the LCNS as pathways will be limited. ○ The development is not likely to maintain or enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed.	0/?
Landscape	-	○ The site is situated in the Coastal Zone and the Southeast Aberdeenshire Special Landscape Area. ○ The site is located in a visually prominent area of land that forms a 'gateway' to Inverbervie and the development would have a negative impact on the landscape causing urbanisation of the countryside and the effect is likely to be long-term. Strategic planting is not expected to mitigate against this impact in this location. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations.	-
Material Assets	-	○ The proposal will lead to pressure on local infrastructure, namely road access, potentially WTW/WWTW capacity, and school capacity which overall will have a medium to long-term affect. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. Nonetheless there remains uncertainty with regard to infrastructure. ○ The site has poor connectivity with the settlement as it is segregated from the settlement by the Bervie Water valley, although the development would help support local services such as the shops.	0/?
Population	-	○ No details of housing types, numbers or tenures have been provided. However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types, which would be specified in the Settlement Statement (e.g. in the vision statement).	+/0
Human Health	0	○ It would not result in loss of open space or core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	0	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

JOHNSHAVEN

Preferred Site

None that are new sites.

Alternative sites

None.

KIRKTON OF DURRIS

Preferred Sites

None.

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: KN075 Land North of B9077, Kirkton of Durris		**Proposal: 12 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ Proposal is likely to have limited effect on air quality	0
Water	**--**	○ The WWTW capacity is not available and a private drainage system for 12 houses could have an impact on the River Dee Special Area of Conservation. Further discussion with the Scottish Environment Protection Agency would be required if this proposal were to be supported. Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity.	--/?
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, the scale of the proposal is insignificant to have an impact.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases	0
Biodiversity	**-**	○ River Dee SAC is set to the northwest and west. The site is at a close proximity to the qualifying site and the qualifying features are likely to be affected through tourism/visits by residents and drainage. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the River Dee SAC. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. ○ The development, including planting and open space, of this agricultural land is likely to lead to an improvement in the existing biodiversity of the site. Substantial planting is proposed along the north and eastern boundary. ○ However, the site is adjacent to the River Dee Special Area of Conservation and a buffer strip adjacent to the tributary is required.	+/0
Landscape	**--**	○ The site is located within the Dee Valley Special Landscape Area. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ Given the scale and location of the proposal in relation to the existing houses, it would result in overdevelopment in a sensitive landscape. ○ While screening is proposed, it would take several years to mature, although given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	-

		○ If the site was allocated, the proposed strategic landscaping and open space would be classified as protected land to avoid infill development. ○ A much smaller housing development along the north side of the road, which would fill in the gap between the existing houses and the two consented homes would be a more appropriate scale of development.	
Material Assets	**--**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely the lack of sewage treatment works in the area and education capacity at Woodlands of Durris Primary School, which will have a long-term effect. If the allocation at OP1 in Woodlands of Durris is increased to 50 homes, there will be no spare capacity at the school, and there is no room to extend the school.	--
Population	**0/-**	○ Limited mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population (3+ bedrooms only). ○ However, proposals must accord with the design policy in the LDP and include a mix of house types.	+/0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ There are two C listed cottages to the west of the site, and a B listed Glebe House and burial aisle and C list church to the north of the site. Development on the site would encroach on to their setting. However, effects are lessoned as the proposed houses, as shown in the indicative layout, are set further back and existing trees screen part of these listed buildings. ○ Mitigation measures, such as restricting the size of the allocation to the location of the houses proposed in the indicative layout could ensure effects are minimised.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN137 Land East of Kirkton House, South East of Kirkton of Durris	**Proposal: 20 homes**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**--**	○ The WWTW is not available and a private drainage system for around 20 houses could have an adverse impact on the River Dee Special Area of Conservation. Further discussions would be required with SEPA if this was supported. Durris WWTW is just under 1km for the site, but it requires upgrading to support the development. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ No impact on flooding or the watercourse subject to appropriate SUDS.	--/?

Climatic Factors	**0**	○ Unlikely to have an impact, but cumulatively the development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. The site is remote from employment and retail services. ○ Infrequent bus service to Banchory/Strachan and Aberdeen (twice a day – morning and night). Proposal is unlikely to increase this frequency.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**-**	○ River Dee SAC is set to the west. The site is at a close proximity to the qualifying site and the qualifying features are likely to be affected through tourism/visits by residents and drainage. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the River Dee SAC. ○ The development of this scrub woodland greenfield site is likely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ Clarity of where the compensatory planting will go is not clear in the bid form.	-
Landscape	**-**	○ The site is isolated from Kirkton of Durris by trees and has no physical connection. The impact of the proposal is unlikely to be mitigated unless it is screened by strategic planting. However, this proposal introduces 20 houses into the countryside where there is little else. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. Effects on the wider landscape are unlikely to be significant.	-
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely upgrading road access to an adoptable standard (road widening) and education provision at Woodlands of Durris Primary School, which will have a temporary effect. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ The development would help sustain the viability of the local school, but cumulatively there could be issues with other sites, as the school has limited room to extend.	-/+
Population	**-/?**	○ Limited mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. ○ However, proposals must accord with the design policy in the LDP and include a mix of house types.	+/0
Human Health	**-**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths and could contribute to the existing space by the school. ○ Development is within the Health and Safety Executive outer and middle pipeline consultation zones.	-
Cultural Heritage	**--/?**	○ Could affect the setting of scheduled field system, cairnfield and settlement at Upper Balfour. Strategic landscaping along the southeast boundary could reduce the impact on the setting of the cairns. This would be stated in the development requirement of the site.	-/0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

KIRKTON OF MARYCULTER

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: Infill (KN040) Land at Polston Road, Maryculter		**Proposal for infill (housing)**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	0	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	-/?	○ Insufficient capacity at Maryculter WWTW. A growth project may be initiated as a result of development of the adjacent site. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies is good (Crynoch Burn).	0
Climatic Factors	0	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) but a site of this scale is unlikely to have any effect on CO_2 emissions.	0
Soil	0	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases	0
Biodiversity	0/?	○ River Dee SAC is set to the east. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species through drainage. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts should development be promoted, and the proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the River Dee SAC. ○ Development is of a scale which is unlikely to negatively affect the adjacent LNCS or wider biodiversity, with modest biodiversity enhancements on site. ○ However, the proposal could result in the loss of trees that have grown on the site. ○ Mitigation measures, such as compensatory planting or retaining these trees would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. If the site is allocated, the need for compensatory planting and/or retaining existing trees will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	0
Landscape	0	○ The site is within the Aberdeen green belt, but it is sandwiched between houses to the south and OP1 to the north. Therefore, development is of a scale and in a location that is unlikely to have any effects on landscape quality. ○ Landscape also characterised by pockets of intimate landscape that can contain impact.	0

Material Assets	0	○ The proposal is unlikely to have any significant pressure on local infrastructure (notably WWTW and schools). ○ The site is a logical extension to the settlement in terms of proximity from services and meeting housing need.	0
Population	+/?	○ Mix of house types is unknown. ○ However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types. The density of the site could be increased to allow for local low-cost homes.	+/0
Human Health	0/?	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	0	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative sites

Site Ref: KN005 Site 1, Field 18, Maryculter		**Proposal: 36 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect - post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**0/?**	○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water is good, but where it joins the River Dee, it is bad. ○ Insufficient capacity at Maryculter WWTW. A growth project will be required to mitigate effects. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity.	0
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ There would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**-**	○ River Dee SAC is set to the east and west. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species through drainage. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the River Dee SAC.	0

Landscape	**-**	○ Within the Aberdeen green belt and the nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change.	-
Material Assets	**- -**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access, foul drainage and education provision at Primary and Secondary, which will have a short-term effect. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	-/?
Population	**-**	○ Limited mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP.	+/0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths.	0
Cultural Heritage	**- -**	○ Invariably the allocation will adversely affect the built features, their context, pattern of past historic use, and the setting in which they sit, in landscapes and also in Kirkton of Maryculter. Strategic landscaping could mitigate effects, but the openness of the area would be affected and unlikely to be fully mitigated.	- -
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN006 Site 2, Field 18, Maryculter		**Proposal: 36 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**0/?**	○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water is good, but where it joins the River Dee, it is bad. ○ Insufficient capacity at Maryculter WWTW. A growth project will be required to mitigate effects. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity.	0
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ There would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**-**	○ River Dee SAC is set to the east and west. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species through drainage. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the River Dee SAC.	0

Landscape	**-**	○ Within the Aberdeen green belt and the nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change.	-
Material Assets	**- -**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access, foul drainage and education provision at Primary and Secondary, which will have a short-term effect. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	-/?
Population	**-**	○ Limited mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP.	+/0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths.	0
Cultural Heritage	**- -**	○ Invariably the allocation will adversely affect the built features, their context, pattern of past historic use, and the setting in which they sit, in landscapes and also in Kirkton of Maryculter. Strategic landscapinge could mitigate effects on the setting of the listed buildings, but the openness of the area would be lost and unlikely to be fully mitigated. ○ Is adjacent to a scheduled cropmark enclosure, but it is unlikely to have any effects on this historic asset. However, as a precaution, an Archaeological Survey may be required	- -
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN007 Site 3, Field 3, Maryculter		**Proposal: 6 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effects – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**0/?**	○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near the River Dee, which is classed as poor then bad downstream. ○ Insufficient capacity at Maryculter WWTW. A growth project will be required to mitigate effects. Possible minor effect if private waste water treatment is required. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity.	0/-
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ There would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**-**	○ River Dee SAC is set to the west. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species through drainage. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the River Dee SAC.	0

Landscape	**-**	○ Within the Aberdeen green belt and the nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change.	-
Material Assets	**- -**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access, foul drainage and education provision at Primary and Secondary, which will have a short-term effect. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	-/0
Population	**-**	○ Limited mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP.	+/0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ It is adjacent to a former designed landscape at Templars Park, but it is unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN008 Site 4, Field 12, Maryculter		**Proposal: 1 house**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**0/-**	○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near Crynoch Burn where the quality of water is good, but where it joins the River Dee, it is bad. ○ Insufficient capacity at Maryculter WWTW, which is less than 1km away. Possible minor effect if private waste water treatment required. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity.	0/-
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ There would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**0**	○ Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity.	0
Landscape	**-**	○ Within the Aberdeen green belt and the nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change.	-
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely foul drainage and education provision at Primary and Secondary, which will have a short-term effect.	0/?

		○ Scale of development is too small to be allocated and would need to be determined under relevant LDP policies.	
Population	**-**	○ Potential for negative cumulative effects on the variety of house types, as only a single house is proposed in the countryside and there are other similar-sized single houses adjacent or nearby.	-
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN009 Site 5, Field 12, Maryculter		**Proposal: 1 house**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**0/-**	○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near Crynoch Burn where the quality of water is good, but where it joins the River Dee, it is bad. ○ Insufficient capacity at Maryculter WWTW, which is less than 1km away. Possible minor effect if private waste water treatment required. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity.	0/-
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ There would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**0**	○ Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity.	0
Landscape	**-**	○ Within the Aberdeen green belt and the nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change.	-
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely foul drainage and education provision at Primary and Secondary, which will have a short-term effect. ○ Scale of development is too small to be allocated and would need to be determined under the relevant LDP policies.	0/?
Population	**-**	○ Potential for negative cumulative effects on the variety of house types, as only a single house is proposed in the countryside and there are other similar-sized single houses adjacent or nearby.	-
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths.	0

Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN010 Site 6, Field 12, Maryculter		**Proposal: 1 house**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**0/-**	○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near Crynoch Burn where the quality of water is good, but where it joins the River Dee, it is bad. ○ Insufficient capacity at Maryculter WWTW, which is less than 1km away. Possible minor effect if private waste water treatment required. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity.	0/-
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ There would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**0**	○ Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity.	0
Landscape	**-**	○ Within the Aberdeen green belt and the nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change.	-
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely foul drainage and education provision at Primary and Secondary, which will have a short-term effect. ○ Scale of development is too small to be allocated and would need to be determined under the relevant LDP policies.	0/?
Population	**-**	○ Potential for negative cumulative effects on the variety of house types, as only a single house is proposed in the countryside and there are other similar-sized single houses adjacent or nearby.	-
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN011 Site 7, Field 12, Maryculter		Proposal: 1 house	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**0/-**	○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near Crynoch Burn where the quality of water is good, but where it joins the River Dee, it is bad. ○ Insufficient capacity at Maryculter WWTW, which is less than 1km away. Possible minor effect if private waste water treatment required. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity.	0/-
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ There would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**0**	○ Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity.	0
Landscape	**-**	○ Within the Aberdeen green belt and the nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change.	-
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely foul drainage and education provision at Primary and Secondary, which will have a short-term effect. ○ Scale of development is too small to be allocated and would need to be determined under relevant LDP policies.	0/?
Population	**-**	○ Potential for negative cumulative effects on the variety of house types, as only a single house is proposed in the countryside and there are other similar-sized single houses adjacent or nearby.	-
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Is adjacent to a scheduled cropmark enclosure, but it is unlikely to have any effects on this historic asset. However, as a precaution, an Archaeological Survey may be required.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN012 Site 8, Field 11, Maryculter		**Proposal: 1 house**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**0/-**	○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse that feeds into the River Dee where the quality of water is moderate and just after Peterculter, it is bad. ○ Insufficient capacity at Maryculter WWTW, which is less than 1km away. Possible minor effect if private waste water treatment required. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity.	0/-
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ There would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**0**	○ Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity.	0
Landscape	**-**	○ Within the Aberdeen green belt and the nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change.	-
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely foul drainage and education provision at Primary and Secondary, which will have a short-term effect. ○ Scale of development is too small to be allocated and would need to be determined under relevant LDP policies.	0/?
Population	**-**	○ Potential for negative cumulative effects on the variety of house types, as only a single house is proposed in the countryside and there are other similar-sized single houses adjacent or nearby.	-
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on historic assets.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN013 Site 9, Field 11, Maryculter		**Proposal: 1 house**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**0/-**	○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse that feeds into the River Dee where the quality of water is moderate and just after Peterculter, it is bad. ○ Insufficient capacity at Maryculter WWTW, which is less than 1km away. Possible minor effect if private waste water treatment required. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity.	0/-
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ There would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**0**	○ Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity.	0
Landscape	**-**	○ Within the Aberdeen green belt and the nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change.	-
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely foul drainage and education provision at Primary and Secondary, which will have a short-term effect. ○ Scale of development is too small to be allocated and would need to be determined under relevant LDP policies.	0/?
Population	**-**	○ Potential for negative cumulative effects on the variety of house types, as only a single house is proposed in the countryside and there are other similar-sized single houses adjacent or nearby.	-
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on historic assets.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

LAURENCEKIRK

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP4 (KN024) Land north of Gardenston Street		**Proposal: 20 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ In terms of air quality, the development is unlikely to have long-term negative effect on air quality.	0
Water	**-**	○ A growth project at Laurencekirk WWTW has been completed. It took into account all domestic allocations in the current LDP up to 2020. As such, further upgrades may be required. This is a reversible short-medium term impact. ○ There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW, but a Strategic WIA will be required for all sites. About 1.6km of existing main needs to be replaced so that it can cope with the higher flows and pressures needed to support any further expansion in the town. The Service Reservoir is also nearing capacity and will require to be enlarged to accommodate further growth to maintain storage levels/Security of Supply. Water main may need upsizing. If allocated, these issues will be highlighted in the settlement statement. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near Gaugers Burn that feeds into the Luther Water, where the quality of water bodies is moderate. Ground water is categorised as poor. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure.	0
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ A Flood Risk Assessment will be required to assess the risk from the Gaugers Burn and consideration should be given to any culverts/bridges which may exacerbate flood risk. ○ There would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel.	0
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land, and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-
Biodiversity	**0**	○ Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity.	0

Landscape	**0**	○ This is a small-scale development that is or will be mostly enclosed by development. The site is flat, and it is a logical location for further housing. Strategic landscaping can help mitigate effects along the core path to Denlethen Wood.	0
Material Assets	**-/0**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely education provision at the secondary and primary schools (although this would be marginal). These issues would need to be resolved in the short-term. ○ There may be a need to upgrade the road access in the site.	0
Population	**-/0**	○ No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. ○ However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types, and the density of the site could be increased. The local community has also expressed a need for smaller homes, which would be specified in the Settlement Statement (e.g. in the vision statement).	+/0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: OP5 (KN022) Land south of Gardenston Street	**Proposal: 11 homes**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ In terms of air quality, the development is unlikely to have long-term negative effect on air quality. ○ Site is on a bus route.	0
Water	**-**	○ A growth project at Laurencekirk WWTW has been completed. It took into account all domestic allocations in the current LDP up to 2020. As such, further upgrades may be required. This is a reversible short-medium term impact. ○ There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW, but a Strategic WIA will be required for all sites. About 1.6km of existing main needs to be replaced so that it can cope with the higher flows and pressures needed to support any further expansion in the town. The Service Reservoir is also nearing capacity and will require to be enlarged to accommodate further growth to maintain storage levels/Security of Supply. Water main may need upsizing. If allocated, these issues will be highlighted in the settlement statement. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is next to Gaugers Burn that feeds into the Luther Water, where the quality of water bodies is moderate. Ground water is categorised as poor.	0

		○ A buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent Gaugers Burn and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. A Flood Risk Assessment will be required."	
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ There would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel. ○ Within the settlement boundary and less than 1km from services.	0
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land, and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-
Biodiversity	**0/+**	○ Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity. ○ Phase 1 Habitats Survey would be undertaken to identify if protected species will be affected. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. ○ Existing burn to be enhanced and protected by a landscape buffer. ○ If the site is allocated, the need for a buffer strip will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	+
Landscape	**0**	○ Although visually prominent from the southern gateway into the settlement, this is a small-scale development that is enclosed by development, and is a logical location for further development. Strategic landscaping along the Gaugers Burn can provide an appropriate boundary treatment, and if allocated, this will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	0/+
Material Assets	**-/0**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely education provision at the secondary and primary schools (although this would be marginal). This issue would need to be resolved in the short-term. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	0
Population	**-/0**	○ No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and the local community has expressed a need for smaller homes, which would be specified in the Settlement Statement (e.g. in the vision statement). ○ The development is proposed close to existing services and employment.	?
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: OP6 (KN073) Land south of High Street		**Proposal: Mix of uses including 100 homes, 0.8ha employment land and a petrol station**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0/-**	○ The development is likely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality. Laurencekirk not identified as having air quality issues. ○ Employment uses are unlikely to adversely affect air quality. ○ The site is next to a bus route and within walking distance of services and facilities.	0
Water	**-**	○ A growth project at Laurencekirk WWTW has been completed. It took into account all domestic allocations in the current LDP up to 2020. As such, further upgrades may be required. This is a reversible short-medium term impact. ○ There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW, but a Strategic WIA will be required for all sites. About 1.6km of existing main needs to be replaced so that it can cope with the higher flows and pressures needed to support any further expansion in the town. The Service Reservoir is also nearing capacity and will require to be enlarged to accommodate further growth to maintain storage levels/Security of Supply. Water main may need upsizing. If allocated, these issues will be highlighted in the settlement statement. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ Ground water is categorised as poor. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure. ○ The site is adjacent to Gaugers Burn and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to Gaugers Burn and should/will be integrated as positive feature of the development. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required."	0
Climatic Factors	**-/0**	○ There would be lower CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel given the services and facilities available in Laurencekirk, and that is it next to the A90. Effects are likely to be medium. ○ Effects are also reduced as it is a mixed-use site. ○ Surface water flood risk in the northeast corner, off the High Street. Can be mitigated with proposed rain gardens proposed and SUDS ponds adjacent to existing burn. Risk will be localised. A Flood Risk Assessment will be required.	0
Soil	**--**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of class 2 prime agricultural land, and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	--
Biodiversity	**+/0**	○ Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity.	+

		○ New planting proposed along the A90 and Gaugers Burn. This mitigation measure will be set out in the development requirement for the site, if it is allocated.	
Landscape	**-/0**	○ This is a large development that would further alter the character of the area. It will introduce development beyond the existing tree line of ancient woodland, which acts as a natural boundary of Laurencekirk. However, the site is relatively flat, and the visual impact on the setting of the town is reduced as the ancient woodland could also act as a natural backdrop, and development is set back from the A90 as additional landscaping is proposed alongside the A90. ○ It is also a logical location for development, especially the employment land element. ○ Given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	-/0
Material Assets	**-/+**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely water, waste water provision, and education provision at the secondary and primary school. However, these effects are resolvable, so are only temporary. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ Provision of affordable housing (19-25 homes).	+
Population	**+**	○ Mix of house types is proposed resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population. ○ The development would allow integration of the people where they live and work. Employment opportunity in the settlement.	+
Human Health	**0**	○ New areas of open space will be proposed. Potential to improve linkages to Denlethen Wood, but this is not confirmed.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to affect the setting of the C listed Johnston Lodge's West Lodge Gates.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: OP7 (part of KN114) Land West of Fordoun Road	**Proposal: 15 homes (self-build)**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ In terms of air quality, the development is unlikely to have long-term negative effect on air quality.	0
Water	**-**	○ A growth project at Laurencekirk WWTW has been completed. It took into account all domestic allocations in the current LDP up to 2020. As such, further upgrades may be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW, but a Strategic WIA will be required for all sites. About 1.6km of existing main needs to be replaced so that it can cope with the higher flows and pressures needed to support any further expansion in the town. The Service Reservoir is also nearing capacity and will require to be enlarged to accommodate further growth to maintain storage levels/Security of Supply. Water main may need upsizing. If allocated, these issues will be highlighted in the settlement statement.	0

		○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ Ground water is categorised as poor. Luthermuir Water is classified as moderate ecological potential. ○ The site is adjacent to a watercourse and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the minor watercourse should be integrated as positive feature of the development. A Flood Risk Assessment may be required."	
Climatic Factors	**0/-**	○ There would be lower CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel given the services and facilities available in Laurencekirk, and that is it next to the A90. Effects are likely to be medium. ○ The edge of the site is at risk from fluvial flooding from a small watercourse to the west. A FRA will be required and this will be specified in the development requirements for the site.	0
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land, and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-
Biodiversity	**0/+**	○ Arable land. Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity. ○ Enhancing the existing tree belt will improve biodiversity. ○ Impact on watercourses will be mitigated by buffer strips.	0/+
Landscape	**0**	○ This is a large low-density development that would elongate the settlement further into the countryside. However, the site gently slopes away from the settlement, is partially contained by a tree belt to the west, extends no further than allocated site OP1, and would appear to be a logical extension to the settlement. The site would have minimum visual impact, and any impacts can be mitigated by strategic landscaping.	0
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely water provision, road access and education provision at the secondary and primary school. However, these effects are resolvable, so are only temporary. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	0
Population	**-**	○ No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. ○ However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types.	+/-
Human Health	**0**	○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ The site contains a cropmark of a square enclosure plus possible arc of a ditch and is listed on the sites and Monument Record. An Archaeological Assessment would be required for the rest of the site. This will be set out in the development requirements for the site.	0/-
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: KN017 Land at Westlodge, Laurencekirk		**Proposal: 12 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ In terms of air quality, the development is unlikely to have long-term negative effect on air quality. ○ Site is on a bus route.	0
Water	**-**	○ A growth project at Laurencekirk WWTW has been completed. It took into account all domestic allocations in the current LDP up to 2020. As such, further upgrades may be required. This is a reversible short-medium term impact. ○ There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW, but a Strategic WIA will be required for all sites. About 1.6km of existing main needs to be replaced so that it can cope with the higher flows and pressures needed to support any further expansion in the town. The Service Reservoir is also nearing capacity and will require to be enlarged to accommodate further growth to maintain storage levels/Security of Supply. Water main may need upsizing. If allocated, these issues will be highlighted in the settlement statement. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse that feeds into the Luther Water, where the quality of water bodies is moderate. Ground water is categorised as poor. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure.	0
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ There would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel. ○ Within the settlement boundary and less than 1km from services.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**0**	○ Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity if the ancient woodland is not affected. ○ Partially development, and a Phase 1 Habitats Survey would be undertaken to identify if protected species will be affected. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities.	0
Landscape	**0**	○ This is a small-scale development that is partially screened by trees and houses, and as it will not exceed the existing building line, will not adversely affect the setting of Laurencekirk.	0
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access and education provision at the secondary and primary schools (although this would be marginal). The former issues would need to be resolved in the short-term.	0

		○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	
Population	**-**	○ No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and the local community has expressed a need for smaller homes. ○ Affordable homes are not proposed in the bid, but are required in the LDP. ○ However, the development is proposed close to existing services and employment.	+/0
Human Health	**0/+**	○ It would not result in loss of open space core paths. Off-site contributions could help either existing open space or access to core paths at Denlethen Woods. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0/+
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN018 Site OP3, Land at Beattie Lodge, Laurencekirk	**Proposal: 20 homes**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ In terms of air quality, the development is unlikely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality. ○ Site is near a bus route.	0
Water	**-**	○ A growth project at Laurencekirk WWTW has been completed. It took into account all domestic allocations in the current LDP up to 2020. As such, further upgrades may be required. This is a reversible short-medium term impact. ○ There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW, but a Strategic WIA will be required for all sites. About 1.6km of existing main needs to be replaced so that it can cope with the higher flows and pressures needed to support any further expansion in the town. The Service Reservoir is also nearing capacity and will require to be enlarged to accommodate further growth to maintain storage levels/Security of Supply. Water main may need upsizing. If allocated, these issues will be highlighted in the settlement statement. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ Ground water is categorised as poor. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure.	0

Climatic Factors	**0**	○ There would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel. ○ Within the settlement boundary and less than 1km from services.	0
Soil	**0/-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ Would result in the minor loss of prime agricultural land. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	0/-
Biodiversity	**-**	○ Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity. ○ However, if access is taken off Garvocklea Gardens it would result in the loss of trees, which could be replaced as part of the open space for the site.	0/?
Landscape	**0**	○ This is a small-scale development that is partially screened by trees and houses, and as it will not exceed the existing building line at Garvocklea Gardens, will not adversely affect the setting of Laurencekirk.	0
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely waste water provision and education provision at the secondary and primary school (although this would be marginal). The former issues would need to be resolved in the short-term.	0
Population	**+/0**	○ Mix of house types is proposed. Bid form mentions a Housing Association, but it also notes that the site will be privately built. ○ The site is closed to existing services and employment.	+/0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN019 Land at Beattie Lodge, Laurencekirk	**Proposal: 150 homes**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**-**	○ In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality. ○ However, the site is near a bus route and within walking distance of services and facilities.	0/-
Water	**--**	○ A growth project at Laurencekirk WWTW has been completed. It took into account all domestic allocations in the current LDP up to 2020. As such, further upgrades may be required. This is a reversible medium-term impact.	0

		○ There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW, but a Strategic WIA will be required for all sites. About 1.6km of existing main needs to be replaced so that it can cope with the higher flows and pressures needed to support any further expansion in the town. The Service Reservoir is also nearing capacity and will require to be enlarged to accommodate further growth to maintain storage levels/Security of Supply. Water main may need upsizing. If allocated, these issues will be highlighted in the settlement statement. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ Ground water is categorised as poor.	
Climatic Factors	**-/0**	○ There would be high CO_2 emissions from general travelling, but these would be offset as the site is less than 1km from services and facilities. ○ Renewables are proposed on the site.	0
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land, and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term.	-
Biodiversity	**0**	○ Arable land. Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity.	0
Landscape	**0**	○ Significant scale development that would further alter the character of the area. However, the site is relatively flat and would appear to be a logical extension to the settlement. The impact could be mitigated by strategic landscaping.	0
Material Assets	**--/++**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely waste water provision, road access and education provision at the secondary and primary schools. However, these effects are resolvable, so are only temporary. ○ Provision of affordable housing and open space and potential to expand Cairn Wood.	++
Population	**+**	○ Mix of house types is proposed. Bid form mentions a Housing Association, but it also notes that the site will be privately built. ○ The site is closed to existing services and employment.	+
Human Health	**-/+**	○ Opportunity to provide an alternative route to the recreation ground, if well designed. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ Development within the Health and Safety Executive outer and middle pipeline consultation zones. HSE has not been objecting to planning applications of less than 40dph.	-/+
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ The two storey B listed Johnston Lodge - Beattie Lodge is only partially screened. Setting could be affected if development is poorly designed. ○ Any proposed mitigation measure(s) would be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	0/-
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN020 Land South-West of Cemetery at Beattie Lodge, Laurencekirk		**Proposal: 20 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ The development is unlikely to have long-term negative effect on air quality. ○ The site is near a bus route and within walking distance of services and facilities.	0
Water	**-**	○ A growth project at Laurencekirk WWTW has been completed. It took into account all domestic allocations in the current LDP up to 2020. As such, further upgrades may be required. This is a reversible short-medium term impact. ○ There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW, but a Strategic WIA will be required for all sites. About 1.6km of existing main needs to be replaced so that it can cope with the higher flows and pressures needed to support any further expansion in the town. The Service Reservoir is also nearing capacity and will require to be enlarged to accommodate further growth to maintain storage levels/Security of Supply. Water main may need upsizing. If allocated, these issues will be highlighted in the settlement statement. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ Ground water is categorised as poor.	0
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ There would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel.	0
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land, and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-
Biodiversity	**-**	○ The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of Cairn Wood. ○ Compensatory planting proposed along a bund adjacent to the A90. However, increasing the density of the site would negate the need to remove the trees.	?
Landscape	**-**	○ Large low-density site that would further alter the character of the area. However, the site is relatively flat the impact could be mitigated by strategic landscaping. A “landscape mound” is proposed, but this would alter the character of the landscape, which is flat. Furthermore, the houses would be visible along the A90 when the bund stops. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	-/0
Material Assets	**--**	○ Would result in the loss of land reserved for the long-term expansion of the cemetery.	-

		○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely water provision, road access and education provision at the secondary and primary schools. However, these effects are resolvable, so are only temporary. ○ Provision of affordable housing.	
Population	**-**	○ Only detached homes are proposed, which limits the housing choice available. However, 25% of the site will be affordable. ○ However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP.	-/0
Human Health	**-**	○ Would result in loss of open space – Cairn Wood. Increasing the density of the site would negate the need to remove the trees. ○ Development is wholly within Health and Safety Executive middle pipeline consultation zone. However, the HSE has not objected to low density developments on other sites (e.g. <40dph).	-/?
Cultural Heritage	**-/?**	○ The setting of the two storey B listed Johnston Lodge - Beattie Lodge could be affected as the proposed road access runs next to it. In terms of visual impact, most of the site is screened by existing vegetation. ○ Any proposed development on this site would have to be well sited and designed. Any proposed mitigation measure(s) would be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	0/-
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN021 Land North-East of Cemetery at Beattie Lodge, Laurencekirk		**Proposal: 600m2 employment land (e.g. drive through restaurant or petrol station)**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ Is unlikely to have long-term negative effect on air quality. Laurencekirk not identified as having air quality issues.	0
Water	**?**	○ A growth project at Laurencekirk WWTW has been completed. It took into account all domestic allocations in the current LDP up to 2020. The demand for water and wastewater capacity for the non-domestic element of this development will depend on the business use. ○ There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW, but a Strategic WIA will be required for all sites. About 1.6km of existing main needs to be replaced so that it can cope with the higher flows and pressures needed to support any further expansion in the town. The Service Reservoir is also nearing capacity and will require to be enlarged to accommodate further growth to maintain storage levels/Security of Supply. Water main may need upsizing. If allocated, these issues will be highlighted in the settlement statement. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ Ground water is categorised as poor.	0

		○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure.	
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ Unlikely to have an impact on CO_2 emissions.	0
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of class 2 prime agricultural land, and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-
Biodiversity	**0**	○ Site used for grazing and has limited biodiversity value.	0
Landscape	**-/0**	○ The location of the proposal will have a negative impact on the landscape character and sense of place. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects. ○ Development is set back from the A90 which would mitigate its impact, and uncertain how much screening there will be if the site is to be a drive through that relies on passing trade. Good design and use of materials could reduce its visual impact.	0/-
Material Assets	**0**	○ Proposal is unlikely to lead to a significant increase on pressure on local infrastructure.	0
Population	**+**	○ Employment opportunity in the village.	0
Human Health	**-/0**	○ Loss of green network, although it is not accessible, as it is used for grazing. ○ However, the site contributes to the setting of the settlement.	-/0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN023 Land Adjacent to Railway Line, Gardenston Street, Laurencekirk	**Proposal: 5 homes**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ In terms of air quality, the development is unlikely to have long-term negative effect on air quality.	0
Water	**-/0**	○ A growth project at Laurencekirk WWTW has been completed. It took into account all domestic allocations in the current LDP up to 2020. As such, further upgrades may be required. This is a reversible short-medium term impact.	0

		○ There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW, but a Strategic WIA will be required for all sites. About 1.6km of existing main needs to be replaced so that it can cope with the higher flows and pressures needed to support any further expansion in the town. The Service Reservoir is also nearing capacity and will require to be enlarged to accommodate further growth to maintain storage levels/Security of Supply. Water main may need upsizing. If allocated, these issues will be highlighted in the settlement statement. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse that feeds into the Luther Water, where the quality of water bodies is moderate. Ground water is categorised as poor. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure.	
Climatic Factors	**0/-**	○ There would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel. ○ Within the settlement boundary and less than 1km from services. ○ Southern edge at risk from surface water flooding, but given the topography of the site, it should not have any adverse impacts. Nonetheless, part of the site found to be at risk from flooding will not be included within an allocation and could form part of the open space provision. It could also be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), and if allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA may or will be required.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**0**	○ Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities.	0/+
Landscape	**0**	○ This is a small-scale development that is enclosed by development, and is a logical location for further housing. Strategic landscaping can help mitigate effects.	0
Material Assets	**0**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely education provision at the secondary and primary schools, but this would be marginal for the scale of development proposed. There may be a need to upgrade the road access.	0
Population	**-/0**	○ No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types. The local community has also expressed a need for smaller homes, which would be specified in the Settlement Statement (e.g. in the vision statement). ○ The development is proposed close to existing services.	+/0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN025 Land Adjacent to Pedestrian Track, Gardenston Street, Laurencekirk		**Proposal: 4 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ In terms of air quality, the development is unlikely to have long-term negative effect on air quality.	0
Water	**-**	○ A growth project at Laurencekirk WWTW has been completed. It took into account all domestic allocations in the current LDP up to 2020. As such, further upgrades may be required. This is a reversible short-medium term impact. ○ There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW, but a Strategic WIA will be required for all sites. About 1.6km of existing main needs to be replaced so that it can cope with the higher flows and pressures needed to support any further expansion in the town. The Service Reservoir is also nearing capacity and will require to be enlarged to accommodate further growth to maintain storage levels/Security of Supply. Water main may need upsizing. If allocated, these issues will be highlighted in the settlement statement. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is next to Gaugers Burn that feeds into the Luther Water, where the quality of water bodies is moderate. Ground water is categorised as poor. ○ The site is adjacent to Gaugers Burn and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to Gaugers Burn and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required." ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure.	0
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ There would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel.	0
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land, and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-
Biodiversity	**0**	○ Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity, but it is not clear how much of the lower part of the site that is adjacent to the Gaugers Burn will be developed.	+

		○ The Gaugers Burn runs parallel to the site. Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. If the site is allocated, the need for compensatory planting and/or a buffer strip will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	
Landscape	**-**	○ This is a small-scale development that is or will be mostly enclosed by development and the Gaugers Burn valley. The site is split, but it is not clear how much of the lower half, next to the burn, will be developed. ○ The Gaugers Burn forms a natural boundary and the existing road to the west, south of the site already forms an appropriate boundary for the settlement. Development should avoid the Gaugers Burn valley.	-
Material Assets	**-/0**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely education provision at the secondary and primary schools (although this would be marginal), and possibly widening the road. These issues would need to be resolved in the short-term. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	0
Population	**0/-**	○ No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. Only 4 houses are proposed, but the site could hold more. ○ Nonetheless, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types, the density of the site could be increased, and the local community has expressed a need for smaller homes, which would be specified in the Settlement Statement (e.g. in the vision statement).	+/0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN026 Land West of A90 Laurencekirk	**Proposal: 250 homes and 10,000m2 employment land**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ The development may increase the number of vehicles that go along the High Street, but the proposal is within walking distance of housing estates. Also, Laurencekirk is not identified as having air quality issues. ○ The site is near a bus route and within walking distance of services and facilities.	0

Water	--	○ A growth project at Laurencekirk WWTW has been completed. It took into account all domestic allocations in the current LDP up to 2020. As such, further upgrades may be required. The demand for water and wastewater capacity for the non-domestic element of this development will depend on the business use. This is a reversible medium term impact. ○ There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW, but a Strategic WIA will be required for all sites. About 1.6km of existing main needs to be replaced so that it can cope with the higher flows and pressures needed to support any further expansion in the town. The Service Reservoir is also nearing capacity and will require to be enlarged to accommodate further growth to maintain storage levels/Security of Supply. Water main may need upsizing. If allocated, these issues will be highlighted in the settlement statement. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ Ground water is categorised as poor. ○ The site includes Gaugers Burn and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to Gaugers Burn and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required." ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure.	0
Climatic Factors	-	○ There would be lower CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel give the services and facilities available in Laurencekirk, and that is it next to the A90. Effects are likely to be medium. ○ Surface water flood risk in the northwest corner, off the High Street. Can be mitigated with SUDS. Rain gardens proposed on perimeter of SUDS arrangements and adjacent to existing burn. This could also be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), and if allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA may or will be required.	0/-
Soil	--	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of class 2 prime agricultural land, and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	--
Biodiversity	-	○ The development of a greenfield site is likely to have long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of trees (ancient woodland) in the southwest corner. ○ Compensatory planting proposed along the A90. If the site is allocated, the need for compensatory planting and/or a buffer strip will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	0/-
Landscape	-	○ A large development that would further alter the character of the area and bring development to the edge of the A90. It is not clear how many trees will be lost in the southwest corner, which acts as a visual buffer and screens the town. However, the site is flat, and compensatory tree planting is proposed adjacent to the A90 to screen the site, but this would change the character of the area. ○ A landscape mound is proposed adjacent to the A90, which will remove the openness of the area and affect its character. ○ Development on this site may be more appropriate in the long-term after the new A90 grade separated junction is built, and the adjacent development on the south side of the ancient woodland/site P5 is built (APP/2010/2822 and 2823, which was	-

		approved in August 2016 – is also a bid KN073). Otherwise, the preference is to retain separation between the town and the A90 to the north of site P5/ancient woodland. ○ Nonetheless, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	
Material Assets	**--/+**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely water provision, road access and education provision at the secondary and primary schools. However, these effects are resolvable, so are only temporary. ○ Provision of affordable housing. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ Potential to develop a smart business district in accordance with EU Smart Cities legislation.	+
Population	**+**	○ Mix of house types is proposed resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population. ○ The development would allow integration of the people where they meet and work. Employment opportunity in the settlement.	+
Human Health	**-/+**	○ Would impact on existing open space – site P5. ○ New areas of open space will be proposed. Potential for active travel (paths). ○ Proposed housing is within the Health and Safety Executive middle and outer pipeline consultation zones. HSE has not been objecting to planning applications for low density proposals (less than 40dph).	+
Cultural Heritage	**-/?**	○ The two storey B listed Johnston Lodge - Beattie Lodge is visible from this site, and development would have to be well sited and designed to respect its setting. ○ Access off the High Street is proposed through Johnston Lodge's West Lodge Gates. This road is single carriageway. It is not clear what will happen to these gates, but they can be reused. ○ Any proposed mitigation measure(s) would be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	?/-
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN083 Land East of Denlethen Wood, Laurencekirk	**Proposal: 400 homes**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ The development is likely to have a long-term effect on air quality, but Laurencekirk is not identified as having air quality issues. ○ The site is next to a bus route and within walking distance of services and facilities.	0
Water	**--**	○ A growth project at Laurencekirk WWTW has been completed. It took into account all domestic allocations in the current LDP up to 2020. As such, further upgrades may be required. This is a reversible medium term impact.	0

		○ There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW, but a Strategic WIA will be required for all sites. About 1.6km of existing main needs to be replaced so that it can cope with the higher flows and pressures needed to support any further expansion in the town. The Service Reservoir is also nearing capacity and will require to be enlarged to accommodate further growth to maintain storage levels/Security of Supply. Water main may need upsizing. If allocated, these issues will be highlighted in the settlement statement. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ Luther Water is categorised as poor. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure. ○ The site is adjacent to Gaugers Burn and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to Gaugers Burn and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. A Flood Risk Assessment may be required."	
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel further to services) and increase emissions. ○ This impact could be mitigated as the site is next to a bus route. There are limited services to the west of Laurencekirk.	-/0
Soil	**--**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of class 2 prime agricultural land, and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	--
Biodiversity	**-/0**	○ Unlikely to impact on biodiversity, but during the construction would disturb species (e.g. red squirrel). This is likely to be temporary. ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ The development would include biodiversity improvements that are likely to enhance connectivity to existing green networks/ create new links where needed. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of woodland and Gaugers Burn would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities.	+
Landscape	**-**	○ This is a large development that would further alter the character of the area. It will introduce development beyond the Gaugers Burn, which acts as a natural boundary of Laurencekirk, and the A937. ○ Proposal relates poorly to the settlement as the burn and the A937 segregates the site from the settlement. ○ Development would run alongside the A90, whereas Laurencekirk is set back from the A90.	-
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely water, waste water provision, and education provision at the secondary and primary schools. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ Potential to improve access to Denlethen Wood.	0/?

		○ Potential to provide the southern part of the distributor road; but this is not confirmed.	
Population	**+**	○ Mix of house types is proposed resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population.	+
Human Health	**0**	○ Potential to improve linkages to Denlethen Wood, but this is not confirmed. ○ Population not at risk from hazardous developments.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to affect the setting of the C listed Johnston Lodge's West Lodge Gates.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN114 Land West of Fordoun Road, North of Finella View, Laurencekirk	**Proposal: 42 homes (self-build)**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0/-**	○ The site is over 6ha and can accommodate over 100 houses. As such, although 42 homes are proposed, this figure could vary, and so could the impact on air quality. ○ However, the site is less than 1km from the train and bus station and local services.	0/?
Water	**-**	○ A growth project at Laurencekirk WWTW has been completed. It took into account all domestic allocations in the current LDP up to 2020. As such, further upgrades may be required. This is a reversible short-medium term impact. ○ There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW, but a Strategic WIA will be required for all sites. About 1.6km of existing main needs to be replaced so that it can cope with the higher flows and pressures needed to support any further expansion in the town. The Service Reservoir is also nearing capacity and will require to be enlarged to accommodate further growth to maintain storage levels/Security of Supply. Water main may need upsizing. If allocated, these issues will be highlighted in the settlement statement. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ Ground water is categorised as poor. Luthermuir Water is classified as moderate ecological potential. ○ The site is adjacent to watercourses, buffer strips would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the minor watercourse and Luther Water and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. A Flood Risk Assessment may be required."	0

Climatic Factors	**0/-**	○ The site is over 6ha and can accommodate over 100 houses. As such, although 42 homes are proposed, this figure could vary, and there could be higher CO_2 emissions from general travelling, but these would be offset as the site is less than 1km from services and facilities. ○ The edge of the site is at risk from fluvial flooding, but no development is proposed on this area. A FRA may be required and this will be specified in the development requirements for the site.	0/?
Soil	**--/-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land, and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	--/-
Biodiversity	**0/+**	○ Arable land. Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity. ○ Enhancing the existing tree belt will improve biodiversity. ○ Impact on watercourses will be mitigated by buffer strips.	0/+
Landscape	**0**	○ This is a large low-density development that would elongate the settlement further into the countryside. However, the site gently slopes away from the settlement, is partially contained by a tree belt to the west, extends no further than the allocated site OP1, and would appear to be a logical extension to the settlement. The site would have minimum visual impact, and any impacts can be mitigated by strategic landscaping.	0
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely water provision, road access and education provision at the secondary and primary schools. However, these effects are resolvable, so are only temporary. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	0
Population	**-**	○ No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. ○ However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types.	+/-
Human Health	**0/-**	○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ Part of the development is within the Health and Safety Executive outer pipeline consultation zones. HSE has not been objecting to planning applications of less than 40dph in the middle zone.	?/-
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ A third of the site contains a cropmark of a square enclosure plus possible arc of a ditch and is listed on the sites and Monument Record. An Archaeological Assessment would be required for the rest of the site. This will be set out in the development requirements for the site.	0/-
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

LUTHERMUIR

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP1 (KN098) The Chapel		**Proposal: 31 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**-/?**	○ There is limited capacity in Luthermuir septic tank. A growth project will be required to mitigate effects. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW. Local mains reinforcement may be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (ground, coastal, transitional or loch) is poor. ○ Field drains appear to link to a local water body with unknown impact. ○ The site is adjacent to a minor watercourse (ditch) and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting. A Flood Risk Assessment will also be required."	0
Climatic Factors	**0/-**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, the scale of the proposal is unlikely to have an adverse impact and a local bus services the area.	0/-
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of class 2 prime agricultural land, and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ However, the site is a logical extension to the settlement in terms of proximity from services and meeting housing need, and would offer potential benefits in terms of increased biodiversity.	-
Biodiversity	**+**	○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat.	+

		○ The development proposes biodiversity improvements that are likely to enhance connectivity to existing green networks/ create new links where needed. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to the watercourse may be required. This would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. Tree removal should be kept to a minimum and this will be stated in the development requirements for the site. ○ Path maintenance regime proposed to encourage wildlife diversity.	
Landscape	**0/-**	○ The nature of land use in the area will not be noticeably changed and displaced. ○ The landscape experience is unlikely to change noticeably. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects. ○ The site is relatively flat and would appear to be a logical extension to the existing village. The site is largely contained by an existing residential area within a field structured by hedgerow/tree lined edges.	0
Material Assets	**0**	○ There are some infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access (single track access) and education provision at Mearns Academy with temporary impacts. ○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ New development will help sustain the local community.	0
Population	**+**	○ Mix of house types is proposed resulting in housing choice for all groups of the population.	+/0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Limited adverse impact on the historic environment although in close proximity to listed buildings (the church and Muirton House are C-listed – site will not detract from their setting). ○ Trees help to screen the site, and additional planting could be added if required. Modern houses are adjacent to the church.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: OP3 (amended KN125) Land north of Church Road		Proposal: 13 homes	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**0/?**	○ There is limited capacity in Luthermuir septic tank. A growth project will be required to mitigate effects. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW. Local mains reinforcement may be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (ground, coastal, transitional or loch) is poor. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure.	0/?
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, its scale is not likely to have a significant effect. ○ Bid form states there have been issues with water running from the site and concentrating in their gardens. ○ Bid form proposes new drainage is formed within the site to pipe this water to the surface water drain in Church Road. ○ The Council's Flood Prevention Unit have concerns about the site, but the proposer has demonstrated that while the soil has poor porosity it will be possible to form individual surface water soakaways within each garden. ○ The above issues need to be investigated further, and if allocated, the development requirements for the site may state that a Flood Risk Assessment will be required.	+/?
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of class 2 prime agricultural land, and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-
Biodiversity	**0/+**	○ The development of this greenfield site is unlikely to have long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ The development is not likely to conserve, protect and enhance the diversity of species and habitats and the natural heritage of the area. ○ The development will enhance biodiversity – current land use is pastureland with low biodiversity value.	0/+

		○ A buffer strip is proposed next to neighbouring gardens to provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities.	
Landscape	**0/-**	○ Potential landscape impact given the site sits in a flat landscape. However, this impact could be minimised as the site is enclosed on three sides although and can be further minimised by strategic landscaping. ○ Furthermore, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	0
Material Assets	**+/-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely potential access constraint (long-term effect) and education provision at Mearns Academy (temporary effect). ○ New development may initiate a water treatment and waste water treatment growth project which will have a longer term effect. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ Provision of a new buffer strip along neighbouring gardens and surface water drainage improvements will be an asset to the local settlement. ○ Potential for new path link to the north of Caldhame Wood to provide a safe route for primary school children.	+/?
Population	**+**	○ A mix of house types is proposed resulting in housing choice for all groups of the population.	+/0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of public open space/core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ Sites includes the remains of cottages (not visible). To mitigate any effects, an Archaeological Survey will be required.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative sites

Site Ref: KN063 Land at Mains of Luther Farm, Luthermuir		**Proposal: Mixed use: Roadside Services (Comprising Class 1 (Shops), Class 2 (Financial, Professional and Other Services), Class 3 (Food and Drink) and Class 7 (Hotels and Hostels) and Petrol Station (Sui Generis)) with Associated Car Parking.**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**-**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have long term effects. ○ Proposed as a service station for passing trade, but the proposed uses would mean it would also be a destination centre. ○ There is very limited public transport provision and no sustainable travel options.	-

		○ Site over 1km form the nearest settlement.	
Water	**-**	○ There is limited capacity in Luthermuir septic tank. Private WWTW may be required, as advised by Scottish Water. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW. Local mains reinforcement may be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The site is adjacent to a watercourse and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting." ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (ground, coastal, transitional or loch) is poor.	0/?
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (as the site is more than 1km from the nearest settlement and is not served by frequent public transport for workers and visitors) and increased emissions.	-
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of class 2 prime agricultural land, and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-
Biodiversity	**0/+**	○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ The development proposes biodiversity improvements.	0/+
Landscape	**0/-**	○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced – this development would comprise a significant growth of the village and landscape experience is likely to change at local level (largely undeveloped). ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects. ○ The site is relatively flat and would be able to accommodate the development. The impact would be mitigated by setting back the buildings from the A90, landscaping and good design and materials, which are proposed.	0
Material Assets	**+**	○ There are infrastructure constraints associated with the site, and WTW and WWTW which are all likely to have a temporary impact ○ New development will help sustain the local community, and provide business opportunities.	+
Population	**0**	○ Unlikely to have an impact.	0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space core paths. ○ Local population unlikely to be disturbed by this proposal – noise, dust, fumes, as it is over 1km from Luthermuir..	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect		

Key	- = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect

Site Ref: KN099 Site OP2 The Chapel, North of School Road, Luthermuir	Proposal: 51 homes/Village Shop and Commercial Unit		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term insignificant effects. ○ A local bus serves the area. ○ Mixed use development this may mitigate transport related air pollution by avoiding car dependence but small-scale retail/business will not have a significant impact.	0
Water	**-/?**	○ There is limited capacity in Luthermuir septic tank. A growth project will be required to mitigate effects. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW. Local mains reinforcement may be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (ground, coastal, transitional or loch) is poor. ○ Field drains appear to link to a local water body with unknown impact. ○ The site is adjacent to a minor watercourse (ditch) and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required."	0
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. ○ However, site will be mixed use with small scale retail/business use to lessen impact, but this will not make significant impact. ○ A local bus services the area.	0/-
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of class 2 prime agricultural land, and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-
Biodiversity	**+**	○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat.	+

		○ The development proposes biodiversity improvements that are likely to enhance connectivity to existing green networks/ create new links where needed. ○ Path maintenance regime proposed to encourage wildlife diversity.	
Landscape	**0/-**	○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced – this development would comprise a significant growth of the village and the landscape experience is likely to change at local level (changed relationship between village and countryside at edge of settlement where landscape impact more discernible). ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects. ○ The site is relatively flat and would appear to be a logical extension to the existing village. However, it would elongate the settlement, and better sites are available during the lifetime of the plan.	0
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are infrastructure constraints associated with the site, education provision at Mearns Academy and WTW and WWTW which are all likely to have a temporary impact. ○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ New development will help sustain the local community, in particular the mixed-use element with shop and small business opportunities. However, the viability of the shop is questioned, and the site is currently allocated in the LDP with no progress made to develop the site.	0/?
Population	**+**	○ Mix of house types is proposed resulting in housing choice for all groups of the population. ○ The development would allow integration of the people where they live and work. Employment opportunity in the village.	+
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Limited adverse impact on the historic environment although in close proximity to listed buildings (the church and Muirton House are C-listed – site will not detract from their setting).	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN107 Land at Caldhame Plantation, West of School Road, Luthermuir		**Proposal: 56 homes and a shop**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**-**	○ There is limited capacity in Luthermuir septic tank. A growth project will be required to mitigate effects. ○ There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW. Local mains reinforcement may be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (ground, coastal, transitional or loch) is poor. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure. ○ The site is adjacent to a minor watercourse (ditch) and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. “A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required.”	0/?
Climatic Factors	**--**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. Although a local shop is proposed, the site has limited facilities overall and car travel is needed to access most main services. ○ The site is not identified at risk according to SEPA’s flood risk maps, but the Council’s Flood Prevention Team do not support the site due to the flood risk. They hold records of flooding and do not just rely on maps. In this case, mitigation is unlikely to resolve this issue.	--
Soil	**--**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of class 2 prime agricultural land, and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	--
Biodiversity	**--**	○ The development of this greenfield site (ancient woodland) is likely to have long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat, although some bio diversity enhancement is proposed, the loss of woodland habitat is far greater.	--

		○ The development could affect the conservation objectives and natural features as per the Ancient Woodland Inventory. ○ The development is not likely to conserve, protect and enhance the diversity of species and habitats and the natural heritage of the area. ○ The development may adversely affect populations of protected species notably red squirrel. ○ The development will result in the loss of existing trees, woodland and hedges.	
Landscape	**-**	○ The nature of land use and landscape experience in the area will be changed and landscape character impacted due to loss of woodland: Caldhame Plantation adds visual and structural diversity within this expansive, flat landscape within the Agricultural Heartlands (Central Howe of the Mearns) largely characterised by large scale farmland mosaic. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are likely to have medium-term effects.	-
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely water treatment and waste water treatment, road access, and high school capacity which will have a temporary effect in the main. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ Development of the site amounts to loss of a natural asset. ○ A shop would be a welcomed asset to the village, but it may not be viable and there is competition from other sites.	-
Population	**+**	○ A mix of house types is proposed resulting in housing choice for all groups of the population.	+
Human Health	**+**	○ Development would result in loss of green space but access to open space/core paths retained, with potentially improved connectivity. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	+
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN126 Land East of Muirfoot, Luthermuir	**Proposal: 12 homes**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0

Water	**0/?**	○ There is limited capacity in Luthermuir septic tank. A growth project will be required to mitigate effects. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW. Local mains reinforcement may be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, site water budgets, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (ground, coastal, transitional or loch) is poor. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure.	0/?
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, its scale is not likely to have a significant effect. ○ Bid form states there have been issues with water running from the site and concentrating in their gardens. ○ Bid form proposes new drainage is formed within the site to pipe this water to the surface water drain in Church Road. ○ The Council's Flood Prevention Unit have strong concerns about the site, but the proposer has demonstrated that while the soil has poor porosity it will be possible to form individual surface water soakaways within each garden. ○ The above issues need to be investigated further, and if allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a Flood Risk Assessment will be required.	+/?
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of class 2 prime agricultural land, and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-
Biodiversity	**0/+**	○ The development of this greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ The development is not likely to conserve, protect and enhance the diversity of species and habitats and the natural heritage of the area. ○ The development will enhance biodiversity – current land use is pastureland with low biodiversity value.	0/+
Landscape	**0/-**	○ Potential negative landscape impact as the site sits in a flat landscape. However, this effect could be minimised as site enclosed on three sides although and can be further minimised by strategic landscaping. ○ Furthermore, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	0
Material Assets	**+/-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely potential access constraint (long-term effect) and education provision at Mearns Academy (temporary effect). ○ New development may initiate a water treatment and waste water treatment growth project which will have a longer term effect. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	+/?

		○ Provision of surface water drainage improvements will be an asset to the local settlement. ○ Potential for a new path link to north of Caldhame wood to provide a safe route for primary school children.	
Population	**+**	○ A mix of house types is proposed resulting in housing choice for all groups of the population.	+/0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of public open space/core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

MARYKIRK

Preferred Sites

None that are new sites.

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: KN088 Land West of Napier Place, North of Site OP1, Marykirk, Laurencekirk		**Proposal: 30 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**-**	○ Marykirk WWTW has insufficient capacity and will require upgrading. This is a reversible short-term impact. This will be stated in the development requirements for the site, if allocated. There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW. Local mains reinforcement may be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near the River North Esk where the quality of water bodies (ground, coastal, transitional or loch) is moderate. ○ The site is adjacent to a minor watercourse (ditch) and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, this will be set out on the development requirements for the site.	0
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, there are unlikely to be any significant effects due to its small scale.	0
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land, and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-
Biodiversity	**0**	○ Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity.	0/+

		○ The development, including planting and open space, of this agricultural land is likely to lead to an improvement in the existing biodiversity of the site.	
Landscape	**-**	○ The site would appear to be a logical extension to the existing allocation, but the indicative layout could be improved by strategic landscaping and use of active frontages along the northern boundary. ○ Given that over a long term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	0/?
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely education provision which will have a long-term effect. The school cannot be expanded on its current site. As such, it is more appropriate that if supported, this site is reserved. Furthermore, site OP1 to the south has yet to be built. ○ Proposal will sustain the future capacity of the school.	-/+
Population	**-**	○ No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. ○ However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types.	+/0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ The site contains a number of ring ditches and other indeterminate cropmarks, which could represent the remains of an unenclosed settlement of prehistoric date. No significant finds to date. ○ The development will have long-term and permanent negative effect on the site of an archaeological asset. ○ To mitigate this impact, an Archaeological Survey will be required (as well as on housing site OP1). This may affect the layout of the site.	-/?
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN089 Land at Maryhill Farm, South East of Marykirk, Laurencekirk		**Proposal: 30-40 homes with scope for mixed use**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**-**	○ Marykirk WWTW has insufficient capacity and will require upgrading. This is a reversible short-term impact. This will be stated in the development requirements for the site, if allocated. There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW. Local mains reinforcement may be required.	-/?

		○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near the River North Esk where the quality of water bodies (ground, coastal, transitional or loch) is moderate. ○ The site is adjacent to the Burn of Balmaleedy and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, this will be set out on the development requirements for the site. ○ The southern part of the site is at risk from flooding. The land slopes towards this area and how surface water is dealt with could affect water quality in this area. SUDS are not shown in the indicative plan. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure.	
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The southern entrance to the site is in an area identified at fluvial water flood risk and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. This issue could be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), and if allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA will be required. ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, there are unlikely to be any significant effects due to its small scale.	0/-
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land, and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-
Biodiversity	**+/-**	○ The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats. Development should avoid areas of broadleaf woodland. ○ Biodiversity enhancements are proposed including a tree belt however woodland removal would also take place.	+/-
Landscape	**-**	○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries will change. It will breach the natural southern boundary and spread development along the southwestern flank of the Hill of Balmaleedy. ○ However, given that over a long term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects. The impact could be mitigated by strategic landscaping.	-/0
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely education provision which will have a long-term effect. The school cannot be expanded on its current site. As such, it is more appropriate that if supported, this site is reserved. Furthermore, site OP1 to the south has yet to be built. ○ Proposal will sustain the future capacity of the school. ○ Kirkton Road, which provides the north access into the site is narrow and may not be suitable for increased traffic. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	+/-
Population	**+**	○ Proposes a mix of house types resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population.	+/0

		○ The development would allow integration of the people where they live and work. Providing a small employment opportunity in the village.	
Human Health	**0/-**	○ Southern access route is at risk from flooding. No development is proposed on this land. Permanent and long-term implications. ○ It could provide for a new circular path network, although this is proposed to the rear of houses. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0/-
Cultural Heritage	**--**	○ The development will have a long-term and permanent negative effect on the setting of scheduled monuments (SM SM5936 (Marykirk) and SM3313 (St Cyrus)) and of the site of an archaeological asset. ○ To mitigate this impact, an Archaeological Survey will be required. This may affect the layout of the site. Further tree planting could help screen Marykirk Parish Church, but development is proposed right next to it.	-
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

MARYWELL

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP1 (KN029) Land east of Old Stonehaven Road		**Proposal: 52 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**-**	○ Increase commuter traffic into Aberdeen. ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary effects. ○ The site is next to a busy bus route, which could reduce commuter traffic.	-/0
Water	**0**	○ Nigg WWTW has capacity, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity, but local water reinforcement may be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	0
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ There would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating but some impact from travelling due to the lack of services in the area. However, the site is next to a busy bus route, which could reduce commuter traffic. ○ The development is in an area identified at fluvial and surface water flood risk and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. Part of the site found to be at risk could form part of the open space provision. Development should avoid this area. A Flood Risk Assessment may be required and any surface water flooding should be addressed with appropriate SuDS measures.	-/0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases	0
Biodiversity	**0/-**	○ Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity. Lowland Raised Peatbog nearby, but does not appear to extend into this site. Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to any bog land could reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. If the site is allocated, the need for a buffer strip will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	0/+
Landscape	**-**	○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations. ○ However, the site is already designated for employment land, and given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	0/-
Material Assets	**+/-**	○ There are infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely education provision at Hillside Primary School and Portlethen Academy, which will have a temporary, but potentially long-term effect.	+

		○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ Provision of affordable housing and finance towards education facilities upgrade will have a positive effect.	
Population	**+**	○ Mix of house types are proposed resulting in a good housing choice for all groups of the population. ○ The development would allow integration of the people where they meet and work. Employment opportunity in the village.	+
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: BUS1 (KN111) Land at Mains of Cairnrobin, Marywell		**Proposal: Safeguarded for business and class 11 leisure uses**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**-**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term insignificant effects. The site is not near a place with poor air quality. ○ The site is near a frequent bus route, which could mitigate effects.	-/0
Water	**--**	○ Nigg WWTW has capacity, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity, but local water reinforcement may be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The site is bisected by a minor watercourse and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. “A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required.”	0
Climatic Factors	**--**	○ There would be some CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel given the scale of the proposal. ○ The site is near a frequent bus route, which could mitigate effects. ○ The development is in an area identified at risk from surface water flooding and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. This could be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), and if allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA will be required.	-/0

Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases	0
Biodiversity	**0**	○ Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to minor watercourses would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities.	0
Landscape	**0**	○ The landscape is likely to change, but the development would not be out of character with the existing surrounding land uses and so would minimise the effect. The impact would be mitigated by landscaping, including bunding along the perimeter.	0
Material Assets	**0/+**	○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure. Some road upgrades may be required. ○ Would enable a distributor road through this area and to adjacent sites, which is needed, and would be stated in the development requirements for the site.	0/+
Population	**0**	○ The proposal will not lead to any significant impacts upon the population.	0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths.	0
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ Although there is evidence of architectural value on and near the site, the development is unlikely to have any significant effects on the historic environment. Archaeological evaluation may be required.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN031 Blackhills of Cairnrobin		**Proposal: Mineral extraction**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**?**	○ Biomass/quarrying etc. could worsen air quality in the area, however an air quality report submitted with a future planning application would assess the impacts from the quarry and propose appropriate mitigation measures. ○ The effect of the proposal at present is unknown.	0
Water	**-**	○ Nigg WWTW has capacity, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity, but local water reinforcement may be required. However, no additional resource is required for this development. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The site is adjacent to a watercourse and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. “A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse.”	0

Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. Due to the nature of the proposal, this is unlikely to be mitigated, but most quarries serve a local area.	-
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ Quarrying would have an effect on soil, but would be restored.	0
Landscape	**0**	○ The landscape is likely to change, but the development would not be out of character with the existing surrounding land uses and so would minimise the effect.	0
Material Assets	**?**	○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure. Some road upgrades may be required.	0
Population	**0**	○ The proposal will not lead to any significant impacts upon the population.	0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Mitigation measures for dust/noise impacts which may have impacts on health, would require to be submitted and assessed with an application to ensure they fall within required levels.	0
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ Although there is evidence of architectural value on and near the site, the development is unlikely to have any significant effects on the historic environment. Archaeological evaluation may be required.	0/-
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: KN028 Land East of A90, Phase 2, Checkbar		**Proposal: 40 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**0**	○ Nigg WWTW has capacity, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity, but local water reinforcement may be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	0
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ There would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel.	0

Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases	0
Biodiversity	**0**	○ Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity.	0
Landscape	**--**	○ The site is located within the Aberdeen green belt even if the proposal is screened from the A90, this proposal would threaten the green belt's integrity by increasing coalescence with Aberdeen City. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	--
Material Assets	**+/-**	○ There are infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely education provision at Hillside Primary School and Portlethen Academy, which will have a temporary, but potentially long-term affect. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ Provision of affordable housing and finance towards education facilities upgrade.	+
Population	**+**	○ The development would allow integration of the people where they live and work. Employment opportunity in the village. ○ Proposes to develop smaller house types, namely flats and terraces, along with 25% affordable housing provision.	+/0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN079 Land at Oakridge, North + West of Hillcrest, Findon		**Proposal: 1 Home and small hold for grazing**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**?**	○ Connection to Nigg WWTW is over 300m away, but the bid form does not state if the proposal will connect to it or use a septic tank. The bid form states they will connect to mains water on the road nearby. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity, but local water reinforcement may be required.	0/?

		○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The effect on the water environment depends on whether the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure due to surface water flooding.	
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ There would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel, but the site is not near any settlement. Long-term impacts. ○ The entrance into the site is at risk from surface water flooding and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. This could be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), and if allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA may or will be required.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**0**	○ Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity. ○ Mitigation measures would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities.	0
Landscape	**-**	○ The site is within the Aberdeen green belt. It would likely result in an increased coalescence of development, which is not a pattern of development that is desirable here.	-
Material Assets	**0**	○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure.	0
Population	**0**	○ Only one home proposed so technically no mix of house types. There could also be a negative cumulative impact as there are other similar sized properties in the area, but this proposal includes a smallholding. Therefore, in this instance, this proposal is not likely to have a negative impact on population.	-
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ No impacts of note.	0
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ There is a boundary stone on the site. This would be mitigated by ensuring development avoids this stone and would be stated in the development requirements for the site.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

MILL OF URAS

Preferred Site

None.

Alternative sites

Site Ref: KN131 Site West of The Whinns, Mill of Uras		**Proposal: Housing (undisclosed for 4.4 hectare site)**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect - post mitigation**
Air	-	○ The development is likely to have long-term negative effect on air quality due to the scale and distance to services and facilities. ○ The site is on a bus route (A92) which may in part help reduce commuter traffic.	-/0
Water	--	○ There is no public sewerage system for Mill Of Uras. The developer should liaise with SW and SEPA to determine the appropriate solution. There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW, but local mains reinforcement may be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (ground, coastal, transitional or loch) is moderate. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure. ○ The site is adjacent to Catterline Burn and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would state that "a buffer strip will be required adjacent to the Catterline Burn and this should be integrated as positive feature of the development. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required."	0/?
Climatic Factors	-	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. The site is on a bus route (A92) which may in part help reduce commuter traffic. ○ The development is adjacent to an area identified at fluvial flood risk, which could have localised effects downstream. Buffer strip and SuDS would be required to mitigate effects, which would be specified in the settlement statement for the site, if allocated.	-/0

		○ The small part of the site found to be at risk from flooding will not be included within the allocation and a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) would be required due to the site's proximity to a flood risk zone. If allocated, these mitigations would be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	
Soil	-	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land on 60% of the site and a development of this scale will cause a significant loss relative to the scale of site affected, and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-
Biodiversity	0	○ Fowlsheugh SPA is set to the east. This site is at a close proximity to the qualifying site and has a potential to have an impact on qualifying species through tourism or visits by the residents and drainage. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the SPA. ○ Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity. The development, including planting and open space, of this agricultural land is likely to lead to an improvement in the existing biodiversity of the site.	0
Landscape	-	○ The scale and location of the proposal will have a negative impact on the landscape character, and the effect is likely to be long-term. ○ A visual impact assessment would be required, and if allocated, this will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	-/0
Material Assets	-	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access and secondary school education provision at Mackie Academy, which will have a long-term effect. However, the development would help support the falling primary school roll at Catterline. ○ However, there is no footpath network and there are potential safety issues related to the A92 junction for vehicles. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	-/0
Population	0	○ No mix of house types is proposed. However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types resulting in housing choice for all groups of the population.	+
Human Health	0	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ Population not at risk from hazardous developments.	0
Cultural Heritage	0	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

MUCHALLS

Preferred Site

None.

Alternative sites

Site Ref: KN059 Land at Dunnyfell Road, Muchalls		**Proposal: 50 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ Individual developments of this scale are generally unlikely to have a significant impact upon air quality; however, the location of the site would encourage the use of unsustainable modes of transportation in order to access employment, services and facilities which would have a negative impact on air quality.	0
Water	**--**	○ Nigg WWTW has capacity, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity, but local water reinforcement may be required. ○ The site is bisected by a watercourse and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required." ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	0
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The site does not lie within an area known to be at risk of fluvial flooding. ○ The site contains areas known to be at risk of pluvial flooding, however that could likely be managed by adequate SUDS provision. This would be stated in the Settlement Statement. Provided this is delivered, the scheme would not have a negative impact. ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. There is a bus service along the A90 that could mitigate effects.	-/0
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land to the north of the site and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-

Biodiversity	**-**	○ The development of a greenfield site is likely to have long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the water course running through the site as a habitat. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to the watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. If the site is allocated, the need for a buffer strip will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site ○ The development is not likely to maintain or enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed. ○ The site lies within a LNCS buffer; however, the designation does not identify a qualifying criterion related to biodiversity, which this development is likely to impact.	0
Landscape	**-**	○ The site is with the Southeast Aberdeenshire Coast Special Landscape Area. ○ The scale and location of the proposal will have a negative impact on the landscape character, and the effect is likely to be long-term. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations.	-
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely education provision which will have a temporary affect. Contributions may be required to address any shortfall. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	0
Population	**?**	○ A mix of house types is proposed (however breakdown of housing mix is unknown) – provided a suitable mix is provided, this would increase housing choice within the village. Proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP. ○ A modest amount of affordable housing would be provided – 12 units	+
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Poor air quality is likely to have a long-term on effect on human health ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	**--**	○ The development will have a long-term and permanent negative effect on the setting of Muchalls Conservation Area. The development may weaken the sense of place, and the identity of the settlement through edging development towards the A90 and through the sheer scale of the proposal. ○ Invariably the allocation will adversely affect the built features, their context, pattern of past historic use, and the setting in which they sit, in landscapes and within the soil (archaeology), and also in our towns, villages and streets. ○ New developments that deviate from existing designs, layouts and materials could adversely affect the setting of historic settlements in the long-term.	--
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

NEWTONHILL

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP1 (KN100) Park Place		**Proposal: 121 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. Good access to the bus service and shops.	0
Water	**0**	○ Nigg WWTW has capacity, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity, but local water reinforcement may be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	0
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ There would be an increase in CO_2 emissions from traveling, but the effect could be mitigated as the site near several bus routes and shops.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**-**	○ The development of a greenfield site is likely to have long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat, namely birds. ○ However, this will be offset by the landscape buffer.	0
Landscape	**-**	○ Large scale development that would impact on the landscape experience of the area in the long term - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness. ○ However, the site gently undulates, with the exception towards the train line, and would appear to be a logical extension to the settlement, as it would facilitate a link road between Park Place and Cairnhill Drive and provide secondary access to these parts of the settlement. ○ The impact would be mitigated by a landscape buffer, as identified as site P4 in the 2017 LDP. In 2018, a masterplan has been agreed for the site.	0
Material Assets	**+/-**	○ The proposal will increase pressure on the primary school, which is forecast to be at 113% capacity by 2022. This calculation includes this bid site, as it is currently allocated in the 2017 LDP. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ Will provide a much-needed secondary access to Park Lane and Cairnhill Drive by linking them together.	+

Population	**+**	○ Mix of house types is proposed resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population.	+
Human Health	**-**	○ It would result in loss of open space, but new areas will be provided. The core path will be protected and enhanced. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ Population not at risk from hazardous developments.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment. The Sites and Monuments note there was once a croft in the area, but it has since been destroyed.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: OP2 (KN056), Land West of the A90, Newtonhill		**Proposal: 12.1ha employment land**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	0	○ A proposal of this scale will lead to a decrease in air quality, but Newtonhill does not have air quality issues. Effects are likely to be medium/long-term. ○ The site is located in close proximity to Newtonhill and Chapelton. Opportunities to enhance and encourage active transport would lessen carbon emissions related to vehicle use and would help offset any negative air quality impact.	0
Water	0	○ Nigg WWTW has capacity, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity, but local water reinforcement may be required.	0
Climatic Factors	-	○ The site does not contain an area known to be at risk of fluvial or pluvial flooding. ○ A proposal on this scale has the potential to cause an increase in concentrations of CO_2 emissions through increased car travel. Effects are likely to be medium-term and will be lessened given the site is adjacent to Newtonhill.	-/0
Soil	0	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases	0
Biodiversity	0	○ The site is currently farmland and is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity. ○ No measures to enhance biodiversity have been identified, but LDP policy requires all development to include open space and biodiversity enhancement.	0/+
Landscape	-	○ Significant scale development that would further alter the character of the area. However, the site is relatively flat and would appear to be a logical extension to the settlement. The site is currently allocated in the LDP as site OP2. The impact could be mitigated by strategic landscaping, and if it is continued to be allocated, this will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	+/-

		○ To maintain some 'rural' landscape setting between Newtonhill and Chapelton, development should be concentrated towards the eastern extent of this site.	
Material Assets	+	○ The development is unlikely to have a significant impact upon local infrastructure, but given its scale the site could provide biodiversity enhancement (e.g. trees).	+
Population	+	○ Provide employment land near where people live in Newtonhill and Chapelton.	+
Human Health	+	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Poor air quality is likely to have a long-term effect on human health. ○ Provision and promotion of sustainable transport modes would have a positive impact on human health.	+
Cultural Heritage	0	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative sites

Site Ref: KN101 Site Directly South of OP1, North of Mains on Monduff, Newtonhill		**Proposal: 120 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. Good access to the bus service and shops.	0
Water	**0**	○ Nigg WWTW has capacity, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity, but local water reinforcement may be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	0
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ There would be an increase in CO_2 emissions from travelling, but the effects are mitigated as the site is near bus routes and shops.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**-**	○ The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat, namely birds. ○ However, this will be offset by the landscape buffer.	0

Landscape	**--**	○ The site is located within the Southeast Aberdeenshire Coast Special Landscape Area and the Aberdeen green belt. ○ Large scale development that breaks the skyline and would impact on the landscape experience of the area in the long-term - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness. ○ Urban creep towards Muchalls. The site is in the green belt, which is designated to prevent coalescence between Newtonhill and Muchalls. ○ Mitigation in the form of a landscape buffer would partially mitigate the impacts, it would threaten the green belt's integrity by increasing coalescence with Muchalls.	--
Material Assets	**-**	○ The proposal will increase pressure on the primary school, which is forecast to be at 113% capacity by 2022. There will be capacity issues until the Chapelton Primary school is built. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	?
Population	**+**	○ A mix of house types is proposed resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population.	+
Human Health	**-**	○ It would result in loss of open space, but new areas will be provided. The core path will be protected and enhanced. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ Population not at risk from hazardous developments.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN132 Land at Cammachmore, Newtonhill	**Proposal: 10 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect - post mitigation**
Air	0	For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	0	○ Nigg WWTW has capacity, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity, but local water reinforcement may be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The site is adjacent to a watercourse and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, this mitigation would be stated as a development requirement of the opportunity site.	0

Climatic Factors	0	○ The development is small scale and not likely to have significant impacts. ○ The development is in an area identified at risk from surface water flooding and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. Parts of the site found to be at risk from flooding could form part of the open space provision, also a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) may be required. If allocated, these mitigations would be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	0
Soil	0	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases ○ There is potential soil contamination on site and development presents an opportunity for soil remediation.	0/+
Biodiversity	0	○ Development will include field areas with low biodiversity value and development including planting is likely to lead to biodiversity improvement (although small scale). ○ Greenspace network close by and linkages are possible.	0
Landscape	-	○ The site is located within the Aberdeen green belt. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change, with long-term effects. ○ The location of development within a green belt area threatens its integrity through coalescence of settlements. There are no measures available to mitigate against this.	-
Material Assets	0	○ The small-scale proposal of 10 homes will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure. However, Portlethen Secondary School is overcapacity. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	0
Population	0	○ A mix of houses is possible, small scale enhancement within existing cluster of houses. ○ However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types.	+/0
Human Health	0	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	0	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN133 Land at Michael Tunstall Place & Cairnhill Drive, Newtonhill		**Proposal: 150 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. Good access to the bus service and shops.	0
Water	**-**	○ Nigg WWTW has capacity, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity, but local water reinforcement may be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The site is adjacent to Pheppie Burn and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the Pheppie Burn and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required."	0
Climatic Factors	**--**	○ There would be an increase in CO_2 emissions from traveling, but the effects are mitigated as the site is near bus routes and shops. ○ The development is in an area identified at risk from fluvial flooding and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. Part of the site found to be at risk from flooding will not be included within an allocation and could form part of the open space provision. If allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA will be required.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**-**	○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. Part of the site is farmed. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to Pheppie Burn would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities.	0
Landscape	**--**	○ The site is located within the Southeast Aberdeenshire Coast Special Landscape Area and the Aberdeen green belt. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change.	--

		○ The built form of Newtonhill would move towards Muchalls, leading to potential impacts on the setting. ○ The site is in the green belt, which is designated to prevent coalescence between Newtonhill and Muchalls. ○ Mitigation in the form of a landscape buffer would partially mitigate the impacts and provide a better settlement treatment for the southern boundary of Newtonhill, but it would threaten the green belt's integrity by increasing coalescence with Muchalls.	
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely education provision, which could have a long-term effect. ○ The proposal will increase pressure on the primary school, which is forecast to be at 113% capacity by 2022. There will be capacity issues until the Chapelton Primary school is built. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	?
Population	**+**	○ An adequate mix of house types is proposed resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population, including up to 37 affordable homes.	+
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ Population not at risk from hazardous developments.	0
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ Would result in Newtonhill settlement boundary edging very close to Muchalls Conservation Area, and potential coalescence of settlements. ○ The strip of strategic landscaping is unlikely to fully mitigate against this impact.	-
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

PARK

Preferred Site

None that are new sites.

Alternative sites

Site Ref: KN090 Land at Upper Park, Drumoak		**Proposal: 4 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**-**	○ No public wastewater treatment available in this area, however there is sufficient capacity at Drumoak WWTW, over 2km away. No solution is proposed. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	-/?
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, its scale is not likely to have a significant effect.	0
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the significant loss of prime agricultural land. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-
Biodiversity	**0**	○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat.	0
Landscape	**-**	○ The site is within the Dee Valley Special Landscape Area. It would join two housing areas together, creating a large cluster of houses. Within the valley, it is preferred that houses are proposed adjacent to settlements. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change.	-

		○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	
Material Assets	**0**	○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure.	0
Population	**-**	○ No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. LDP policy would require one house to be deemed affordable.	+/0
Human Health	**0**	○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN091 Land West Park, Drumoak	**Proposal: 8 homes**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**-**	○ No public wastewater treatment available in this area, however there is sufficient capacity at Drumoak WWTW, over 2km away. No solution is proposed. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	-/?
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, its scale is not likely to have a significant effect.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**0**	○ River Dee SAC is set to the south. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and cumulatively is likely to have an impact on the qualifying species through drainage. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the River Dee SAC.	0
Landscape	**-**	○ The site is within the Dee Valley Special Landscape Area. It would double the number of houses in this area, creating a large cluster of houses. Within the valley, it is preferred that houses are proposed adjacent to settlements. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change.	-

		○ While planting along the road could mitigate the effects, this is dependent on the occupiers. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	
Material Assets	**0**	○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure.	0
Population	**-**	○ No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. LDP policy would require two houses to be deemed affordable.	+/0
Human Health	**-/?**	○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ A high voltage pylon supported powerline runs across the eastern part of the site. Uncertain of effects. Adjacent is a converted steading.	-/?
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

PORTLETHEN

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP1 (KN042) Schoolhill (Land at Leathan Fields, Portlethen)		**Proposal: 176 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**-**	○ A proposal of this scale will lead to a decrease in air quality, but Portlethen does not have air quality issues to date. ○ Its impact is lessened as it is close to services and facilities. ○ Findon junction has capacity issues and will require to be upgraded. This could affect air quality in the future. Issues are likely to be persistent and long-term.	-/?
Water	**0**	○ Nigg WWTW has sufficient capacity, but local network reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	0
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ A proposal on this scale has potential to cause an increase in concentrations of CO_2 emissions through increased car travel. Its impact is lessened as it is close to services and facilities.	-/0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**0**	○ Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity. ○ Managed open space across the whole site will be long-term and positive for new developments.	0
Landscape	**0**	○ The proposal is of a scale or in a location that is unlikely to have any effects on landscape quality.	0
Material Assets	**--/?**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely education provision at Hillside school capacity at Findon junction off the A90, which will have a long-term affect. Solutions are to be identified. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ Provision of affordable housing (44 units).	--/?
Population	**+**	○ Mix of house types included provides a housing choice for the population.	+
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/ ore paths.	0

		○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ Development of the site is unlikely to have any significant effects on existing pathways or access to open space.	
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: OP3 (KN106) Faireview Central	**Proposal: 5.5ha employment land (Storage and distribution)**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**-**	○ In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have long-term negative effect on air quality, but effects would not affect Portlethen, given its out of town location, and close proximity to the A90.	-/0
Water	**0**	○ Nigg WWTW has sufficient capacity, but local network reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure. Two SUDS ponds are proposed, although this is more to mitigate flooding. ○ The site is adjacent to a minor watercourse and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. “A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. A Flood Risk Assessment will also be required.	0
Climatic Factors	**--**	○ There would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel given the nature of the use and its peripheral location. ○ The development is in an area identified at high risk from surface water flooding risk and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. Two SUDS ponds are proposed to mitigate flooding.	+/-
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ However, the site is already allocated for an employment use so it is a logical location for the proposed use for storage and distribution.	0
Biodiversity	**-**	○ Potentially there could be some peatland to the north of the site. To mitigate this effect the development requirements for the site will state that further assessments will be required.	0/+

		○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to the watercourse and/or peatland would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. ○ The proposed ponds could help to enhance biodiversity.	
Landscape	**0**	○ The proposal will have a notable impact on the landscape, but there are already a number of large sheds in the area – farming and waste/recycling centre. As such, the impact should not be significant, and strategic landscaping is proposed around the site to mitigate effects. ○ Also, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	0
Material Assets	**-**	○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure, but the Findon A90(T) junction is at capacity. ○ The loss of land for waste and recycling is not desirable, but if there is no demand, and an alternative employment use is possible, this should be encouraged. However, given the distance of the site from Portlethen, only class 6 uses and waste and recycling facilities should be allowed.	+/-
Population	**0**	○ No impact.	0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: OP5 (KN092) Land South of Portlethen Club House		**Proposal: Health fitness club**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**-/0**	○ Nigg WWTW has sufficient capacity, but local network reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Findon Burn is classified as having poor ecological potential. ○ The northern part is at risk from flooding. SUDS to be confirmed, but the land is flat. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	0/?

Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The development is in an area identified at risk from surface water flooding and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. The development requirements for the site will ensure development avoids that area and that a Flood Risk Assessment will be required.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**-/0**	○ Unused area next to the golf course could have some biodiversity value. Trees are present on the site. ○ To mitigate effects, loss of trees should be kept to a minimum. A 40m tree buffer between the gym and golf course is proposed. ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats or habitat fragmentation or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ The development could enhance biodiversity through delivery of a planted woodland belt to the north of the site.	+/-
Landscape	**0/-**	○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ However, the site is next to the town centre, proposes a 40m wide buffer and given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	0
Material Assets	**+**	○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure, as the Transport Assessment demonstrates the network can cope. ○ The quality of the new asset, created through the development of this site, would be a positive facility for the town and local catchment.	+
Population	**+**	○ The development would allow integration of the people where they live, work and exercise. Leisure/recreation opportunity in the town.	0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: OP6 (KN094) Land east of Badentoy (Option 2)	**Proposal: Garden centre and restaurant (2500m2)**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0

Water	**0**	○ Nigg WWTW has sufficient capacity, but local network reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Findon Burn is classified as having poor ecological potential. ○ SUDS to be confirmed, but land is flat. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	0
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ No likely impacts.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**+/-**	○ Unused area next to the golf course could have some biodiversity value. Trees are present on the site. ○ To mitigate effects, loss of trees should be kept to a minimum. A tree buffer between the site and golf course is proposed and would be a requirement of the development. ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats or habitat fragmentation or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ The development could enhance biodiversity through delivery of a planted woodland belt to the southeast of the site.	+/-
Landscape	**0/-**	○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ However, the site is next to the town centre, proposes buffer strips around three sides of the site and given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	0
Material Assets	**+**	○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure, a Transport Assessment demonstrates the network can cope and land is available should the A90 slip road need to be widened. ○ The quality of the new asset, created through the development of this site, would be a positive facility for the town and local catchment.	+
Population	**+**	○ The development would allow integration of the people where they live, work and shop. ○ Retail opportunity, on edge of the town centre, in the town.	0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: Infill (KN041) Land at Former Poultry Sheds, Portlethen		**Proposal: 55 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ A proposal of this scale will lead to a decrease in air quality, but Portlethen does not have air quality issues, and its impact is lessoned as it is close to services and facilities. Issues are likely to be persistent and long-term.	0
Water	**0**	○ Nigg WWTW has sufficient capacity, but local network reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	0
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The development area is affected by surface water flooding, but it is likely to be negligible. Issues were resolved at the planning application stage for this site (APP/2007/2042). ○ A proposal on this scale has potential to cause an increase in concentrations of CO_2 emissions through increased car travel. However, there would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel.	-/0
Soil	**+**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in remediation of contaminated soil.	+
Biodiversity	**0/+**	○ Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity. ○ The development will enhance biodiversity through redevelopment of brownfield land, albeit marginally due to its small scale (mostly strategic landscaping around the periphery). ○ Managed open space across the whole site will be long-term and positive for new developments	0/+
Landscape	**0/-**	○ The site is in a prominent location, but the proposal is of a scale or in a location that is unlikely to have any negative significant effects on landscape quality. Strategic landscaping will mitigate its effects, and the rear fences will be set back along the Causeymouth Road.	0
Material Assets	**--**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely education provision at Hillside school, which will have a long-term effect. Solutions are still being sought.	--/?
Population	**+**	○ Only a limited mix of house types is proposed, resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. The plans for the approved planning application only show detached homes. However, a commuted sum for affordable homes is proposed in the S75 Agreement (APP/2007/2042).	+
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ Development of the site is unlikely to have any significant effects on existing pathways or access to open space.	0

		○ Although the site is adjacent to Badentoy Industrial Estate, the population should not be at risk from hazardous developments.	
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment providing development respects their setting (i.e. set back): ○ Site 70m to the north of Craighead Stone circle. HES did not object to the planning application. The proposed screening by trees would mitigate any impact. ○ The Causeymouth Road will not be affected. ○ The remains of a World War II Radar station, now partly demolished, includes two unusual pill boxes, one within this site. Development should be set back. Strategic landscaping would mitigate any impact on its setting.	0/-
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: OP7 (KN027) Land North of Thistle Drive, Hillside	**Proposal: 300 homes**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0/-**	○ A proposal of this scale will affect air quality, but Portlethen is not identified as having air quality issues. Any impacts would be mitigated by its close proximity to services and bus routes. ○ However, the Findon junction off the A90 is at capacity and would need upgrading. If the site is allocated, the need to upgrade the junction will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	0
Water	**--**	○ Nigg WWTW has sufficient capacity, but local network reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ However, the site is bisected by a watercourse and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and will be integrated as positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required." ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	0
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ This site is affected by fluvial flooding along two ditches and in the northeast corner. This could be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), and if allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA will be required. ○ The proposal is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. ○ A proposal on this scale has potential to cause an increase in concentrations of CO_2 emissions through increased car travel. However, there would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel.	0/-

Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**+/?**	○ Existing woodland on the site could be enhanced, and there will be opportunities across the site, but details are unknown. ○ Managed open space across the whole site will be long-term and positive for new developments. ○ If the site is allocated, the need for compensatory planting and/or buffer strips will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	+
Landscape	**-/0**	○ This is a large-scale development that would further alter the character of the area. However, this area is largely urbanised, but this site is in the Aberdeen green belt and its scale will have a noticeable visual impact that could create coalescence issues with Marywell/Checkbar and north of Portlethen. Nonetheless, the site is relatively flat, contained and would appear to be a logical extension to north Portlethen. The impact could be mitigated by strategic landscaping, and towards the south, land next to the A90 is not proposed for development. ○ The site was covered by the Portlethen Corridor Capacity Study in the late 2000's and was one of four most favoured sites. ○ To mitigate the visual impact further and reduce coalescence issues, the southern half of the site should come forward first to allow a more gradual development of this area. Given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. ○ If the site is allocated, these mitigation measures would be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	0/-
Material Assets	**-**	○ The local road network may require to be upgraded (A92 widened until its access point and Thistle Drive) as well as the A90 junction. Portlethen Academy will have capacity issues by 2022, but Portlethen Primary School has a falling school roll and will only be at 69% capacity by 2022. Timescale and funding to deliver these could be an issue. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	0/-
Population	**-**	○ A mix of house types is not proposed, resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. This is to be clarified later. Nonetheless, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types.	+
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. Provides an opportunity to create new paths along the watercourse. If allocated, this should be stated in the development requirements for the site. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ Development of the site is unlikely to have any significant effects on existing pathways or access to open space. ○ Population not at risk from hazardous developments.	0/+
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative sites

Site Ref: OP6 (KN093) Land east of Badentoy (Option 1)		**Proposal: Food retail (1100m2) and drive through restaurant (450m2)**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**0**	○ Nigg WWTW has sufficient capacity, but local network reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Findon Burn is classified as having poor ecological potential. ○ SUDS to be confirmed, but land is flat. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	0
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ No likely impacts.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**+/-**	○ Unused area next to the golf course could have some biodiversity value. Trees are present on the site. ○ To mitigate effects, loss of trees should be kept to a minimum. A tree buffer between the site and golf course is proposed and would be a requirement of the development. ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats or habitat fragmentation or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ The development could enhance biodiversity through delivery of a planted woodland belt to the southeast of the site.	+/-
Landscape	**0/-**	○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ However, the site is next to the town centre, proposes buffer strips around three sides of the site and given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	0
Material Assets	**+**	○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure, a Transport Assessment demonstrates the network can cope and land is available should the A90 slip road need to be widened. ○ The quality of the new asset, created through the development of this site, would be a positive facility for the town and local catchment.	+
Population	**+**	○ The development would allow integration of the people where they live, work and shop. ○ Retail opportunity, on edge of the town centre, in the town.	0

Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN039 Site R2, Land at North West Portlethen		**Proposal: Employment land with scope for mixed uses**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ Individual developments of this scale are unlikely to have any effects on air quality. ○ However, the Findon junction off the A90 is at capacity and would need upgrading. If the site is allocated, the need to upgrade the junction will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	0
Water	**?**	○ As the scale of development has not been specified and can be either employment or mixed use no assessment can be made. ○ Nigg WWTW has sufficient capacity, but local network reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment.	0/?
Climatic Factors	-	○ Small areas of surface water flooding affects the site but is unlikely to be an issue. Surface water flooding does affect the access road. ○ At 5ha a proposal on this scale has potential to cause an increase in concentrations of CO_2 emissions through increased car travel. The site is within 400m of a bus stop. ○ The site is safeguarded in the LDP 2017 as site R2 for a park and ride facility.	-/0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases	0
Biodiversity	**?**	○ Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact as the proposal is of a scale or in a location that is unlikely to negatively affect a nature conservation site or wider biodiversity on biodiversity. ○ No information is provided on biodiversity enhancement or habitat augmentation.	0
Landscape	**--**	○ The scale and location of the proposal will have a negative impact on the landscape character, and the effect is likely to be long-term. The site is within the Aberdeen green belt and the proposed uses would impact on the openness of the landscape. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change.	--

		○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations. ○ Mitigation measures are unlikely to improve the impact and buildings and bunds would reduce the openness of the area.	
Material Assets	**?**	○ No details have been provided on the nature of the development and no assessment of impact on material assets can be judged. However, the Findon A90 road junction has capacity issues. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	-/?
Population	**?**	○ No specification for the mix of house types that may be proposed as part of a mixed development results in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, mixed house types would be required. ○ The development would allow integration of the people where they live and work. Employment opportunity in the village.	0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Population not at risk from hazardous developments.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN057 Land to the West of Cookston Road, Portlethen	**Proposal: Mixed use: 400 homes, education, retail and associated infrastructure**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ Individual developments of this scale are unlikely to have any effects on air quality. It does not impact on an area with air quality issues and is not for industrial uses.	0
Water	**0/--**	○ Nigg WWTW has sufficient capacity, but local network reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The site includes watercourses and a buffer strips will be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. “Buffer strips will be required adjacent to the watercourse and will be integrated as positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required.”	0

Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The development is in an area identified at surface water flood risk and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. ○ A large part of the site is found to be at risk from flooding. No development should be allocated on this land, which could affect the viability of this site. It could form part of the open space provision or be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). If allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA may or will be required. ○ A proposal on this scale has potential to cause an increase in concentrations of CO_2 emissions through increased car travel. However, there would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel.	-/?
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would have an adverse effect on the ability of the peat rich soil to store carbon and therefore have a detrimental effect on CO_2 emissions. An assessment would be required to identify the extent of the peat. ○ Any loss cannot be compensated and could only be mitigated by avoiding the peat.	-/0
Biodiversity	**-/+**	○ The development of a greenfield site is likely to have long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. (Lowland Raised Peat bog. An assessment would be required to identify extend of the peat and a buffer strip created. These requirements would be stated in the Settlement Statement if the site is allocated. ○ The development is not likely to conserve, protect and enhance the diversity of species and habitats and the natural heritage of the area. ○ The development is of a scale that could enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed.	+/-
Landscape	**--**	○ The scale and location of the proposal will have a negative impact on the landscape character, and the effect is likely to be long-term. The site is within the Aberdeen green belt and the proposed uses would impact on the openness of the landscape and integrity of the green belt. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	--
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access (Findon A92(T) junction which has capacity issues) and education provision at Hillside school, which will have a long-term effect. ○ While a new school is proposed, consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	+/-
Population	**?**	○ The mix of house types is not disclosed, but proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types. The proposal would provide for 100 affordable homes.	+
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Poor air quality is likely to have long-term on effect on human health.	0/+

		○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ Development of the site is unlikely to have any significant effects on existing pathways or access to open space, but could create new areas of open space. ○ Population is not at risk from hazardous developments.	
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN058 Land North of Schoolhill, Portlethen	**Proposal: Mixed use: 1550 homes, education, retail and associated infrastructure**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**-**	○ A proposal of this scale will have an adverse effect on air quality. Issues are likely to be persistent and long-term ○ However, it does not impact on an area with air quality issues and is not for industrial uses. ○ Portlethen does have a mix of services and employment land, which wold reduce effects, as well as public transport.	-/0
Water	**0/--**	○ Nigg WWTW has sufficient capacity, but local network reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ A wetland park is proposed and would be masterplanned into the site. ○ The site includes watercourses and a buffer strips will be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. “Buffer strips will be required adjacent to the watercourse and will be integrated as positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required.”	+
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The development is in an area identified at surface water flood risk and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. ○ Part of the site found to be at risk from flooding could form part of the open space provision or be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). If allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA will be required. ○ A proposal on this scale has potential to cause an increase in concentrations of CO_2 emissions through increased car travel. However, there would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel.	-/?

Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would have an adverse effect on the ability of the peat rich soil to store carbon and therefore detrimental effect on CO_2 emissions. An assessment would be required to identify the extent of the peat. ○ Any loss cannot be compensated and could only be mitigated by avoiding the peat.	-/?
Biodiversity	**-/+**	○ The development of a greenfield site is likely to have long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. (Lowland Raised Peat bog). An assessment would be required to identify extend of the peat and a buffer strip created. These requirements would be stated in the Settlement Statement if the site is allocated. ○ The development is not likely to conserve, protect and enhance the diversity of species and habitats and the natural heritage of the area. ○ The development is of a scale that could enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed. ○ Managed open space across the whole site will be long-term and positive for new developments.	+/-
Landscape	**--**	○ The scale and location of the proposal will have a negative impact on the landscape character, and the effect is likely to be long-term. The site is within the Aberdeen green belt and the proposed uses would impact on the openness of the landscape and integrity of the green belt. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations. ○ Effects could be mitigated by setting any development back from the distributor road to create a strategic landscape and visual buffer. The existing wood at Duff's Hill provides a backdrop that would help to contain the site.	--/-
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access (Findon A92(T) junction which has capacity issues) and education provision at Hillside school, which will have a long-term effect. ○ While a new school is proposed, consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ A wetland park will also have a positive impact.	+/-
Population	**?**	○ The mix of house types is not disclosed, but proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types. The proposal would provide for 387 affordable homes.	+
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Poor air quality is likely to have a long-term on effect on human health ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ Development of the site is unlikely to have any significant effects on existing pathways or access to open space, but could create new areas of open space. ○ Population not at risk from hazardous developments.	+
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0

Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect

Site Ref: KN082 Land South of Bramble Way, Clashfarquhar, Portlethen		**Proposal: 160 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ A proposal of this scale will have an impact on air quality, but Portlethen is not approaching the AQMA level. ○ Issues are likely to be persistent and long-term, but mitigated by its close proximity to services and bus routes.	0
Water	**-**	○ Nigg WWTW has sufficient capacity, but local network reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The site is adjacent to the Burn of Daff and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. Such measures will be included in the development requirements of the site, if it is allocated.	0
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ This site is affected by surface water flooding along the Burn of Daff, and areas to the north and south. A Flood Risk Assessment will be required, and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. Development should avoid these areas of flood risk. Mitigation measures will be stated in the development requirements for the site. ○ A proposal on this scale has the potential to cause an increase in concentrations of CO_2 emissions through increased car travel. This would be long-term and permanent. The site is near a bus route, which could reduce effects.	-/0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**-**	○ The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. In this case, the proposal would result in the loss of a young, but established tree belt, and lowland raised peatbog. ○ The extent of any peatland habitats would have to be assessed, and this would be stated in the development requirements for the site, if allocated. ○ While buffer strips are proposed, most are narrow in comparison. ○ Managed open space across the whole site will be long-term and positive for new developments. ○ An alternative to the indicative masterplan is to retain the tree belt and incorporate it into the scheme.	-

Landscape	**-**	○ This area is largely urbanised, but this site is in the Aberdeen green belt and its scale will have a noticeable visual impact that could create coalescence issues with Newtonhill and south of Portlethen. ○ Strategic landscaping already exists to define the southern boundary of Portlethen, which is reinforced by the scrubland to the west that is not farmed. ○ This proposal would elongate the settlement further and encourage more development to the south in the future.	-
Material Assets	**--**	○ It is not clear whether adequate road infrastructure could be provided to serve the number of dwellings proposed, as only one access off Bramble Road, whereas two vehicle access points are required. ○ Portlethen Academy will have capacity issues by 2022, but Forehill Primary School has a static school roll and will only be at 77% capacity by 2022. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	-
Population	**-**	○ A mix of house types are not proposed, resulting in poor housing choice. ○ However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types. ○ Up to 40 affordable homes could be provided.	+
Human Health	**-/+**	○ It would result in loss of open space and would need to safeguard a route for the proposed core path along the eastern boundary. However, a new area of open space is proposed, namely down the centre alongside a watercourse. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ Population not at risk from hazardous developments.	+/-
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN109 Land at Causeyport Farm, North of Portlethen		**Proposal: 1800 homes, business uses, education and retail**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**-**	○ A proposal of this scale will have an adverse effect on air quality. Issues are likely to be persistent and long-term ○ However, it does not impact on an area with air quality issues and is not for industrial uses. ○ Portlethen does have a mix services and employment land, which wold reduce effects, as well as public transport.	-/0
Water	**0/-**	○ Nigg WWTW has sufficient capacity, but local network reinforcement and DIA may be required.	0

		○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, site water budgets, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The site includes watercourses and buffer strips will be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "Buffer strips will be required adjacent to the watercourse and will be integrated as positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required."	
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The development is in an area identified at surface water flood risk and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. ○ Part of the site found to be at risk from flooding could form part of the open space provision or be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). If allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA may or will be required. ○ A proposal on this scale has the potential to cause an increase in concentrations of CO_2 emissions through increased car travel. However, there would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel.	-/0
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would have an adverse effect on the ability of the peat rich soil to store carbon and therefore detrimental effect on CO_2 emissions. An assessment would be required to identify the extent of the peat. ○ Any loss cannot be compensated and could only be mitigated by avoiding the peat.	-/?
Biodiversity	**+/-**	○ River Dee SAC is set to the north and qualifying features are likely to be affected through tourism and drainage. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the River Dee SAC. ○ The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat (Lowland Raised Peat bog). An assessment would be required to identify the extent of the peat and a buffer strip created. These requirements would be stated in the Settlement Statement if the site is allocated. ○ The development is not likely to conserve, protect and enhance the diversity of species and habitats and the natural heritage of the area. ○ The development is of a scale that could enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed. ○ Managed open space across the whole site will be long-term and positive for new developments.	+/-
Landscape	**--**	○ The scale and location of the proposal will have a negative impact on the landscape character, and the effect is likely to be long-term. The site is within the Aberdeen green belt and the proposed uses would impact on the openness of the landscape and integrity of the green belt. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations.	--/-

		○ Effects could be mitigated by setting any development back from the distributor road to create a strategic landscape and visual buffer. The existing wood at Duff's Hill provides a backdrop that would contain the site. ○ A central focal point (mound) is proposed, which helps with orientation and local identity.	
Material Assets	**--**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access (Findon A90 junction which has capacity issues) and education provision at Hillside school, which will have a long-term affect. ○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure, provided services are integral to the development. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	-
Population	**?**	○ The mix of house types is not disclosed, but proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types. The proposal would provide for 450 affordable homes.	+
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Poor air quality is likely to have a long-term on effect on human health. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ Development of the site is unlikely to have any significant effects on existing pathways or access to open space. ○ Population not at risk from hazardous developments.	+
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

PORTLETHEN VILLAGE

Preferred Site

None.

Alternative sites

None.

ROADSIDE OF KINNEFF

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP1 (KN033) Land west of Roadside of Kinneff		**Proposal: 46 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0/-**	○ While individual developments of this scale are unlikely have a significant impact on air quality, the site is disjointed from the rest of the settlement unless it comes forward at the same time as OP1. Otherwise, residents would be more likely to rely on private transport which would decrease air quality through emissions. This is likely to be a negative, long-term impact.	0
Water	**--**	○ There is currently no available capacity at the Kinneff WWTW. A growth project would be initiated once the 5 growth criteria were met. DIA is also required. If the site is allocated, this will be specified in the Settlement Statement. but a private sewer is proposed, otherwise it will have to connect to a public sewer, as advised by SEPA. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Capacity is available at Whitehillocks WTW, but local mains reinforcement may be required. This issue will be noted in the Settlement Statement. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	0
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ There would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel. ○ The site is near a busy bus route, which could reduce commuter traffic.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The development does not lie within an area of Prime Agricultural Land. ○ The development does not lie within an area known to contain Peat.	0
Biodiversity	**0**	○ Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity. ○ The development site may present opportunities to enhance biodiversity through design, which would have a positive impact. However, if these opportunities are not seized or utilised, the scheme is likely to have a negative impact on biodiversity. ○ The development is not likely to maintain or enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed.	0/+
Landscape	**-**	○ The scale and location of the proposal will have a negative impact on the landscape character, and the effect is likely to be long-term. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations.	0/-

		○ However, the site concentrates development in the heart of the settlement, avoiding ribbon development and would appear to be a logical extension to the existing allocation. The impact could be mitigated by strategic landscaping along the north, south and west boundary, and if allocated, this will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site, or designated as protected land.	
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely WTW/WWTW capacity, which will have a temporary effect. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	+
Population	**-/0**	○ A small mix of house (detached & semi-detached, 3/4 bed) types are proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. ○ 20% affordable housing is proposed, this falls below the existing expectation of 25%. ○ However, proposals must accord with the design and affordable housing policies in the LDP. ○ The development would allow integration of the people where they live and work. Employment opportunity in the village.	+/0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space or core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative Sites

None.

ST CYRUS

Preferred Sites

None that are new sites.

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: KN002 Site North of Invergarry Park, St Cyrus		**Proposal: 19 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ In terms of air quality, the development is unlikely to have a negative effect on air quality. ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**-/+**	○ Sewage pumping stations in St Cyrus and Johnshaven to Nether Knox WWTW are to be part of a growth project that requires to be delivered. A DIA may be required depending on the nature and volume of discharge, especially for any developments that are not providing betterment to the system, to establish if the Sewage Pumping Station could cope with additional flows to the storage capacity etc. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW, but local water mains reinforcement may be required and an increase in storage is also required for the service reservoir. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The site has a watercourse running the lower part of the site and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required."	+
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ There would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel. ○ Facilities are further away as the only access and egress into the site is from the north. No connection is provided from the south.	0
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term.	-

		○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	
Biodiversity	**0/-**	○ Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity, other than from disturbance during construction. ○ The development is not likely to enhance an informal green network north of the A92 as a house is proposed in between it and the SUDS pond. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. If allocated, this would be stated in the Settlement Statement.	0
Landscape	**0/-**	○ The scale and location of the proposal fits well within the landscape. ○ However, the site will be visually prominent from the A92. This could be mitigated by strategic landscaping.	0
Material Assets	**0/-**	○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure, but the WTW requires upgrading.	0/-
Population	**-**	○ Limited mix of house types is proposed resulting in a very limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, LDP policy requires a mix of house types. The community prefer to see smaller 1-2 bedroom homes.	+/0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space core paths.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN003 Site Adjacent to Lochside Road, St Cyrus (Option 2)	**Proposal: 30 homes**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ In terms of air quality, the development is unlikely to have a negative effect on air quality. ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**-/+**	○ Sewage pumping stations in St Cyrus and Johnshaven to Nether Knox WWTW are to be part of a growth project that requires to be delivered. A DIA may be required depending on the nature and volume of discharge, especially for any developments that are not providing betterment to the system, to establish if the Sewage Pumping Station could cope with additional flows to the storage capacity etc. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW, but local water mains reinforcement may be required and an increase in storage is also required for the service reservoir. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	+

		○ The site is adjacent to a watercourse and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting."	
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ There would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel. ○ Facilities are further away as the only access and egress into the site is from the north. No connection is provided from the south.	0
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-
Biodiversity	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any significant effects on biodiversity.	0
Landscape	**-**	○ The location of the proposal will have a negative impact on the landscape character, as it will extend Lochside and St Cyrus to the T-junction, elongating them both and joining these two places together. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use will change, as the landscape is more rural on the north side of the A92 when approaching St Cyrus from the west. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations. ○ However, the impact could be mitigated by strategic landscaping, reducing its impact in the long-term. A thick tree belt along Lochside Road would minimise the landscape and visual impact the most.	0/-
Material Assets	**0/-**	○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure, but the WTW requires upgrading.	0
Population	**?**	○ Housing types are unknown. The community prefer to see smaller 1-2-bedroom homes. LPD policy will require a mix of house types.	+/0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Strategic landscaping could allow for traffic calming, encouraging vehicles to slow down when approaching St Cyrus.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment, but the design of homes should respect the 19th century cottages along the A92.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN004 Site Adjacent to St Cyrus Park (Option 1)		**Proposal: 49 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effects – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ In terms of air quality, the development is unlikely to have a negative effect on air quality. ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**-/+**	○ Sewage pumping stations in St Cyrus and Johnshaven to Nether Knox WWTW are to be part of a growth project that requires to be delivered. A DIA may be required depending on the nature and volume of discharge, especially for any developments that are not providing betterment to the system, to establish if the Sewage Pumping Station could cope with additional flows to the storage capacity etc. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW, but local water mains reinforcement may be required and an increase in storage is also required for the service reservoir. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The site is adjacent to a watercourse and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting. A Flood Risk Assessment will be required."	+
Climatic Factors	**0/-**	○ There would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel. ○ Pedestrian links to the south allows access to services. ○ The southeast corner is at risk from surface water flooding, which could affect homes along the A92. This could be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), and if allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA will be required.	0
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-
Biodiversity	**0/+**	○ Unlikely to have any significant effects on biodiversity. ○ The scale of site and the adjacent park allow for enhancement opportunities, but their scale is not specified.	0/+
Landscape	**-**	○ The scale and location of the proposal will have a negative impact on the landscape character and setting of St Cyrus, as it will develop a central open area (approx. over 500m long and 270m wide) that is free from development (contains the park and fields), with St Cyrus to the northeast and Lochside to the southwest. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use will change, introducing development in this open central area.	-/0

		○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations. ○ However, the impact could be mitigated by restricting development to the south, next to St Cyrus.	
Material Assets	**-**	○ Could increase pressure on the local C class road network, and the WTW requires upgrading.	-/0
Population	**?**	○ Housing types are unknown. The community prefer to see smaller 1-2-bedroom homes. LDP design policy requires a mix of house types.	+/0
Human Health	**+**	○ Opportunity to enhance existing provision of open space and paths.	+
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ Could obstruct St Cyrus Church when viewed from the minor road to the northwest of the site and affect its setting.	-
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN014 Land at Burnhead, St Cyrus		**Proposal: 30-50 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effects – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ Poor connectivity to services – would have to go through Lochside or towards Ecclesgreig Road. ○ However, due to its scale, the development is unlikely to have a negative effect on air quality.	0
Water	**+/--**	○ Sewage pumping stations in St Cyrus and Johnshaven to Nether Knox WWTW are to be part of a growth project that requires to be delivered. A DIA may be required depending on the nature and volume of discharge, especially for any developments that are not providing betterment to the system, to establish if the Sewage Pumping Station could cope with additional flows to the storage capacity etc. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW, but local water mains reinforcement may be required and an increase in storage is also required for the service reservoir. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The site includes a pond and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. “A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the pond and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required.”	+
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ Due to the scale of the proposal, there would be low CO_2 emissions from travel.	0
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	-

		○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land, although it is currently enclosed and used as private ground. Nonetheless, it will result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	
Biodiversity	**+/-**	○ The development of this site is likely to have an impact on biodiversity through disturbance to red squirrels that periodically use the site as a habitat. Construction of the site would cause the most disturbance, but development has occurred immediately adjacent in Lochside. ○ However, the intention is to retain all the woodland, pond and avoid fragmenting habitats, although trees will have to be removed to allow appropriate road access. ○ The duration of effects will vary – construction will be short-medium-term, but disturbance from people and dogs could be longer. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities.	+
Landscape	**0**	○ Development is hidden behind a thick tree belt, so unlikely to have an impact on the landscape.	0
Material Assets	**+/-**	○ Creation of a publicly accessible wood (albeit a tree belt). However, there is opportunity to enhance what is there, although there is no footpath from St Cyrus to it (pedestrian safety). ○ Development will slightly increase pressure on Mearns Academy, which is forecast to be over capacity by 2022. ○ Would increase pressure on the local C class road network. Uncertain about possibilities of widening the road – if required and land in separate ownership. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	+/-
Population	**?**	○ House type is unknown. ○ However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP. The local community has expressed a need for smaller homes, which would be specified in the Settlement Statement (e.g. in the vision statement).	+
Human Health	**+**	○ Proposes a new area of open space and paths.	+
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN043 Land South of Burnhead Croft, Lochside, St Cyrus		**Proposal: 9 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ Poor connectivity to services – would have to go through Lochside or towards Ecclesgreig Road. ○ However, due to its scale, the development is unlikely to have a negative effect on air quality.	0
Water	**-**	○ Sewage pumping stations in St Cyrus and Johnshaven to Nether Knox WWTW are to be part of a growth project that requires to be delivered. A DIA may be required depending on the nature and volume of discharge, especially for any developments that are not providing betterment to the system, to establish if the Sewage Pumping Station could cope with additional flows to the storage capacity etc. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW, but local water mains reinforcement may be required and an increase in storage is also required for the service reservoir. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The site is adjacent to a watercourse and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required."	0
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ Due to the scale of the proposal, there would be minimal CO_2 emissions from travel and solar heating is proposed.	0
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-
Biodiversity	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any significant effect on biodiversity.	0
Landscape	**-**	○ The continued spread of ribbon development towards Ecclesgreig Road will further alter the rural character of the area and would elongate Lochside. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects	-/0
Material Assets	**0/-**	○ The proposal could increase pressure on the local minor road network.	0/-
Population	**0/-**	○ The community prefer to see smaller 1-2 bedroom homes, of which only two homes are proposed to be 2 bedrooms. The rest will be larger detached and semi-detached houses. However, LDP policies require a mix of house types.	+/0

Human Health	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any impact on human health. It would not result in loss of open space/core paths.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ It will obstruct views of the B listed St Cyrus Church when viewed from the minor road, but it is unlikely to affect the setting of the church.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN065 Land North of Beach Road, St Cyrus	**Proposal: 60 homes**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0/-**	○ Good connectivity to services will encourage more walking. ○ Due to its scale, it could increase traffic through Inverbervie, which has air quality issues. ○ However, the impact can be mitigated as St Cyrus is on a bus route.	0
Water	**0**	○ Sewage pumping stations in St Cyrus and Johnshaven to Nether Knox WWTW are to be part of a growth project that requires to be delivered. A DIA may be required depending on the nature and volume of discharge, especially for any developments that are not providing betterment to the system, to establish if the Sewage Pumping Station could cope with additional flows to the storage capacity etc. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW, but local water mains reinforcement may be required and an increase in storage is also required for the service reservoir. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	0
Climatic Factors	**0/-**	○ Due to the scale of the proposal, there will be some CO_2 emissions from travelling, but this is lessened due to the close proximity of local services.	0
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-
Biodiversity	**0**	○ Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity, but the former railway line includes species rich grassland. The proposal should avoid development on this area – it could contribute towards the site's open space requirement. ○ The proposal is less than 500 from local and national natural heritage designations, but the development itself will not impact on them.	0

Landscape	**-**	○ Site is with the southeast Coast Special Landscape Area and Coastal Zone. ○ Large scale development that would further alter the character of the area. However, the site is enclosed by development on three sides and would appear to be a logical extension to the settlement. The impact could be mitigated by strategic landscaping, which could be supported by a strong gateway feature off the A92.	0
Material Assets	**-/+**	○ There are several infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access off the A92 and development will slightly increase pressure on Mearns Academy, which is forecast to be over capacity by 2022. This later effect will be long-term. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ WTW requires upgrading. ○ Could increase pressure on the local C class road network to the SE of the site, if an emergency access is provided. ○ Has the potential to enhance the core path network.	+/-
Population	**?**	○ House type is unknown. However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types. Would include up to 15 affordable homes.	+
Human Health	**0**	○ Connects with a core path.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ It will affect the setting of the B listed St Cyrus Church when viewed from the A92, although this impact will only be noticeable the nearer you are to the village. Site lines in the proposal could mitigate this impact. If the site is allocated, the proposed mitigation measure(s) would be stated as part of the development requirements for the site. The affects would be long-term and permanent. ○ Site includes part of the dismantled railway line, which is incorporated into the indicative layout.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN134 Land at Highfield, Adjacent to Ecclesgreig Road, St Cyrus	**Proposal: 24 homes**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ Due to its scale, the development is unlikely to have a negative effect on air quality.	0
Water	**-**	○ Sewage pumping stations in St Cyrus and Johnshaven to Nether Knox WWTW are to be part of a growth project that requires to be delivered. A DIA may be required depending on the nature and volume of discharge, especially for any developments that are not providing betterment to the system, to establish if the Sewage Pumping Station could cope with additional flows to the storage capacity etc. This is a reversible short-term impact.	0

		○ There is available capacity at Whitehillocks WTW, but local water mains reinforcement may be required and an increase in storage is also required for the service reservoir. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The site is adjacent to a watercourse and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required."	
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ Due to the scale of the proposal, there would be minimal CO_2 emissions from travel and solar heating is proposed. ○ The development is in an area identified at risk from surface water flooding and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. This could be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), and if allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA will be required.	0
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-
Biodiversity	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any significant effect on biodiversity.	0
Landscape	**-**	○ The proposal is not immediately adjacent to St Cyrus, and the encroachment of houses into the countryside could negatively impact on the rural character. It also increases coalescence between St Cyrus and Lochside that will further alter the rural character of the area. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	-/0
Material Assets	**0/-**	○ The proposal could increase pressure on the local minor road network unless the road and the junction at Ecclesgrieg Road is upgraded.	0/-
Population	**+**	○ Promotes 2 bedrooms homes, which the community support.	+/0
Human Health	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any impact on human health. It would not result in loss of open space core paths.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ The gently undulating topography and location of the proposal is unlikely to affect Woodside Croft, which is listed on the Sites and Monuments Record.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

STONEHAVEN

Preferred sites

Site Ref: OP1 (KN080) Carron Den Road		**Proposal: 155 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**-**	○ In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality, particularly in towns like Stonehaven, where air quality is approaching the EU objective. ○ An Air Quality Assessment deemed the planning application for 142 homes on the site acceptable. ○ Mitigate by providing a bus stop nearer to the site.	0/-
Water	**-**	○ There is available capacity at Nigg WWTW, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Whitehillocks WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ The lower part of the site is at risk from flooding. This is proposed as open space and SEPA approved the FRA for planning application APP/2016/1986 for 142 homes (allowed at appeal pending s75 Agreement by December 2018). ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of Carron Water is categorised as poor. ○ The site is adjacent to Carron Water and mitigation measures would be required, which would be stated as part of the development requirements for the site (e.g. a buffer strip).	0
Climatic Factors	**--**	○ The scale of development would increase emissions, but the overall affect is reduced as the site will have a bus stop close to it, and through more pedestrian links ○ Air source heat pumps and solar PV proposed. ○ Part of the development is in an area identified at risk from fluvial flooding and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. Part of the site found to be at risk from flooding will not be included within an allocation and could form part of the open space provision. This is proposed in the approved planning applications.	0/-
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**0**	○ Fowlsheugh SPA is set to the southeast. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and has a potential to have an impact on qualifying species through tourism or visits by the residents and through drainage. Recreational access	0

		to the site is actively managed. by the RSPB. SNH advise that there should be no additional pressures from visitors where facilities and visitor management plans are in place. No significant issues from increased public access is foreseen. ○ Dunnottar Woods is already popular with people.	
Landscape	**0**	○ Isolated infill site that is contained by trees, woods and the Carron Water. ○ It is a logical location for development and would not impact on the setting of the town. ○ Given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	0
Material Assets	**+**	○ Improved access to Dunnottar Woods via a foot bridge to the south of the site.	+
Population	**+**	○ Mix of house types is proposed. ○ The site is in close proximity to services.	+
Human Health	**+/-**	○ Proposes new area of open space and links to core paths. ○ Poor air quality is likely to have long-term effect on human health. Impact can be mitigated (see above). ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	+
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the listed buildings around Dunnottar, as there is a significant visual separation created by the burn, the woodland, and the distance between the edge of the development and the setting of these buildings.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: OP2 (KN102) Ury House, East Lodge		**Proposal: 212 homes (enabling development)**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**-**	○ In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have long-term negative effect on air quality, particularly in towns like Stonehaven, where air quality is approaching the EU objective. ○ The site is adjacent to a bus route, which could mitigate effects if access is provided to it. A supermarket has planning permission to the west of OP2.	-/?
Water	**--**	○ There is available capacity at Nigg WWTW, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Whitehillocks WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Not clear where the SUDS would go, especially as the site is on a hill. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	0

		○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse (Cowie Water) where the water quality is classified as good. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure. ○ The site is bisected by a minor watercourse and adjacent to Cowie Water and buffer strips would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourses and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required."	
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. ○ The site is adjacent to a bus route, which could mitigate effects if access is provided to it.	-/?
Soil	**--**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ Would lead to the loss of prime agricultural land, and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. However, the social, economic and landscape benefits of restoring Ury House outweigh this loss.	--
Biodiversity	**0**	○ The site may have an impact on Garron Point SAC due to tourism or walking. Garron Point SAC is set to the east. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species. This is likely to be caused by tourism/visits. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. These are likely to be very small given the accessibility of Garron Point. ○ Development avoids the river valley.	0
Landscape	**-**	○ While the site is located on a hill that is visible from the A90 and other viewpoints, the indicative layout has been designed to take a linear form following the contours of the land, thus minimising the impact from prominent viewpoints within Stonehaven and beyond. ○ Furthermore, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	0
Material Assets	**+**	○ The scale of development of Ury Estate may trigger the need for a primary on the north side of the A90. However, the masterplan for the whole estate does not show this. Re-zoning may be an option to an alternative school, if required in the future. ○ Restoration and reuse of Ury House will provide social and economic benefits.	+
Population	**-**	○ The indicative layout shows a limited mix of house types, which could exclude some groups, although there will be 25% affordable homes. ○ However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types, which would be specified in the Settlement Statement (e.g. in the vision statement).	+
Human Health	**+/-**	○ New area of open space is proposed to the north (wide tree belt). ○ Proposal is within Health and Safety Executive outer and middle consultation zone. However, BP did not object to the planning application.	+/-
Cultural Heritage	**+/--**	○ The setting of Ury House, which is B listed, could be affected, as the proposal will overlook it. However, its distance and the tree lined valley of Cowie Water help to reduce the site's impact on the setting of Ury House.	+/-

		○ This proposal could have an adverse cumulative impact given the development that is already permitted west, east and south of Ury House. ○ Proposal has the potential to enhance the former designed landscape, which is listed on the Sites and Monuments Record.	
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: OP3 (KN087) Ury House, Blue Lodge		**Proposal: 99 homes (enabling development)**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**-**	○ In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality, particularly in towns like Stonehaven, where air quality is approaching the EU objective. ○ The bus route could be extended, although there may not be a sufficient turning area in this location.	-
Water	**--**	○ There is available capacity at Nigg WWTW, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Whitehillocks WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse (Cowie Water) where the water quality is classified as good. ○ The site is bisected by a minor watercourse and is adjacent to Cowie Water, and buffer strips would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "Buffer strip will be required adjacent to the minor watercourse and Cowie Water and will be integrated as positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required." ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure.	0
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. ○ Stonehaven has a number of services that will reduce the need to travel long distance.	-/0
Soil	**-/0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ Partial loss of prime agricultural land, which would result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long term.	-/0

Biodiversity	**--**	○ The site may have an impact on Garron Point SAC due to tourism or walking. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. These are likely to be very small given the accessibility of Garron Point. ○ Part of the development is within ancient woodland, which will disturb wildlife within it. It is not clear the extent of the woodland removal, but planning application APP/2012/1617 shows only the trees fronting the A975 will be retained. Compensatory planting has not been explained, and the areas of open space, as shown in the planning application are outwith this bid. ○ Planning permission has been granted on this site. However, the landscaped area is outwith this bid. ○ Riparian habitat is identified next to Cowie Water. ○ To mitigate these effects, riparian habitat should be avoided. Preference is not to allocate housing on land identified as ancient woodland, despite the granting of planning consent. This will depend on whether development commences prior to LDP adoption.	--/?
Landscape	**-/0**	○ The site is within a contained landscape that forms part of the former designed landscape of Ury House. There is very little development on the west side of the A90. As such the introduction of development on this site would have a significant visual impact. ○ However, the site is flat, and strategic landscaping/buffer strip along the Cowie Water tree belt would mitigate its impact. ○ Furthermore, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	0/-
Material Assets	**-/+**	○ The scale of development at Ury Estate may trigger the need for a primary on the north side of the A90. However, the masterplan for the whole estate does not show this. Re-zoning may be an option to an alternative school, if required in the future. ○ Restoration and reuse of Ury House will provide social and economic benefits.	+
Population	**+**	○ A mix of house types are proposed resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population.	+
Human Health	**-**	○ Core path will not be affected, but the ancient woodland to the north will be. New area of open space is proposed to the south (wide tree belt). ○ Development within the Health and Safety Executive outer and middle consultation zones. Development on the approved planning application shows no development in the inner consultation zone.	-
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ The setting of the scheduled Cowie Line, pill box and anti-tank blocks forming part of the WWII defences could be affected, as the site is located just north and west of the scheduled monument. The monument is presently set within trees, which is likely to screen any development from view. Development must avoid any direct (i.e. physical) impacts on the legally protected scheduled area of the monument, which is at this strategic crossing point of the Cowie Burn. This should inform any assessment of the potential impact on its setting. ○ Landscaping and the layout of houses would reduce this impact. Sensitive housing design and landscaping - such as leaving undeveloped land, should considered, in line with HES Setting guidance. ○ The setting of Ury House, which is B listed, could be affected, as the proposal will be viewed in the same vista as Ury House on the Slug Road bridge. However, there is sufficient separation distance and the tree lined valley of Cowie Water help to reduce the site's impact on the setting of Ury House. ○ This proposal could have an adverse cumulative impact given the development that is already permitted west, east and south of Ury House.	0/-

		○ The proposal has the potential to slightly enhance the former designed landscape, which is listed on the Sites and Monuments Record, if the offsite open space is planted (this has begun).	
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: OP5 (KN103) Land at East Lodge		**Proposal: 60 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	-	○ In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality, particularly in towns like Stonehaven, where air quality is approaching the EU objective. ○ The site is adjacent to a bus route, which could mitigate effects if access is provided to it. A supermarket has planning permission to the west of OP2.	-/?
Water	-	○ There is available capacity at Nigg WWTW, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Whitehillocks WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Not clear where the SUDS would go, especially as the site is on a hill. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse (Cowie Water) where the water quality is classified as good. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure. ○ The site is bisected by a minor watercourse and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. “A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as positive feature of the development.”	0
Climatic Factors	-	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. ○ The site is adjacent to a bus route, which could mitigate effects if access is provided to it.	-/?
Soil	-	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the minor loss of prime agricultural land and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. However, the social, economic and landscape benefits of restoring Ury House outweigh this loss.	-

Biodiversity	**0**	○ The site may have an impact on Garron Point SAC due to tourism or walking. Garron Point SAC is set to the east. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species. This is likely to be caused by tourism/visits. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. These are likely to be very small given the accessibility of Garron Point.	0
Landscape	**-**	○ The site is located on a hill that is visible from the A90 and other viewpoints, and the indicative layout has been designed to take a linear form following the contours of the land and proposed a substantial area of open space along its northern boundary, thus reducing the impact from prominent viewpoints within Stonehaven and beyond. ○ Development of the full extent of this site is likely to incur significant effects on the designed (non-inventory) landscape of Ury House and is likely to compromise the balance of open to enclosed spaces which typify this historic parkland. To minimise effects on the designed landscape, the siting and massing of housing should seek to focus on the lower slopes, with a landscape structure to reflect the character, scale and species of the existing policy woodlands. ○ Furthermore, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	+/-
Material Assets	**-**	○ Site falls within Dunnottar Primary School catchment, which is nearing its capacity, but a solution is being sought. Re-zoning may be an option to an alternative school. ○ The scale of development Ury Estate may trigger the need for a primary on the north side of the A90. However, the masterplan for the whole estate does not show this. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	0
Population	**-**	○ The indicative layout shows a limited mix of house types, which could exclude some groups, although there will be 25% affordable homes. ○ However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types, which would be specified in the Settlement Statement (e.g. in the vision statement).	+
Human Health	**+/?**	○ New area of open space is proposed to the north (wide tree belt). ○ Small number of the population within a Health and Safety Executive outer and middle consultation zone. Open space/road is proposed.	+/?
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ The setting of Ury House, which is B listed, could be affected, as the proposal will overlook it. However, its distance and the tree lined valley of Cowie Water help to reduce the site's impact on the setting of Ury House. ○ This proposal could have an adverse cumulative impact given the development that is already permitted west, east and south of Ury House. ○ Proposal has the potential to enhance the former designed landscape, which is listed on the Sites and Monuments Record.	+/-
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: OP6 (KN104) Mackie Village Ury Estate		Proposal: 91 affordable homes (enabling development)	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**-**	○ In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality, particularly in towns like Stonehaven, where air quality is approaching the EU objective. However, the link road will improve connectivity to Stonehaven's services. ○ The site is next to a future bus route, which could mitigate effects if access is provided to it. Adjacent to the site, planning permission is approved for a supermarket.	-/0
Water	**-**	○ There is available capacity at Nigg WWTW, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Whitehillocks WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Not clear where the SUDS would go, especially as the site is flat and adjacent to Cowie Water. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse (Cowie Water) where the water quality is classified as good. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure. ○ The site is adjacent to a watercourse, Cowie Water and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to Cowie Water and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required."	0
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. ○ The site is next to a future bus route, which could mitigate effects if access is provided to it. ○ However, the link road will improve connectivity to Stonehaven's services.	0
Soil	**0/?**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ Could remove contaminated soil from landfill, but this is unknown.	0/?
Biodiversity	**0**	○ The site may have an impact on Garron Point SAC due to tourism or walking. Garron Point SAC is set to the east. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species. This is likely to be caused by tourism/visits. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. These are likely to be very small given the accessibility of Garron Point.	0

		○ NESBReC notes the presence of badgers in the area when commenting on the pending planning application APP/2018/0121. Land is currently a field. ○ Minimum open space provision, so unlikely to significantly improve biodiversity.	
Landscape	**-**	○ The site is within a contained landscape that forms part of the former designed landscape of Ury House. There is very little development on the west side of the A90. As such the introduction of development on this site would have a significant visual impact. ○ However, the site is flat, is only prominent from parts of the A90, and strategic landscaping along the A90 from the Cowie Water tree belt would mitigate its impact. ○ Furthermore, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	0
Material Assets	**+**	○ The scale of development at Ury Estate may trigger the need for a primary on the north side of the A90. However, the masterplan for the whole estate does not show this. Re-zoning may be an option to an alternative school, if required in the future. ○ Restoration and rescue of Ury House will provide social and economic benefits.	+
Population	**+**	○ A mix of house types are proposed resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population.	+
Human Health	**-/?**	○ Unlikely to have an impact, but the site is next to the proposed location of a supermarket. ○ Half of the site is within a Health and Safety Executive middle and outer consultation zone. HSE have previously supported low density development (up to 40dph). This proposal is close to that figure. Health and Safety Executive have not objected to the pending planning application on part of this site (APP/2018/0121).	-/?
Cultural Heritage	**+/--**	○ The setting of Ury House, which is B listed, could be affected, but its distance and the small tree lined valley of Cowie Water will help to reduce the site's impact on the setting of Ury House. ○ This proposal could have an adverse cumulative impact given the development that is already permitted west, east and south of Ury House. ○ Proposal has the potential to enhance the former designed landscape, which is listed on the Sites and Monuments Record.	+/-
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: KN016 Land Adjacent to Baille Na Choile Coach House, Stonehaven		**Proposal: 5 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ In terms of air quality, the development is unlikely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality.	0
Water	**0/-**	○ Assuming this site can connect to the public sewer system, there is available capacity at Nigg WWTW, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Whitehillocks WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Not clear where the SUDS would go, especially as there is a surface water issue in the northeast corner. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse (Cowie Water) where the water quality is classified as good. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure.	0/-
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The location of the site and lack of public bus service will increase travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions, but the scale of the site will mean the impact is insignificant. ○ Part of the site found to be at risk from surface water flooding, which could be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), and if allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA may or will be required. The indicative plan shows pat of this area as open space.	0/-
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**0**	○ Private grounds, but open space is proposed.	0
Landscape	**-**	○ Introduces houses in an enclosed rural landscape. The proposal does not link well with existing buildings and because of the suburban character of the development, it would appear out of place in its setting. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	0/-
Material Assets	**-**	○ Dunnottar Primary School is nearing its capacity, but re-zoning exercises is managing this issue. Re-zoning may be an option to an alternative school, if required in the future.	0

Population	**-**	○ The indicative layout shows a limited mix of house types, which would exclude some groups, and no affordable homes are proposed. However, proposals must accord with the housing and design policies in the LDP. ○ Potential for negative cumulative effects on the variety of house types, as only a single house is proposed in the countryside and there are other similar-sized single houses adjacent or nearby.	+/0
Human Health	**--**	○ New area of open space is proposed to the north with a path. ○ Development within the Health and Safety Executive inner consultation zone.	--
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ The setting of the B listed Ury House and C listed Coach House would be affected, as the proposal will sit in open countryside, and while there will be a new car park and development within the walled garden associated with the new hotel, they have a more formal layout. The houses are proposed in an organic manner that have a more suburban character. Mitigation measures are unlikely to resolve this unless the design and layout complement the listed buildings.	-
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN032 Land at Braehead, Stonehaven	**Proposal: 400 homes**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**-**	○ In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality, particularly in towns like Stonehaven, where air quality is approaching the EU objective. ○ The site is next to a bus route, which would be incorporated into the development.	-
Water	**--**	○ There is available capacity at Nigg WWTW, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Whitehillocks WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (high) is good, but Carron Water is categorised as poor. ○ The site includes a watercourse and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. “A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as positive feature of the development.” ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure.	0
Climatic Factors	**0/-**	○ The scale of development would increase emissions, but the overall effect is reduced as the site is close to the town centre, it could have a bus route through it.	?

		○ A small part near the cliff edge is at risk from surface water flooding. Impacts downstream will need to be addressed as part of a Flood Impact Assessment. ○ Use of renewables is unknown.	
Soil	--	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the significant loss of prime agricultural land and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	--
Biodiversity	+/-	○ The site may have an impact on Fowlsheuch SAC due to tourism or walking. Fowlsheugh SPA is set to the southeast. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and has a potential to have an impact on qualifying species through tourism or visits by the residents. ○ New open space proposed next to the green network.	+/-
Landscape	--	○ This is a large development that would further alter the character of the area on the periphery of Stonehaven. It follows the contours of the hill, but the development would be visually prominent from multiple places. ○ Although given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are still likely to have medium-term effects, even if the houses are set back.	--
Material Assets	-/+	○ Dunnottar Primary School is nearing its capacity, but re-zoning exercises is managing this issue. Re-zoning may be an option to an alternative school, if required in the future. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ A reserved primary school on site P9 is not supported by the Council's Education Service. ○ New distributor road to Dunottar Castle for vehicles, replacing Bervie Braes.	+
Population	+	○ A mix of house types are proposed resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population.	+
Human Health	+	○ It could enhance the green network and open space in an area previously inaccessible.	+
Cultural Heritage	--	○ Overlooks Stonehaven Conservation Area and its setting could be affected, although strategic landscaping (assuming trees) are proposed and the indicative layout shows the side gables of houses facing the harbour. ○ Adjacent is the B listed Green Den, but it is surrounded by trees. ○ Development will encroach further towards the C listed Blackhill War Memorial, and affect views to and from it. However, the proposal includes lines of no development to retain a visual connection. ○ Dunottar Castle is unlikely to be affected as development is concentrated towards the western half of the site.	--
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN050 Land at Mains of Cowie (Mixed Use), Stonehaven		**Proposal: Mixed use: 250 homes, 4000m2 food retail and primary school**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	-	○ In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality, particularly in towns like Stonehaven, where air quality is approaching the EU objective. ○ The site is next to a bus route – not sure how accessible it would be for buses to get up the hill.	-
Water	--	○ There is available capacity at Nigg WWTW, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Whitehillocks WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Swales and other measures proposed. ○ Land around the steading is at risk from surface water flooding. ○ The site is bisected by watercourses and buffer strips would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "Buffer strips will be required adjacent to the ditches and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required." ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (coastal) is good. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure.	0
Climatic Factors	-	○ The scale of development would increase emissions, but the overall effect is reduced as the site is close to the town centre, it could have a bus route through it. ○ Use of renewables is unknown.	0/-
Soil	--	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the significant loss of prime agricultural land and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	--
Biodiversity	+	○ Fowlsheugh is set to the southeast. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species. However, recreational access to the site is actively managed by the RSPB. SNH advise that there should be no additional pressures from visitors where facilities and visitor management plans are in place. No significant issues from increased public access foreseen. ○ Proposal should not affect nearby nature conservation sites.	+

		○ New open space proposed along the northern, upper part of the site, which could expand the adjacent green network.	
Landscape	**-/?**	○ Is within the Southeast Aberdeenshire Coast Special Landscape Area. ○ This is a large development that would further alter the character of the area on the periphery of Stonehaven. However, development is proposed on the flattest part of the site, is a logical location for development, and strategic landscaping and appropriate design can mitigate its impact. ○ Furthermore, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	-/0
Material Assets	**-**	○ Dunnottar Primary School is nearing its capacity, but re-zoning exercises is managing this issue. Re-zoning may be an option to an alternative school, if required in the future. ○ A new primary school is proposed, but this has not been discussed with the Council's Education Service and may not be a preferred option. ○ Provision of community uses through reuse of farmhouse and steading.	+/-
Population	**+**	○ A mix of house types are proposed resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population. ○ Employment opportunities with the school and supermarket.	+
Human Health	**+**	○ It could enhance the green network and open space in an area previously inaccessible. ○ However, the indicative layout could be improved by having a peripheral (circular) route of open space for people to walk, especially along the western edge, as this site would have excellent views across the coastline, and would be a popular walking route.	+
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ The B listed Cowie House and its offices are screened by trees, so is unlikely to be affected. ○ The impact could be mitigated if the design and mass of the proposed houses respect the dimensions of the C listed Mains of Cowie farmhouse and steading, they should not affect their setting. If the site is allocated, the proposed mitigation measure(s) would be stated as part of the development requirements for the site. ○ The scheduled monuments of Castle of Cowie and St Mary's Church are unlikely to be affected as development is concentrated towards the western half of the site and does not go beyond Cowie House.	-/0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN051 Land at Mains of Cowie (Residential), Stonehaven		**Proposal: Mixed use: 350 homes and primary school**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**-**	○ In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality, particularly in towns like Stonehaven, where air quality is approaching the EU objective. ○ The site is next to a bus route – not sure how accessible it would be for buses to get up the hill.	-
Water	**0**	○ There is available capacity at Nigg WWTW, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Whitehillocks WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Swales and other measures proposed. ○ Land around the steading is at risk from surface water flooding. ○ The site is bisected by watercourses and buffer strips would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "Buffer strips will be required adjacent to the ditches and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required." ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (coastal) is good. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure.	0
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The scale of development would increase emissions, but the overall effect is reduced as the site is close to the town centre, it could have a bus route through it. ○ Use of renewables is unknown.	0/-
Soil	**--**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the significant loss of prime agricultural land and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	--
Biodiversity	**+**	○ Fowlsheugh is set to the southeast. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species. However, recreational access to the site is actively managed by the RSPB. SNH advise that there should be no additional pressures from visitors where facilities and visitor management plans are in place. No significant issues from increased public access foreseen. ○ Proposal should not affect nearby nature conservation sites.	+

		○ New open space proposed along the northern, upper part of the site, which could expand the adjacent green network.	
Landscape	**-/?**	○ Is within the Southeast Aberdeenshire Coast Special Landscape Area. ○ This is a large development that would further alter the character of the area on the periphery of Stonehaven. However, development is proposed on the flattest part of the site, is a logical location for development, and strategic landscaping and appropriate design can mitigate its impact. ○ Furthermore, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	-/0
Material Assets	**-**	○ Dunnottar Primary School is nearing its capacity, but re-zoning exercises is managing this issue. Re-zoning may be an option to an alternative school, if required in the future. ○ A new primary school is proposed, but this has not been discussed with the Council's Education Service and may not be a preferred option. ○ Provision of community uses through reuse of farmhouse and steading.	+/-
Population	**+**	○ A mix of house types are proposed resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population. ○ Employment opportunities with the school.	+
Human Health	**+**	○ It could enhance the green network and open space in an area previously inaccessible. ○ However, the indicative layout could be improved by having a peripheral (circular) route of open space for people to walk, especially along the western edge, as this site would have excellent views across the coastline, and would be a popular walking route.	+
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ The B listed Cowie House and its offices are screened by trees, so is unlikely to be affected. ○ The impact could be mitigated if the design and mass of the proposed houses respect the dimensions of the C listed Mains of Cowie farmhouse and steading, they should not affect their setting. If the site is allocated, the proposed mitigation measure(s) would be stated as part of the development requirements for the site. ○ The scheduled monuments of Castle of Cowie and St Mary's Church are unlikely to be affected as development is concentrated towards the western half of the site and does not go beyond Cowie House.	-/0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN068 Land at Beattie's Hill, Stonehaven	**Proposal: 20-25 homes**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ In terms of air quality, the development is unlikely to a have long-term negative effect on air quality.	0

Water	**0**	○ There is available capacity at Nigg WWTW, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Whitehillocks WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, site water budgets, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	0
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The lower part of the site is at risk from surface water flooding. This could be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), and if allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA may or will be required.	0
Soil	**0/-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ Would include the loss of a small area of prime agricultural land, and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	0/-
Biodiversity	**0/?**	○ Unlikely to have an impact if existing tree belt is maintained. If allocated, the settlement statement for the site will ensure the retention of this tree belt.	0
Landscape	**-**	○ The proposal will encroach into the countryside and elongate the settlement. As such, the scale and location of the proposal will have a negative impact on the landscape character. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	-
Material Assets	**-**	○ Dunnottar Primary School is nearing its capacity, but re-zoning exercises is managing this issue. Re-zoning may be an option to an alternative school, if required in the future. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	0/-
Population	**+/-**	○ Limited mix of house types are proposed, and the size is unknown. However, LDP policy requires a mix of house types. 5-6 homes will be affordable. ○ The site is around 400m from Spurryhillock Industrial Estate.	+/0
Human Health	**-**	○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ Development within the Health and Safety Executive outer and middle consultation zones.	-
Cultural Heritage	**-/?**	○ Could impact on the setting of Kirkton of Fetteresso Conservation Area and the scheduled St Ciaran's Church, Fetteresso. Could be mitigated by strategic landscaping and setting the houses away from the skyline. ○ Archaeological remains have been found on the site (Cists), but they may have been lost from historic gravel extraction. ○ Further assessments would be required, and these issues would be stated in the Settlement Statement if the site is allocated.	-/?
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN076 Land at East Newtonleys, East of A957, Stonehaven		**Proposal: 100 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	-	○ In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality, particularly in towns like Stonehaven, where air quality is approaching the EU objective. ○ The site is next to a bus route.	0/-
Water	-	○ There is available capacity at Nigg WWTW, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Whitehillocks WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (coastal) is high, but Carron Water is categorised as poor. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure. ○ To mitigate effects, surface water runoff from the area flows naturally to the Glasslaw Burn, which could be attenuated, and some flows directed eastwards to the coast. ○ The site is adjacent to a watercourse and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. “A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting.”	0
Climatic Factors	-	○ The scale of development would increase emissions, but the overall effect is reduced as the site is close to a bus route. However, the twisty steep road may make journeys on foot less attractive. ○ Use of renewables is unknown.	-/0
Soil	--	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the significant loss of prime agricultural land and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	--
Biodiversity	+	○ The site may have an impact on Foulsheugh SAC due to tourism or walking. Fowlsheugh SPA is set to the southeast. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and has a potential to have an impact on qualifying species through tourism or visits by the residents. Recreational access to the site is actively managed by the RSPB. SNH advise that there should be no additional pressures from visitors where facilities and visitor management plans are in place. No significant issues from increased public access foreseen.	+

		○ Ancient woodland to be part of the open space of the site. Footpaths would need to be provided. ○ Biodiversity enhancement measures proposed.	
Landscape	**--**	○ This is a moderately large development that would further alter the character of the area on the periphery of Stonehaven. Although the site is partially contained by tree belts and ancient woodland, it would still be visually prominent from multiple places, could appear to elongate the existing developed area at Braehead, and would appear detached from Stonehaven and out of place in its setting. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	--
Material Assets	**-**	○ There is no WTW capacity for this area. In light of the delay to provide water to employment sites OP5 and BUS2 in the LDP, it is uncertain if this to be provided. ○ Dunnottar Primary School is nearing its capacity, but re-zoning exercises is managing this issue. Re-zoning may be an option to an alternative school, if required in the future. ○ Locating the replacement Dunnottar Primary School on site P9 in the LDP 2017 is not supported by the Council's Education Service. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	-/?
Population	**+**	○ A mix of house types are proposed resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population. ○ Located next to allocated employment sites, reducing the need to travel for work – however these sites are not yet built.	+
Human Health	**+/-**	○ Proposes new area of open space and links to core paths. ○ Poor air quality is likely to have long-term on effect on human health ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	+/-
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Development will encroach further towards the C listed Blackhill War Memorial, but it is unlikely to affect views to and from it. ○ Dunnottar Castle is unlikely to be adversely affected as development is on the other side of the tree belt and ridge.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN077 Land at East Newtonleys, Between A957 and Boggartyhead, Stonehaven		Proposal: 400 homes, primary school and retail (200sqm)	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**-**	○ In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality, particularly in towns like Stonehaven, where air quality is approaching the EU objective. ○ The site is next to a bus route.	-/0
Water	**--**	○ There is available capacity at Nigg WWTW, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Whitehillocks WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (coastal) is high, but Carron Water is categorised as poor. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure. ○ To mitigate effects, surface water runoff from the area flows naturally to the Glasslaw Burn, which could be attenuated, and some flows directed eastwards to the coast. ○ The site contains several watercourses (ditches) and buffer strips would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting. A Flood Risk Assessment will be required"	0/?
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The scale of development would increase emissions, but the overall effect is reduced as the site is close to the town centre, it could have a bus route through it. ○ Use of renewables is unknown.	-/0
Soil	**--**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the significant loss of prime agricultural land and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	--
Biodiversity	**+/-**	○ The site may have an impact on Foulsheugh SAC due to tourism or walking. Fowlsheugh SPA is set to the southeast. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and has a potential to have an impact on qualifying species through tourism or visits by the residents. Recreational access to the site is actively managed by the RSPB. SNH advise that there	+/?

		should be no additional pressures from visitors where facilities and visitor management plans are in place. No significant issues from increased public access foreseen. ○ Ancient woodland to be part of the open space of the site. Footpaths would need to be provided. ○ New open space proposed, but the indicative plans shows they would not be connected. It could be improved with wildlife links across the A975 to Dunnottar Woods.	
Landscape	**--**	○ The eastern half of the site is within the Southeast Coast Special Landscape Area. ○ This is a large development that would further alter the character of the area on the periphery of Stonehaven. It would be visually prominent from multiple places, and would appear detached from Stonehaven and out of place in its setting. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	--
Material Assets	**--**	○ There is no WTW capacity for this area. Provision of water infrastructure to employment sites OP5 and BUS2 has been delayed, but this proposal could provide the critical mass to justify its upgrade. ○ Dunnottar Primary School is nearing its capacity, but re-zoning exercises is managing this issue. Re-zoning may be an option to an alternative school, if required in the future. ○ The replacement Dunnottar Primary School on site P9 in the LDP 2017 (within this bid) is not supported by the Council's Education Service. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	0/?
Population	**+/-**	○ A mix of house types are proposed resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population. ○ Located next to allocated employment sites, reducing the need to travel for work – however these sites are not yet built.	+
Human Health	**+/-**	○ Proposes new area of open space and links to core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ Poor air quality is likely to have long-term on effect on human health, but to mitigate effects, the bus route would be redirected through the development.	+/-
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Development will encroach further towards the C listed Blackhill War Memorial, but it is unlikely to affect views to and from it. ○ Dunnottar Castle is unlikely to be adversely affected as development is on the other side of the tree belt and ridge.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN078 South of Braehead, East of A957, Stonehaven		**Proposal: 100 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**-**	○ In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality, particularly in towns like Stonehaven, where air quality is approaching the EU objective. ○ The site is next to a bus route.	0/-
Water	**-**	○ There is available capacity at Nigg WWTW, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Whitehillocks WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (coastal) is high, but Carron Water is categorised as poor. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure. ○ To mitigate effects, surface water runoff from the area flows naturally to the Glasslaw Burn, which could be attenuated, and some flows directed eastwards to the coast. ○ The site is bisected and adjacent to watercourses (ditches) and buffer strips would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. “A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting. A Flood Risk Assessment may be required.”	0/?
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The scale of development would increase emissions, but the overall effect is reduced as the site is close to a bus route. However, the twisty steep road may make journeys on foot less attractive. ○ Use of renewables is unknown.	-/0
Soil	**--**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the significant loss of prime agricultural land and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	--
Biodiversity	**+**	○ The site may have an impact on Foulsheugh SAC due to tourism or walking. Fowlsheugh SPA is set to the southeast. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and has a potential to have an impact on qualifying species through tourism or visits by the residents. Recreational access to the site is actively managed by the RSPB. SNH advise that there	+

		should be no additional pressures from visitors where facilities and visitor management plans are in place. No significant issues from increased public access foreseen. ○ Biodiversity enhancement measures proposed.	
Landscape	**--**	○ This is a moderately large development that would further alter the character of the area on the periphery of Stonehaven. Although open space is proposed to the east to mitigate any impact on the Special Landscape Area, it would be visually prominent from multiple places, would elongate the existing developed area at Braehead, and would appear detached from Stonehaven and out of place in its setting. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	--
Material Assets	**-**	○ There is no WTW capacity for this area. In light of the delay to provide water to employment sites OP5 and BUS2 in the LDP, it is uncertain if this to be provided. ○ Dunnottar Primary School is nearing its capacity, but re-zoning exercises is managing this issue. Re-zoning may be an option to an alternative school, if required in the future. ○ Locating the replacement Dunnottar Primary School on site P9 is not supported by the Council's Education Service. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	-/?
Population	**+**	○ A mix of house types are proposed resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population. ○ Located next to allocated employment sites, reducing the need to travel for work – however these sites are not yet built.	+
Human Health	**+/-**	○ Proposes new area of open space and links to core paths. ○ Poor air quality is likely to have long-term on effect on human health. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	+/-
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Development will encroach towards the C listed Blackhill War Memorial, but it is unlikely to affect views to and from it. ○ Dunnottar Castle is unlikely to be adversely affected as development is on the other side of the tree belt and ridge.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN081 Land South of Braehead, Adjacent to A975, Stonehaven		**Proposal: 50 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**-**	○ In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality, particularly in towns like Stonehaven, where air quality is approaching the EU objective. ○ The site is next to a bus route.	0/-
Water	**0**	○ There is available capacity at Nigg WWTW, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Whitehillocks WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of Carron Water is categorised as poor. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure.	0
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The scale of development would increase emissions, but the overall effect is reduced as the site is close to a bus route. However, the twisty steep road may make journeys on foot less attractive. ○ Part of the site is at risk form surface water flooding. To mitigate effects, a SUDS pond is proposed. ○ Use of renewables is unknown.	0/-
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**0**	○ The site may have an impact on Foulsheugh SAC due to tourism or walking. Fowlsheugh SPA is set to the southeast. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and has a potential to have an impact on qualifying species through tourism or visits by the residents and through drainage. Recreational access to Foulsheugh is actively managed by the RSPB. SNH advise that there should be no additional pressures from visitors where facilities and visitor management plans are in place. No significant issues from increased public access foreseen. ○ Small scale biodiversity enhancement measures proposed.	0
Landscape	**-**	○ This development encroaches further into the countryside, opposite the former landscape of Dunnottar Woods, and would further alter the rural character of this area. Although the site is partially screen by ancient woodland from Stonehaven, it would still be visually prominent from multiple places, could appear to elongate the existing developed area at Braehead, and impact on the setting of the town. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	-/0

Material Assets	**-**	○ Dunnottar Primary School is nearing its capacity, but re-zoning exercises is managing this issue. Re-zoning may be an option to an alternative school, if required in the future. ○ The replacement Dunnottar Primary School on site P9 in the LDP 2017 is not supported by the Council's Education Service, and will be removed from the Plan. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	0
Population	**-**	○ Limited mix of house types are proposed, 3-5 bedroom with affordable housing, their size is unknown. ○ However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types ○ The site could take advantage of the being less than 1km from the town centre and within 400m of the allocated employment sites, reducing the need to travel for work – however these employment sites are not yet built, and access to the town is by a twisty steep road.	+
Human Health	**0**	○ Proposes new area of open space and links to core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ Development is opposite the former Dunnottar House designed landscape and could impact on its setting. However, the proposed layout could mitigate this impact, as the houses are proposed to be set back from the A975 where the woodland opens up to a field. Strategic landscaping could also mitigate its impact. ○ The B listed Dunnottar House is surrounded by trees and is unlikely to be affected.	-/0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN086 Site at North Lodge, Ury Estate, Stonehaven	**Proposal: 150 homes**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**-**	○ In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality, particularly in towns like Stonehaven, where air quality is approaching the EU objective. ○ The site is adjacent to a bus route, which could mitigate effects if access is provided to it.	-/0
Water	**0**	○ There is available capacity at Nigg WWTW, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Whitehillocks WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	0

		○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse (Cowie Water) where the water quality is classified as good. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure.	
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions.	-/0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**+**	○ The site may have an impact on Garron Point SAC due to tourism or walking. Garron Point SAC is set to the east. The site is likely to have an impact on the qualifying site due to tourism/visits by residents and indirect drainage. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. These are likely to be very small given the accessibility of Garron Point. ○ The development will enhance biodiversity through significant tree planting and open space to the south.	+
Landscape	**-**	○ The scale and location of the proposal near the summit of a south facing slope, will have a negative impact on the landscape character when view from prominent viewpoints and around Stonehaven. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations. ○ This is a large development on a prominent location north of Stonehaven. The linear layout and tree planting to the south could mitigate its effects, but the development would appear detached and have a detrimental landscape and visual impact. ○ Therefore, due to the scale and location of the proposed development, mitigation measures are unlikely to be able to reduce the potential impact on the landscape.	-
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access off the B979 and education provision at Dunnottar Primary School, which is overcapacity. These will have a temporary effect. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ Re-zoning of the primary schools may be an option to an alternative school. ○ The scale of development at Ury Estate may trigger the need for a primary on the north side of the A90 in the long-term. However, the masterplan for the whole estate does not show this.	-/?
Population	**-**	○ No mix of house types are proposed, which could exclude some groups, but proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types and 25% will be affordable homes.	+
Human Health	**+/-**	○ New area of open space is proposed, although it is not clear when it will be delivered. ○ Poor air quality is likely to have a long-term effect on human health.	+/-
Cultural Heritage	**+/-**	○ The setting of Ury House, which is B listed, could be affected, as the proposal will overlook the site, although this impact would be reduced as a result of its distance from Ury House and existing and proposed tree planting. ○ The proposal has the potential to enhance the former Ury House designed landscape, which is listed on the Sites and Monuments Record, through tree planting to the south. ○ Nonetheless, this proposal could have an adverse cumulative impact with the development that is already permitted west, east and south of Ury House.	+/-
	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect		

Key	- = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect

Site Ref: KN108 Land East and West of Mains of Dunnottar, Stonehaven		Proposal: Visitor centre (approx. 140m^2 retail, 50m^2 reception, 25m^2 exhibition space and 300m^2 café), car park and 10 homes (enabling development)	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ In terms of air quality, the development is unlikely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality. ○ The site is near to a bus route.	0
Water	**-**	○ There is available capacity at Nigg WWTW, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. Private facilities are proposed, but connection to public sewers is always preferred. ○ Whitehillocks WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (coastal) is high, but Carron Water is categorised as poor. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure. ○ The site is adjacent to a minor watercourse and a buffer strip, ponds or soakaways would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. “A buffer strip, ponds or soakaways will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as positive feature of the development.”	0
Climatic Factors	**0/-**	○ The development is adjacent to an area identified at risk from surface water flooding and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. Any risk could be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), and if allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA may or will be required. ○ The scale of development would not increase emissions, but the site is distant from services. ○ Use of renewables is unknown.	0
Soil	**--**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed housing development would result in the significant loss of prime agricultural land and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term.	--

		○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	
Biodiversity	**0**	○ Scale of development is unlikely to disturb nearby nature conservation sites – LNCS and Fowlsheugh Special Protection Area.	0
Landscape	**-**	○ The site is located within the Southeast Aberdeenshire Coast Special Landscape Area; the scale and location of the houses is out of keeping with this area and will have a negative impact on the landscape character. The effect is likely to be long-term. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change as a result of the houses proposed - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations. ○ Whilst mitigation in the form of a tree belt would soften the development into the landscape, the area is characterised by single properties and the proposed homes would not be in keeping. ○ The effect of the visitor centre would be minimum. It is in a logical location, and relates well to the existing building and farm opposite.	-
Material Assets	**+**	○ Dunnottar Primary School is nearing its capacity, but re-zoning exercises is managing this issue. Re-zoning may be an option to an alternative school, if required in the future. Development is unlikely to have an adverse impact. ○ A reserved primary school on site P9 in the LDP 2017 is not supported by the Council's Education Service. ○ Provision of a visitor centre and café will enhance visitor experience of the Dunnottar Castle.	+
Population	**-**	○ No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. ○ However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types, which would be specified in the Settlement Statement (e.g. in the vision statement). ○ Located near to allocated employment sites, reducing the need to travel for work – however these sites are not yet built.	+/0
Human Health	**+/?**	○ Proposes to improve core paths, although this is not part of the bid, and how this would be delivered is unknown.	+/?
Cultural Heritage	**--/?**	○ Effects on the setting of Dunnottar Castle are likely, but unlikely to be adverse if the visitor centre is unobtrusive. A setting assessment should be identified (this is separate methodology for assessing impact on the Scheduled monument at Dunnottar Castle). ○ However, the visitor centre and car park are proposed on land listed in the sites and Monument Record for crop marks. ○ To mitigate effects a landscape and visual impact assessment will be required that includes a setting assessment.	--/?
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN112 Site North of The Views, Gallaton, Stonehaven		Proposal: 2 homes	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**-**	○ There is available capacity at Nigg WWTW, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. Connection to public sewer may not be possible due to its location south of Stonehaven. A small-scale private drainage system may be acceptable ○ Whitehillocks WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure. ○ The site is adjacent to a minor watercourse and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required."	0
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ There would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel. ○ The development is in an area identified at risk from surface water flooding and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. Part of the site found to be at risk from flooding will not be included within an allocation. Or, this could be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), and if allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA may be required.	0
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the significant loss of prime agricultural land and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-
Biodiversity	**0**	○ Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity.	0
Landscape	**--**	○ The site is located within the Southeast Aberdeenshire Coast Special Landscape Area and whilst it is of a small scale, the cumulative impact of development on the landscape character would be significant. ○ Mitigation such as tree planting would impact on the open character of the SLA.	--

Material Assets	**0**	○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure.	0
Population	**-**	○ Potential for negative cumulative effects on the variety of house types, as only detached houses are proposed in the countryside and there are other similar-sized single houses adjacent or nearby.	-
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN113 Site South of The Views, Gallaton, Stonehaven	**Proposal: 1 home**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have a short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**-**	○ There is available capacity at Nigg WWTW, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. Connection to public sewer may not be possible due to its location south of Stonehaven. A small-scale private drainage system may be acceptable ○ Whitehillocks WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure. ○ The site is adjacent to a minor watercourse and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required."	0
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ There would be minimal CO_2 emissions from general heating and travel. ○ The development is in an area identified at risk from surface water flooding and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. Part of the site found to be at risk from flooding will not be included within an allocation. Or, this could be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), and if allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA may be required.	0

Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the minor loss of prime agricultural land however this area of land is not likely to be suitable for farming due to its location.	-
Biodiversity	**0**	○ Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity.	0
Landscape	**--**	○ The site is located within the Southeast Aberdeenshire Coast Special Landscape Area and whilst it is of a small scale, the cumulative impact of development on the landscape character would be notable. ○ Mitigation through additional planting alongside existing tree belts would lessen the impact.	-
Material Assets	**0**	○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure.	0
Population	**-**	○ Potential for negative cumulative effects on the variety of house types, as only a single detached home is proposed in the countryside and there are other similar-sized single houses adjacent or nearby.	-
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths.	0
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ The site is listed on the Sites and Monuments Record as a farmstead. No development is on the site and a tree belt partially screens the site. ○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment as the Gallaton archaeological site was recorded prior to adjacent development.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN115 Land at New Mains of Ury (Retail), Stonehaven		**Proposal: Class 1 Retail – 2,787 m2 (30,000FT2)**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**-**	○ In terms of air quality, the nature and location of the development would encourage car journeys which means that the proposal is likely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality, particularly in towns where air quality is approaching the EU objective. ○ This effect would be mitigated as the site is located off the A90, therefore not all journeys need to go through the centre of Stonehaven. ○ A bus stop closer to the site would increase footfall.	0
Water	**0**	○ There is available capacity at Nigg WWTW, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required.	0

		○ Whitehillocks WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ Use of renewable energy to heat and power the building is unknown. ○ The location and nature of the development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel by car) and increased emissions.	-
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-
Biodiversity	**0**	○ The site is partially used for the construction of the AWPR, and as such, the proposal is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity.	0
Landscape	**0**	○ This is a moderately large development that would further alter the character of the area on the periphery of Stonehaven. However, the site is flat, immediately adjacent to existing housing, the supermarket would be built next to the A90, and would appear to be a logical location with minimal visual impact. ○ Furthermore, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	0
Material Assets	**+**	○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure, and would provide a supermarket for the area.	+
Population	**+**	○ Employment opportunity in the town and is close to residential areas.	0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths.	0
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ The development will have a negative effect on the New Mains of Ury farmstead, which is listed as an archaeological site on the Sites and Monuments Record. Whilst the site could be lost to the development, record taking would be appropriate mitigation.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN116 Land at New Mains of Ury (Residential), Stonehaven		Proposal: 32 homes	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ In terms of air quality, the proposal is unlikely to have a negative impact.	0
Water	**0**	○ There is available capacity at Nigg WWTW, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Whitehillocks WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	0
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ Use of renewable energy to heat and power the buildings are unknown. ○ The location and nature of the development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel by car) and increased emissions.	-
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-
Biodiversity	**0**	○ The site may have an impact on Garron Point SAC due to tourism or walking. Garron Point SAC is set to the east. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species. This is likely to be caused by tourism/visits, although it is not easily accessible. ○ The site is partially used for the construction of the AWPR, and as such, the proposal is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity.	0
Landscape	**0**	○ This is a moderately large development that would further alter the character of the area on the periphery of Stonehaven. However, the site is flat, immediately adjacent to existing housing, the supermarket would be built next to the A90, and would appear to be a logical location with minimal visual impact. ○ Furthermore, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	0
Material Assets	**0**	○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure.	0
Population	**-**	○ No mix of house types are proposed which could exclude some groups, although there will be 25% affordable homes. ○ However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types, which would be specified in the Settlement Statement (e.g. in the vision statement).	+/0

Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths.	0
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ The development will have a negative effect on the New Mains of Ury farmstead. Whilst the site could be lost to the development, record taking would be appropriate mitigation.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN117 Land at New Mains of Ury (Retail), Stonehaven		**Proposal: Employment land (Class 4 business and office: 325m2, Class 5 general industrial: 743m2 and Class 6 storage and distribution: 2,601m2)**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**-**	○ In terms of air quality, the nature and location of the development would encourage car journeys which means that the proposal is likely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality, particularly in towns where air quality is approaching the EU objective. ○ A bus stop closer to the site would further improve this proposal.	0
Water	**0**	○ There is available capacity at Nigg WWTW, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Whitehillocks WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	0
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ Use of renewable energy to heat and power the building is unknown. ○ The location and nature of the development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel by car) and increased emissions.	-
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-
Biodiversity	**0**	○ The site is partially used for the construction of the AWPR, and as such, the proposal is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity.	0

Landscape	**0**	○ This is a moderately large development that would further alter the character of the area on the periphery of Stonehaven. However, the site is flat, immediately adjacent to existing housing, the supermarket would be built next to the A90, and would appear to be a logical location with minimal visual impact. ○ Furthermore, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	0
Material Assets	**+**	○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure, and would provide jobs for the area.	+
Population	**+**	○ Employment opportunity in the town and is close to residential areas.	0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths.	0
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ The development will have a negative effect on the New Mains of Ury farmstead. Whilst the site could be lost to the development, record taking would be appropriate mitigation.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN118 Land East of East Lodge, New Mains of Ury, Stonehaven		**Proposal: Hotel and Restaurant**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**-**	○ In terms of air quality, the nature and location of the development would encourage car journeys which means that the proposal is likely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality, particularly in towns where air quality is approaching the EU objective. ○ This effect would be mitigated as the site is located off the A90, therefore not all journeys need to go through the centre of Stonehaven. ○ However, the proposal is also likely to be seeking passing trade. ○ A bus stop closer to the site would increase footfall.	0
Water	**0**	○ There is available capacity at Nigg WWTW, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Whitehillocks WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	0
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ Use of renewable energy to heat and power the building is unknown.	0

		○ The location and nature of the development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel by car) and increased emissions. However, the proposal would also be seeking passing trade, which would reduce its potential effect.	
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-
Biodiversity	**0**	○ Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity.	0
Landscape	**-**	○ This is a small-scale development, but its location north of the B979 that would further alter the character of the area. However, the site is relatively flat, is set against a backdrop of trees along the Polbare Belt, is adjacent to existing buildings and would not extend beyond the current building line, and would appear to be a logical location for passing trade at the A90 and AWPR interchange. The impact could be mitigated by limiting the height of the buildings and strategic landscaping. ○ Furthermore, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	0/-
Material Assets	**+/-**	○ Proposal would provide a hotel and restaurant in the area, which is a welcomed asset. ○ Land may also be required for any future upgrading of the AWPR/A90(T) junction, which this proposal could obstruct and increase traffic on, which is undesirable.	+/-
Population	**+**	○ Employment opportunity in the town and is close to residential areas.	0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Due to its small scale, the development is unlikely to have any effects on the tree belt known as Polbare Belt, which is on the Sites and Monuments Record as being part of the former design landscape for Ury House.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN119 Land East of Megray Burn, New Mains of Ury, Stonehaven		**Proposal: Roadside Services comprising Petrol Filling Station and ancillary class 1 (retail) and class 3 (food and drink) uses.**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**-**	○ Impact on air quality should be low, as the development is seeking passing trade.	0

		○ However, the drive through element could encourage car journeys, although because of its location, not all journeys need to go through the centre of Stonehaven, which has air quality issues. ○ A bus stop closer to the site would increase footfall.	
Water	**-/0**	○ There is available capacity at Nigg WWTW, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Whitehillocks WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The site is adjacent to a minor watercourse and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the small watercourse and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required."	0
Climatic Factors	**-/?**	○ Use of renewable energy to heat and power the building is unknown. ○ The location and nature of the development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel by car) and increased emissions. However, the proposal would also be seeking passing trade, which would reduce its potential effect. ○ However, the food and drink element could attract locals, although these journeys would be short given the availability of fast food outlets in Stonehaven. ○ The development is adjacent to an area identified at risk from surface water flooding and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. Any risk could be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), and if allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA may or will be required.	0/?
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-
Biodiversity	**0**	○ Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity.	0
Landscape	**-**	○ This is a small-scale development, but its location north of the A90/AWPR interchange would introduce development where there is very little, and further alter the character of the area. However, the site is small, is right next to the interchange and would appear to be a logical location for passing trade. The impact could be mitigated by strategic landscaping. ○ Furthermore, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	0/-
Material Assets	**+**	○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure, and would provide roadside services in the area.	+
Population	**+**	○ Employment opportunity in the town and is close to residential areas.	0

Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN120 Mill of Forest (Site for 250 Units), Land at Toucks		**Proposal: 250 homes and local retail/commercial/service facilities**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**-**	○ In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality, particularly in towns where air quality is approaching the EU objective. ○ Effects could be mitigated if the Stonehaven bus service could be extended to this site, although for the scale of development this is probably unlikely.	-
Water	**-**	○ There is available capacity at Nigg WWTW, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Whitehillocks WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of Carron Water is categorised as poor, but SUDS ponds are proposed adjacent to Toucks Burn, which feeds into the Carron Water. ○ The site includes to a minor watercourse and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. “A buffer strip will be required adjacent to Toucks burn and associated drains and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required.”	0
Climatic Factors	**-/?**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel to services across the A90) and increased emissions. ○ Effects could be mitigated if the Stonehaven bus could be extended to this site. ○ The site is in an area identified at risk from fluvial and surface water flooding and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. Any risk could be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), and if allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA may or will be required.	-/?
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0

Biodiversity	**--**	○ Garron Point SAC and Fowlsheugh SPA are set to the northeast and east respectively. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species. This is likely to be caused by tourism/visits and indirect drainage. ○ Would result in the loss of ancient woodland, which forms part of the green network. This is to be replaced by strategic landscaping along the A90, Toucks Burn and the southern distributor road. However, these are marginal in scale and the proposal does not include a dedicated area of woodland. ○ This displacement is likely to have long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats, habitat fragmentation and disturbance to species that use these wooded areas as a habitat. ○ The development is likely to fragment green networks, and cause habitat fragmentation/connectivity.	--
Landscape	**-**	○ The proposal will encroach into the countryside and elongate the settlement. As such, the scale and location of the proposal will have a negative impact on the landscape character. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations. ○ However, this can be mitigated with strategic tree planting, which is a character of this area, and given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects. Such areas will be identified in the development requirements for the site.	-/0
Material Assets	**-/?**	○ Dunnottar Primary School is nearing its capacity, but re-zoning exercises is managing this issue. Re-zoning may be an option to an alternative school, if required in the future. The site could be re-zoned to Mill O'Forest Primary School, which does have capacity. ○ New local facilities proposed, but uncertain if there is sufficient critical mass to support them.	0/?
Population	**-/+**	○ House types proposed and size are unknown. ○ However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types, which would be specified in the Settlement Statement (e.g. in the vision statement). ○ The site is around 400m from Spurryhillock Industrial Estate and allocated employment sites OP5 and BUS2.	+
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ The proposal has the potential to negatively impact the former designed landscape and the crop marks, which are listed on the Sites and Monuments Record. ○ Recording of the site and compensatory planting would mitigate the impacts. This would be set out in the development requirements for the site.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN121 Mill of Forest (Site for 750 Units), Land at Toucks		Proposal: 750 homes and local retail/commercial/service facilities	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	-	○ In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality, particularly in towns where air quality is approaching the EU objective. ○ Effects could be mitigated if the Stonehaven bus service could be extended to this site and once the new link road is provided across the A90(T), which would encourage active travel. However, the latter would likely be in the later phases of the bid's development ○ Grade separated junction allows traffic to avoid the town centre.	0/-
Water	--	○ There is available capacity at Nigg WWTW, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Whitehillocks WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of Carron Water is categorised as poor, but SUDS ponds are proposed adjacent to Toucks Burn, which feeds into the Carron Water. ○ The site includes to a minor watercourse and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to Toucks burn and associated drains and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required."	0
Climatic Factors	-	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel to services across the A90) and increased emissions. ○ Effects could be mitigated if the Stonehaven bus could be extended to this site. ○ The site is in an area identified at risk from fluvial and surface water flooding and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. Any risk could be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), and if allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA may or will be required.	0/-
Soil	--	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the significant loss of prime agricultural land and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	--

Biodiversity	**--**	○ Garron Point SAC and Fowlsheugh SPA are set to the northeast and east respectively. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species. This is likely to be caused by tourism/visits and indirect drainage. ○ Would result in the partial loss of ancient woodland, which forms part of the green network. This is to be replaced by strategic landscaping along the A90, Toucks Burn and the southern distributor road. However, these are marginal in scale and unlikely to contribute to a dedicated area of parkland ○ Until replaced, this displacement is likely to have medium-term impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats, habitat fragmentation and disturbance to species that use these wooded areas as a habitat. ○ The development is likely to fragment green networks, and cause habitat fragmentation/connectivity in the medium-term. ○ Retaining the ancient woodland would contribute to a local park.	-/--
Landscape	**--**	○ The proposal will encroach into the countryside and elongate the settlement. Partially built on a hill, the development will be visible above the existing houses in Stonehaven when approaching the settlement from the north along the A90. As such, the scale and location of the proposal will have a negative impact on the landscape character. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations. ○ However, this can be mitigated with strategic tree planting throughout the development, which is a characteristic of this area, and given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	-
Material Assets	**--/++**	○ Mackie Academy will not have capacity. ○ Dunnottar Primary School is nearing its capacity, but re-zoning exercises is managing this issue. Re-zoning may be an option to an alternative school, if required in the future. Mill O'Forest Primary School could just have enough capacity, if used as an alternative. ○ No new primary school is proposed for the scale of development proposed. ○ New local facilities proposed, but uncertain if there is sufficient critical mass to support them. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ Would contribute significantly to affordable housing provision.	-/++
Population	**-/+**	○ House types proposed and size are unknown. ○ However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types, which would be specified in the Settlement Statement (e.g. in the vision statement). ○ The site is around 400m from Spurryhillock Industrial Estate and allocated employment sites OP5 and BUS2.	+
Human Health	**0**	○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ The proposal has the potential to negatively impact the former designed landscape and the crop marks, which are listed on the Sites and Monuments Record. ○ Recording of the site and compensatory planting would mitigate the impacts. These would be set out in the development requirements of the site.	0
	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect		

Key	- = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect

Site Ref: KN122 Mill of Forest (Site for 1500 Units), Land at Toucks		Proposal: 1500 homes, primary school and local retail/commercial/service facilities	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	--	○ In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality, particularly in towns where air quality is approaching the EU objective. ○ Effects could be mitigated if the Stonehaven bus service could be extended to this site and once the new link road is provided across the A90(T), which would encourage active travel. However, the latter would likely to be in the later phases of the bid's development ○ Grade separated junction allows traffic to avoid the town centre.	-
Water	--	○ There is available capacity at Nigg WWTW, but local sewer reinforcement and DIA may be required. ○ Whitehillocks WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of Carron Water is categorised as poor, but SUDS ponds are proposed adjacent to Toucks Burn, which feeds into the Carron Water. ○ The site includes to a minor watercourse and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to Toucks burn and associated drains and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required."	0
Climatic Factors	--	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel to services across the A90) and increased emissions. ○ Effects could be mitigated if the Stonehaven bus could be extended to this site. ○ The site is in an area identified at risk from fluvial and surface water flooding and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. Any risk could be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), and if allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA may or will be required.	-/0
Soil	--	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the significant loss of prime agricultural land and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term.	--

		○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	
Biodiversity	**--**	○ Garron Point SAC and Fowlsheugh SPA are set to the northeast and east respectively. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species. This is likely to be caused by tourism/visits and indirect drainage. ○ Would result in the partial loss of ancient woodland, which forms part of the green network. However, this is to be replaced by strategic landscaping along the A90, railway line, Toucks Burn and the southern distributor road. ○ Until replaced, this displacement is likely to have medium-term impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats, habitat fragmentation and disturbance to species that use these wooded areas as a habitat. ○ Proposal is likely to fragment green networks, and cause habitat fragmentation/connectivity in the medium-term. ○ Retaining the ancient woodland would contribute to a local park.	-
Landscape	**--**	○ The proposal will encroach into the countryside and elongate the settlement. Built on a hill, the development will be highly visible above the existing houses in Stonehaven when approaching the settlement from the north along the A90. As such, the scale and location of the proposal will have a negative impact on the landscape character. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have long-term effects.	-
Material Assets	**--/++**	○ Mackie Academy will not have capacity. ○ Mill O'Forest Primary School will not have capacity. New school is proposed for the scale of development proposed. ○ New local facilities proposed, but uncertain if there is sufficient critical mass to support them. ○ Increase in traffic through Kirkton of Fetteresso, which is only served by a minor road. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ Would contribute significantly to affordable housing provision.	-/++
Population	**-/+**	○ House types proposed and size are unknown. ○ However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types, which would be specified in the Settlement Statement (e.g. in the vision statement). ○ The site is around 400m from Spurryhillock Industrial Estate and allocated employment sites OP5 and BUS2.	+
Human Health	**+**	○ Provides new areas of open space. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	+
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ The proposal has the potential to negatively impact the former designed landscape and the crop marks, which are listed on the Sites and Monuments Record. ○ Recording of the site and compensatory planting would mitigate the impacts.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

WEST CAIRNBEG

Preferred Sites

None.

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: KN052 Land at West Cairnbeg, Laurencekirk		**Proposal: 12 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have a short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**-**	○ WWTW is not available for this area and replacing the private treatment plant is proposed. However, the site is in a SEPA drainage hot spot and connection to a pubic sewer is preferred. If the site is to be allocated, further clarification will be required, and the outcome would be set out in the Settlement Statement. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	?
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. No bus service serves this area. ○ A small part of the development identified for open space is in an area identified at flood risk (surface water) and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment.	-
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-
Biodiversity	**-/+**	○ Part of the site is unused/rough grazing. The development of a greenfield site is likely to have long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ However, the development will enhance biodiversity through the creation of open space and woodland.	+

Landscape	**-/0**	○ The site is on the edge of the Braes of the Mearns Special Landscape Area. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change due to increasing development in this location - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, and naturalness will change. ○ The proposal will intensify development in this location, and while public open space is proposed adjacent to the B966, it would have a negative impact on the landscape character and the effect is likely to be long-term.	-/0
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely education which will have a temporary effect. Re-zoning the area to fall within Fettercairn School catchment could resolve this issue.	-/0
Population	**0**	○ A mix of house types is proposed resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population, but the majority for larger homes (3+ bedrooms).	+/0
Human Health	**+**	○ Would create open space. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	+
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ The development will have a long-term and permanent negative effect on an archaeological site (souterrain and ring ditch). Other than avoiding the site or recording any finding prior to building, there are few mitigation options to preserve the site if it is built on.	-
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN097 Land North of West Cairnbeg Cottages, West Cairnbeg, Laurencekirk	**Proposal: 30 Homes and Community use (100sq. metres)**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have a short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**-**	○ Bid form reports that the WTW has capacity for 25 units. The development requirements for this site would require an upgrade of the water supply infrastructure. ○ WWTW is not available for this area and replacing the private treatment plant is proposed. However, the site is in a SEPA drainage hot spot and connection to a pubic sewer is preferred. If the site is to be allocated, further clarification will be required, and the outcome would be set out in the Settlement Statement. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	-/?
Climatic Factors	**0/-**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. No bus service serves this area.	0/-

		○ While a community centre is proposed, all other services (education, retail etc) are outwith the settlement.	
Soil	**-**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land and result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-
Biodiversity	**0**	○ Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity. ○ The development, including planting and open space, of this agricultural land is likely to lead to an improvement in the existing biodiversity of the site	0
Landscape	**-**	○ The site is on the edge of the Braes of the Mearns Special Landscape Area. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change due to increasing development in this location - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, and naturalness will change. ○ The site is exposed and would intensify development in this location, almost doubling the size of West Cairnbeg, and have a negative impact on the landscape character. The effect is likely to be long-term.	-
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely education which will have a temporary effect. Re-zoning the area to fall within Fettercairn School catchment could resolve this issue.	-/0
Population	**0/+**	○ A modest mix of house types is proposed resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population, but the majority for larger homes (3+ bedrooms). ○ There would be up to 7 affordable homes, but there are no services in the area so occupiers would be need to be car dependent.	+/0
Human Health	**+**	○ Proposes a community use building, which would be a welcomed asset to the settlement. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	+
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any impact on cultural heritage.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

WOODLANDS OF DURRIS

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP1 (KN074) Land north west of Clune Gardens		**Proposal: 27 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have a short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**-**	○ There is currently no available capacity at Durris WWTW, and a growth project would be required to upgrade the treatment works. Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ No impact on flooding or watercourse subject to appropriate SUDS.	0
Climatic Factors	**-/0**	○ Cumulatively the development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. The site is remote from employment and retail services. ○ Infrequent bus service to Banchory/Strachan and Aberdeen (twice a day – morning and night). The proposal is unlikely to increase this frequency.	-/0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**-**	○ River Dee SAC is set to the northwest and west. The site is at a close proximity to the qualifying site and the qualifying features are likely to be affected through tourism/visits by residents and drainage. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the River Dee SAC. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts, as demonstrated by the adjacent development. A Habitats Regulations Appraisal will be required to assess impacts on River Dee. ○ The development of a greenfield agricultural site is unlikely to have long-term adverse impact on biodiversity. It could have minor benefits if linked with planting from the rest of the OP1 site. This would be stated in the revised Settlement Statement.	0/+
Landscape	**0**	○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced, but this will not have a significant effect on the wider landscape. A more welcoming layout with active frontages is preferred; the indicative layout has rear gardens facing out. ○ However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP, and this could be highlighted in the development requirements for the site.	0/?

Material Assets	**-**	○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure. The bid form states existing WWTW will be upgraded. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ The development would help sustain the viability of the local school.	0
Population	**-**	○ Limited mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population (3+ bedrooms only). ○ However, proposals must accord with the design policy in the LDP and include a mix of house types.	+/0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths and could contribute to the existing space by the school.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: KN136 Land at Upper Balfour, North of Woodlands of Durris		**Proposal: 15-20 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have a short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**-**	○ There is currently no available capacity at Durris WWTW, and a growth project would be required to upgrade the treatment works. Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ No impact on flooding or watercourses subject to appropriate SUDS.	0
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ Unlikely to have an impact, but cumulatively the development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. The site is remote from employment and retail services. ○ Infrequent bus service to Banchory/Strachan and Aberdeen (twice a day – morning and night). Proposal is unlikely to increase this frequency.	0

Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**-**	○ River Dee SAC is set to the north. The site is at a close proximity to the qualifying site and the qualifying features are likely to be affected through tourism/visits by residents and drainage. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the River Dee SAC. ○ The development of a greenfield agricultural site is unlikely to have long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmenting on and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. It could have minor benefits if linked with planting along the northern boundary. ○ This would be stated in the revised Settlement Statement.	0/+
Landscape	**-**	○ Would breach the ridgeline although existing farm and houses are already located here so unlikely to be significantly detrimental. ○ This could be mitigated by tree planting along the northern boundary. This would be stated in the development requirements for the site. ○ However, the site is detached from the settlement and this lack of connection is unlikely to be mitigated without more development resulting in overdevelopment (and impacts on road network and school capacity).	-
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely poor road network (single track road) and education provision at Woodlands of Durris Primary School, which will have a long-term (road) and temporary (school) effect. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ The development would help sustain the viability of the local school, but cumulatively there could be issues with other sites, as the school has limited room to extend.	-/+
Population	**-/?**	○ Limited mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. ○ However, proposals must accord with the design policy in the LDP and include a mix of house types.	+/0
Human Health	**-**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths and could contribute to the existing space by the school. ○ A safe route to school would need to be provided along the single-track road. Land outside the site would be required. This mitigation measure would be stated in the development requirements for the site. ○ Development is within Health and Safety Executive outer and middle pipeline consultation zones.	-
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ The site is adjacent to a farmstead that is listed on the Sites and Monuments Record. However, the proposal is unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN138 Land North West of Woodlands of Durris		**Proposal: 30 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have a short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**-**	○ There is currently no available capacity at Durris WWTW, and a growth project would be required to upgrade the treatment works. Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ No impact on flooding or watercourse subject to appropriate SUDS.	0
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ Unlikely to have an impact, but cumulatively the development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. The site is remote from employment and retail services. ○ Infrequent bus service to Banchory/Strachan and Aberdeen (twice a day – morning and night). Proposal is unlikely to increase this frequency.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**0**	○ River Dee SAC is set to the north. The site is at a close proximity to the qualifying site and the qualifying features are likely to be affected through tourism/visits by residents and drainage. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the River Dee SAC. ○ The development of a greenfield agricultural site is unlikely to have long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmenting on and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. It could have minor benefits if linked with planting from the rest of the OP1 site. ○ This would be stated in the revised Settlement Statement.	0/+
Landscape	**-**	○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change but this will not have a significant effect on the wider landscape. ○ Proposes a substantial extension to Woodlands of Durris and would result in overdevelopment. The landscape and trees would contain this site, but it's scale would negatively impact on the setting of the settlement. ○ The proposal represents underdevelopment of the site – it could accommodate much more houses. No layout has been provided to show how much would be public open space that could mitigate effects. As such, the site could be reduced to lessen its impact on the landscape. However, it would still result in overdevelopment. ○ Nonetheless, it breaches the natural setting of the settlement, which is contained by trees and the gently sloping nature of the area.	-

Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely poor road network (single track road) and education provision at Woodlands of Durris Primary School, which will have a long-term (road) and temporary (school) effect. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ The development would help sustain the viability of the local school, but cumulatively there could be issues with other sites, as the school has limited room to extend.	-/+
Population	**-/?**	○ Limited mix of house types are proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. ○ However, proposals must accord with the design policy in the LDP and include a mix of house types.	+/0
Human Health	**-/0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths and could contribute to the existing space by the school. ○ A safe route to school would need to be provided through site OP1. This mitigation measure would be stated in the development requirements for the site.	0
Cultural Heritage	**--**	○ Could affect the setting of scheduled field system, cairnfield and settlement. Existing trees and topography screen the site, but effects are likely. Houses would need to be set back from the western corner of the site. This mitigation measure would be stated in the development requirements for the site. If the northern half of the site was excluded from the allocation, effects would be significantly reduced.	-/0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

LANDWARD SITES – ARDOE

Preferred sites

None

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: KN030 Site North East of Ardoe House Hotel, Mid Ardoe		**Proposal: 1 house**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ No effect.	0
Water	**0/-**	○ Possible minor effect if private waste water treatment required. Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity.	0/-
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**0**	○ River Dee SAC is set to the west. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and cumulatively is likely to have an impact on the qualifying species through drainage. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the River Dee SAC.	0
Landscape	**0**	○ Site is within the Aberdeen green belt, but this is a brownfield site, and as such, effects are likely to be neutral.	0
Material Assets	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on material assets.	0
Population	**-**	○ Potential for negative cumulative effects on the variety of house types, as only a large single house is proposed in the countryside and there are other similar-sized single houses adjacent or nearby.	-
Human Health	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on human health.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN124 Land North of Thurcroft House, Ardoe		Proposal: 1 house	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ No effect.	0
Water	**0/-**	○ Possible minor effect if private waste water treatment required. Nigg WWTW network is 400m away. Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity.	0/-
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases	0
Biodiversity	**--**	○ Site identified as ancient woodland (Roy Map). ○ Removal of woodland and habitat likely to have negative effect. ○ Bid form states it will retain and enhance woodland along the north and eastern boundaries. However, adjacent houses are exposed and open, although trees run along some of the boundaries. A private owner will be able to remove trees.	--
Landscape	**-**	○ Site is within the Aberdeen green belt, the former Ardoe Designed Landscape and ancient woodland. ○ The proposed retention of trees along the roadside could mitigate its effects, but once in private ownership, trees can be removed. ○ It would increase ribbon development. The cumulative loss of trees to house development will impact negatively on the landscape character. This is the last group of trees along this road that have no houses on it.	-
Material Assets	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on material assets.	0
Population	**-**	○ Potential for negative cumulative effects on the variety of house types, as only a large single house is proposed in the countryside and there are other similar-sized single houses adjacent or nearby.	-
Human Health	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on human health.	0
Cultural Heritage	**--**	○ Would impact on the former Ardoe House Designed Landscape, which while not listed on the Inventory, it is protected as an archaeological site. The proposal is right on the edge of the protected site and the loss of woodland would be noticeable. ○ While retaining trees along the east and north boundary could reduce its impact, trees can be removed once a site is in private ownership – unless it has a Tree Preservation Order. ○ These trees represent the last area of woodland that has not been lost to development. There are no measures that could mitigate against this loss. It would also put pressure on development on the remaining patch of trees adjacent.	--
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

LANDWARD SITES – BANCHORY DEVENICK

Preferred Sites

None.

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: KN069 Land at Tollohill Wood, Banchory Devenick (Phase 1)		**Proposal: 289 homes, Commercial, Employment Land**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	-	○ Scale of development is likely to have an impact on air quality in Aberdeen City. ○ The impact could be mitigated by increasing public transport, but the scale of the proposal may not be enough to justify increasing bus services along the B9077.	-/0
Water	--	○ Nigg Head WWTW has capacity, but local network reinforcement and DIA may be required. Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The bid form does not state precise measures to handle surface water runoff. ○ The River Dee Special Conservation Area is classified as having bad water quality in this location. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure. ○ The site includes waterbodies, buffer strips would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. “A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required.” ○ With the information on the quality of water around the site, the effects can be significant in the longer term.	--/?
Climatic Factors	-	○ The development could be incorporated into the city transport network and this would reduce impacts from emissions, although the scale of the development may not make this option viable.	-/0

		○ The development includes small areas at risk from fluvial and pluvial flood risk and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. Parts of the site found to be at risk from flooding will be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), and if allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA will be required.	
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**--/-**	○ River Dee SAC is set to the north. The site is at a close proximity to the qualifying site and the qualifying features are likely to be affected through tourism/visits by residents and drainage. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the River Dee SAC. ○ Potential for significant impact on River Dee. Treatment of surface water is not disclosed (bid form states this will not be considered until the planning application stage). ○ The development is likely to fragment green networks, and cause habitat fragmentation/connectivity and disturbance to species. The remaining woodland is proposed as Tollohill Woodland Park. ○ Excludes developing on the ancient woodland at Tollohill Wood, but the development will result in the loss of existing trees, woodland and hedges on the north slope closest to the River Dee. Compensatory planting is not proposed (proposes tree-lined streets). ○ Later phases propose a new green corridor linking the Den of Leggart with the public open space and sports grounds of enterprise campus. Between the River Dee and the South Deeside Road a potential new parkland area is defined with a river promenade. ○ Mitigation measures, such as compensatory planting or a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. If the site is allocated, the need for compensatory planting and/or a buffer strip will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	-
Landscape	**--**	○ Significant scale development that would further alter the character of the area. The site is located within the Aberdeen green belt, and proposes development on the north flank of Tollohill Wood, which is visible from Aberdeen. It would affect the integrity of the green belt and increase development along the River Dee valley. There is no strategic need to remove the green belt designation from this location. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change.	--
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access and education provision at Banchory-Devenick Primary School, which will have a temporary effect. Later phases propose a new primary school. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ The quality of the new asset created through the development of this site are not likely to be delivered during the initial phases.	-
Population	**+**	○ The proposal could provide a range of house types within relatively close proximity to Aberdeen City. ○ The development would allow integration of the people where they live and work. Employment opportunity in the village. ○ Commercial and retail is also proposed although no details are provided.	+

Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. Later phases propose new routes. ○ Poor air quality is likely to have a long-term effect on human health, unless mitigated (see above). ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0/-
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ There would be some impacts on cultural heritage including the setting of Tollohill Monument to the northwest of the wood. ○ The impact would need to be assessed and if the site is allocated, this mitigation measure would be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	-/?
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN070 Land at Tollohill Wood, Banchory Devenick (Phase 1-2)	**Proposal: 466 homes, Commercial, Employment Land, School**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	-	○ Scale of development is likely to have an impact on air quality in Aberdeen City. ○ The impact could be mitigated by increasing public transport, but the scale of the proposal may not be enough to justify increasing bus services along the B9077.	-
Water	**--**	○ Nigg Head WWTW has capacity, but local network reinforcement and DIA may be required. Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The bid form does not state precise measures to handle surface water runoff. ○ The River Dee Special Conservation Area is classified as having bad water quality in this location. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure. ○ The site includes waterbodies, buffer strips would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. “A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required.” ○ With the information on the quality of water around the site, the effects can be significant in the longer term.	--/?
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The development could be incorporated into the city transport network and this would reduce impacts from emissions, although the scale of the development may not make this option viable.	-/0

		○ The development includes small areas at risk from fluvial and pluvial flood risk and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. Parts of the site found to be at risk from flooding will be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), and if allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA will be required.	
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**--/-**	○ River Dee SAC is set to the north. The site is at a close proximity to the qualifying site and the qualifying features are likely to be affected through tourism/visits by residents and drainage. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the River Dee SAC. ○ Potential for significant impact on River Dee. Treatment of surface water is not disclosed (bid form states this will not be considered until the planning application stage). ○ The development is likely to fragment green networks, and cause habitat fragmentation/connectivity and disturbance to species. The remaining woodland is proposed as Tollohill Woodland Park. ○ Excludes developing on the ancient woodland at Tollohill Wood, but the development will result in the loss of existing trees, woodland and hedges on the north slope closest to the River Dee. ○ Phase 2 proposes a new green corridor linking the Den of Leggart with the public open space and sports grounds of enterprise campus. Between the River Dee and the South Deeside Road a potential new parkland area is defined with a river promenade. ○ Mitigation measures, such as compensatory planting or a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. If the site is allocated, the need for compensatory planting and/or a buffer strip will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	-
Landscape	**--**	○ Significant scale development that would further alter the character of the area. The site is located within the Aberdeen Greenbelt, and proposes development on the north flank of Tollohill Wood, which is visible from Aberdeen. It would affect the integrity of the green belt and increase development along the River Dee valley. There is no strategic need to remove the green belt designation from this location. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change.	--
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access and education provision at Banchory-Devenick Primary School, which will have a temporary effect. Phase 2 proposes a new primary school. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ The quality of the new asset created through the development of this site are not likely to be delivered during the initial phases.	-/+
Population	**+**	○ The proposal includes improved links to Tollohill Wood and could provide a range of house types within relatively close proximity to Aberdeen City. ○ The development would allow integration of the people where they live and work. Employment opportunity in the village. ○ Commercial and retail is also proposed although no details are provided.	+

Human Health	**+/-**	○ Phase 2 proposes new routes and parkland within the existing woods. ○ Poor air quality is likely to have a long-term effect on human health, unless mitigated (see above). ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	+/-
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ There would be some impacts on cultural heritage including the setting of Tollohill Monument to the northwest of the wood. ○ Adjacent to the remains of Drumduan House Designed Landscape to the west. ○ These impacts would need to be assessed and if the site is allocated, this mitigation measure would be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	-/?
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN071 Land at Tollohill Wood, Banchory Devenick (Phase 1-3)		**Proposal: 804 homes, Commercial, Employment Land, School**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**--**	○ Scale of development is likely to have an impact on air quality in Aberdeen City. ○ The impact could be mitigated by increasing public transport along the B9077. ○ A90 road upgrades are proposed (new roundabout), which could reduce stationary traffic on the road.	--/-
Water	**--**	○ Nigg Head WWTW has capacity, but local network reinforcement and DIA may be required. Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The bid form does not state precise measures to handle surface water runoff. ○ The River Dee Special Conservation Area is classified as having bad water quality in this location. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure. ○ The site includes waterbodies, buffer strips would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. “A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required.” ○ With the information on the quality of water around the site, the effects can be significant in the longer term.	--/?

Climatic Factors	**--**	○ The development could be incorporated into the city transport network and this would reduce impacts from emissions, although the scale of the development may not make this option viable. ○ The development includes small areas at risk from fluvial and pluvial flood risk and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. Parts of the site found to be at risk from flooding will be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), and if allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA will be required.	-
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**--/-**	○ River Dee SAC is set to the north. The site is at a close proximity to the qualifying site and the qualifying features are likely to be affected through tourism/visits by residents and drainage. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the River Dee SAC. ○ Potential for significant impact on the River Dee. Treatment of surface water is not disclosed (bid form states this will not be considered until the planning application stage). ○ The development is likely to fragment green networks, and cause habitat fragmentation/connectivity and disturbance to species. The remaining woodland is proposed as Tollohill Woodland Park. ○ Excludes developing on the ancient woodland at Tollohill Wood, but the development will result in the loss of existing trees, woodland and hedges on the north slope closest to the River Dee. ○ Later phases propose a new green corridor linking the Den of Leggart with the public open space and sports grounds of enterprise campus. Between the River Dee and the South Deeside Road a potential new parkland area is defined with a river promenade. ○ Mitigation measures, such as compensatory planting or a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. If the site is allocated, the need for compensatory planting and/or a buffer strip will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	-
Landscape	**--**	○ Significant scale development that would further alter the character of the area. The site is located within the Aberdeen green belt, and proposes development on the north flank of Tollohill Wood, which is visible from Aberdeen. It would affect the integrity of the green belt and increase development along the River Dee valley. There is no strategic need to remove the green belt designation from this location. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change.	--
Material Assets	**-/++**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access and education provision at Banchory-Devenick Primary School, which will have a temporary effect. Phase 2 proposes a new primary school. ○ The proposal will lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure during initial phases but may deliver appropriate infrastructure at later phases. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ The quality of the new asset created through the development of this site are not likely to be delivered during the initial phases.	-/++

		○ Would contribute significantly to affordable housing provision.	
Population	**+**	○ The proposal includes improved links to Tollohill Wood and could provide a range of house types within relatively close proximity to Aberdeen City. ○ The development would allow integration of the people where they live and work. Employment opportunity in the settlement. ○ Commercial and retail is also proposed although no details are provided.	+
Human Health	**+/-**	○ Phase 2 proposes new routes and parkland within existing woods. ○ Poor air quality is likely to have a long-term effect on human health, unless mitigated (see above). ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	+
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ There would be some impacts on cultural heritage including the setting of Tollohill Monument to the northwest of the wood. ○ Adjacent to the remains of Drumduan House Designed Landscape to the west. ○ These impacts would need to be assessed and if the site is allocated, this mitigation measure would be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	-/?
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

KN072 Land at Tollohill Wood, Banchory Devenick (Phase 1-4) 1310 homes, Commercial, Employment Land, School	**Proposal: 1310 homes, Commercial, Employment Land, School**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**--**	○ Scale of development is likely to have an impact on air quality. ○ The impact could be mitigated by increasing public transport along the B9077. ○ A90 road upgrades are proposed (new roundabout and river crossing), which could reduce stationary traffic on the road.	-
Water	**--**	○ Nigg Head WWTW has capacity, but local network reinforcement and DIA may be required. Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of Flow & Pressure test or Water Impact Assessment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The bid form does not state precise measures to handle surface water runoff. ○ The River Dee Special Conservation Area is classified as having bad water quality in this location.	--/?

		○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure. ○ The site includes waterbodies, buffer strips would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required." ○ With the information on the quality of water around the site, the effects can be significant in the longer term.	
Climatic Factors	**--**	○ The development could be incorporated into the city transport network and this would reduce impacts from emissions, although the scale of the development may not make this option viable. ○ The development includes small areas at risk from fluvial and pluvial flood risk and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. Parts of the site found to be at risk from flooding will be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), and if allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA will be required.	-/0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**--**	○ River Dee SAC is set to the north. The site is at a close proximity to the qualifying site and the qualifying features are likely to be affected through tourism/visits by residents and drainage. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the River Dee SAC. ○ Potential for significant impact on River Dee. River crossing proposed, and treatment of surface water is not disclosed (bid form states this will not be considered until the planning application stage). ○ The development is likely to fragment green networks, and cause habitat fragmentation/connectivity and disturbance to species. The remaining woodland is proposed as Tollohill Woodland Park. ○ Excludes developing on the ancient woodland at Tollohill Wood, but the development will result in the loss of existing trees, woodland and hedges on the north slope closest to the River Dee. ○ Later phases propose a new green corridor linking the Den of Leggart with the public open space and sports grounds of enterprise campus. Between the River Dee and the South Deeside Road a potential new parkland area is defined with a river promenade. ○ Mitigation measures, such as compensatory planting or a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. If the site is allocated, the need for compensatory planting and/or a buffer strip will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	-/?
Landscape	**--**	○ Significant scale development that would further alter the character of the area. The site is located within the Aberdeen green belt, and proposes development on the north flank of Tollohill Wood, which is visible from Aberdeen. It would affect the integrity of the green belt and increase development along the River Dee valley. There is no strategic need to remove the green belt designation from this location. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change.	--

Material Assets	**--/++**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access and education provision at Banchory-Devenick Primary School, which will have a temporary effect. Phase 2 proposes a new primary school. ○ The proposal will lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure during initial phases but may deliver appropriate infrastructure at later phase ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ Would contribute significantly to affordable housing provision.	-/++
Population	**+**	○ The proposal includes improved links to Tollohill Wood and could provide a range of house types within relatively close proximity to Aberdeen City. ○ The development would allow integration of the people where they live and work. Employment opportunity in the settlement. ○ Commercial and retail is also proposed although no details are provided.	+
Human Health	**+/-**	○ Phase 2 proposes new routes and parkland within existing woods. ○ Poor air quality is likely to have a long-term effect on human health, unless mitigated (see above). ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	+
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ There would be some impacts on cultural heritage including the setting of Tollohill Monument to the northwest of the wood. ○ Adjacent to the remains of Drumduan House Designed Landscape to the west. ○ These impacts would need to be assessed and if the site is allocated, this mitigation measure would be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	-/?
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

LANDWARD SITES – MARYCULTER

Preferred Sites

None.

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: KN044 Land South of Stranog, Maryculter		**Proposal: 8 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**-**	○ Private sewage is proposed, but this method is not preferred. Maryculter WWTW is >2km away. This is a reversible short-medium term impact. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (Crynoch Burn) is good. This burn is a tributary of the River Dee, a Special Area of Conservation. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	?
Climatic Factors	**0/-**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions.	0/-
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is unlikely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**-**	○ River Dee SAC is set to the northeast. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species through drainage. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the River Dee SAC. ○ The development is not likely to conserve, protect and enhance the diversity of species and habitats and the natural heritage of the area. ○ The development is likely to adversely affect populations of protected species, including European Protected Species, their habitats and resting places or roosts.	-

		○ The development might result in the loss of existing trees, woodland and hedges. Without reducing the number of homes, mitigation measures are unlikely.	
Landscape	**-**	○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	-/0
Material Assets	**-**	○ There is an infrastructure constraint associated with the site, namely education provision at Lairhillock School, which will have a temporary effect. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	-
Population	**-**	○ No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, proposals must accord with the housing and design policies in the LDP.	+/0
Human Health	**0**	○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ Will not affect open space or core paths, but would result in the loss of trees.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN045 Land to South of Invercrynoch House, Maryculter	**Proposal: 5 homes**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**-**	○ Private sewage is proposed, but this method is not preferred. Maryculter WWTW is >1.5km away. This is a reversible short-medium term impact. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure.	?

		○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (Crynoch Burn) is good. This burn is a tributary of the River Dee, a Special Area of Conservation. ○ The site is adjacent to Crynoch Burn and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the Crynoch Burn and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required."	
Climatic Factors	**0/-**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions.	0/-
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction	0
Biodiversity	**0/-**	○ River Dee SAC is set to the northeast. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species through drainage. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the River Dee SAC. ○ The development of a greenfield site adjacent to existing woodland could have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through disturbance to species that use the woodland. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of woodland would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities.	0
Landscape	**-**	○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	0/-
Material Assets	**-**	○ There is an infrastructure constraint associated with the site, namely education provision at Lairhillock School, which will have a temporary effect. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	-/?
Population	**-**	○ No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP.	+/0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN046 Land to West of Mill of Crynoch House, Maryculter		**Proposal: 2 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**-**	○ Private sewage is proposed. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (Crynoch Burn) is good. This burn is a tributary of the River Dee, a Special Area of Conservation. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure. ○ The site is adjacent to Crynoch Burn and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the Crynoch Burn and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required." ○ With the information on the quality of water around the site, the effects can be significant in the longer term.	?
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. ○ The development is in an area identified at risk from surface water flooding and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. This could be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), and if allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA may or will be required.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases	0
Biodiversity	**-**	○ River Dee SAC is set to the south. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species through drainage. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the River Dee SAC. ○ The development will result in the loss of existing trees, which cover the whole site.	-

Landscape	**-**	○ This proposal would intensify development and create a housing cluster, linking two small housing areas together. The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	-/0
Material Assets	**-**	○ There is an infrastructure constraint associated with the site, namely education provision at Lairhillock School, which will have a temporary effect. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	0/-
Population	**-**	○ No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types.	-
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN053 Site East of Westside Cottage, Maryculter (Site 1)	**Proposal: 15 homes**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**--**	○ WWTW is not available for this area, and no solution is proposed. Preferably it should to connect to a public sewer. Further discussion will be required. If the site is allocated, this will be specified in the Settlement Statement. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The site is bisected by a watercourse and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. “A buffer strip will be required adjacent to	?

		the ditch and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required."	
Climatic Factors	**0/-**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. There is no bus servicing this area.	0/-
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases	0
Biodiversity	**-**	○ Red Moss of Netherley SAC is set to the south and River Dee SAC is set to the north. There is a potential to have an impact on the qualifying species through tourism/visits by residents. ○ Ground appears wet and may provide conditions for biodiversity. Therefore, the development of a greenfield site is likely to have long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of wetland or watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities.	-/?
Landscape	**-**	○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	-/0
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely education provision at Lairdhillock School, which will have a temporary effect. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	-/0
Population	**-**	○ The mix of house types is unknown, which could result in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, the LDP requires a mix of house types. ○ 25% will be affordable housing (3 units).	+/0
Human Health	**-**	○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ Development is within the Health and Safety Executive outer and middle pipeline consultation zones. This issue would have to be mitigated (move or reinforce pipeline, or not allocate development on it), but it may not be viable.	-/?
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN054 Site East of Westside Cottage, Maryculter (Site 2)		Proposal: 72 homes	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**--**	○ WWTW is not available for this area, but a private WWTW is proposed, although part of it will be in an area at risk from flooding. Preferably it should to connect to a public sewer. Further discussion will be required. If the site is allocated, this will be specified in the Settlement Statement. This is a reversible short-medium term impact. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The site is bisected by a watercourse and adjacent to Crynoch Burn, and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to all watercourses and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required."	?/0
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. There is no bus servicing this area. ○ The development is in an area identified at flood risk and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. Part of the site found to be at risk from flooding will not be included within an allocation and would form part of the open space provision. If allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) may or will be required.	-
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases	0
Biodiversity	**-**	○ Red Moss of Netherley SAC is set to the south and River Dee SAC is set to the north. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and there is a potential to have an impact on the qualifying species through tourism/visits by residents and drainage. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the River Dee SAC. ○ Ground appears wet and may provide conditions for biodiversity. Therefore, the development of a greenfield site is likely to have long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ However, new woodland is proposed along the eastern boundary, which will mitigate effects. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of wetland or watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities.	-/?

Landscape	**-**	○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects. The proposed strategic landscaping would also reduce effects on this flat site.	-/0
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely education provision at Lairdhillock School, which will have a temporary effect. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	-/0
Population	**?**	○ Mix of house types is unknown, but LDP policy requires a mix of house types and 25% will be affordable housing (18 units).	+
Human Health	**-**	○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ Development is within the Health and Safety Executive outer, middle and inner pipeline consultation zones. This issue would have to be mitigated (move or reinforce pipeline, or not allocate development on it), but it may not be viable.	-/?
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN123 Land East of Altries Wood, Maryculter	**Proposal: 10 homes and employment land**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**--**	○ WWTW is not available for this area. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity. ○ Possible negative effect if private waste water treatment is required. The bid form does not confirm this. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies is moderate (River Dee).	-/?

		○ The site is bisected by a minor watercourse (ditch) and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required."	
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, a proposal of this scale would not have a significant effect.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**-**	○ River Dee SAC is set to the northeast. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and there is a potential to have an impact on the qualifying species through drainage. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the River Dee SAC. ○ Site includes semi-natural habitat with acid grassland and rush pasture. ○ Proposal is unlikely to mitigate against its loss. Open space would be provided, but at a much-reduced scale.	-
Landscape	**-**	○ The scale and location of the proposal will have a negative impact on the landscape character, and the effect is likely to be long-term. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landform and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity. ○ Although a small scale development, this would alter the character of the area as this landscape is sensitive to development eroding structural integrity and sense of coherence - in this instance the ancient woodland creates a clear edge to the existing housing group, adding a sense of order to this complex landscape that is easily impacted by ad hoc development.	-
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely waste water treatment provision and school capacity, which will have a temporary effect. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	0/-
Population	**+/-**	○ Limited mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types. ○ The development may allow integration of the people where they meet and work - employment opportunity provided, if deliverable.	+/0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ Population not at risk from hazardous developments.	0
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ The site of a farm steading is recorded on the site, but the proposal is unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment. ○ An Archaeological Assessment could be requested, which would be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	0
	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect		

Key	- = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect

Site Ref: KN127 Land South of North Burnside, Maryculter	Proposal: 12 homes		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	-	○ WWTW is not available for this area. Possible negative effect if private waste water treatment required. This is not clarified in the bid form. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies is good (Crynoch Burn).	-/?
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, a proposal of this scale would not have a significant effect.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases	0
Biodiversity	**+/-**	○ River Dee SAC is set to the northeast. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and there is a potential to have an impact on the qualifying species through drainage. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the River Dee SAC. ○ The development is likely to enhance the diversity of species and habitats and the natural heritage of the area (the site is currently rough grazing land). ○ With the exception of a road access into the site, no further loss to existing trees are proposed. Existing tree belts to be retained with new tree lines within the development.	+
Landscape	**0**	○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. The proposal introduces a small group of houses in the countryside. ○ However, the site is relatively flat, well screened by existing trees and its impact could be mitigated further with more strategic landscaping. The existing trees running along the perimeter of the site would be protected in the Plan.	0
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely waste water treatment provision and school capacity, which will have a temporary effect.	-/?

		○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	
Population	**-**	○ Limited mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types.	+/0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ Population not at risk from hazardous developments.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

LANDWARD SITES – NETHERLEY

Preferred Sites

None.

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: KN015 Land at Netherley House, Netherley		**Proposal: 4 homes**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments and mitigation measures** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effects – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**-**	○ The WWTW is not available for this area and the site is at risk from flooding, which could make it inappropriate for septic tanks. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse in the River Dee catchment. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to public sewage infrastructure.	-
Climatic Factors	**--**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. ○ The Burn of Monquich runs parallel to the site and the development is in an area identified at medium-high flood risk, and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. Mitigation measures are unlikely.	--
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**-**	○ Red Moss of Netherley SAC is set to the east. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and there is a potential to have an impact on the qualifying species through visits by the residents. River Dee SAC catchment areas would be affected through drainage. ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat.	-

		○ The development will result in the loss of existing trees, woodland and hedges. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. However, most of the trees would be in private gardens and could be removed in the future.	
Landscape	**-**	○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. Mitigation measures are unlikely as the development will result in the further urbanisation of the countryside given the number of detached houses to the west.	-
Material Assets	**-**	○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure. ○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely education provision at Lairhillock Primary School, which will have a temporary effect.	0
Population	**-**	○ No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, LDP Policy requires 25% of the site to have affordable housing. ○ Potential for negative cumulative effects on the variety of house types, as only a single house is proposed in the countryside and there are other similar-sized single houses adjacent.	+/0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ The development is within an archaeological site (Netherley House - remains of a 17th to 19th century designed landscape), will have long-term and permanent negative effect on the site/setting of a listed building and gardens and designed landscapes. The development may weaken the sense of place, and the identity of existing communities. ○ Invariably the allocation will adversely affect the built features, their context, pattern of past historic use, and the setting in which they sit, in landscapes and within the soil (archaeology), and also in our towns, villages and streets. ○ New developments that deviate from existing designs, layouts and materials could adversely affect the setting of historic settlements in the long-term.	-
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN047 Land at Whiteside, Netherley, Stonehaven	**Proposal: 8 homes**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0

Water	**-**	○ Private drainage proposed, but this is not desirable. Maryculter WWTW is >3km away. This is a reversible short-medium term impact. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The site includes a pond and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the pond and will be integrated as positive feature of the development. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required."	?
Climatic Factors	**0/-**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. ○ No public transport serves this area.	0/-
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**-**	○ Red Moss of Netherley SAC is set to the south. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and there is a potential to have an impact on the qualifying species. ○ Entire site is located on scrubland that could have some habitat value. It would result in the loss of habitats and disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ Effects would be long term and unlikely to be mitigated.	-
Landscape	**-**	○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between land forms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change.	-
Material Assets	**-**	○ There is an infrastructure constraint associated with the site, namely education provision at Lairdhillock School, which will have a temporary effect. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	?
Population	**-**	○ No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, proposals must accord with the housing and design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types.	+/0
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Site is adjacent to the stump of a standing stone. As such, it is unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment. Farmhouse is listed on the Site and Monuments Record, but there is sufficient distance to avoid adverse negative impacts.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN049 Land North of Lairhillock School, Netherley, Stonehaven		**Proposal: 70 Homes, commercial units and nursery**	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**?**	○ The WWTW is not available for this area. Maryculter WWTW is >3km away. No details provided in submission. This is a reversible short-medium term impact. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity. ○ Given the scale of the proposal, it will have to connect to a public sewer. If the site is allocated, this will be specified in the Settlement Statement. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	?/0
Climatic Factors	**-**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. There is no public transport serving this area. ○ The commercial units are welcomed, but demand for such units in a rural area is unknown.	-
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**-/+**	○ Red Moss of Netherley SAC is set to the south. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and there is a potential to have an impact on the qualifying species. ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ The indicative layout shows strategic planting around the edge, but the development is not likely to conserve, protect and enhance the diversity of species and habitats and the natural heritage of the area.	0/+
Landscape	**-**	○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ Due consideration has been given to the indicative layout, which shows strategic planting to mitigate effects, although much is outwith the bid site. However, there is no need to establish a settlement here, and Lairhillock Primary School serves a rural population. The character of this area is very small-scale development. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	-/0

Material Assets	**-/+**	○ There is an infrastructure constraint associated with the site, namely education provision at Lairdhillock School, which will have a temporary effect, and poor road access onto the A90. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ A modest number of affordable houses are proposed (17 units).	-/?
Population	**+**	○ Mix of house types are proposed. ○ The development would allow integration of the people where they live and work. Employment opportunity in the new village.	+
Human Health	**+**	○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ Indicative layout shows orchards, a green and allotments.	+
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment ○ New developments that deviate from existing designs, layouts and materials could adversely affect the setting of historic settlements in the long-term.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN060 Land at Cairnieburn Wood, Nether Craigwell, Netherley	Proposal: 4 homes (Low Cost Private Rent)	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality, particularly in towns where air quality is approaching the EU objective.	0
Water	**-**	○ There is no WWTW in the area. Private drainage connected to field drainage is proposed. This is a reversible short-term impact. Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	0
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, its scale would result in a neutral impact. ○ Promotes renewables through biomass.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases	0

Biodiversity	**-**	○ Red Moss of Netherley SAC is set to the south. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and there is a potential to have an impact on the qualifying species. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. Recreational impacts are unlikely due to the nature of the SAC habitat. ○ The development of a greenfield site is likely to have long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ The development will result in the loss of existing trees, woodland and hedges (ancient woodland). ○ Mitigation measures, such as compensatory planting are possible, but this is not proposed in the bid.	-
Landscape	**0/-**	○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects. .	0/-
Material Assets	**-**	○ There is an Infrastructure constraint associated with the site, namely education provision at Lairdhillock School, which will have a temporary effect. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	0
Population	**0**	○ No mix of house types proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, the proposal is for low cost homes and LDP policy requires 25% affordable homes on site.	+/0
Human Health	**-**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ Development is within the Health and Safety Executive outer and middle pipeline consultation zones	-
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment .	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN062 Land at Rothnick Croft, Netherley	**Proposal: 3 homes for nursery workers**		
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**-**	○ WWTW is not available for this area. Link to Nigg WWTW is >2km away. The bid form states “No connection required”, which could imply septic tanks. This is a reversible short-term impact.	?

		○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (ground) is moderate.	
Climatic Factors	**0**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions – the bid site is related to a proposed day care nursery business requiring parents/carers to drive to the site. However, the scale of the proposal is unlikely to impact on air quality.	0
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	**0/?**	○ Red Moss of Netherley SAC is set to the south. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and there is a potential to have an impact on the qualifying species. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. Recreational impacts are unlikely due to the nature of the SAC habitat. ○ The site may have some biodiversity value, although no important species have been recorded on the site. However, there are bats in the area, and there could be an impact on their feeding patterns. ○ Could be mitigated by a Habitats Survey.	0/?
Landscape	**0/-**	○ Landscape impact caused by a cluster of buildings in a landscape characterised by scattered houses can be mitigated by screen planting. ○ Given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	0/-
Material Assets	**-**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely waste water treatment and education provision at Lairhillock PS: the scale of development is unlikely to have a significant impact. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	0
Population	**-/?**	○ These homes are meant to be for workers associated with the nursery, but LDP policy cannot control the occupants of a dwelling. ○ The development would not necessarily allow integration of the people where they live and work as day nursery workers would not need to live on site.	-/?
Human Health	**0**	○ It would not result in loss of open space/core paths. ○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	**0**	○ Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment (i.e. the nearby croft house, which is listed on the Sites and Monuments record).	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: KN067 Land at Reinchall, North West of Woodend Cottages, Netherley		Proposal: 15-20 homes, shop or meeting space	
SEA Topics	**Effect**	**Comments** Effects should be assessed in terms of • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term)	**Effect – post mitigation**
Air	**0**	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	**-**	○ The WWTW is not available for this area. Nigg WWTW connection is >3.5km away. The bid form is not clear. Preferably it should to connect to a public sewer. Further discussion will be required. If the site is allocated, this will be specified in the Settlement Statement. This is a reversible short-medium term impact. ○ Invercannie and Mannofield WTW has capacity. ○ The site is adjacent to several watercourses and buffer strips would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "Buffer strips will be required adjacent to the watercourses and will be integrated as positive feature of the development. There will be no culverting." ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ These ditches drain into Red Moss Special Conservation Area.	?
Climatic Factors	**0/-**	○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. There is no bus servicing this area.	0/-
Soil	**0**	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases	0
Biodiversity	**?**	○ Red Moss of Netherley SAC is set to the east. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying site and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species through visits by the residents. River Dee SAC catchment areas would be affected through drainage. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. Recreational impacts are unlikely due to the nature of the SAC habitat. ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strips next to the area of ancient woodland and waterbodies would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities.	0/+
Landscape	**-**	○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ Development is proposed to be set back from the B979 with amenity ground and community shop adjacent to the road.	0/-

		○ Furthermore, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects.	
Material Assets	**-/+**	○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely education provision at Lairdhillock School, which will have a temporary effect. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ The need for a shop is welcomed, but may not be viable, and Cookney Hall is around 2km from the site.	0/+
Population	**-/+**	○ Mix of house types is limited, which could result in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. 25% will be affordable housing (3-4 units). However, LDP policies require a mix of house types.	+/0
Human Health	**-**	○ Provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ Development is within the Health and Safety Executive outer and middle pipeline consultation zones. This issue would have to be mitigated (move or reinforce pipeline, or not allocate development on it), but it may not be viable with a reduction of three homes.	-/?
Cultural Heritage	**-**	○ Likely to have a small effect on the historic environment (Designed Landscape), which is listed on the Sites and Monuments Record. Can be mitigated with open space along the B979 and the south-eastern boundary. ○ Invariably the allocation will adversely affect the built features, their context, pattern of past historic use, and the setting in which they sit, in landscapes. ○ New developments that deviate from existing designs, layouts and materials could adversely affect the setting of historic settlements in the long-term. Active frontages along the south-eastern boundary may help with the site's integration (i.e. no back garden fences)	0/-
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		