Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Orkney Local Development Plan Proposed Plan (2016)

Appendix C.3 Assessment of the Kirkwall Land Allocations

LEGEND:

| ++ | | + | | 0 | ? | - | | - |
|--|-----------|---|--|--|--|------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| Significantly positive | Positiv | 9 | Minor or ne | eutral | Uncertain | Adverse | Significant | y adverse |
| KIRKWALL SITE K-1 | | Source of site Call for sites. Site Size (ha):0.80 | e suggestion: Current Use: Agriculture | Identified as S A developmer | Previous planning application Site 19 in the MIR. In this for the service of the service of the service of the services. | _ | | |
| Site assessment ques | tion | | Related SEA topic | Comment Information visit? | available – GIS/site | Scoring pre mitigation | Mitigation | Scoring post mitigation |
| Climate change | | | | <u>.</u> | | | | |
| Is the proposal close to a r these be accessed by pub | | | Population and Human health | Kirkwall. Glait Pickaquoy Ce are within 15 I It is located cl | o the existing boundary of ness primary School, the ntre and a number of shops minutes walking distance. ose to the route of the scheduled bus service. | + | N/A | + |
| Is the proposal protected f | rom preva | iling winds? | | from westerly | offers a degree of protection winds but the site is exposed other directions. | 0 | Policy 2 <i>Design</i> requires new development to | + |
| Site aspect – does the pro solar gain? | posal mak | e best use of | | Yes the site is good use of se | relatively open and makes olar gain. | + | demonstrate how it will minimise use of energy and maximise opportunities for | + |

| | | | | shelter. | |
|--|---------------------------|--|---|----------|----------|
| Is the proposal thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere? | Water and Human Health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Could the development of the proposal help alleviate any existing flooding problems in the area? | Water | Unlikely. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna | | | | | i |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any international or national biodiversity designation, e.g. SAC/SPA/Ramsar/SSSI? | | There is no connectivity between this site and any of Orkney's international and national designations. Its development is therefore unlikely to have any effect on their qualifying interests or their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any locally important designations such as LNRs or LNCSs. | | The site is remote from any of Orkney's locally important designations and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect non designated features – e.g. trees, TPOs, hedges, woodland, species rich grasslands, | | Development of the site is unlikely to affect non designated features as the land is currently managed for agriculture. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect Protected Species –e.g. bats, otters, etc.? | | Development of the site is unlikely to affect Protected Species. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity? | | Development of the site is unlikely to affect habitat connectivity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Water | | | | | |
| Could the option result in a change of status of a water body or significantly affect a designated water body as identified in the Scotland River Basin Management Plan? | Water | Unlikely. There is currently capacity at Kirkwall waste water treatment works; however, should demand exceed available capacity, Scottish | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| Can the proposal connect to the public foul sewer? | | Water will initiate a Growth Project once one development meets the 5 Growth Criteria. | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|
| Could the proposal have a direct impact on the water environment (for example result in the need for watercourse crossings or allow the de-culverting of a watercourse? | Water | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Does the proposal avoid impact on Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs), i.e. are there any wetlands and boggy areas on the site? | Water and Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| For large scale developments are there any private or public water supplies within 250m of the proposal which may be affected? | Water and Human Health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Soils | L | | | | |
| Is the proposal on greenfield or brownfield land? Does it result in the loss of high quality agricultural land? | Material Assets and Soils | This is a greenfield site which is managed for agriculture. Soils are classed as 4 ₂ <i>Capable of producing a narrow range of</i> <i>crops</i> . | - | Due to the proximity of the site to the Kirkwall boundary its development is considered to be a sustainable option. | 0 |
| Are there any contaminated soil issues on the proposal and if so, will the option reduce contamination? | Material Assets and Soils | This area falls within a former Military site. No specific concerns have been identified with regards to contaminated land; however future development may require further investigation, which would be dependent on the proposed use. | ? | The settlement statement highlights the possible requirement for further investigation. | 0 |
| Is the proposal on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat? | Climatic Factors and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Geology | L | | | | |
| Are there any national geodiversity sites that | | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| could be affected by the proposal? | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal? | | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Landscape | | · | | | |
| To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations? | Landscape | This area is remote from the Hoy and West Mainland NSA. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? Such as current settlement boundaries, existing townscape and character of surrounding area? | Landscape | Site is separated from the existing town boundary by one field. However it is adjacent to a small cluster of houses known as Hatston Park. | - | Policy 2 <i>Design</i> includes a set of fundamental principles with which all development should comply. Further guidance will be provided in the development brief. | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect features of landscape interest, including the distinctive character of the landscape and the qualities of wild land? | landscape | The Orkney Landscape Character Assessment identifies this area as the <i>Urban and Rural Development</i> character type and recommends that urban fringe development around Kirkwall should be restricted to the lower parts of the town's topographic basin. | ? | | 0 |
| | | There is no wild land in the area. | | | |
| Cultural Heritage | | | | | |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any scheduled monuments or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any locally important archaeological site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any listed buildings and/or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No | 0 | N/A | 0 |
|--|---|--|---|-----|---|
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Conservation Areas? (e.g. will it result in the demolition of any buildings) | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Service Infrastructure | | <u>.</u> | | | |
| Are there educational or health facilities nearby? | Population | Glaitness Primary School is within 15-20 minutes walking distance. | + | N/A | + |
| To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space, or result in a loss of open space? | Population, human health or material assets | Development of the site will not affect any area of open space. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will development of the proposal affect core path links or other key access networks such as cycle paths, coastal paths and rights of way? | Population, human health, material assets or climatic factors | Development of the site will not affect any core path or other key access network. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| Is there any opportunity to enhance the green network through for example green infrastructure on site? | Population, human health or material assets | Uncertain. | ? | Options for greenspace enhancement should be explored through the development brief. Further guidance is available in the Orkney Open Space Strategy. | ? |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| Material assets | | | | | |
| Will development of the proposal minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does it re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover existing on-site materials / resources? | | New development would link into roads existing infrastructure. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is the proposal in the vicinity of a waste management site and could its development therefore compromise the waste handling operation? | Human health | Part of the nearby industrial estate is under consideration for redevelopment as a waste management site. Scottish Planning Policy requires planning authorities to consider the need for buffer zones between dwellings or other sensitive receptors and some waste management facilities and suggests the following buffer distances: 100m between sensitive receptors and recycling facilities and small-scale thermal treatment; 250m between sensitive receptors and outdoor composting, anaerobic digestion, mixed waste processing and thermal treatment. | - | Policy 5 Business, Industry and Employment safeguards Orkney's main waste handling facilities, including the Hatston facility, and will not support development which would compromise operations or prevent their future expansion to incorporate new handling, processing or operational methods. | 0 |
| Deliverability/sustainability constraints | | | | | |
| Will the proposal be delivered within the LDP timeframe? Are there any site servicing constraints, e.g. waste water treatment capacity? | Material assets | There is currently capacity at Kirkwall waste water treatment works; however, should demand exceed available capacity, Scottish Water will initiate a Growth Project once one development meets the 5 Growth | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| | | Criteria. | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities - is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated? | Material assets and climatic factors | At this stage no vehicle access constraints have been identified. However issues have been raised relating to visibility at the existing junction with the A965 which forms part of a crossroads with the Sunnybrae Road. Development of K-1 and K-2 may present opportunities to explore alternative access options to this area. | - | The settlement statement requires vehicular access to be provided from the track to Hatston Farm, with easy direct access to allocations K-2 and K- 21. It also requires the provision of pedestrian access to the town. | ? |

| KIRKWALL | Source of si Call for sites | te suggestion: | Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals: Identified as site 18 in the MIR 2015 | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|--|
| SITE K-2 | Site Size (ha): 5.50 | Current Use: Agriculture | A development brief would be required which the strategic nature of these sites. | allocations K-1, K-2 ar | nd K-21, due to | | |
| Site assessment question | | Related SEA topic | Comment Information available – GIS/site visit? | Scoring pre mitigation | Mitigation | Scoring post mitigation | |
| Climate change | | | | . <u>.</u> | <u>.</u> | | |
| Is the proposal close to a range of these be accessed by public trans | | Population and Human health | Site is close to the existing boundary of Kirkwall. Glaitness primary School, the Pickaquoy Centre and a number of shops are within 15 minutes walking distance. | + | N/A | + | |
| | | | It is located alongside the route of the Kirkwall Town scheduled bus service. | | | | |
| Is the proposal protected from pre | vailing winds? | | Wideford Hill offers a degree of protection from westerly winds but the site is exposed to winds from other directions. | 0 | Policy 2 <i>Design</i> requires new development to | + | |

| Site aspect – does the proposal make best use of solar gain? | | Yes the site is relatively open and makes good use of solar gain. | + | demonstrate how it will minimise use of energy and maximise opportunities for shelter. | + |
|--|---------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Is the proposal thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere? | Water and Human Health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Could the development of the proposal help alleviate any existing flooding problems in the area? | Water | Unlikely. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna | | d | | | |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any international or national biodiversity designation, e.g. SAC/SPA/Ramsar/SSSI? | | There is no connectivity between this site and any of Orkney's international and national designations. Its development is therefore unlikely to have any effect on their qualifying interests or their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any locally important designations such as LNRs or LNCSs. | | The site is remote from any of Orkney's locally important designations and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect non designated features – e.g. trees, TPOs, hedges, woodland, species rich grasslands, | | Development of the site is unlikely to affect non designated features as the land is currently managed for agriculture. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect Protected Species –e.g. bats, otters, etc.? | | Development of the site is unlikely to affect Protected Species. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity? | | Development of the site is unlikely to affect habitat connectivity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Water | • | | | | |

| Could the option result in a change of status of a water body or significantly affect a designated water body as identified in the Scotland River Basin Management Plan? Can the proposal connect to the public foul sewer? | Water | Unlikely. There is currently capacity at Kirkwall waste water treatment works; however, should demand exceed available capacity, Scottish Water will initiate a Growth Project once one development meets the 5 Growth Criteria. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| Could the proposal have a direct impact on the water environment (for example result in the need for watercourse crossings or allow the de-culverting of a watercourse? | Water | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Does the proposal avoid impact on Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs), i.e. are there any wetlands and boggy areas on the site? | Water and Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| For large scale developments are there any private or public water supplies within 250m of the proposal which may be affected? | Water and Human Health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Soils | | ۵ | | ۰ | |
| Is the proposal on greenfield or brownfield land? Does it result in the loss of high quality agricultural land? | Material Assets and Soils | This is a greenfield site which is managed for agriculture. Soils are classed as 4 ₂ <i>Capable of producing a narrow range of</i> <i>crops</i> . | - | Due to the proximity of the site to the Kirkwall boundary its development is considered to be a sustainable option. | 0 |
| Are there any contaminated soil issues on the proposal and if so, will the option reduce contamination? | Material Assets and Soils | This area falls within a former Military site. No specific concerns have been identified with regards to contaminated land; however future development may require further investigation, which would be dependent on the proposed use. | ? | The settlement statement highlights the possible requirement for further investigation. | 0 |
| Is the proposal on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat? | Climatic Factors and | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| | Soils | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| Geology | | ······ | L | | |
| Are there any national geodiversity sites that could be affected by the proposal? | | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal? | | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Landscape | | | | | |
| To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations? | Landscape | This area is remote from the Hoy and West Mainland NSA. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? Such as current settlement boundaries, existing townscape and character of surrounding area? | Landscape | Site is separated from the existing town boundary by one field. | - | Policy 2 <i>Design</i> includes a set of | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect features of landscape interest, including the distinctive character of the landscape and the qualities of wild land? | landscape | The Orkney Landscape Character Assessment identifies this area as the <i>Urban and Rural Development</i> character type and recommends that urban fringe development around Kirkwall should be restricted to the lower parts of the town's topographic basin. There is no wild land in the area. | ? | fundamental principles with which all development should comply. Further guidance will be provided in the development brief. | 0 |
| Cultural Heritage | | | | | |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any scheduled monuments or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any locally important archaeological site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No | 0 | N/A | 0 |
|--|--|--|---|-----|---|
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any listed buildings and/or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Conservation Areas? (e.g. will it result in the demolition of any buildings) | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Service Infrastructure | | | | L | 1 |
| Are there educational or health facilities nearby? | Population | Glaitness Primary School is within 15-20 minutes walking distance. | + | N/A | + |
| To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space, or result in a loss of open space? | Population, human health or material assets | Development of the site will not affect any area of open space. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| To what extent will development of the proposal affect core path links or other key access networks such as cycle paths, coastal paths and rights of way? | Population, human health, material assets or climatic factors | Development of the site will not affect any core path or other key access network. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|
| Is there any opportunity to enhance the green network through for example green infrastructure on site? | Population, human health or material assets | Uncertain. | ? | Options for greenspace enhancement should be explored through the development brief. Further guidance is available in the Orkney Open Space Strategy. | ? |
| Material assets | | | | • | |
| Will development of the proposal minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does it re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover existing on-site materials / resources? | | New development would link into roads existing infrastructure. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is the proposal in the vicinity of a waste management site and could its development therefore compromise the waste handling operation? | Human health | Part of the adjacent industrial estate is under consideration for redevelopment as a waste management site. Scottish Planning Policy requires planning authorities to consider the need for buffer zones between dwellings or other sensitive receptors and some waste management facilities and suggests the following buffer distances: 100m between sensitive receptors and recycling facilities and small-scale thermal treatment; 250m between sensitive receptors and outdoor composting, anaerobic digestion, mixed waste processing and thermal treatment. | - | Policy 5 Business, Industry and Employment safeguards Orkney's main waste handling facilities, including the Hatston facility and will not support development which would compromise operations or prevent their future expansion to incorporate new handling, processing or operational methods. | 0 |

| Will the proposal be delivered within the LDP timeframe? Are there any site servicing constraints, e.g. waste water treatment capacity? | Material assets | There is currently capacity at Kirkwall waste water treatment works; however, should demand exceed available capacity, Scottish Water will initiate a Growth Project once one development meets the 5 Growth Criteria. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities - is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated? | Material assets and climatic factors | At this stage no vehicle access constraints have been identified. However issues have been raised relating to visibility at the existing junction with the A965 which forms part of a crossroads with the Sunnybrae Road. Development of K-1 and K-2 may present opportunities to explore alternative access options to this area. | - | The settlement statement requires vehicular access to be provided from the track to Hatston Farm, with easy direct access to allocations K-2 and K- 21. It also requires the provision of pedestrian access to the town. | ? |

| KIRKWALL SITE K-3 | Source of s Existing alloc Site Size (ha): | ite suggestion: cation. Current Use: Housing allocation. | Summary Description: Identified as Site KW-B in the adopted Orkney LDP 2014. Identified as site 1 and part of site 2 in the MIR 2015 This area is known as Grainbank. The Grainbank Development Brief was produced in 2011 to provide guidance for potential developers in terms of opportunities and constraints, providing a framework on how the site can be developed in a phased and coherent manner. | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|------------|-------------------------------|----------|--|--|
| Site assessment question Related SEA topic | | Comment Information available – GIS/site visit? | Scoring pre mitigation | Mitigation | Scoring post mitigation | | | |
| Climate change | | | <u>.</u> | · | <u>.</u> | <u>-</u> | | |
| Is the proposal close to a range of facilities? Can human health these be accessed by public transport? | | Yes it is within 10 minutes walking range of Glaitness primary School, the Pickaquoy Leisure Centre and a number of supermarkets. It is on the route of the | + | N/A | + | | | |

| | | scheduled Kirkwall town bus service. | | | |
|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Is the proposal protected from prevailing winds? | | Wideford Hill to the west provides a degree of shelter. | + | Policy 2 <i>Design</i> requires new development to | + |
| Site aspect – does the proposal make best use of solar gain? | | Yes, this site has a southerly aspect. | + | development to demonstrate how it will minimise use of energy and maximise opportunities for shelter. | + |
| | | | | The Grainbank Development Brief requires consideration to be given to the use of building form to create shelter and micro climates. | |
| Is the proposal thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere? | Water and Human Health | A small part of the site is considered to be at risk of flooding; and it is upslope from the Pickaquoy area which is at risk of flooding. | - | The settlement statement notes the flood risk on the | 0 |
| Could the development of the proposal help alleviate any existing flooding problems in the area? | Water | Uncertain – this may be possible through enhanced SuDS. | ? | site, as well as the potential for development of the site to contribute to flooding elsewhere. | ? |
| Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna | | | | • | |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any international or national biodiversity designation, e.g. SAC/SPA/Ramsar/SSSI? | | There is no connectivity between the site and any of Orkney's international and national designations. Its development is therefore unlikely to have any effect on their qualifying interests or their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any locally important designations such as LNRs or LNCSs. | | Site is remote from any of Orkney's locally important designations and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| | | integrity. | | | |
|---|-------|--|----------|---|---|
| To what extent will the proposal affect non designated features – e.g. trees, TPOs, hedges, woodland, species rich grasslands, | | Development of site is unlikely to affect any non-designated features as it is currently managed for agriculture. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect Protected Species –e.g. bats, otters, etc.? | | Otters are likely to use the nearby Muddisdale Burn and may also use drainage ditches in the wider area as access routes. | ? | The potential for otters to be present in areas close to waterbodies and drainage ditches is highlighted in the introduction to the settlement statements. | 0 |
| How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity? | | Vegetation on site is improved grassland and has limited ecological value. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Water | | | <u>.</u> | ······································ | |
| Could the proposal result in a change of status of a water body or significantly affect a designated water body as identified in the Scotland River Basin Management Plan? | Water | The nearby Peedie Sea is classed as a heavily modified water body. The water quality of the Peedie Sea is high and its overall status is good. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Can the proposal connect to the public foul sewer? | | There is currently capacity at Kirkwall waste water treatment works; however, should demands exceed available capacity, Scottish Water will initiate a Growth Project once one development meets the 5 Growth Criteria. | | | |
| Could the option have a direct impact on the water environment (for example result in the need for watercourse crossings or allow the de-culverting of a watercourse? | Water | There is a small watercourse nearby, to the south east of the Pickaquoy Mound and a culverted section may cross this site. | ? | Policy 9 Natural Environment and Landscape requires an appropriate development-free buffer zone to be included where a waterside location is not essential to | 0 |

| | | | | the development. | |
|--|--|--|---|---|----------|
| Does the proposal avoid impact on Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs), i.e. are there any wetlands and boggy areas on the site? | Water and Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| For large scale developments are there any private or public water supplies within 250m of the proposal which may be affected? | Water and Human Health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Soils | L | | | | <u>.</u> |
| Is the proposal on greenfield or brownfield land? Does the proposal result in the loss of high quality agricultural land? | Material Assets and Soils | This is a greenfield site. The land is identified as category 4_2 , capable of producing a narrow range of crops. | - | Site is an existing allocation, within the town boundary, therefore its development is considered to be a sustainable option. | 0 |
| Are there any contaminated soil issues on the site and if so, will the proposal reduce contamination? | Material Assets and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is the proposal on peatland and could the development of the proposal lead to a loss of peat? | Climatic Factors and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Geology | . | | | | |
| Are there any national geodiversity sites that could be affected by the proposal? | | Site is remote from any of Orkney's national geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal? | | Site is remote from any of Orkney's local geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Landscape | L | | | | 1 |

| To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations? | Landscape | Site is remote from, and will not affect, the Hoy and West Mainland NSA or any local landscape designation. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? Such as current settlement boundaries, existing townscape and character of surrounding area? | Landscape | Site is an existing allocation, within the current Kirkwall town boundary and is bordered by built development and agricultural land. | 0 | Policy 2 <i>Design</i> includes a set of fundamental principles with which all development | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect features of landscape interest, including the distinctive character of the landscape and the qualities of wild land? | landscape | The landscape character type for this area is described as Urban and Rural Development. There is no wild land in this area. | 0 | should comply and further guidance is included in the Development Brief. | 0 |
| Cultural Heritage | | | | | |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any scheduled monuments or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | The Pickaquoy Burnt Mound and Settlement is located to the SE of the site. A 30m no build zone has been established around the monument. This has been incorporated into an area of open space bordering the burn. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any locally important archaeological site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any listed buildings and/or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | Grainbank House and its walled garden are category B listed. | ? | The settlement requires Grainbank House and its curtilage to be preserved in any development, and its setting to be taken into account. | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Conservation Areas? (e.g. will it result in the | Cultural heritage, & | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| demolition of any buildings) | links with landscape | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Service Infrastructure | ••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••• | | | | ••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••• |
| Are there educational or health facilities nearby? | Population | Site is within 10 minutes walking distance from Glaitness Primary School and the Pickaquoy Leisure Centre. The Kirkwall Health Centre and the hospital are probably within 15-20 minutes walking distance. | + | N/A | + |
| To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space, or result in a loss of open space? | Population, human health or material assets | The proposal is unlikely to affect any existing area of open space or connectivity. | 0 | Policy 10 Green Infrastructure provides the policy approach to Open Space. | + |
| | | | | The Development Brief proposes the retention of a substantial area of open land around Grainbank House, its policies and walled garden to provide a large central open space | |

| | | | | as a hub to the whole development. | |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| To what extent will development of the site affect core path links or other key access networks such as cycle paths, coastal paths and rights of way? | Population, human health, material assets or climatic factors | Development of this site presents opportunities to link into the adjacent pathways in the Pickaquoy Loan development. This would provide an alternative route to facilities such as the Pickaquoy Centre and Glaitness Primary School. | + | Policy 10 Green Infrastructure promotes improvements to public access and permeability. The Development Brief proposes the provision of a network of pedestrian and cycle routes to maximise permeability and linkage with neighbouring areas. | + |
| Is there any opportunity to enhance the green network through for example green infrastructure on site? | Population, human health or material assets | Yes. | + | The Development Brief promotes the establishment of an amenity wildlife and pedestrian green space linking all the different phases of the site, while improving connectivity between town and country. It also promotes further tree planting. Further guidance is available in the Orkney Open Space Strategy. | + |

| Material assets | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Will development of the proposal minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does it re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover existing on-site materials / resources? | | New development would link into roads existing infrastructure. | 0 | N/A | 0 | | | | |
| Is the proposal in the vicinity of a waste management site and could its development therefore compromise the waste handling operation? | Human health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 | | | | |
| Deliverability/sustainability constraints | | | | | | | | | |
| Will the proposal be delivered within the LDP timeframe? Are there any site servicing constraints, e.g. waste water treatment capacity? | Material assets | There are no known site servicing constraints. A foul sewer crosses this site. The developer should contact Scottish Water to ascertain whether a diversion is required. | - | The settlement statement notes the presence of the foul sewer. | 0 | | | | |
| Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities - is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated? | Material assets and climatic factors | Vehicular access is already in place, connecting site with the A 965. | 0 | N/A | 0 | | | | |

| Source of site suggestion: Submitted in response to the Call for Sites. | | | o the Call for | Identified as part of site 2 in the MIR 2014. | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---|------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| SITE K-4 | Site Size (ha 4.4 | 4.4 He | | (ha): Current Use: Housing A development brief would be r allocation | | | equired for this | allocation, due to its s | trategic nature. |
| Site assessment question | | | elated SEA opic | Comment Information available – GIS/site visit? | Scoring pre mitigation | Mitigation | Scoring post mitigation | | |
| Climate change | | | | | | | - | | |
| Is the proposal close to a range of fa these be accessed by public transpo | | Populatior health | n and Human | Yes, it is within 10 minutes walking distance of the Glaitness Primary School, the Pickaquoy Leisure Centre and a number of shops and supermarkets. | + | N/A | + | | |
| Is the proposal protected from preva | ailing winds? | | | Wideford Hill to the west provides a degree of shelter. | + | Policy 2 <i>Design</i> requires new development to | + | | |
| Site aspect – does the proposal ma solar gain? | ke best use of | | | Yes, it has a southerly aspect | + | development to demonstrate how it will minimise use of energy and maximise opportunities for shelter. | + | | |
| Is the proposal thought to be at risk could its development result in addit risk elsewhere? | | | | A small part of this site is considered to be at risk of flooding and it is upslope from the Muddisdale and Pickaquoy areas to the south and east which are prone to flooding. | - | The settlement statement notes the flood risk on site, as well as the potential for development of the site to | 0 | | |

| Could the development of the proposal help alleviate any existing flooding problems in the area? | Water | Uncertain. | ? | contribute to flooding elsewhere. | 0 |
|--|-------|--|---|--|---|
| Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna | k | | | • | |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any international or national biodiversity designation, e.g. SAC/SPA/Ramsar/SSSI? | | There is no connectivity between site and any of Orkney's international and national designations. Its development is therefore unlikely to have any effect on their qualifying interests or their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any locally important designations such as LNRs or LNCSs. | | Site is remote from any of Orkney's locally important designations and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect non designated features – e.g. trees, TPOs, hedges, woodland, species rich grasslands, | | Development of site is unlikely to affect any non-designated features as it is currently managed for agriculture. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect Protected Species –e.g. bats, otters, etc.? | | Otters are likely to use the nearby Muddisdale Burn and may also use drainage ditches in the area as access routes. | ? | The potential for otters to be present in areas close to waterbodies and drainage ditches is highlighted in the introduction to the settlement statements. | 0 |
| How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity? | | Vegetation on site is improved grassland and has limited ecological value. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| Water | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| Could the proposal result in a change of status of a water body or significantly affect a designated water body as identified in the Scotland River Basin Management Plan? Can the proposal connect to the public foul sewer? | Water | The nearby Peedie Sea is classed as a heavily modified water body. The water quality of the Peedie Sea is high and its overall status is good. There is currently capacity at Kirkwall waste water treatment works; however, should demands exceed available capacity, Scottish Water will initiate a Growth Project once one development meets the 5 Growth Criteria. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Could the option have a direct impact on the water environment (for example result in the need for watercourse crossings or allow the de-culverting of a watercourse? | Water | Unlikely. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Does the proposal impact on Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs), i.e. are there any wetlands and boggy areas on the site? | Water and Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| For large scale developments are there any private or public water supplies within 250m of the proposal which may be affected? | Water and Human Health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Soils | | | | | |
| Is the proposal on greenfield or brownfield land? Does the proposal result in the loss of high quality agricultural land? | Material Assets and Soils | This is a greenfield site. The land is identified as category 4_2 , capable of producing a narrow range of crops. | - | Site is within the town boundary, therefore its development is considered to be a sustainable option. | 0 |
| Are there any contaminated soil issues on the site | Material Assets and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| and if so, will the proposal reduce contamination? | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Is the proposal on peatland and could the development of the proposal lead to a loss of peat? | Climatic Factors and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Geology | | | | | |
| Are there any national geodiversity sites that could be affected by the proposal? | | Site is remote from any of Orkney's national geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal? | | Site is remote from any of Orkney's local geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Landscape | | | | | |
| To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations? | Landscape | Site is remote from, and will not affect, the Hoy and West Mainland NSA or any local landscape designation. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? Such as current settlement boundaries, existing townscape and character of surrounding area? | Landscape | Site is located within the current Kirkwall town boundary and is bordered by built development and a golf course. | 0 | Policy 2 <i>Design</i> includes a set of fundamental principles with | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect features of landscape interest, including the distinctive character of the landscape and the qualities of wild land? | landscape | The landscape character type for this area is described as Urban and Rural Development. There is no wild land in this area. | 0 | which all development should comply. Further guidance will be provided in the development brief. | 0 |

| Cultural Heritage | | | | | |
|--|--|--|----------|-----|----|
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any scheduled monuments or their setting? Cultural heritage, & I with landscape | | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any locally important archaeological site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any listed buildings and/or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Conservation Areas? (e.g. will it result in the demolition of any buildings) | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Service Infrastructure | 4 | | <u>.</u> | | .1 |
| Are there educational or health facilities nearby? | Population | Site is within 10 minutes walking distance from Glaitness Primary School and the Pickaquoy Leisure Centre. The Kirkwall Health Centre and the hospital are within approximately 15-20 minutes walking distance. | + | N/A | + |
| To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space, or result in a loss of open space? | Population, human health or material assets | The proposal is unlikely to affect open space or connectivity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| To what extent will development of the site affect core path links or other key access networks such as cycle paths, coastal paths and rights of way? | Population, human health, material assets or climatic factors | Development of this site may present opportunities to link into the adjacent Core Path at Muddisdale. This would provide an alternative route to facilities such as the Pickaquoy Centre and Glaitness Primary School. | ? | Policy 10 <i>Green</i> <i>Infrastructure</i> promotes improvements to public access and permeability. | ? |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| Is there any opportunity to enhance the green network through for example green infrastructure on site? | Population, human health or material assets | There may be opportunities to create/enhance green infrastructure linking into existing woodland at Muddisdale. | ? | Potential access links and the creation or enhancement of green infrastructure should be addressed in the Development Brief. | ? |
| Material assets | | | | | |
| Will development of the proposal minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does it re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover existing on-site materials / resources? | | New development would link into existing infrastructure and services. | + | The settlement statement requires the provision of vehicular access to Muddisdale Road and allocation K-3. | + |
| Is the proposal in the vicinity of a waste management site and could its development therefore compromise the waste handling operation? | Human health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Deliverability/sustainability constraints | | | | | |
| Will the proposal be delivered within the LDP timeframe? Are there any site servicing constraints, e.g. waste water treatment capacity? | Material assets | There are no known site servicing constraints. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities - is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated? | Material assets and climatic factors | At this stage no vehicle access constraints have been identified. | 0 | The settlement statement requires the provision of | 0 |

| | | vehicular access to | |
|--|--|---------------------|--|
| | | Muddisdale Road | |
| | | and allocation K-3. | |
| | | | |

| KIRKWALL Source of site s Submitted in resp Call for Sites. | | | Summary Description: Site is in the Walliwall area of Kirkwall adj to the Old Finstown Road. It is included in both options 1 and 2. | I adjacent to the town's western boundary. It is adjace | | |
|---|-------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| SITE K-5 | Site Size (ha): 6.46 | Current Use: Agriculture | Identified as site 3 in the MIR 2015. Development brief required for this allocat | | | |
| Site assessment question | | Related SEA topic | Comment Information available – GIS/site visit? | Scoring pre mitigation | Mitigation | Scoring post mitigation |
| Climate change | | | | | | |
| Is the proposal close to a range of f these be accessed by public transp | | luman health | Site is approximately 15 minutes walking distance from the town centre and is probably within 10 minutes walking distance from Glaitness Primary School, the Pickaquoy Leisure Centre and three supermarkets. It is located alongside the route of the Kirkwall Town scheduled bus service. | + | N/A | + |
| Is the proposal protected from preva | ailing winds? | | The land slopes gently toward the N. Higher land nearby, including Wideford Hill, provides a degree of shelter from westerly and southerly winds. | + | Policy 2 <i>Design</i> requires new development to demonstrate how it will minimise use of | + |
| Site aspect – does the proposal ma solar gain? | ke best use of | | Site has a relatively open aspect and benefits from solar gain for most of the day. | + | energy and maximise opportunities for shelter. | + |

| Is the proposal thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere? | Water and Human Health | Site is not considered to be at risk of flooding. However it is upslope from the Muddisdale and Pickaquoy areas to the north which are prone to flooding. | - | The settlement statement notes the flood risk on site, as well as the potential for development of | 0 |
|--|---------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| Could the development of the proposal help alleviate any existing flooding problems in the area? | Water | Uncertain. | ? | the site to contribute to flooding elsewhere. | ? |
| Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna | | | | | |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any international or national biodiversity designation, e.g. SAC/SPA/Ramsar/SSSI? | | There is no connectivity between site and any of Orkney's international and national designations. Its development is therefore unlikely to have any effect on their qualifying interests or their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any locally important designations such as LNRs or LNCSs. | | Site is remote from any of Orkney's locally important designations and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect non designated features – e.g. trees, TPOs, hedges, woodland, species rich grasslands, | | Development of site is unlikely to affect any non-designated features as it is currently managed for agriculture. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect Protected Species –e.g. bats, otters, etc.? | | Otters are likely to use the nearby Muddisdale Burn and may also use drainage ditches in the area as access routes. | ? | The potential for otters to be present in areas close to waterbodies and drainage ditches is highlighted in the introduction to the settlement statements. | 0 |
| How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity? | | Vegetation on site is improved grassland and has limited ecological value. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Water | | | | ıi | |

| Could the proposal result in a change of status of a water body or significantly affect a designated water body as identified in the Scotland River Basin Management Plan? Can the proposal connect to the public foul sewer? | Water | The nearest designated water body is the Peedie Sea which is classed as a heavily modified water body. The water quality of the Peedie Sea is high and its overall status is good. There is currently capacity at Kirkwall waste water treatment works; however, should demand exceed available capacity, Scottish Water will initiate a Growth Project once one development meets the 5 Growth Criteria. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| Could the option have a direct impact on the water environment (for example result in the need for watercourse crossings or allow the de-culverting of a watercourse? | Water | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Does the proposal avoid impact on Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs), i.e. are there any wetlands and boggy areas on the site? | Water and Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| For large scale developments are there any private or public water supplies within 250m of the proposal which may be affected? | Water and Human Health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Soils | 4 | dd | | | |
| Is the proposal on greenfield or brownfield land? Does the proposal result in the loss of high quality agricultural land? | Material Assets and Soils | This is a greenfield site. The land is identified as category 4 ₂ , capable of producing a narrow range of crops. | - | Site is adjacent to the town boundary, therefore its development is considered to be a sustainable option. | 0 |
| Are there any contaminated soil issues on the site and if so, will the proposal reduce contamination? | Material Assets and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is the proposal on peatland and could the | Climatic | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| development of the proposal lead to a loss of peat? | Factors and Soils | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| Geology | | | | | |
| Are there any national geodiversity sites that could be affected by the proposal? | | Site is remote from any of Orkney's national geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal? | | Site is remote from any of Orkney's local geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Landscape | • | | L | L | |
| To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations? | Landscape | Site is remote from, and will not affect, the Hoy and West Mainland NSA or any local landscape designation. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? Such as current settlement boundaries, existing townscape and character of surrounding area? | Landscape | Site is located adjacent to the current Kirkwall town boundary and is bordered by built development and agricultural land | ? | Policy 2 <i>Design</i> includes a set of fundamental principles with | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect features of landscape interest, including the distinctive character of the landscape and the qualities of wild land? | landscape | The landscape character type for this area is described as Urban and Rural Development. There is no wild land in this area. | ? | which all development should comply. | 0 |
| Cultural Heritage | <u> </u> | | | l | |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any scheduled monuments or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any locally important archaeological site? | Cultural heritage, & links with | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| | landscape | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any listed buildings and/or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Conservation Areas? (e.g. will it result in the demolition of any buildings) | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Service Infrastructure | | | 1 | | 1 |
| Are there educational or health facilities nearby? | Population | Site is within 10 minutes walking distance from Glaitness Primary School and the Pickaquoy Leisure Centre. The Kirkwall Health Centre and the hospital are probably within 15-20 minutes walking distance. | + | N/A | + |
| To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space, or result in a loss of open space? | Population, human health or material assets | The proposal is unlikely to affect open space or connectivity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will development of the site affect core path links or other key access networks such | Population, human health, | Development of this site may present opportunities to link into the adjacent Core | ? | The settlement statement requires | + |

| as cycle paths, coastal paths and rights of way? | material assets or climatic factors | Path at Muddisdale. This would provide an alternative route to facilities such as the Pickaquoy Centre and Glaitness Primary School. | | the site to connect to existing Muddisdale core path and green infrastructure. | |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| Is there any opportunity to enhance the green network through for example green infrastructure on site? | Population, human health or material assets | Uncertain. | ? | Further guidance is available in the Orkney Open Space Strategy. | + |
| Material assets | | <u>.</u> | | • | |
| Will development of the proposal minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does it re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover existing on-site materials / resources? | | Yes, new development would link into existing infrastructure and services. | + | N/A | + |
| Is the proposal in the vicinity of a waste management site and could its development therefore compromise the waste handling operation? | Human health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Deliverability/sustainability constraints | | L | | | |
| Will the proposal be delivered within the LDP timeframe? Are there any site servicing constraints, e.g. waste water treatment capacity? | Material assets | There are no known site servicing constraints. There is currently a wind turbine development on this site. | ? | The settlement statement notes the presence of the wind turbines. | 0 |
| Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities - is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated? | Material assets and climatic factors | At this stage no vehicle access constraints have been identified. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| KIRKWALL | Existing alloc | | Summary Description: Identified as Site KW-D in the adopted Orkne | y LDP 2014. | | | |
|---|----------------------------|--|---|------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|--|
| SITE K-6 | Site Size (ha): 11.5 | Current Use: Housing allocation. | Identified as sites 5 and 6 in the MIR 2015. Site is also known as Corse West. The Corse West Development Brief which was prepare 2010 sets out the main opportunities and constraints relating to phased development of the This is a potential site for development of a new care home, along with 100 houses. | | | | |
| Site assessment question | | Related SEA topic | Comment Information available – GIS/site visit? | Scoring pre mitigation | Mitigation | Scoring post mitigation | |
| Climate change | | | | | | | |
| Is the proposal close to a range of fa these be accessed by public transpo | | Population and Human health | Yes it is within 10 minutes walking range of Glaitness primary School, the Pickaquoy Leisure Centre and a number of shops and supermarkets. It is on the route of the scheduled Kirkwall town bus service. | + | N/A | + | |
| Is the proposal protected from preva | iling winds? | | Wideford Hill to the west as well as elevated land to the south provides a degree of shelter. | + | Policy 2 <i>Design</i> requires new development to demonstrate how it | + | |
| Site aspect – does the proposal mak solar gain? | e best use of | | Yes, this site is low lying and relatively flat with an open aspect. | + | will minimise use of energy and maximise opportunities for shelter. | + | |
| Is the proposal thought to be at risk of could its development result in additi risk elsewhere? | | Water and Human Health | An area adjacent to the northern boundary of this site is at risk of flooding, e.g. when the Muddisdale Burn surcharges and overflows. This area has already been removed from | - | The settlement statement notes the | 0 | |

| | | the allocations and it has been identified as open space. The site is upslope from the Pickaquoy area which is prone to flooding. | | flood risk on site, as well as the potential for development of the site to contribute to | |
|--|-------|---|---|--|---|
| Could the development of the proposal help alleviate any existing flooding problems in the area? | Water | Uncertain – this may be possible through enhanced SuDS. | ? | flooding elsewhere. | 0 |
| Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna | | | | • | |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any international or national biodiversity designation, e.g. SAC/SPA/Ramsar/SSSI? | | There is no connectivity between site and any of Orkney's international and national designations. Its development is therefore unlikely to have any effect on their qualifying interests or their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any locally important designations such as LNRs or LNCSs. | | Site is remote from any of Orkney's locally important designations and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect non designated features – e.g. trees, TPOs, hedges, woodland, species rich grasslands, | | Development of site is unlikely to affect any non-designated features as it is currently managed for agriculture. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect Protected Species –e.g. bats, otters, etc.? | | Otters are likely to use the nearby Muddisdale Burn and may also use drainage ditches in the wider area as access routes. | ? | The potential for otters to be present in areas close to waterbodies and drainage ditches is highlighted in the introduction to the settlement statements. | 0 |
| How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity? | | Vegetation on site is improved grassland and has limited ecological value. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Water | | i | | | |

| Could the proposal result in a change of status of a water body or significantly affect a designated water body as identified in the Scotland River Basin Management Plan? | Water | The nearby Peedie Sea is classed as a heavily modified water body. The water quality of the Peedie Sea is high and its overall status is good. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| Can the proposal connect to the public foul sewer? | | There is currently capacity at Kirkwall waste water treatment works; however, should demands exceed available capacity, Scottish Water will initiate a Growth Project once one development meets the 5 Growth Criteria. | | | |
| Could the option have a direct impact on the water environment (for example result in the need for watercourse crossings or allow the de-culverting of a watercourse? | Water | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Does the proposal avoid impact on Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs), i.e. are there any wetlands and boggy areas on the site? | Water and Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| For large scale developments are there any private or public water supplies within 250m of the proposal which may be affected? | Water and Human Health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Soils | | | | · | |
| Is the proposal on greenfield or brownfield land? | Material Assets and Soils | This is a greenfield site. The land is identified as category 4_2 , capable of producing a narrow range of crops. However it is currently in use as a sports pitch. | - | Site is an existing allocation, within the town boundary, therefore its development is considered to be a sustainable option. | 0 |
| Does the proposal result in the loss of high quality agricultural land? | | | | | |
| Are there any contaminated soil issues on the site and if so, will the proposal reduce contamination? | Material Assets and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is the proposal on peatland and could the | Climatic | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| development of the proposal lead to a loss of peat? | Factors and Soils | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| Geology | | | | | |
| Are there any national geodiversity sites that could be affected by the proposal? | | Site is remote from any of Orkney's national geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal? | | Site is remote from any of Orkney's local geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Landscape | | | | | |
| To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations? | Landscape | Site is remote from, and will not affect, the Hoy and West Mainland NSA or any local landscape designation. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? Such as current settlement boundaries, existing townscape and character of surrounding area? | Landscape | Site is an existing allocation, within the current Kirkwall town boundary and is bordered by built development and agricultural land | 0 | Policy 2 <i>Design</i> includes a set of fundamental principles with which all development | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect features of landscape interest, including the distinctive character of the landscape and the qualities of wild land? | landscape | The landscape character type for this area is described as Urban and Rural Development. There is no wild land in this area. | 0 | Further guidance is provided in the Development Brief. | 0 |
| Cultural Heritage | | | | | |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any scheduled monuments or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any locally important archaeological site? | Cultural heritage, & links with | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| | landscape | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any listed buildings and/or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Conservation Areas? (e.g. will it result in the demolition of any buildings) | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Service Infrastructure | | | 1 | | 1 |
| Are there educational or health facilities nearby? | Population | Site is within 10 minutes walking distance from Glaitness Primary School and the Pickaquoy Leisure Centre. The Kirkwall Health Centre and the hospital are probably within 15-20 minutes walking distance. | + | N/A | + |
| To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space, or result in a loss of open space? | Population, human health or material assets | The proposal is unlikely to affect open space or connectivity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will development of the site affect core path links or other key access networks such | Population, human health, | Development of this site would present opportunities to link into the Muddisdale | + | The settlement statement requires | + |

| as cycle paths, coastal paths and rights of way? Is there any opportunity to enhance the green network through for example green infrastructure on site? | material assets or climatic factors Population, human health or material assets | core path. This would provide an alternative route to facilities such as the Pickaquoy Centre and Glaitness Primary School. A path which is listed in the Catalogue of Rights of Way passes adjacent to the western boundary of the site. The proposal is unlikely to affect any existing area of open space or connectivity. | 0 | development on the site to contribute positively to the existing green infrastructure that provides linkage between the Peedie Sea and the countryside. The Development Brief highlights the requirement for development of this | + |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| | | | | area to include effective, usable open spaces which will become a natural focus for community activity. | |
| Material assets | | | | | |
| Will development of the proposal minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does it re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover existing on-site materials / resources? | | New development would link into existing infrastructure and services. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is the proposal in the vicinity of a waste management site and could its development therefore compromise the waste handling operation? | Human health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Deliverability/sustainability constraints | | | | | |
| Will the proposal be delivered within the LDP timeframe? Are there any site servicing constraints, e.g. waste water treatment capacity? | Material assets | There are no known site servicing constraints. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities - is the road network capable of | Material assets and | At this stage no vehicle access constraints have been identified. | 0 | The settlement statement sets out | 0 |

| accommodating traffic generated? | climatic factors | the r | equirements |
|----------------------------------|------------------|-------|-----------------|
| | | for v | ehicular access |
| | | provi | ision to this |
| | | site. | |
| | | | |

| KIRKWALL | Source of si Existing alloc | ite suggestion: cation. | se: Identified as Site KW-F in the adopted Orkney LDP 2014. | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--|--|------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|--|
| SITE K-7 | Site Size (ha): 3.30 | Current Use: Housing allocation. | | | | | |
| Site assessment question | | Related SEA topic | Comment Information available – GIS/site visit? | Scoring pre mitigation | Mitigation | Scoring post mitigation | |
| Climate change | | | | | | | |
| Is the proposal close to a range of fa these be accessed by public transpo | | Population and Human health | Yes it is within 10 minutes walking range of Glaitness Primary School, the Pickaquoy Leisure Centre and a number of shops and supermarkets. It is on the route of the scheduled Kirkwall town bus service. | + | N/A | + | |
| Is the proposal protected from preva | iling winds? | | Wideford Hill to the west, as well as elevated land to the south, provides a degree of shelter. | + | Policy 2 <i>Design</i> requires new development to demonstrate how it | + | |
| Site aspect – does the proposal mak solar gain? | e best use of | | This site has a northerly aspect. | 0 | will minimise use of energy and maximise opportunities for shelter. | + | |
| Is the proposal thought to be at risk of could its development result in additi | | Water and | Site is not considered to be at risk of flooding; however it is upslope from the | ? | | 0 | |

| risk elsewhere? | Human Health | Pickaquoy area which is prone to flooding. | | N/A. | |
|---|--------------|---|---|--|---|
| Could the development of the proposal help alleviate any existing flooding problems in the area? | Water | Uncertain – this may be possible through enhanced SuDS. | ? | | ? |
| Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna | | | | | |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any international or national biodiversity designation, e.g. SAC/SPA/Ramsar/SSSI? | | There is no connectivity between site and any of Orkney's international and national designations. Its development is therefore unlikely to have any effect on their qualifying interests or their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any locally important designations such as LNRs or LNCSs. | | Site is remote from any of Orkney's locally important designations and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect non designated features – e.g. trees, TPOs, hedges, woodland, species rich grasslands, | | Development of site is unlikely to affect any non-designated features as it is currently managed for agriculture. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect Protected Species –e.g. bats, otters, etc.? | | Otters are likely to use the nearby Muddisdale Burn and may also use drainage ditches in the wider area as access routes. | ? | The potential for otters to be present in areas close to waterbodies and drainage ditches is highlighted in the introduction to the settlement statements. | 0 |
| How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity? | | Vegetation on site is improved grassland and has limited ecological value. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Water | | | | L | |
| Could the proposal result in a change of status of a water body or significantly affect a designated water body as identified in the Scotland River | Water | The nearby Peedie Sea is classed as a heavily modified water body. The water quality of the Peedie Sea is high and its | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| Basin Management Plan? | | overall status is good. | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| Can the proposal connect to the public foul sewer? | | There is currently capacity at Kirkwall waste water treatment works; however, should demands exceed available capacity, Scottish Water will initiate a Growth Project once one development meets the 5 Growth Criteria. | | | |
| Could the option have a direct impact on the water environment (for example result in the need for watercourse crossings or allow the de-culverting of a watercourse? | Water | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Does the proposal avoid impact on Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs), i.e. are there any wetlands and boggy areas on the site? | Water and Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| For large scale developments are there any private or public water supplies within 250m of the proposal which may be affected? | Water and Human Health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Soils | | | | | |
| Is the proposal on greenfield or brownfield land? Does the proposal result in the loss of high quality agricultural land? | Material Assets and Soils | This is a greenfield site. The land is identified as category 4_2 , capable of producing a narrow range of crops. | - | Site is an existing allocation, within the town boundary, therefore its development is considered to be a sustainable option. | 0 |
| Are there any contaminated soil issues on the site and if so, will the proposal reduce contamination? | Material Assets and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is the proposal on peatland and could the development of the proposal lead to a loss of peat? | Climatic Factors and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| Geology | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| Are there any national geodiversity sites that could be affected by the proposal? | | Site is remote from any of Orkney's national geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal? | | Site is remote from any of Orkney's local geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Landscape | ••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••• | | | | |
| To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations? | Landscape | Site is remote from, and will not affect, the Hoy and West Mainland NSA or any local landscape designation. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? Such as current settlement boundaries, existing townscape and character of surrounding area? | Landscape | Site is an existing allocation, within the current Kirkwall town boundary and is bordered by built development and agricultural land. | 0 | Policy 2 <i>Design</i> includes a set of fundamental principles with | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect features of landscape interest, including the distinctive character of the landscape and the qualities of wild land? | landscape | The landscape character type for this area is described as Urban and Rural Development. There is no wild land in this area. | 0 | which all development should comply. | 0 |
| Cultural Heritage | | | | 4 | 1 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any scheduled monuments or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any locally important archaeological site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any listed buildings and/or their setting? | Cultural | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
|--|--|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| noted banango ana/or then betting: | heritage, & links with landscape | | | | |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Conservation Areas? (e.g. will it result in the demolition of any buildings) | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Service Infrastructure | ••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••• | | | • | · |
| Are there educational or health facilities nearby? | Population | Site is within 10 minutes walking distance from Glaitness Primary School and the Pickaquoy Leisure Centre. The Kirkwall Health Centre and the hospital are within approximately 15-20 minutes walking distance. | + | N/A | + |
| To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space, or result in a loss of open space? | Population, human health or material assets | The proposal is unlikely to affect open space or connectivity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will development of the site affect core path links or other key access networks such | Population, human health, | A path which is listed in the Catalogue of Rights of Way appears to pass along the | + | The settlement statement requires | + |

| as cycle paths, coastal paths and rights of way? | material assets or climatic factors | southern boundary of the site. | | vehicular access to be taken provided from Glaitness Road and tracks surrounding the site boundary (upgraded as required). | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| Is there any opportunity to enhance the green network through for example green infrastructure on site? | Population, human health or material assets | Uncertain. | ? | Guidance is available in the Orkney Open Space Strategy. | ? |
| Material assets | | | | | |
| Will development of the proposal minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does it re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover existing on-site materials / resources? | | New development would link into existing infrastructure and services. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is the proposal in the vicinity of a waste management site and could its development therefore compromise the waste handling operation? | Human health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Deliverability/sustainability constraints | | L | | L | |
| Will the proposal be delivered within the LDP timeframe? Are there any site servicing constraints, e.g. waste water treatment capacity? | Material assets | There are no known site servicing constraints. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities - is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated? | Material assets and climatic factors | At this stage no vehicle access constraints have been identified. | 0 | The settlement statement sets out the requirements for vehicular access provision to this site. | 0 |

| KIRKWALL SITE 8 | The northern was submitte the call for sit | was identified | In the current LDP Site 8 is located adjacent to the town boundary, on the experimentsponse to be dentified view.In the current LDP Site 8 is located adjacent to the town boundary, on the experimentDevelopment of this allocation will be addressed through a joint developmentTube:K-10, K-11, the Scapa Link Road, the new hospital site and the existing hose | | | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|---|-------------------------|--|--|
| Site assessment question | | Related SEA topic | Comment Information available – GIS/site visit? | Scoring pre mitigation | Mitigation | Scoring post mitigation | | |
| Climate change | | | | | | | | |
| Is the proposal close to a range o these be accessed by public trans | | Population and Human health | Yes, site 8 is within 10-15 minutes walking distance from core facilities such as shops, schools and healthcare facilities. It is located on the route of the Kirkwall Town Service scheduled bus service. | + | N/A | + | | |
| Is the proposal protected from pre | evailing winds? | | Higher land to the west provides a degree of shelter. | + | Policy 2 <i>Design</i> requires new development to | + | | |
| Site aspect – does the proposal n solar gain? | nake best use of | | The land slopes very slightly towards the NE, with a relatively open aspect, and benefits from solar gain during most of the day. | + | development to demonstrate how it will minimise use of energy and maximise opportunities for shelter. | + | | |
| Is the proposal thought to be at ris could its development result in ad risk elsewhere? | | Water and Human Health | Low lying parts of the site are known to flood from a combination of fluvial (Crantit Burn), surface water runoff, and tide locking. FRA will be required and areas at risk will have to be avoided. This may reduce the | - | The settlement statement notes the flood risk on site, as well as the potential for development of the site to | 0 | | |

| | | developable area of the site and impact the capacity of the site. | | contribute to flooding elsewhere. | |
|--|-------|---|---|--|---|
| Could the development of the proposal help alleviate any existing flooding problems in the area? | Water | Uncertain. There may be potential for the SUDS to incorporate natural flood risk management techniques, e.g. through creation of a wetland area. | ? | A Flood Risk Assessment may be required and certain areas may not be developable. | ? |
| Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna | | | | | |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any international or national biodiversity designation, e.g. SAC/SPA/Ramsar/SSSI? | | There is no connectivity between site 8 and any of Orkney's international and national designations. Its development is therefore unlikely to have any effect on their qualifying interests or their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any locally important designations such as LNRs or LNCSs. | | Site 8 is remote from any of Orkney's locally important designations and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect non designated features – e.g. trees, TPOs, hedges, woodland, species rich grasslands, | | Development of site 8 is unlikely to affect any non-designated features as it is currently managed for agriculture. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect Protected Species –e.g. bats, otters, etc.? | | Otters are known to frequent the nearby Crantit Canal and the animals may also use drainage ditches in the area as access routes. | ? | The potential for otters to be present in areas close to waterbodies and drainage ditches is highlighted in the introduction to the settlement statements. | 0 |
| How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity? | | Vegetation on site is improved grassland and has limited ecological value. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Water | | | | | |

| Could the proposal result in a change of status of a water body or significantly affect a designated water body as identified in the Scotland River Basin Management Plan? Can the proposal connect into the public sewer. | Water | Unlikely. There is currently capacity at Kirkwall waste water treatment works; however, should demand exceed available capacity, Scottish Water will initiate a Growth Project once one development meets the 5 Growth Criteria | 0 | N/A | 0 |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| Could the proposal have a direct impact on the water environment (for example result in the need for watercourse crossings or allow the de-culverting of a watercourse? | Water | The Crantit Canal is adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site. | ? | Policy 9 Natural Environment and Landscape provides planning | 0 |
| Does the proposal avoid impact on Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs), i.e. are there any wetlands and boggy areas on the site? | Water and Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora | Uncertain – there may be boggy areas in the vicinity of the Crantit Canal and adjacent lagoons | ? | policy for the protection of the water environment and requires an appropriate | 0 |
| For large scale developments are there any private or public water supplies within 250m of the proposal which may be affected? | Water and Human Health | No. Lagoons adjacent to the southern boundary of the site are used by a local distillery; however the private water supply operated by the distillery is located at HY 45162 09493 | ? | development-free buffer zone to be included where a waterside location is not essential to the development. The settlement statement requires water quality and flow to be protected. | 0 |
| Soils | | | | • | |
| Is the proposal on greenfield or brownfield land? | Material Assets and Soils | Site 8 is on a greenfield site. The land is identified as category 4_1 and is capable of producing a narrow range of crops, e.g. barley, oats and forage crops. | - | Development is considered to be a sustainable option as the site is located close to services and facilities. | 0 |

| Are there any contaminated soil issues on the proposal and if so, will the option reduce contamination? | Material Assets and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
|---|----------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Is the proposal on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat? | Climatic Factors and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Geology | | | • | | |
| Are there any national geodiversity sites that could be affected by the proposal? | | The site is remote from any of Orkney's national geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal? | | The site is remote from any of Orkney's local geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Landscape | | | | | |
| To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations? | Landscape | The proposal is remote from, and will not affect, the Hoy and West Mainland NSA. | 0 | New development should comply with Policy 9 Natural Environment and | 0 |
| Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? Such as current settlement boundaries, existing townscape and character of surrounding area? | Landscape | Part of the proposal is located adjacent to the current Kirkwall town boundary and is surrounded by housing and agricultural land. | ? | Landscape. Policy 2 Design includes a set of fundamental principles with | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect features of landscape interest, including the distinctive character of the landscape and the qualities of wild land? | landscape | The landscape character type for this area is described as Urban and Rural Development. The spire of St Magnus Cathedral is clearly visible throughout the Crantit Valley. | ? | which all development should comply. Further guidance will be provided in the Development Brief. | 0 |
| | | There is no wild land in this area. | | Policy 9 requires | |

| | | | | development proposals to be sympathetic to locally important historic features. | |
|--|--|-----|---|---|---|
| Cultural Heritage | | | | | |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any scheduled monuments or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any locally important archaeological site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any listed buildings and/or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Conservation Areas? (e.g. will it result in the demolition of any buildings) | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? | Cultural heritage, & links with | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| | landscape | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| Service Infrastructure | | | | | |
| Are there educational or health facilities nearby? | Population | Site 8 is within 10-15 minutes walking distance of the Kirkwall Health Centre and the hospital. | + | N/A | + |
| To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space, or result in a loss of open space? | Population, human health or material assets | Development of site 8 is unlikely to affect open space or connectivity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will development of the proposal affect core path links or other key access networks such as cycle paths, coastal paths and rights of way? | Population, human health, material assets or climatic factors | The proposal is unlikely to affect core path links or other key access networks such as cycle paths, coastal paths and rights of way. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is there any opportunity to enhance the green network through for example green infrastructure on site? | Population, human health or material assets | Uncertain. | ? | Opportunities will be explored through the Kirkwall South Development Brief. Guidance is available in the Orkney Open Space Strategy. | ? |
| Material assets | | <u>.</u> | | | |
| Will development of the proposal minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does it re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover existing on-site materials / resources? | | New development would link into existing infrastructure and services. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is the proposal in the vicinity of a waste management site and could its development therefore compromise the waste handling operation? | Human health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Deliverability/sustainability constraints | | · | | | |

| Will the proposal be delivered within the LDP timeframe? Are there any site servicing constraints, e.g. waste water treatment capacity? | Material assets | There is currently capacity at Kirkwall waste water treatment works; however, should demand exceed available capacity, Scottish Water will initiate a Growth Project once one development meets the 5 Growth Criteria. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities - is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated? | Material assets and climatic factors | The proposal is adjacent to the A964 Kirkwall-Orphir road. A new road is proposed to the south of the healthcare campus. This will provide a link between the Old and new Scapa roads. | ? | The settlement statement sets out the requirements for vehicular access provision to this site. | 0 |

| KIRKWALL SITE K-9 | | ite suggestion: ers/interested ified/aware? Current Use: Agriculture | Site History/Previous planning applications, existing local plan policies and proposals: Identified as site 17 in the MIR 2015. Development of this allocation will be addressed through a joint development brief with K-8, K-9 K-10, K-11, the Scapa Link Road, the new hospital site and the existing hospital site (the Kirkwa South Development Brief). | | | |
|--|---------------|--|--|---|--|---|
| Site assessment question | | Related SEA topic | A Comment Scoring pre mitigation Mitigation Sco pos mitigation Information available – GIS/site Scoring pre mitigation Mitigation Scoring pre mitigation | | | |
| Climate change | | | | | | |
| Is the proposal close to a range of faithese be accessed by public transport | | Population and Human health | Site is within 10-15 minutes walking distance from core facilities such as shops, schools and healthcare facilities. It is located on the route of the Kirkwall Town Service scheduled bus service. | + | N/A | + |
| Is the proposal protected from preva | ailing winds? | | Higher land to the east and west provide a degree of shelter. | + | Policy 2 <i>Design</i> requires new | + |

| Site aspect – does the proposal make best use of solar gain? | | Yes, the site is open to the south. | + | development to demonstrate how it will minimise use of energy and maximise opportunities for shelter. | + |
|--|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Is the proposal thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere? | Water and Human Health | Low lying parts of the site are known to flood from a combination of fluvial (Crantit Burn), surface water runoff, and tide locking. FRA will be required and areas at risk will have to be avoided. This may reduce the developable area of the site and impact the capacity of the site. | | The settlement statement notes the flood risk on site, as well as the potential for development of the site to contribute to flooding elsewhere. A Flood Risk Assessment may be required and certain areas may not be developable. | 0 |
| Could the development of the proposal help alleviate any existing flooding problems in the area? | Water | Unlikely. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna | • | | | | |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any international or national biodiversity designation, e.g. SAC/SPA/Ramsar/SSSI? | | There is no connectivity between site and any of Orkney's international and national designations. Its development is therefore unlikely to have any effect on their qualifying interests or their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any locally important designations such as LNRs or LNCSs. | | Site is remote from any of Orkney's locally important designations and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect non designated features – e.g. trees, TPOs, hedges, woodland, species rich grasslands, | | Development of site is unlikely to affect any non-designated features as it is currently managed for agriculture. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| To what extent will the proposal affect Protected Species –e.g. bats, otters, etc.? | | Otters are known to frequent the nearby Crantit Canal and the animals may also use drainage ditches in the area as access routes. | ? | The potential for otters to be present in areas close to waterbodies and drainage ditches is highlighted in the introduction to the settlement statements. | 0 |
|--|--|--|----------|--|---|
| How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity? | | Vegetation on site is improved grassland and has limited ecological value. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Water | ••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••• | <u>.</u> | <u>.</u> | | |
| Could the option result in a change of status of a water body or significantly affect a designated water body as identified in the Scotland River Basin Management Plan? Can the proposal connect to the public foul sewer? | Water | Unlikely. There is currently capacity at Kirkwall waste water treatment works; however, should demand exceed available capacity, Scottish Water will initiate a Growth Project once one development meets the 5 Growth Criteria. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Could the proposal have a direct impact on the water environment (for example result in the need for watercourse crossings or allow the de-culverting of a watercourse? | Water | Unlikely. | 0 | Policy 9 Natural Environment and Landscape provides planning policy for the protection of the water | 0 |
| Does the proposal avoid impact on Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs), i.e. are there any wetlands and boggy areas on the site? | Water and Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora | Crantit Canal is adjacent to the western boundary of this site. | ? | environment and requires an appropriate development-free buffer zone to be | 0 |
| For large scale developments are there any private or public water supplies within 250m of the proposal which may be affected? | Water and Human Health | No. Lagoons adjacent to the SW boundary of the site are used by a local distillery; however the private water supply operated by the distillery is located at HY 45162 09493 | ? | included where a waterside location is not essential to the development. The settlement statement requires water quality and flow to be protected | 0 |

| Soils | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--------|
| Is the proposal on greenfield or brownfield land? Does it result in the loss of high quality agricultural land? | Material Assets and Soils | Site is on a greenfield site. The land is identified as category 4 ₁ and is capable of producing a narrow range of crops, e.g. barley, oats and forage crops. | - | Development is considered to be a sustainable option as the site is located close to services and facilities. | 0 |
| Are there any contaminated soil issues on the proposal and if so, will the option reduce contamination? | Material Assets and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is the proposal on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat? | Climatic Factors and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Geology | | | | | |
| Are there any national geodiversity sites that could be affected by the proposal? | | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal? | | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Landscape | | | •••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••• | | • • |
| To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations? | Landscape | The proposal is remote from, and will not affect, the Hoy and West Mainland NSA. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? Such as current settlement boundaries, existing townscape and character of surrounding area? | Landscape | Part of the proposal is located adjacent to the current Kirkwall town boundary and is surrounded by housing and agricultural land. | ? | New development should comply with Policy 9 <i>Natural</i> <i>Environment and</i> <i>Landscape.</i> | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect features of | landscape | The landscape character type for this area | ? | Policy 2 <i>Design</i> includes a set of | 0 |

| landscape interest, including the distinctive character of the landscape and the qualities of wild land? | | is described as Urban and Rural Development. The spire of St Magnus Cathedral is clearly visible throughout the Crantit Valley. There is no wild land in this area. | | fundamental principles with which all development should comply. Further guidance will be provided in the Development Brief. | |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|
| Cultural Heritage | | | | | |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any scheduled monuments or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any locally important archaeological site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any listed buildings and/or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Conservation Areas? (e.g. will it result in the demolition of any buildings) | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| Is development of the proposal likely to result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| Service Infrastructure | | • | | | |
| Are there educational or health facilities nearby? | Population | Site is within 5-10 minutes walking distance of the Kirkwall Health Centre and the hospital. | + | N/A | + |
| To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space, or result in a loss of open space? | Population, human health or material assets | The proposal is unlikely to affect open space or connectivity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will development of the proposal affect core path links or other key access networks such as cycle paths, coastal paths and rights of way? | Population, human health, material assets or climatic factors | The proposal borders core path K13, the Crantit Trail. | ? | Policy 10 <i>Green</i> <i>Infrastructure</i> promotes improvements to public access and permeability. | 0 |
| Is there any opportunity to enhance the green network through for example green infrastructure on site? | Population, human health or material assets | Uncertain. | ? | Potential access links and the creation or enhancement of green infrastructure should be addressed in the Development Brief | ? |
| Material assets | | | | · | |
| Will development of the proposal minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does it re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover existing on-site materials / resources? | | New development would link into existing infrastructure and services. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is the proposal in the vicinity of a waste management site and could its development therefore compromise the waste handling operation? | Human health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| Deliverability/sustainability constraints | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Will the proposal be delivered within the LDP timeframe? Are there any site servicing constraints, e.g. waste water treatment capacity? | Material assets | There is currently capacity at Kirkwall waste water treatment works; however, should demand exceed available capacity, Scottish Water will initiate a Growth Project once one development meets the 5 Growth Criteria. | 0 | N/A | 0 | | | | |
| Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities - is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated? | Material assets and climatic factors | A new road is being constructed, adjacent to the northern boundary of site. Any access into the site would be subject to approval by the Council's Roads Service. | ? | The settlement statement sets out the requirements for vehicular access provision to this site. | 0 | | | | |

| KIRKWALL SITE K-10 | | ite suggestion: response to the s. Current Use: Agriculture | Summary Description: In the current LDP Site 10 is located adjacent to the town boundary, on New Scapa Road. It was included in both MIR options 1 and 2. Development of this allocation will be addressed through a joint development brief with K-8, K-9 K-10, K-11, the Scapa Link Road, the new hospital site and the existing hospital site (the Kirkwa South Development Brief) | | | |
|---|--|--|---|------------|-------------------------|--|
| Site assessment question Related SEA topic | | Comment Information available – GIS/site visit? | Scoring pre mitigation | Mitigation | Scoring post mitigation | |
| Climate change | | | | | | |
| Is the proposal close to a range of facilities? Can health these be accessed by public transport? | | Site 10 is within 10-15 minutes walking distance from core facilities such as shops, schools and healthcare facilities. It is located on the route of the Kirkwall Town | + | N/A | + | |

| | | Service scheduled bus service. | | | |
|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Is the proposal protected from prevailing winds? | | Higher land to the west of the Crantit Valley provides some shelter however the site remains quite open to the west. It is more sheltered from easterly winds. | - | Policy 2 <i>Design</i> requires new development to demonstrate how it will minimise use of | + |
| Site aspect – does the proposal make best use of solar gain? | | The site has a westerly aspect and makes good use of solar gain from mid-day onwards. | + | energy and maximise opportunities for shelter. | + |
| Is the proposal thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere? | Water and Human Health | Part of site 10 is at risk of surface water drainage, where Highland Park Burn flows along its northern boundary. The site is upstream of areas which are prone to flooding. Care is required with site drainage arrangements to ensure flood risk downstream is not exacerbated. Buffer zones will be required to small watercourse within the site. | - | The settlement statement notes the flood risk on site, as well as the potentia for development of the site to contribute to flooding elsewhere. Proposed drainage on site must ensure flood risk on lower | 0 |
| Could the development of the proposal help alleviate any existing flooding problems in the area? | Water | Uncertain. There may be potential for the SUDS to incorporate natural flood risk management techniques. | ? | flood risk on lower ground is not exacerbated | ? |
| Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna | | | | | |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any international or national biodiversity designation, e.g. SAC/SPA/Ramsar/SSSI? | | There is no connectivity between site 10 and any of Orkney's international and national designations. Its development is therefore unlikely to have any effect on their qualifying interests or their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any locally important designations such as LNRs or LNCSs. | | Site 10 is remote from any of Orkney's locally important designations and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| To what extent will the proposal affect non designated features – e.g. trees, TPOs, hedges, woodland, species rich grasslands, | | Development of site 10 is unlikely to affect any non-designated features as it is currently managed for agriculture. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| To what extent will the proposal affect Protected Species –e.g. bats, otters, etc.? | | There is potential for otters to use the Highland Park Burn which flows along the northern boundary of the proposal. | ? | The potential for otters to be present in areas close to waterbodies and drainage ditches is highlighted in the introduction to the settlement statements. | 0 |
| How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity? | | There is potential for new development to impact upon the Highland Park Burn. Vegetation on site is improved grassland and has limited ecological value. | ? | The site statement highlights the presence of the burn and the possible requirement for a protective buffer zone. | 0 |
| Water | | | | | |
| Could the proposal result in a change of status of a water body or significantly affect a designated water body as identified in the Scotland River Basin Management Plan? Can the proposal connect to the public foul sewer? | Water | Unlikely. There is currently capacity at Kirkwall waste water treatment works; however, should demand exceed available capacity, Scottish Water will initiate a Growth Project once one development meets the 5 Growth Criteria. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Could the proposal have a direct impact on the water environment (for example result in the need for watercourse crossings or allow the de-culverting of a watercourse? | Water | Unlikely | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Does the proposal avoid impact on Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs), i.e. are there any wetlands and boggy areas on | Water and Biodiversity, Fauna and | There are no wetlands or boggy areas on site. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| the site? | Flora | | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| For large scale developments are there any private or public water supplies within 250m of the proposal which may be affected? | Water and Human Health | There is a private water supply at Highland Park Distillery – at HY45162 09493. However it is unlikely that development of site 10 would have an adverse effect on the water supply as any new development would be expected to connect to the public sewer and the site is downslope from the water supply. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Soils | | | | | |
| Is the proposal on greenfield or brownfield land? | Material Assets and Soils | This is a greenfield site. Land on this site is classed as category 4_2 and is capable of producing a narrow range of crops. | - | Site is adjacent to the town boundary, therefore its development is considered to be a sustainable option. | 0 |
| Are there any contaminated soil issues on the proposal and if so, will the option reduce contamination? | Material Assets and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is the proposal on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat? | Climatic Factors and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Geology | | | | | |
| Are there any national geodiversity sites that could be affected by the proposal? | | The proposal is remote from any of Orkney's national geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal? | | The proposal is remote from any of Orkney's local geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| Landscape | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations? | Landscape | The proposal is remote from, and will not affect, the Hoy and West Mainland NSA. | 0 | New development should comply with Policy 9 <i>Natural</i> <i>Environment and</i> | 0 |
| Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? Such as current settlement boundaries, existing townscape and character of surrounding area? | Landscape | Site 10 is adjacent to the current Kirkwall town boundary and is surrounded by housing, the distillery buildings and agricultural land | ? | Landscape. Policy 2 Design includes a set of fundamental principles with which all | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect features of landscape interest, including the distinctive character of the landscape and the qualities of wild land? | landscape | The landscape character type for this area is described as Urban and Rural Development. The spire of St Magnus Cathedral is clearly visible throughout the Crantit Valley. There is no wild land in this area. | ? | development should comply. Further guidance will be provided in the Development Brief. | 0 |
| Cultural Heritage | | | | | |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any scheduled monuments or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any locally important archaeological site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any listed buildings and/or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | Highland Park Distillery including its ancillary buildings is located close to this allocation. It is category B listed. | ? | The settlement statement requires development to avoid impact on the setting of the Distillery. | 0 |

| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Conservation Areas? (e.g. will it result in the demolition of any buildings) | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Service Infrastructure | | | | | |
| Are there educational or health facilities nearby? | Population | Site 10 is within 5-10 minutes walking distance of the Kirkwall Health Centre and the hospital. | + | N/A | + |
| To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space, or result in a loss of open space? | Population, human health or material assets | The proposal is unlikely to affect open space or connectivity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will development of the proposal affect core path links or other key access networks such as cycle paths, coastal paths and rights of way? | Population, human health, material assets or climatic factors | The proposal is unlikely to affect core path links or other key access networks such as cycle paths, coastal paths and rights of way. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is there any opportunity to enhance the green network through for example green infrastructure on site? | Population, human health or material assets | There may be opportunities for enhancement alongside the Highland Park Burn. | ? | Any options for enhancement will be explored in the development brief. | ? |

| | | | | Further guidance is available in the Orkney Open Space Strategy. | |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| Material assets | | | | | |
| Will development of the proposal minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does it re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover existing on-site materials / resources? | | Yes, new development would link into existing infrastructure and services. | + | N/A | + |
| Is the proposal in the vicinity of a waste management site and could its development therefore compromise the waste handling operation? | Human health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Deliverability/sustainability constraints | ••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••• | | | | |
| Will the proposal be delivered within the LDP timeframe? Are there any site servicing constraints, e.g. waste water treatment capacity? | Material assets | There is a wind turbine in the field to the south of this site. | ? | The settlement statement notes the presence of the turbine and that this may impact on the density and location of development within site K-10. | 0 |
| Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities - is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated? | Material assets and climatic factors | At this stage no vehicle access constraints have been identified. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| KIRKWALL | Existing alloc | | Identified as Site KW-I in the adopted Orkney LDP 2014. | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|--|---|------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|--|
| SITE K-11 | Site Size (ha): 1.60 | Current Use: Housing allocation. | | | | | |
| Site assessment question | | Related SEA topic | Comment Information available – GIS/site visit? | Scoring pre mitigation | Mitigation | Scoring post mitigation | |
| Climate change | | | | | | | |
| Is the proposal close to a range of fa these be accessed by public transpo | | Population and Human health | Yes it is within 15 minutes walking range of three schools, the Pickaquoy Leisure Centre and a number of shops and supermarkets. It is on the route of the scheduled Kirkwall town bus service. | + | N/A | + | |
| Is the proposal protected from preva | ailing winds? | | Higher land to the east provides a degree of shelter. | + | Policy 2 <i>Design</i> requires new development to | + | |
| Site aspect – does the proposal mał solar gain? | ke best use of | | This site has a westerly aspect. | 0 | demonstrate how it will minimise use of energy and maximise opportunities for shelter. | + | |
| Is the proposal thought to be at risk could its development result in addit risk elsewhere? | | Water and Human Health | Site is not considered to be at risk of flooding; however it is upstream of areas which are prone to flooding. Care is required with site drainage arrangements to ensure flood risk downstream is not exacerbated. Buffer zones will be required to small channels | - | Drainage should be addressed through the development brief. | 0 | |

| | | running along the site boundaries. | | | |
|--|-------|---|---|--|---|
| Could the development of the proposal help alleviate any existing flooding problems in the area? | Water | Uncertain – this may be possible through enhanced SuDS. | ? | | ? |
| Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna | | | | | |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any international or national biodiversity designation, e.g. SAC/SPA/Ramsar/SSSI? | | There is no connectivity between site and any of Orkney's international and national designations. Its development is therefore unlikely to have any effect on their qualifying interests or their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any locally important designations such as LNRs or LNCSs. | | Site is remote from any of Orkney's locally important designations and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect non designated features – e.g. trees, TPOs, hedges, woodland, species rich grasslands, | | Development of site is unlikely to affect any non-designated features as it is currently managed for agriculture. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect Protected Species –e.g. bats, otters, etc.? | | Otters are likely to use the nearby Crantit Canal and may also use drainage ditches in the wider area as access routes. | ? | The potential for otters to be present in areas close to waterbodies and drainage ditches is highlighted in the introduction to the settlement statements. | 0 |
| How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity? | | Vegetation on site is largely improved grassland and has limited ecological value. Wetter areas include stands of flag iris. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Water | .I | I | | <u>.</u> | |
| Could the proposal result in a change of status of a water body or significantly affect a designated | Water | Unlikely. There is currently capacity at Kirkwall waste | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| water body as identified in the Scotland River Basin Management Plan? Can the proposal connect to the public foul sewer? | | water treatment works; however, should demands exceed available capacity, Scottish Water will initiate a Growth Project once one development meets the 5 Growth Criteria. | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| Could the option have a direct impact on the water environment (for example result in the need for watercourse crossings or allow the de-culverting of a watercourse? | Water | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Does the proposal avoid impact on Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs), i.e. are there any wetlands and boggy areas on the site? | Water and Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| For large scale developments are there any private or public water supplies within 250m of the proposal which may be affected? | Water and Human Health | There is a private water supply at Highland Park Distillery – at HY45162 09493. However it is unlikely that development of site 11 would have an adverse effect on the water supply as any new development would be expected to connect to the public sewer and the site is downslope from the water supply. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Soils | | | | | |
| Is the proposal on greenfield or brownfield land? Does the proposal result in the loss of high quality agricultural land? | Material Assets and Soils | This is a greenfield site. The land is identified as category 4_2 , capable of producing a narrow range of crops. | 0 | Site is an existing allocation, within the town boundary, therefore its development is considered to be a sustainable option. | 0 |
| Are there any contaminated soil issues on the site and if so, will the proposal reduce contamination? | Material Assets and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is the proposal on peatland and could the development of the proposal lead to a loss of | Climatic Factors and | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| peat? | Soils | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| Geology | | | | | |
| Are there any national geodiversity sites that could be affected by the proposal? | | Site is remote from any of Orkney's national geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal? | | Site is remote from any of Orkney's local geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Landscape | 1 | | | | |
| To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations? | Landscape | Site is remote from, and will not affect, the Hoy and West Mainland NSA or any local landscape designation. | 0 | New development should comply with Policy 9 Natural | 0 |
| Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? Such as current settlement boundaries, existing townscape and character of surrounding area? | Landscape | Site is an existing allocation, within the current Kirkwall town boundary and is bordered by built development and agricultural land. | 0 | Policy 9 Natural Environment and Landscape. Policy 2 Design includes a set of fundamental principles with which all development should comply. Further guidance will be provided in the Development Brief. | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect features of landscape interest, including the distinctive character of the landscape and the qualities of wild land? | landscape | The landscape character type for this area is described as Urban and Rural Development. There is no wild land in this area. | 0 | | 0 |
| Cultural Heritage | | | | | |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any scheduled monuments or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any locally important archaeological site? | Cultural heritage, & | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| | links with landscape | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|-----|---|
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any listed buildings and/or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Conservation Areas? (e.g. will it result in the demolition of any buildings) | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Service Infrastructure | 4 | | i | | 1 |
| Are there educational or health facilities nearby? | Population | Site is within 15-20 minutes walking distance from three schools, the Pickaquoy Leisure Centre, as well as a number of shops and supermarkets. The Kirkwall Health Centre and the hospital are within approximately 5 minutes walking distance. | + | N/A | + |
| To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space, or result in a loss of | Population, human health or material | The proposal is unlikely to affect open space or connectivity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| open space? | assets | | | | |
|--|---|---|----------|--|---|
| To what extent will development of the site affect core path links or other key access networks such as cycle paths, coastal paths and rights of way? | Population, human health, material assets or climatic factors | Development of this site is unlikely to affect core path links or other key access networks | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is there any opportunity to enhance the green network through for example green infrastructure on site? | Population, human health or material assets | Uncertain. | ? | Any options for enhancement will be included in the development brief. Further guidance is available in the Orkney Open Space Strategy. | + |
| Material assets | | | | | |
| Will development of the proposal minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does it re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover existing on-site materials / resources? | | New development would link into existing infrastructure and services. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is the proposal in the vicinity of a waste management site and could its development therefore compromise the waste handling operation? | Human health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Deliverability/sustainability constraints | | L | <u>.</u> | | |
| Will the proposal be delivered within the LDP timeframe? Are there any site servicing constraints, e.g. waste water treatment capacity? | Material assets | There are no known site servicing constraints. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities - is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated? | Material assets and climatic factors | At this stage no vehicle access constraints have been identified. | 0 | The settlement statement sets out the requirements for vehicular access provision to this | 0 |

| | | site. | |
|--|--|-------|--|
| | | | |

| KIRKWALLSource of site sugges Existing allocation.SITE K-12Site SizeCurrent | | | Summary Description: Identified as Site KW-O in the adopted Orkney LDP 2014. | | | | |
|--|------------------|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|--|
| SITE K-12 | (ha): 4.60 | Housing allocation. | Identified as site 11 in the MIR 2015. A development brief would be required which jointly covers allocations K-12, K-13 and K- to the strategic nature of these sites. | | | | |
| Site assessment question | | Related SEA topic | Comment Information available – GIS/site visit? | Scoring pre mitigation | Mitigation | Scoring post mitigation | |
| Climate change | | ····· | <u>.</u> | . <u>.</u> | | . <u>.</u> | |
| Is the proposal close to a range of these be accessed by public trans | | Population and Human health | Yes it is within 10 minutes walking range of Papdale Primary School and Kirkwall Grammar School and a number of shops. It is on the route of the scheduled Kirkwall town bus service. | + | N/A | + | |
| Is the proposal protected from prevailing winds? | | | Higher ground to the SE provides a degree of shelter. | + | Policy 2 <i>Design</i> requires new development to | + | |
| Site aspect – does the proposal n solar gain? | nake best use of | | This site has a northerly aspect. | 0 | development to demonstrate how it will minimise use of energy and maximise opportunities for shelter. | + | |

| Is the proposal thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere? | Water and Human Health | Site is not considered to be at risk of flooding; however surface drainage water from the site may add pressure to the Papdale Burn. | - | Surface water drainage should be addressed through the development brief. | 0 |
|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Could the development of the proposal help alleviate any existing flooding problems in the area? | Water | Uncertain – there may be potential through enhanced SuDS and greenspace. | ? | Explore through Development Brief. | 0 |
| Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna | | 4 | | | |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any international or national biodiversity designation, e.g. SAC/SPA/Ramsar/SSSI? | | There is no connectivity between site and any of Orkney's international and national designations. Its development is therefore unlikely to have any effect on their qualifying interests or their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any locally important designations such as LNRs or LNCSs. | | Site is remote from any of Orkney's locally important designations and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect non designated features – e.g. trees, TPOs, hedges, woodland, species rich grasslands, | | Development of site is unlikely to affect any non-designated features as it is currently managed for agriculture. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect Protected Species –e.g. bats, otters, etc.? | | Unlikely. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity? | | Vegetation on site is improved grassland and has limited ecological value. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Water | | | | | |
| Could the proposal result in a change of status of a water body or significantly affect a designated water body as identified in the Scotland River | Water | Unlikely. There is currently capacity at Kirkwall waste water treatment works; however, should demands exceed available capacity, | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| Basin Management Plan? | | Scottish Water will initiate a Growth Project | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| Can the proposal connect to the public foul sewer? | | once one development meets the 5 Growth Criteria. | | | |
| Could the option have a direct impact on the water environment (for example result in the need for watercourse crossings or allow the de-culverting of a watercourse? | Water | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Does the proposal avoid impact on Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs), i.e. are there any wetlands and boggy areas on the site? | Water and Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| For large scale developments are there any private or public water supplies within 250m of the proposal which may be affected? | Water and Human Health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Soils | | | | | |
| Is the proposal on greenfield or brownfield land? Does the proposal result in the loss of high quality agricultural land? | Material Assets and Soils | This is a greenfield site. The land is identified as category 4_2 , capable of producing a narrow range of crops. | 0 | Site is an existing allocation, within the town boundary, therefore its development is considered to be a sustainable option. | 0 |
| Are there any contaminated soil issues on the site and if so, will the proposal reduce contamination? | Material Assets and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is the proposal on peatland and could the development of the proposal lead to a loss of peat? | Climatic Factors and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Geology | I | | | | |
| Are there any national geodiversity sites that | | Site is remote from any of Orkney's national geodiversity sites and its development is | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| could be affected by the proposal? | | unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal? | | Site is remote from any of Orkney's local geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Landscape | | | | | |
| To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations? | Landscape | Site is remote from, and will not affect, the Hoy and West Mainland NSA or any local landscape designation. | 0 | New development should comply with Policy 9 Natural Environment and | 0 |
| Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? Such as current settlement boundaries, existing townscape and character of surrounding area? | Landscape | Site is an existing allocation, within the current Kirkwall town boundary and is bordered by built development and agricultural land. | 0 | Landscape. Policy 2 Design includes a set of fundamental principles with | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect features of landscape interest, including the distinctive character of the landscape and the qualities of wild land? | landscape | The landscape character type for this area is described as Urban and Rural Development. There is no wild land in this area. | 0 | which all development should comply. Further guidance will be provided in the Development Brief. | 0 |
| Cultural Heritage | | | | 4 | |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any scheduled monuments or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any locally important archaeological site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any listed buildings and/or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| | landscape | | | | |
|--|---|---|----|--|---|
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Conservation Areas? (e.g. will it result in the demolition of any buildings) | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Service Infrastructure | | 4 | .i | 4 | 4 |
| Are there educational or health facilities nearby? | Population | Site is within 10 minutes walking distance from Papdale Primary School and Kirkwall Grammar School. The Kirkwall Health Centre and the hospital are within approximately 10-15 minutes walking distance. | + | N/A | + |
| To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space, or result in a loss of open space? | Population, human health or material assets | The proposal is unlikely to affect open space or connectivity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will development of the site affect core path links or other key access networks such as cycle paths, coastal paths and rights of way? | Population, human health, material assets or climatic factors | Development of this site could link into an existing path which borders the Papdale East area and links with core path K9. | + | Policy 10 Green Infrastructure promotes improvements to public access and permeability. | + |

| | | | | Potential linkages to this path and with allocations K- 13 and K-14 should be explored through the development brief. | |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|
| Is there any opportunity to enhance the green network through for example green infrastructure on site? | Population, human health or material assets | Uncertain. | ? | Options for enhancement should be explored through the development brief. Guidance is available in the Orkney Open Space Strategy. | + |
| Material assets | | | | | |
| Will development of the proposal minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does it re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover existing on-site materials / resources? | | New development would link into existing infrastructure and services. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is the proposal in the vicinity of a waste management site and could its development therefore compromise the waste handling operation? | Human health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Deliverability/sustainability constraints | ····· | L | | | |
| Will the proposal be delivered within the LDP timeframe? Are there any site servicing constraints, e.g. waste water treatment capacity? | Material assets | There are no known site servicing constraints. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities - is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated? | Material assets and climatic factors | At this stage no vehicle access constraints have been identified. | 0 | The settlement statement sets out the requirements for vehicular access provision to this | 0 |

| site. |
|-------|
|-------|

| KIRKWALL | Source of sin Existing alloc | te suggestion: ation. | Summary Description: Identified as part of Site KW-S in the adopted Orkney LDP 2014. | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|--|--|------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|--|
| SITE K-13 | Site Size (ha): 5.1 | Current Use: Housing allocation. | Identified as site 12 in the MIR 2015. A development brief would be required which to the strategic nature of these sites. | jointly covers | allocations K-12, K-13 | and K-14, due | |
| Site assessment question | | Related SEA topic | Comment Information available – GIS/site visit? | Scoring pre mitigation | Mitigation | Scoring post mitigation | |
| Climate change | | | | | | | |
| Is the proposal close to a range of fa these be accessed by public transpo | | Population and Human health | Yes it is within 10 minutes walking range of Papdale Primary School, Kirkwall Grammar School and a number of shops. It is on the route of the scheduled Kirkwall town bus service. | + | N/A | + | |
| Is the proposal protected from preva | iling winds? | | Elevated land to the south-east provides a degree of shelter. | + | Policy 2 <i>Design</i> requires new | + | |
| Site aspect – does the proposal mak solar gain? | e best use of | | This site has a northerly aspect. | 0 | development to demonstrate how it will minimise use of energy and maximise opportunities for shelter. | + | |
| Is the proposal thought to be at risk could its development result in addit risk elsewhere? | | Water and Human Health | Site is not considered to be at risk of flooding; however surface drainage water from the site may add pressure to the Papdale Burn and further culverted sections downstream | - | Surface water drainage should be addressed through the development brief. | 0 | |

| | | Care is required with site drainage arrangements to ensure flood risk downstream is not exacerbated. Buffer zones will be required to small channels within the site as well as to the burn running along the site boundary on the north of the site. | | | |
|---|----------|---|---|---------------------------------------|---|
| Could the development of the proposal help alleviate any existing flooding problems in the area? | Water | Uncertain – there may be potential through enhanced SuDS and greenspace. | ? | Explore through Development Brief. | 0 |
| Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna | k | | | | |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any international or national biodiversity designation, e.g. SAC/SPA/Ramsar/SSSI? | | There is no connectivity between site and any of Orkney's international and national designations. Its development is therefore unlikely to have any effect on their qualifying interests or their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any locally important designations such as LNRs or LNCSs. | | Site is remote from any of Orkney's locally important designations and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect non designated features – e.g. trees, TPOs, hedges, woodland, species rich grasslands, | | Development of site is unlikely to affect any non-designated features as it is currently managed for agriculture. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect Protected Species –e.g. bats, otters, etc.? | | Development of site is unlikely to affect any protected species. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity? | | Vegetation on site is improved grassland and has limited ecological value. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Water | | | | | |
| Could the proposal result in a change of status of a water body or significantly affect a designated water body as identified in the Scotland River | Water | Unlikely. There is currently capacity at Kirkwall waste water treatment works; however, should | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| Basin Management Plan? | | demands exceed available capacity, | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| Can the proposal connect to the public foul sewer? | | Scottish Water will initiate a Growth Project once one development meets the 5 Growth Criteria. | | | |
| Could the option have a direct impact on the water environment (for example result in the need for watercourse crossings or allow the de- culverting of a watercourse? | Water | Unlikely. However the upper reaches of the Papdale burn flow adjacent to the NW boundary of the site. | ? | The settlement statement notes the presence of the burn and the possible requirement to create an appropriate development-free buffer zone. | 0 |
| Does the proposal avoid impact on Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs), i.e. are there any wetlands and boggy areas on the site? | Water and Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| For large scale developments are there any private or public water supplies within 250m of the proposal which may be affected? | Water and Human Health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Soils | | | | | |
| Is the proposal on greenfield or brownfield land? | Material | | - | Site is an existing | 0 |
| Does the proposal result in the loss of high quality agricultural land? | Assets and Soils | | | allocation, within the town boundary, therefore its development is considered to be a sustainable option. | |
| Are there any contaminated soil issues on the site and if so, will the proposal reduce contamination? | Material Assets and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is the proposal on peatland and could the development of the proposal lead to a loss of | Climatic Factors and | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| peat? | Soils | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|
| Geology | | | | | |
| Are there any national geodiversity sites that could be affected by the proposal? | | Site is remote from any of Orkney's national geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal? | | Site is remote from any of Orkney's local geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Landscape | | | | | |
| To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations? | Landscape | Site is remote from, and will not affect, the Hoy and West Mainland NSA or any local landscape designation. | 0 | New development should comply with Policy 9 Natural Environment and Landscape. Policy 2 Design includes a set of fundamental principles with | 0 |
| Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? Such as current settlement boundaries, existing townscape and character of surrounding area? | Landscape | Site is an existing allocation, within the current Kirkwall town boundary and is bordered by built development and agricultural land | 0 | | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect features of landscape interest, including the distinctive character of the landscape and the qualities of wild land? | landscape | The landscape character type for this area is described as Urban and Rural Development. There is no wild land in this area. | 0 | which all development should comply. Further guidance will be provided in the Development Brief. | 0 |
| Cultural Heritage | | | | | |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any scheduled monuments or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any locally important archaeological site? | Cultural heritage, & | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| | links with landscape | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|-----|----------|
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any listed buildings and/or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Conservation Areas? (e.g. will it result in the demolition of any buildings) | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Service Infrastructure | | | | L | <u>i</u> |
| Are there educational or health facilities nearby? | Population | Site is within 10 minutes walking distance from Papdale Primary School and Kirkwall Grammar School. The Kirkwall Health Centre and the hospital are within approximately 10-15 minutes walking distance. | + | N/A | + |
| To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space, or result in a loss of open space? | Population, human health or material assets | The proposal is unlikely to affect open space or connectivity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| To what extent will development of the site affect core path links or other key access networks such as cycle paths, coastal paths and rights of way? | Population, human health, material assets or climatic factors | An existing path network borders the Papdale East area alongside allocation K- 12 and provides access to the Papdale East Play-park as well as Kirkwall Grammar and Papdale Primary Schools. Provision of pedestrian / cycle access between sites K- 12, K-13 and K-14 would improve permeability through this area, with potential to encourage active travel along a more direct and vehicle free route to the schools. | + | Policy 10 Green Infrastructure promotes improvements to public access and permeability. Potential linkages to this path and with neighbouring allocations K-12 and K-14 should be explored through the development brief. | + |
|--|---|---|----------|--|---|
| Is there any opportunity to enhance the green network through for example green infrastructure on site? | Population, human health or material assets | Uncertain. | ? | Options for enhancement should be explored through the development brief. Guidance is available in the Orkney Open Space Strategy. | + |
| Material assets | | | | | |
| Will development of the proposal minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does it re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover existing on-site materials / resources? | | New development would link into existing infrastructure and services. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is the proposal in the vicinity of a waste management site and could its development therefore compromise the waste handling operation? | Human health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Deliverability/sustainability constraints | | 4 | . | | |
| Will the proposal be delivered within the LDP | Material | There are no known site servicing | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| timeframe? Are there any site servicing constraints, e.g. waste water treatment capacity? | assets | constraints. | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities - is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated? | Material assets and climatic factors | Development of site would require major road improvements to Berstane Road and Berstane Loan in order to facilitate safe access. | - | The settlement statement highlights the need for road improvements. | 0 |
| | | | | It also sets out the requirements for vehicular access provision to this site. | |

| KIRKWALL | | ite suggestion: landowner has nsulted. | andowner has In the current LDP this site forms part of an are | | rrea that is classed as open space. It is located to th dale Valley. | | |
|---|-------------------------|--|--|------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|--|
| SITE K-14 | Site Size (ha): 14.2 | Current Use: Agriculture | Identified as sites 4 and 13 in the MIR 2015. It is included in both options 1 and 2. A development brief would be required which to the strategic nature of these sites. | n jointly covers | pintly covers allocations K-12, K-13 and K-14, due | | |
| Site assessment question | | Related SEA topic | Comment Information available – GIS/site visit? | Scoring pre mitigation | Mitigation | Scoring post mitigation | |
| Climate change | | | | | | | |
| Is the proposal close to a range of these be accessed by public trans | | Population and Human health | Yes it is close to Kirkwall Grammar School, Papdale Primary School and a number of shops. It is also close to the route of the scheduled Kirkwall town bus service. | + | N/A | + | |

| Is the proposal protected from prevailing winds? | | Higher land to the east and built up areas to the north provides some shelter, however it is relatively open to the west and south. | + | Policy 2 <i>Design</i> requires new development to demonstrate how it will minimise use of energy and maximise opportunities for shelter. | + |
|---|---------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Site aspect – does the proposal make best use of solar gain? | | Yes, it has a W - SW aspect and makes good use of solar gain. | + | | + |
| Is the proposal thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere? | Water and Human Health | Site is upslope from areas of past flooding. An open channel section of the Willow Burn runs along the north-western boundary of the site before entering a long culvert. The culvert has surcharged in the past. | ? | The settlement statement notes the presence of the burn. Surface water | 0 |
| Could the development of the proposal help alleviate any existing flooding problems in the area? | Water | Uncertain – there may be potential through enhanced SuDS and greenspace. Care is required with site drainage arrangements to ensure flood risk downstream is not exacerbated. Buffer zones will be required to small channels within the site as well as to the burn running along the site boundary on the north of the site. | ? | drainage and options to mitigate flood risk should be explored through the Development Brief. | 0 |
| Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna | 1 | | | | |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any international or national biodiversity designation, e.g. SAC/SPA/Ramsar/SSSI? | | There is no connectivity between site and any of Orkney's international and national designations. Its development is therefore unlikely to have any effect on their qualifying interests or their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any locally important designations such as LNRs or LNCSs. | | Site is remote from any of Orkney's locally important designations and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect non designated features – e.g. trees, TPOs, hedges, | | Development of site 4 is unlikely to affect any non-designated features as it is | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| woodland, species rich grasslands, | | currently managed for agriculture. | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|
| To what extent will the proposal affect Protected Species –e.g. bats, otters, etc.? | | Development is unlikely to affect protected species. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity? | | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Water | | A | | | |
| Could the option result in a change of status of a water body or significantly affect a designated water body as identified in the Scotland River Basin Management Plan? Can the proposal connect to the public foul sewer? | Water | Unlikely. There is currently capacity at Kirkwall waste water treatment works; however, should demand exceed available capacity, Scottish Water will initiate a Growth Project once one development meets the 5 Growth Criteria. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Could the proposal have a direct impact on the water environment (for example result in the need for watercourse crossings or allow the de- culverting of a watercourse? | Water | Care is required with site drainage arrangements to ensure flood risk downstream is not exacerbated. Buffer zones will be required to small channels within the site as well as to the burn running along the site boundary on the north of the site. | ? | The settlement statement notes the presence of the burn and the requirement to establish a development-free buffer zone. | 0 |
| Does the proposal avoid impact on Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs), i.e. are there any wetlands and boggy areas on the site? | Water and Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| For large scale developments are there any private or public water supplies within 250m of the proposal which may be affected? | Water and Human Health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Soils | | · | | | |
| Is the proposal on greenfield or brownfield land? | Material Assets and | This is a greenfield site where the land is classed as 4_2 capable of producing a | - | The site is adjacent to the town boundary, therefore its | 0 |

| Does it result in the loss of high quality agricultural land? | Soils | narrow range of crops. | | development is considered to be a sustainable option. | |
|---|----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| Are there any contaminated soil issues on the proposal and if so, will the option reduce contamination? | Material Assets and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is the proposal on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat? | Climatic Factors and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Geology | | ······································ | | | |
| Are there any national geodiversity sites that could be affected by the proposal? | | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal? | | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Landscape | | | | | |
| To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations? | Landscape | Kirkwall is not within the Hoy and West Mainland NSA. | 0 | New development should comply with Policy 9 Natural | 0 |
| Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? Such as current settlement boundaries, existing townscape and character of surrounding area? | Landscape | The site is located adjacent to the current Kirkwall town boundary and is bordered by built development and agricultural land | 0 | Environment and Landscape. Policy 2 Design includes a set of fundamental principles with which all | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect features of landscape interest, including the distinctive character of the landscape and the qualities of wild land? | landscape | The landscape character type for this area is described as Urban and Rural Development. There is no wild land in this area. | 0 | development should comply. Further guidance will be provided in the Development Brief. | 0 |
| Cultural Heritage | .i | | | -1 | |

| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any scheduled monuments or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
|--|--|--|---|-----|---|
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any locally important archaeological site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any listed buildings and/or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Conservation Areas? (e.g. will it result in the demolition of any buildings) | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Service Infrastructure | | | | | 1 |
| Are there educational or health facilities nearby? | Population | Yes, Kirkwall Grammar School and Papdale Primary School are nearby. | + | N/A | + |

| To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space, or result in a loss of open space? | Population, human health or material assets | This area was previously classified as open space but has been de-classified as it is not publicly accessible. This is unlikely to affect connectivity or accessibility to open space. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| To what extent will development of the proposal affect core path links or other key access networks such as cycle paths, coastal paths and rights of way? | Population, human health, material assets or climatic factors | An existing path network borders the Papdale East area alongside allocation K- 12 and provides access to the Papdale East Play-park as well as Kirkwall Grammar and Papdale Primary Schools. Provision of pedestrian / cycle access between sites K- 12, K-13 and K-14 would improve permeability through this area, with potential to encourage active travel along a more direct and vehicle free route to the schools. | + | Policy 10 Green Infrastructure promotes improvements to public access and permeability. Potential linkages to this path and with neighbouring allocations K-12 and K-14 should be explored through the development brief. | + |
| Is there any opportunity to enhance the green network through for example green infrastructure on site? | Population, human health or material assets | The KUDF identifies site as part of a green wedge which connects with parkland, school grounds and the Willow Burn. Development of site will result in the loss of a green agricultural field. However it would also present opportunities to create publicly accessible green infrastructure with improved biodiversity potential. | ? | Options for greenspace enhancement, e.g. along the Willow Burn, should be explored through the development brief. Guidance is available in the Orkney Open Space Strategy. | ? |
| Material assets | | 4 | | L | |
| Will development of the proposal minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does it re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover existing on-site materials / resources? | | New development would link into existing infrastructure and services. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is the proposal in the vicinity of a waste management site and could its development therefore compromise the waste handling operation? | Human health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| Deliverability/sustainability constraints | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Will the proposal be delivered within the LDP timeframe? Are there any site servicing constraints, e.g. waste water treatment capacity? | Material assets | There are no known constraints to development. | ? | N/A | ? | | | | |
| Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities - is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated? | Material assets and climatic factors | Development of site would require major road improvements to Berstane Road and Berstane Loan in order to facilitate safe access. | - | The settlement statement highlights the need for road improvements. It also sets out the requirements for vehicular access provision to this site. | 0 | | | | |

| KIRKWALLSource of site suggestion: Existing allocation. | | | Summary Description: Identified as Site KW-T in the adopted Orkney LDP 2014. | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|--|--|------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|--|
| SITE K-15 | Site Size (ha): 11.1 | Current Use: Housing allocation. | Identified as site 14 in the MIR 2015. A development brief would be required for this allocation, due to its identified flood risk. This should be developed with reference to the development brief for the adjacent Watersfield are | | | | |
| Site assessment question | | Related SEA topic | Comment Information available – GIS/site visit? | Scoring pre mitigation | Mitigation | Scoring post mitigation | |
| Climate change | | | | | | | |
| Is the proposal close to a range of fa these be accessed by public transpo | | Population and Human health | Yes it is within 10-15 minutes walking range of Papdale Primary School and Kirkwall Grammar School, as well as a number of shops. | + | N/A | + | |
| Is the proposal protected from preva | ailing winds? | | Elevated land to the east provides a degree of shelter but the site is exposed to the | + | Policy 2 <i>Design</i> requires new | + | |

| Site aspect – does the proposal make best use of | | north and west. It is on the route of the scheduled Kirkwall town bus service. This site has an open, north-westerly | + | development to demonstrate how it will minimise use of energy and | + |
|---|---------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| solar gain? | | aspect. | | maximise opportunities for shelter. | |
| Is the proposal thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere? | Water and Human Health | Site is upstream of areas which have had flooding problems in the past. The watercourse is culverted from the downstream boundary of the site and the culvert has blocked/surcharged in the past. Land along the southern/south-western boundary is low lying and likely to be prone to flooding/waterlogging. | | The settlement statement highlights flood risk issues on this site and requires the preparation of a Flood Risk Assessment to establish the potential for surface water flooding on the site and for development of the site to contribute to flooding elsewhere. Some areas may be undevelopable. | 0 |
| Could the development of the proposal help alleviate any existing flooding problems in the area? | Water | FRA will be required and areas at risk will have to be avoided. This may reduce the developable area of the site and impact the capacity of the site. A buffer strip will be required to the watercourse with all development set back (including plot boundaries). There may be a culverted section of watercourse within the site and this should be daylighted if possible. No development should be permitted above any culvert. The low lying areas of the site may have potential benefit for flood risk management. | ? | The Watersfield Development Brief recommends that the SuDS scheme may be most effectively achieved through an area of open space around the Weyland Burn. Further options should be explored through the new Development Brief. | 0 |

| Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna | | | | | |
|--|-------|---|---|--|---|
| To what extent will the proposal affect any international or national biodiversity designation, e.g. SAC/SPA/Ramsar/SSSI? | | There is no connectivity between site and any of Orkney's international and national designations. Its development is therefore unlikely to have any effect on their qualifying interests or their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any locally important designations such as LNRs or LNCSs. | | Site is remote from any of Orkney's locally important designations and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect non designated features – e.g. trees, TPOs, hedges, woodland, species rich grasslands, | | Development of site is unlikely to affect any non-designated features as it is currently managed for agriculture. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect Protected Species –e.g. bats, otters, etc.? | | Development of this site is unlikely to impact upon protected species. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity? | | Vegetation on site is improved grassland and has limited ecological value. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Water | | | • | | |
| Could the proposal result in a change of status of a water body or significantly affect a designated water body as identified in the Scotland River Basin Management Plan? Can the proposal connect to the public foul sewer? | Water | Unlikely. There is currently capacity at Kirkwall waste water treatment works; however, should demands exceed available capacity, Scottish Water will initiate a Growth Project once one development meets the 5 Growth Criteria. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Could the option have a direct impact on the water environment (for example result in the need for watercourse crossings or allow the de-culverting of a watercourse? | Water | The Weyland Burn passes through this site and is partially culverted. | ? | The settlement statement notes the requirement for an appropriate development-free buffer zone to be established | 0 |

| | | | | alongside the burn. | |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| Does the proposal avoid impact on Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs), i.e. are there any wetlands and boggy areas on the site? | Water and Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| For large scale developments are there any private or public water supplies within 250m of the proposal which may be affected? | Water and Human Health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Soils | L | | | | L |
| Is the proposal on greenfield or brownfield land? Does the proposal result in the loss of high quality agricultural land? | Material Assets and Soils | This is a greenfield site. The land is identified as category 4_2 , capable of producing a narrow range of crops. | - | Site is an existing allocation, within the town boundary, therefore its development is considered to be a sustainable option. | 0 |
| Are there any contaminated soil issues on the site and if so, will the proposal reduce contamination? | Material Assets and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is the proposal on peatland and could the development of the proposal lead to a loss of peat? | Climatic Factors and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Geology | L | di | | | |
| Are there any national geodiversity sites that could be affected by the proposal? | | Site is remote from any of Orkney's national geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal? | | Site is remote from any of Orkney's local geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Landscape | L | ۰ | | | |

| To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations? | Landscape | Site is remote from, and will not affect, the Hoy and West Mainland NSA or any local landscape designation. | 0 | New development should comply with Policy 9 <i>Natural</i> Environment and | 0 |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? Such as current settlement boundaries, existing townscape and character of surrounding area? | Landscape | Site is an existing allocation, within the current Kirkwall town boundary and is bordered by built development and agricultural land | 0 | Landscape. Policy 2 Design includes a set of fundamental principles with | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect features of landscape interest, including the distinctive character of the landscape and the qualities of wild land? | landscape | The landscape character type for this area is described as Urban and Rural Development. There is no wild land in this area. | 0 | principles with which all development should comply. The development brief provides additional guidance on siting, layout and design. | 0 |
| Cultural Heritage | | | | | |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any scheduled monuments or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any locally important archaeological site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any listed buildings and/or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Conservation Areas? (e.g. will it result in the demolition of any buildings) | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| Material assets | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| Is there any opportunity to enhance the green network through for example green infrastructure on site? | Population, human health or material assets | The Development Brief identifies a network of linked open space areas incorporating a children's play area, passive open space and habitat supporting natural areas which may also be part of the development's (SuDS). It recommends that these open space areas should be linked to the footpath network around the site. | + | Further guidance is available in the Orkney Open Space Strategy. | + |
| To what extent will development of the site affect core path links or other key access networks such as cycle paths, coastal paths and rights of way? | Population, human health, material assets or climatic factors | There may be opportunities to establish pedestrian / cycle links with existing development at Weyland Bay, as well as sites K-16 and K-17. | + | Options for pedestrian linkages should be explored in the development brief. | + |
| To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space, or result in a loss of open space? | Population, human health or material assets | The proposal is unlikely to affect open space or connectivity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Are there educational or health facilities nearby? | Population | Site is within 10 minutes walking distance from Papdale Primary School and Kirkwall Grammar School. | + | N/A | + |
| Service Infrastructure | | | | ۰ | |
| Is development of the proposal likely to result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| Will development of the proposal minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does it re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover existing on-site materials / resources? | | New development would link into existing infrastructure and services. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
|--|--|---|---|--|----------|
| Is the proposal in the vicinity of a waste management site and could its development therefore compromise the waste handling operation? | Human health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Deliverability/sustainability constraints | L | L | | L | <u>.</u> |
| Will the proposal be delivered within the LDP timeframe? Are there any site servicing constraints, e.g. waste water treatment capacity? | Material assets | There are no known site servicing constraints. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities - is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated? | Material assets and climatic factors | At this stage no vehicle access constraints have been identified. | 0 | The settlement statement sets out the requirements for vehicular access provision to this site. | 0 |

| KIRKWALL | Source of site suggestion: Existing allocation. | | Summary Description: Identified as Site KW-J in the adopted Orkney LDP 2014. | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|------------------------------|------------|-------------------------------|--|
| SITE K-16 | Site Size (ha): 3.7 | Current Use: Housing allocation. | Identified as site 15 in the MIR 2015. This area is also known as Weyland and a development brief for the site was prepared in 2014. | | | | |
| Site assessment question | | Related SEA topic | Comment Information available – GIS/site visit? | Scoring pre mitigation | Mitigation | Scoring post mitigation | |
| Climate change | | | | | <u>.</u> | | |

| Is the proposal close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport? | Population and Human health | Site is within 20 minutes walking distance of the town centre and it is on the route of the scheduled Kirkwall town bus service. | + | N/A | + |
|---|--------------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| Is the proposal protected from prevailing winds? | | No, it is open to winds from the west and north-west. | + | Policy 2 <i>Design</i> requires new development to | + |
| Site aspect – does the proposal make best use of solar gain? | | Yes, it has a westerly aspect and makes good use of solar gain. | + | development to demonstrate how it will minimise use of energy and maximise opportunities for shelter. | + |
| | | | | The development brief requires all new development to achieve plots sizes and building lines which create sheltered spaces, with consideration of predominant wind directions and utilising deviated building lines. | |
| Is the proposal thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere? | Water and Human Health | Around one third of the site lies below the 5 metre contour and may be at risk of coastal flooding. 1 in 200 year coastal flood level is estimated to be 3.23mAOD. Although the site is adjacent to the flood map, this doesn't take account of wave action, overtopping or climate change. Information suggests the site is susceptible to long term coastal erosion. FRA required to assess coastal flood risk including effects of wave action, overtopping, coastal erosion and climate change. Sustainable approach to development of the site will be required to | | The settlement statement highlights the requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment to be undertaken and notes that development should avoid low- lying land adjacent to the Carness Road. The Weyland | 0 |

| | | ensure long term security of properties. This may affect the developable area and/or capacity of the site, or require mitigation measures to be implemented. | | Development Brief includes the mitigation recommended by the Orkney | |
|---|-------|---|---|--|---|
| Could the development of the proposal help alleviate any existing flooding problems in the area? | Water | There are issues associated with the blocking of existing sea outfalls by beach materials during onshore storm conditions. | 0 | Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, i.e. design of an appropriate development site layout; avoidance of low- lying areas; raising floor levels; and at project level the design of any discharge point constructed on the foreshore will require careful consideration. | 0 |
| Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna | | | | | |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any international or national biodiversity designation, e.g. SAC/SPA/Ramsar/SSSI? | | There is no connectivity between site and any of Orkney's international and national designations. Its development is therefore unlikely to have any effect on their qualifying interests or their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any locally important designations such as LNRs or LNCSs. | | Site is remote from any of Orkney's locally important designations and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect non designated features – e.g. trees, TPOs, hedges, woodland, species rich grasslands, | | Development of site is unlikely to affect any non-designated features as it is currently managed for agriculture. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect Protected | | Otters may use drainage ditches in the | ? | The potential for otters to be present | 0 |

| Species –e.g. bats, otters, etc.? | | wider area as access routes to and from the sea. | | in areas close to waterbodies and drainage ditches is highlighted in the introduction to the settlement statements. | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity? | | Vegetation on site is improved grassland and has limited ecological value. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Water | • | | | | |
| Could the proposal result in a change of status of a water body or significantly affect a designated water body as identified in the Scotland River Basin Management Plan? Can the proposal connect to the public foul sewer? | Water | Unlikely. There is currently capacity at Kirkwall waste water treatment works; however, should demands exceed available capacity, Scottish Water will initiate a Growth Project once one development meets the 5 Growth Criteria. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Could the option have a direct impact on the water environment (for example result in the need for watercourse crossings or allow the de-culverting of a watercourse? | Water | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Does the proposal avoid impact on Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs), i.e. are there any wetlands and boggy areas on the site? | Water and Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| For large scale developments are there any private or public water supplies within 250m of the proposal which may be affected? | Water and Human Health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Soils | | | | | |
| Is the proposal on greenfield or brownfield land? Does the proposal result in the loss of high quality agricultural land? | Material Assets and Soils | This is a greenfield site. The land is identified as category 4_2 , capable of producing a narrow range of crops. | - | Site is an existing allocation, within the town boundary, therefore its | 0 |

| | | | development is considered to be a sustainable option. | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Material Assets and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Climatic Factors and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| | | | | |
| | Site is remote from any of Orkney's national geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| | Site is remote from any of Orkney's local geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| | | | | |
| Landscape | Site is remote from, and will not affect, the Hoy and West Mainland NSA or any local landscape designation. | 0 | New development should comply with Policy 9 Natural | 0 |
| Landscape | Site is an existing allocation, within the current Kirkwall town boundary and is bordered by built development and agricultural land | 0 | Environment and Landscape. Policy 2 Design includes a set of fundamental principles with | 0 |
| landscape | The landscape character type for this area is described as Urban and Rural Development. | 0 | which all development should comply. | 0 |
| | Assets and Soils Climatic Factors and Soils Landscape Landscape | Assets and SoilsNo.Climatic Factors and SoilsNo.Site is remote from any of Orkney's national geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity.Site is remote from any of Orkney's local geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity.Site is remote from any of Orkney's local geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity.LandscapeSite is remote from, and will not affect, the Hoy and West Mainland NSA or any local landscape designation.LandscapeSite is an existing allocation, within the current Kirkwall town boundary and is bordered by built development and agricultural landlandscapeThe landscape character type for this area is described as Urban and Rural | Assets and SoilsNo.0Climatic Factors and SoilsNo.0Site is remote from any of Orkney's national geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity.0Site is remote from any of Orkney's national geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity.0LandscapeSite is remote from, and will not affect, the Hoy and West Mainland NSA or any local landscape designation.0LandscapeSite is an existing allocation, within the current Kirkwall town boundary and is bordered by built development and agricultural land.0landscapeThe landscape character type for this area is described as Urban and Rural Development.0 | Material Assets and SoilsNo.ON/AClimatic Factors and SoilsNo.0N/AClimatic Factors and SoilsNo.0N/AClimatic Factors and SoilsNo.0N/AClimatic Factors and SoilsNo.0N/AClimatic Factors and SoilsNo.0N/AClimatic Factors and SoilsSite is remote from any of Orkney's national geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity.0N/ALandscapeSite is remote from any of Orkney's local geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity.0N/ALandscapeSite is remote from, and will not affect, the Hoy and West Mainland NSA or any local landscape designation.0New development should comply with Policy 9 Natural Environment and argricultural land.New development should comply with policy 2 Design includes a set of fundamental principles with which all development.0landscapeThe landscape character type for this area is described as Urban and Rural Development.0 |

| Cultural Heritage | | | | | |
|--|--|-----|---|-----|---|
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any scheduled monuments or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any locally important archaeological site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any listed buildings and/or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Conservation Areas? (e.g. will it result in the demolition of any buildings) | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Service Infrastructure | i | | | | 1 |

| Are there educational or health facilities nearby? | Population | Site is within 15-20 minutes walking range of Papdale Primary School, Kirkwall Grammar School. | + | N/A | + |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space, or result in a loss of open space? | Population, human health or material assets | The proposal is unlikely to affect any existing open space or connectivity. | 0 | The development brief provides guidance on how new areas of open space should be incorporated into development of the site. | 0 |
| To what extent will development of the site affect core path links or other key access networks such as cycle paths, coastal paths and rights of way? | Population, human health, material assets or climatic factors | There is potential for new development on this site to link into an existing path in the neighbouring site 14 (Watersfield). | ? | The development brief requires new development to link into and extend the existing pedestrian / cycle path. | + |
| Is there any opportunity to enhance the green network through for example green infrastructure on site? | Population, human health or material assets | Uncertain. | ? | The development brief recommends that the flood buffer should take the form of greenspace. This and the combination of green edges and SuDS provide opportunities to add biodiversity value to the site. | + |
| Material assets | | | | | |
| Will development of the proposal minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does it re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover existing on-site materials / resources? | | New development would link into existing infrastructure and services. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| Is the proposal in the vicinity of a waste management site and could its development therefore compromise the waste handling operation? | Human health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| Deliverability/sustainability constraints | ••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••• | | • | • | |
| Will the proposal be delivered within the LDP timeframe? Are there any site servicing constraints, e.g. waste water treatment capacity? | Material assets | There are no known site servicing constraints. The site is adjacent to the Weyland Bay Pumping Station which is likely to detract from the amenity of dwellings in close proximity. | - | Proximity to the Pumping Station is noted in the Weyland Development Brief. It recommends the creations of a 'green edge' through shrub/tree planting to screen the development from the Pumping Station. | 0 |
| Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities - is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated? | Material assets and climatic factors | At this stage no vehicle access constraints have been identified. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| KIRKWALL | Source of si LDP review, ownership. | te suggestion: in Council | Summary Description: In the current LDP Site 16 is located adjacent to the town boundary, on the east side of the Carness Road |
|-----------|---|------------------------------|--|
| SITE K-17 | Site Size (ha): 6.3 | Current Use: Agriculture | It is included in both options 1 and 2. Identified as site 16 in the MIR 2015. A development brief would be required for this allocation, due to its identified flood risk. It should be developed with reference to the Weyland development brief. |

| Site assessment question | Related SEA topic | Comment Information available – GIS/site visit? | Scoring pre mitigation | Mitigation | Scoring post mitigation |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| Climate change | | | | | |
| Is the proposal close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport? | Population and Human health | Site is within 20 minutes walking distance of the town centre and it is on the route of the scheduled Kirkwall town bus service. | + | N/A | + |
| Is the proposal protected from prevailing winds? | | No, it is open to winds from the west and north-west. | - | Policy 2 <i>Design</i> requires new development to demonstrate how it will minimise use of energy and maximise opportunities for shelter. | + |
| Site aspect – does the proposal make best use of solar gain? | | Yes, it has a westerly aspect and makes good use of solar gain. | + | | + |
| Is the proposal thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere? | Water and Human Health | Around one third of the site lies below the 5 metre contour and may be at risk of coastal flooding. 1 in 200 year coastal flood level is estimated to be 3.23mAOD. Although the site is adjacent to the flood map, this doesn't take account of wave action, overtopping or climate change. Information suggests the site is susceptible to long term coastal erosion. Photograph available of the lower part of the site flooded in 2005. | | A Flood Risk Assessment would be required to establish the potential for flooding on this site. Development should avoid the low-lying land adjacent to the Carness Road. | 0 |
| | | FRA required to assess coastal flood risk including effects of wave action, overtopping, coastal erosion and climate change. Sustainable approach to development of the site will be required to ensure long term security of properties. This may affect the developable area and/or capacity of the site, or require mitigation measures to be implemented. Access along the coastal road is vulnerable | | Recommend an alternative access route into this site is identified, e.g. from the Craigiefield Road – this has been included in the settlement statement. | |

| | | to overtopping and flooding, e.g. when high winds and high tides combine with onshore winds. | | | |
|--|-------|---|---|--|---|
| Could the development of the proposal help alleviate any existing flooding problems in the area? | Water | Unlikely. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna | | | | | |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any international or national biodiversity designation, e.g. SAC/SPA/Ramsar/SSSI? | | There is no connectivity between site and any of Orkney's international and national designations. Its development is therefore unlikely to have any effect on their qualifying interests or their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any locally important designations such as LNRs or LNCSs. | | Site is remote from any of Orkney's locally important designations and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect non designated features – e.g. trees, TPOs, hedges, woodland, species rich grasslands, | | Development of site is unlikely to affect any non-designated features as it is currently managed for agriculture. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect Protected Species –e.g. bats, otters, etc.? | | There is potential for otters to use drainage ditches which border this site as they routinely move between the marine and freshwater environments. | ? | The potential for otters to be present in areas close to waterbodies and drainage ditches is highlighted in the introduction to the settlement statements. | 0 |
| How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity? | | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Water | | | | | |
| Could the option result in a change of status of a water body or significantly affect a designated water body as identified in the Scotland River | Water | Unlikely. There is currently capacity at Kirkwall waste | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| Basin Management Plan? | | water treatment works; however, should | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| Can the proposal connect to the public foul sewer? | | demands exceed available capacity, Scottish Water will initiate a Growth Project once one development meets the 5 Growth Criteria. | | | |
| Could the proposal have a direct impact on the water environment (for example result in the need for watercourse crossings or allow the de- culverting of a watercourse? | Water | The site is bordered by drainage ditches and water crossings may be necessary to link site 17 with the adjacent site 16, or to create access onto the Craigiefield Road along the NE boundary of the site. However the effects on the water environment are likely to be minimal. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Does the proposal avoid impact on Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs), i.e. are there any wetlands and boggy areas on the site? | Water and Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| For large scale developments are there any private or public water supplies within 250m of the proposal which may be affected? | Water and Human Health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Soils | | | | | |
| Is the proposal on greenfield or brownfield land? Does it result in the loss of high quality agricultural land? | Material Assets and Soils | This is a greenfield site where the land is classed as 4_2 capable of producing a narrow range of crops. | - | The site is adjacent to the town boundary, therefore its development is considered to be a sustainable option. | 0 |
| Are there any contaminated soil issues on the proposal and if so, will the option reduce contamination? | Material Assets and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is the proposal on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat? | Climatic Factors and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| Geology | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|
| Are there any national geodiversity sites that could be affected by the proposal? | | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal? | | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Landscape | | | • | | |
| To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations? | | | 0 | New development should comply with Policy 9 Natural Environment and | 0 |
| Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? Such as current settlement boundaries, existing townscape and character of surrounding area? | Landscape | The site is located adjacent to the current Kirkwall town boundary and is bordered by built development and agricultural land | ? | Livinoinnent and Landscape. Policy 2 Design includes a set of fundamental principles with which all development should comply. Further guidance will be provided in the Development Brief. | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect features of landscape interest, including the distinctive character of the landscape and the qualities of wild land? | landscape | The landscape character type for this area is described as Urban and Rural Development. There is no wild land in this area. | ? | | 0 |
| Cultural Heritage | | | | • | |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any scheduled monuments or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any locally important archaeological site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any listed buildings and/or their setting? | Cultural | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| | heritage, & links with landscape | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Conservation Areas? (e.g. will it result in the demolition of any buildings) | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Service Infrastructure | | <u>.</u> | | | |
| Are there educational or health facilities nearby? | Population | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space, or result in a loss of open space? | Population, human health or material assets | This area was previously classified as open space but has been de-classified as it is not publicly accessible. This is unlikely to affect connectivity or accessibility to open space | 0 | Policy 10 Green Infrastructure promotes | 0 |
| To what extent will development of the proposal affect core path links or other key access networks such as cycle paths, coastal paths and rights of way? | Population, human health, material assets or climatic factors | Development of site is unlikely to affect core path links or key access routes. | 0 | improvements to public access and permeability. Potential access links and the creation or enhancement of green | 0 |
| Is there any opportunity to enhance the green network through for example green infrastructure | Population, human health | The KUDF identifies a green network route which links the area of open space along | ? | infrastructure should be addressed in the | ? |

| on site? | or material assets | the coast with the Weyland Bay development and the adjacent site 15. Further links may be possible. | | Development Brief. | |
|--|--|--|------------|---|---|
| Material assets | | | | | |
| Will development of the proposal minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does it re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover existing on-site materials / resources? | | New development would link into existing infrastructure and services. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is the proposal in the vicinity of a waste management site and could its development therefore compromise the waste handling operation? | Human health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Deliverability/sustainability constraints | | <u>.</u> | . <u>.</u> | ······································ | |
| Will the proposal be delivered within the LDP timeframe? Are there any site servicing constraints, e.g. waste water treatment capacity? | Material assets | The Weyland Bay Pumping Station is located on the site and there is also Scottish Water infrastructure crossing the site (main sewer leading to Sewage Treatment Works at Head of Work). These assets will have an effect on the potential location, layout and density that this site can deliver. The developer should contact Scottish Water as an early opportunity to discuss. | ? | The site statement highlights the presence of the pumping station and other infrastructure. It requires development to consider these assets and ensure that new development would not impact on their operation. | 0 |
| Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities - is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated? | Material assets and climatic factors | There are no known vehicular access constraints apart from flood risk, for which mitigation has been suggested above. | ? | Access to all new proposals will be assessed by the Roads Service during consultation on the MIR. | 0 |

| KIRKWALL Source of site suggestion: Carried forward from the OLDP 2014. | | | | | | Summary Description: These are a range of business, industrial and mixed | | | | l and mixed | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------------|------------|---|---|
| Site name: Hatston West Hatston Marine Park Orkney Auction Mart, Hatston Hatston South | Carried forwa KUDF 2009 N/A N/A | ard fron OLDP 2014 N/A KB-1/2 KB-3 KB-4 | LDP MIR 014 2015 /A B-1/2 B-3 | | OLDP 2017 K-18 K-19 K-20 K-21 | Site Size (ha): 7.00 15.2 26.6 5.40 | These are a range of business, industrial and mixed use sites. With the exception of site K-18 these sites have beer carried forward from the Orkney LDP 2014 and most were originally identified in the Kirkwall Urban Design Framework; therefore they have already undergone | | | | es have been 14 and most Jrban Design |
| Hatston South Balfour Hospital Former Bus Station Former Jewson's Site Garden's Buildings Shore Street Oil Depot Ambulance Depot Former Papdale Halls Papdale Farm Orkney Research Campus, Kirkwall | KB-4 4B KW-H 3C KB-14 3A KB-13 2A KB-10 2B KB-11 2C KB-12 1C KW-M 1D KW-N 7A KB-6 | | Not number in MIR map for Kirkwall | K K K K K K K | -22 -23 -24 -25 -26 -27 -28 -29 -30 | 2.40 1.1 0.5 0.4 0.2 0.4 1.1 0.4 5.80 | environmental assessment. K-19 is included in the Crowness Development Brief. K-24 is included in the Kirkwall Central West brief K-28 and K-29 are included in the Papdale, Kirkwall Development Brief. K-30 is included in the Watersfield Development Brief. Further briefs will be prepared for: K-1, K-2 & K-21 Kirkwall south, inc K-22 (Balfour Hospital) K-18 which should refer to the Crowness Bief. K-25, K-26 & K-27 | | | | |
| Site assessment question | Related SEA topic | | Informa | Comment Information available – GIS/site visit? | | Sco pre mit | • | ng Ition | Mitigation | Scoring post mitigation | |
| Climate change | | | | | | | | | | L | 1 |
| Is the proposal close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by public transport? | Population a Human healt | l are within 10 m e town centre. | inutes | walkir | king range of | | + | | N/A | + | |
| Is the proposal protected from prevailing winds? | | ce otl | Those sites which are close centre benefit more from so others, e.g. the Orkney Co open and exposed location | | | er, whereas | + | | 0 | Policy 2 <i>Design</i> requires new development to demonstrate how it will minimise use of energy | + |
| Site aspect – does the proposal make best use of solar gain? | | | All of these sites are in relatively open locations and benefit from solar gain for | | | | | + | | and maximise opportunities for | + |

| Could the development of the proposal help alleviate any existing flooding problems in the area? | Water | Uncertain. | ? | Options to include enhanced SUDS may be explored through the development briefs. | 0 |
|--|-------|---|---|---|---|
| Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna | | ······································ | | • | |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any international or national biodiversity designation, e.g. SAC/SPA/Ramsar/SSSI? | | There is no connectivity between these sites and any of Orkney's international and national designations. Their development is therefore unlikely to have any effect on their qualifying interests or their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any locally important designations such as LNRs or LNCSs. | | These sites are remote from any of Orkney's locally important designations and their development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect non designated features – e.g. trees, TPOs, hedges, woodland, species rich grasslands, | | Development of these sites is unlikely to affect any non-designated features as they are either brownfield sites or they are currently managed for agriculture. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect Protected Species –e.g. bats, otters, etc.? | | Otters have been recorded in and around the Peedie Sea so their possible presence should be taken into account in any future development proposals on sites that border Kirkwall's seafront, e.g. the Ayre Mills sites, the Shore Street Oil Depot site and the Ambulance Depot site. There is potential for bats to be present in areas of mature woodland, e.g. the woods adjacent to Papdale Farm House. Bats may also establish roosts in nearby buildings. | ? | The potential for otters to be present in areas close to waterbodies and drainage ditches is highlighted in the introduction to the settlement statements. The statement highlights the potential for bats to be present in areas of mature woodland and/or nearby buildings. | 0 |
| How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in | | Development affecting areas of mature woodland could impact on bats. | ? | The statement highlights the potential | 0 |

| habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity? | | | | for bats to be present in areas of mature woodland. | |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|
| Water | • | | | | |
| Could the option result in a change of status of a water body or significantly affect a designated water body as identified in the Scotland River Basin Management Plan? | Water | Unlikely. All proposals would be required to connect to the public sewer. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Can the proposal connect to the public foul sewer? | | | | | |
| Could the proposal have a direct impact on the water environment (for example result in the need for watercourse crossings or allow the deculverting of a watercourse? | Water | A watercourse on the boundary of site K-30 is partially culverted. | ? | The settlement statement notes the presence of the watercourse and requires any development to allow for an appropriate development-free buffer strip. | 0 |
| Does the proposal avoid impact on Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs), i.e. are there any wetlands and boggy areas on the site? | Water and Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora | There are no wetlands on any of these sites. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| For large scale developments are there any private or public water supplies within 250m of the proposal which may be affected? | Water and Human Health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Soils | | | | | |
| Is the proposal on greenfield or brownfield land? | Material | Most of these sites are on brownfield land. | + | - This site is located | 0 |
| Does it result in the loss of high quality agricultural land? | Assets and Soils | An exception is the area to the west of Orkney College where the land is classed as category 4_2 Land capable of producing a narrow range of crops. | | within the town boundary; therefore its development is considered a sustainable option. | |

| | | | | The settlement statement notes that site K-20 will not be available for general business and industrial development as the Orkney Auction Mart requires this land for animal grazing and fodder. | |
|--|----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| Are there any contaminated soil issues on the proposal and if so, will the option reduce contamination? | Material Assets and Soils | An area to the rear of Station House at the Ayre Mills is the site of the former municipal dump and until its closure during the 1970s a wide variety of wastes was disposed of here. Investigations should be carried out for the presence of underground gases prior to redevelopment of sites nearby, e.g. K-23 and K-24. Investigations should also be carried out for metal residues at site K-24 to take account of its former use as a builder's yard where treated wood was stored. The Balfour Hospital site would require a full investigation. | ? | Potential contamination issues have not been addressed through the settlement statement. | ? |
| Is the proposal on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat? | Climatic Factors and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Geology | | | | | |
| Are there any national geodiversity sites that could be affected by the proposal? | | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal? | | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| Landscape | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations? | Landscape | There are no designated landscape sites in the vicinity of Kirkwall. | 0 | New development should comply with Policy 9 Natural Environment and | 0 |
| Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? Such as current settlement boundaries, existing townscape and character of surrounding area? | Landscape | All of these sites are within the current settlement boundary. The Orkney Landscape Character Assessment (1998) classifies this area as Urban and Rural Development | ? | <i>Landscape.</i> Policy 2 <i>Design</i> includes a set of fundamental principles with which all | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect features of landscape interest, including the distinctive character of the landscape and the qualities of wild land? | landscape | There is no wild land in this area. | ? | development should comply. Further guidance will be provided in the relevant Development Briefs. | 0 |
| Cultural Heritage | | | | | |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any scheduled monuments or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | There is significant potential for archaeological discoveries to be made whilst redeveloping site K-25 | ? | This will be addressed through the relevant development brief. | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any locally important archaeological site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any listed buildings and/or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | Papdale Farm House, its garden and doocot are B listed. Tounigar in K-26 is a listed building; There are further listed buildings in the neighbouring St Catherine's Place and Cromwell Road. | ? | The settlement statement requires the preservation of Papdale Farm House and Tounigar, as well as their curtilage in any development, and their setting to be taken into account. Development | 0 |

| | | | | should avoid impact on the setting of other listed buildings. | |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Conservation Areas? (e.g. will it result in the demolition of any buildings) | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | Site K-25 is located within the Kirkwall Conservation Area. | ? | The settlement statement requires some or all of the buildings on site to be retained as part of any development. These will be identified in the development brief. | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Service Infrastructure | | 4 | | 4 | |
| Are there educational or health facilities nearby? | Population | Yes, there are two primary schools, a secondary school as well as the Orkney College. Health centres | + | N/A | + |
| To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space, or result in a loss of open space? | Population, human health or material assets | Further development on these sites is unlikely to affect any area of open space. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will development of the proposal affect core path links or other key access | Population, human health, | Core path K7 passes to the west of the | ? | Policy 10 Green Infrastructure | 0 |

| networks such as cycle paths, coastal paths and rights of way? | material assets or climatic factors | Orkney College site. Core path K8 passes to the SW of Papdale House. | | promotes improvements to public access and permeability. | |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|
| Is there any opportunity to enhance the green network through for example green infrastructure on site? | Population, human health or material assets | The Kirkwall Urban Development Framework includes a number of recommendations for green infrastructure enhancement in and around Kirkwall. | ? | Any options for enhancement will be addressed through the relevant development briefs. Further guidance is available in the Orkney Open Space Strategy. | ? |
| Material assets | | | | | |
| Will development of the proposal minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does it re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover existing on-site materials / resources? | | There may be opportunities to re-use existing structures, within a number of these sites, e.g. the Balfour Hospital site, the Garden's Buildings site, and the Papdale Farm site. | ? | The settlement statement highlights a number of buildings which should be retained. Options will be explored further in the relevant development briefs. Policy 4 Housing encourages the redevelopment and re- use of redundant buildings. | + |
| Is the proposal in the vicinity of a waste management site and could its development therefore compromise the waste handling operation? | Human health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Deliverability/sustainability constraints | | | | | |
| Will the proposal be delivered within the LDP timeframe? Are there any site servicing constraints, e.g. waste water treatment capacity? | Material assets | Some of these sites are available for redevelopment in the short term, whereas others, e.g. the Balfour Hospital site are highlighted for their long term development | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| | | potential. A combined sewer may lie within site K-21. Developers should contact Scottish Water to discuss possible implications. | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities - is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated? | Material assets and climatic factors | At this stage no vehicular access constraints have been highlighted. | ? | The Council's Roads Services is routinely consulted on planning applications. | 0 |

| KIRKWALL | Source of site suggestion: Submitted in response to the Call for Sites. | | Summary Description: Site 20 is located on the east side of Berstane Loan. It is adjacent to the town boundary as indicated in the current LDP. | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|---|-------------------------|--|
| MIR SITE 20 | Site Size (ha): 3.42 | Current Use: Agriculture | Site 20 is included in Option 2 but not in Option This site has not been included in the Pro | | | | |
| Site assessment question | | Related SEA topic | Comment Information available – GIS/site visit? | Scoring pre mitigation | Mitigation | Scoring post mitigation | |
| Climate change | | | | | | | |
| Is the proposal close to a range of t these be accessed by public transp | | Population and Human health | The proposal is more than15 minutes walking distance from the town centre. Some services are closer, e.g. Papdale Primary and Kirkwall Grammar schools, as well as a number of shops. It is located on the route of the scheduled Kirkwall Town Service bus service. | + | N/A | + | |
| Is the proposal protected from prev | ailing winds? | | No, it is in an exposed position, close to the summit of a hill. | - | The settlement statement will provide guidance | ? | |
| Site aspect – does the proposal ma solar gain? | ke best use of | | Yes, it has an open aspect and makes good use of solar gain. | + | on how to achieve benefit from shelter and solar gain through the form, orientation and design of buildings. | + | |
| Is the proposal thought to be at risk could its development result in add risk elsewhere? | | Water and Human Health | The site is not considered to be at risk of flooding; however it is upslope of areas which are prone to flooding. | ? | The settlement statement should highlight the potential for development to | 0 | |

| | | | | increase flood risk pressure downstream. | |
|--|-------|---|---|--|---|
| Could the development of the proposal help alleviate any existing flooding problems in the area? | Water | Unlikely, given the relatively small scale of the site. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna | | | | | |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any international or national biodiversity designation, e.g. SAC/SPA/Ramsar/SSSI? | | There is no connectivity between the proposal and any of Orkney's international and national designations. Its development is therefore unlikely to have any effect on their qualifying interests or their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any locally important designations such as LNRs or LNCSs. | | The proposal is remote from any of Orkney's locally important designations and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect non designated features – e.g. trees, TPOs, hedges, woodland, species rich grasslands, | | Proposal is unlikely to affect any non- designated features as it is currently managed for agriculture. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect Protected Species –e.g. bats, otters, etc.? | | The proposal is unlikely to affect protected species. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity? | | Vegetation on site is improved grassland and has limited ecological value. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Water | | | | | |
| Could the proposal result in a change of status of a water body or significantly affect a designated water body as identified in the Scotland River Basin Management Plan? Can the proposal connect to the public foul | Water | Unlikely. There is currently capacity at Kirkwall waste water treatment works; however, should demand exceed available capacity, Scottish Water will initiate a Growth Project once one development meets the 5 Growth | ? | N/A | 0 |

| sewer? | | Criteria. | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| Could the proposal have a direct impact on the water environment (for example result in the need for watercourse crossings or allow the de-culverting of a watercourse? | Water | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Does the proposal avoid impact on Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs), i.e. are there any wetlands and boggy areas on the site? | Water and Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| For large scale developments are there any private or public water supplies within 250m of the proposal which may be affected? | Water and Human Health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Soils | - | <u>.</u> | • | • | |
| Is the proposal on greenfield or brownfield land? | Material Assets and Soils | The option is on greenfield land. This land is identified as category 4_2 , capable of producing a narrow range of crops. | - | The site is adjacent to the existing town boundary. | 0 |
| Are there any contaminated soil issues on the site proposal and if so, will the option reduce contamination? | Material Assets and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is the proposal on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat? | Climatic Factors and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Geology | L | L | | | |
| Are there any national geodiversity sites that could be affected by the proposal? | | The site is remote from any of Orkney's national geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal? | | The site is remote from any of Orkney's local geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| | | integrity. | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| Landscape | | | | | |
| To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations? | Landscape | The proposal is remote from the Hoy and West Mainland NSA and any local landscape designation. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? Such as current settlement boundaries, existing townscape and character of surrounding area? To what extent will the proposal affect features of landscape interest, including the distinctive character of the landscape and the qualities of wild land? | Landscape | The proposal is adjacent to the current settlement boundary, approaching the ridgeline of Seatter and Towerhill to the E. The Kirkwall Urban Design Framework (2009) notes that the green backcloth of the rounded ridgelines and hills is considered important to the distinctive landscape setting of the town and recommends that the encroachment of the town up to and over ridgelines where they would be visible from adjacent landscape areas should be avoided. The landscape character type for this area is described as Urban and Rural Development. Development would be likely to break the ridgeline which provides a backdrop to this | - | The settlement statement will provide guidance on siting, layout and design, in order to promote development that is sensitive to the local character of the landscape. | ? |
| Cultural Heritage | | ridgeline which provides a backdrop to this side of the town. There is no wild land in this area. | | | |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any scheduled monuments or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any locally important archaeological site? | Cultural heritage, & links with | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| | landscape | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|-----|---|
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any listed buildings and/or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Conservation Areas? (e.g. will it result in the demolition of any buildings) | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Service Infrastructure | | | 1 | | |
| Are there educational or health facilities nearby? | Population | Papdale Primary and Kirkwall Grammar schools are within approximately 10-15 minutes walking distance of the proposal. | + | N/A | + |
| To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space, or result in a loss of open space? | Population, human health or material assets | The proposal is unlikely to affect open space or connectivity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will development of the proposal affect core path links or other key access networks such as cycle paths, coastal paths and | Population, human health, material | The proposal is unlikely to affect core path links or other key access networks such as cycle paths, coastal paths and rights of | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| rights of way? | assets or climatic factors | way. | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| Is there any opportunity to enhance the green network through for example green infrastructure on site? | Population, human health or material assets | Uncertain. | ? | Any options for enhancement will be highlighted in the settlement statement. Further guidance is available in the Orkney Open Space Strategy. | ? |
| Material assets | | | | | |
| Will development of the proposal minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does it re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover existing on-site materials / resources? | | Yes, new development would link into existing infrastructure and services. | + | N/A | + |
| Is the proposal n the vicinity of a waste management site and could its development therefore compromise the waste handling operation? | Human health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Deliverability/sustainability constraints | ••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••• | <u>.</u> | | | |
| Will the proposal be delivered within the LDP timeframe? Are there any site servicing constraints, e.g. waste water treatment capacity? | Material assets | Waste water? | ? | | ? |
| Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities - is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated? | Material assets and climatic factors | Development of this site would require major road improvements to Berstane Road and Berstane Loan in order to facilitate safe access. | | The requirement for major road improvements should be highlighted in the settlement statement. | 0 |

| KIRKWALL | | ite suggestion: response to the s. | Summary Description: Site 21 is located on the corner of Berstane Loan and Berstane Road. It is adjacent to the town boundary as indicated in the current LDP. | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|--|--|------------------------------|---|-------------------------|--|
| MIR SITE 21 | Site Size (ha): 9.84 | Current Use: Agriculture | Site 21 is included in Option 2 but not in Opt | | | | |
| Site assessment question | | Related SEA topic | Comment Information available – GIS/site visit? | Scoring pre mitigation | Mitigation | Scoring post mitigation | |
| Climate change | | | | | | | |
| Is the proposal close to a range these be accessed by public tran | | Population and Human health | The proposal is at more than15 minutes walking distance from the town centre. However, some services are closer, e.g. Papdale Primary and Kirkwall Grammar schools, as well as a number of shops. It is located on the route of the scheduled Kirkwall Town Service bus service. | + | N/A | + | |
| Is the proposal protected from pr | revailing winds? | | No, it is located on the crest of a hill | - | The settlement statement will | ? | |
| Site aspect – does the proposal solar gain? | make best use of | | Yes, it has an open aspect and makes good use of solar gain. | + | provide guidance on how to achieve benefit from shelter and solar gain through the form, orientation and design of buildings. | + | |
| Is the proposal thought to be at r could its development result in a risk elsewhere? | | Water and Human Health | Some areas of the site appear to be at risk of drainage flooding. There may be potential for development on | ? | The site statement should highlight potential for new development on | 0 | |

| | | site 21 to increase flood risk downstream, e.g. in the nearby Papdale East area which has historically experienced flooding. | | this site to add to existing flood risk issues downstream. | |
|--|-------|---|---|---|---|
| Could the development of the proposal help alleviate any existing flooding problems in the area? | Water | Uncertain. | ? | Potential to incorporate natural flood risk management techniques will be highlighted in the settlement statement. | ? |
| Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna | | | | | |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any international or national biodiversity designation, e.g. SAC/SPA/Ramsar/SSSI? | | There is no connectivity between the proposal and any of Orkney's international and national designations. Its development is therefore unlikely to have any effect on their qualifying interests or their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any locally important designations such as LNRs or LNCSs. | | The proposal is remote from any of Orkney's locally important designations and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect non designated features – e.g. trees, TPOs, hedges, woodland, species rich grasslands, | | There is gorse in parts of the site, e.g. along the eastern boundary fence. | _ | All development proposals should comply with LDP policy on the Wider Biodiversity. | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect Protected Species –e.g. bats, otters, etc.? | | The proposal is unlikely to affect protected species. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity? | | Vegetation on site consists mainly of improved grassland. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Water | | | | | |

| Could the proposal result in a change of status of a water body or significantly affect a designated water body as identified in the Scotland River Basin Management Plan? Can the proposal connect to the public foul sewer? | Water | Unlikely. There is currently capacity at Kirkwall waste water treatment works; however, should demand exceed available capacity, Scottish Water will initiate a Growth Project once one development meets the 5 Growth Criteria. | - | New development should fulfil the requirements of the LDP policy on Waste Water Drainage. | ? |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| Could the proposal have a direct impact on the water environment (for example result in the need for watercourse crossings or allow the de-culverting of a watercourse? | Water | Unlikely. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Does the proposal avoid impact on Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs), i.e. are there any wetlands and boggy areas on the site? | Water and Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora | There are a number of small waterbodies on the proposal. | - | N/A | - |
| For large scale developments are there any private or public water supplies within 250m of the proposal which may be affected? | Water and Human Health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Soils | | · | | L | |
| Is the proposal on greenfield or brownfield land? Does the proposal result in the loss of high quality agricultural land? | Material Assets and Soils | The option is on greenfield land. This land is identified as category 4_2 , capable of producing a narrow range of crops. | - | The allocation is not adjacent to the settlement boundary. | 0 |
| Are there any contaminated soil issues on the site and if so, will the proposal reduce contamination? | Material Assets and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is the proposal on peatland and could the development of the proposal lead to a loss of peat? | Climatic Factors and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Geology | | ۱ | | | |

| Are there any national geodiversity sites that could be affected by the proposal? | | The site is remote from any of Orkney's national geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
|---|-----------|---|---|--|---|
| Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal? | | The site is remote from any of Orkney's local geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Landscape | | | | | |
| To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations? | Landscape | Kirkwall is remote from the Hoy and West Mainland NSA. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? Such as current settlement boundaries, existing townscape and character of surrounding area? | Landscape | The proposal is outside the current settlement boundary, approaching the ridgeline of Seatter and Towerhill to the E. The Kirkwall Urban Design Framework (2009) notes that the green backcloth of the rounded ridgelines and hills is considered important to the distinctive landscape setting of the town and recommends that the encroachment of the town up to and over ridgelines where they would be visible from adjacent landscape areas should be avoided. | - | The settlement statement will provide guidance on siting, layout and design, in order to promote development that is sensitive to the local character of the landscape. | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect features of landscape interest, including the distinctive character of the landscape and the qualities of wild land? | landscape | The landscape character type for this area is described as Urban and Rural Development. Development would be likely to break the ridgeline which provides a backdrop to this side of the town. There is no wild land in this area. | - | | 0 |

| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any scheduled monuments or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
|--|--|--|---|-----|---|
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any locally important archaeological site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any listed buildings and/or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Conservation Areas? (e.g. will it result in the demolition of any buildings) | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Service Infrastructure | | | | | |
| Are there educational or health facilities nearby? | Population | Papdale primary and Kirkwall Grammar schools are within approximately 10 minutes walking distance of the proposal. | + | N/A | + |

| To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space, or result in a loss of open space? | Population, human health or material assets | The proposal is unlikely to affect open space or connectivity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|
| To what extent will development of the proposal affect core path links or other key access networks such as cycle paths, coastal paths and rights of way? | Population, human health, material assets or climatic factors | The proposal is unlikely to affect any core path or other key access route. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is there any opportunity to enhance the green network through for example green infrastructure on site? | Population, human health or material assets | Uncertain. | ? | Any options for enhancement will be highlighted in the settlement statement. Further guidance is available in the Orkney Open Space Strategy. | ? |
| Material assets | ••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••• | • | | • | |
| Will development of the proposal minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does it re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover existing on-site materials / resources? | | Yes, new development would link into existing infrastructure and services. | + | N/A | + |
| Is the proposal in the vicinity of a waste management site and could its development therefore compromise the waste handling operation? | Human health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Deliverability/sustainability constraints | | 4 | | | · |
| Will the proposal be delivered within the LDP timeframe? Are there any site servicing constraints, e.g. waste water treatment capacity? | Material assets | There is a wind turbine development already on site. This would effectively sterilise part of the site for residential development. | - | The site statement should note the presence of the wind turbine. | 0 |

| | | Waste water? | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities - is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated? | Material assets and climatic factors | Development of this site would require major road improvements to Berstane Road and Berstane Loan in order to facilitate safe access. | The requirement for major road improvements should be highlighted in the settlement statement. | 0 |

| KIRKWALL | suggestion: sponse to the Call | | Summary Description: Site 22 is located in Berstane Woods. | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|------------------------------|---|-------------------------|--|--|
| MIR SITE 22 | Site Size (ha): 1.35 | Current Use clearing amongst woodland. | amongst It is included in Option 2 but not in Opti | | | on 1. | | | |
| Site assessment question | | Related SE topic | A | Comment Information available – GIS/site visit? | Scoring pre mitigation | Mitigation | Scoring post mitigation | | |
| Climate change | | | | | | | | | |
| Is the proposal close to a range o these be accessed by public trans | | Population and Human health | | 22 is over 15 minutes walking distance n the town centre. | - | N/A | - | | |
| Is the proposal protected from prevailing winds? | | | Yes, higher land to the west offers protection from westerly and north-westerly winds. The surrounding trees of Berstane Wood also provide shelter. | | + | The settlement statement will provide guidance on how to achieve benefit from shelter | + | | |
| Site aspect – does the proposal make best use of solar gain? | | | | e site has a north-easterly aspect so as note make best use of solar gain. | 0 | and solar gain through the form, orientation and design of buildings | ? | | |

| Is the proposal thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere? | Water and Human Health | It is not considered to be at risk of flooding and is unlikely to result in additional flood risk elsewhere. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
|--|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Could the development of the proposal help alleviate any existing flooding problems in the area? | Water | Unlikely. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna | | | L | | |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any international or national biodiversity designation, e.g. SAC/SPA/Ramsar/SSSI? | | There is no connectivity between the proposal and any of Orkney's international and national designations. Its development is therefore unlikely to have any effect on their qualifying interests or their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any locally important designations such as LNRs or LNCSs. | | The proposal is remote from any of Orkney's locally important designations and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect non designated features – e.g. trees, TPOs, hedges, woodland, species rich grasslands, | | The proposal comprises an area of mature woodland with a clearing at its centre. | - | The settlement statement should note the presence of mature woodland. | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect Protected Species –e.g. bats, otters, etc.? | | Berstane Wood is known to be used by bats. All species of bat are classed as European Protected Species and are afforded a strict level of protection. | - | The settlement statement should highlight the presence of bats. | ? |
| How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity? | | As well as bats, as mentioned above, Berstane Wood provides habitat for a number of bird species, including autumn and spring migrants. | - | The settlement statement should note the presence of mature woodland. | ? |
| Water | | <u>.</u> | | • | |

| Could the proposal result in a change of status of a water body or significantly affect a designated water body as identified in the Scotland River Basin Management Plan? Can the proposal connect to the public foul sewer? | Water | Site 22 is some distance from the town boundary and the feasibility of connecting to the public sewer is uncertain. Berstane is identified by SEPA as a Planning Consultation Area where proliferation of private waste water systems has led to a cumulative impact on the water environment. | - | Private foul water drainage systems will be deemed acceptable for small scale developments, provided that they comply with the current LDP policy on waste water drainage. | 0 |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|
| Could the proposal have a direct impact on the water environment (for example result in the need for watercourse crossings or allow the de-culverting of a watercourse? | Water | Unlikely. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Does the proposal avoid impact on Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs), i.e. are there any wetlands and boggy areas on the site? | Water and Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora | There are no wetlands or boggy areas on site. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| For large scale developments are there any private or public water supplies within 250m of the site which may be affected? | Water and Human Health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Soils | | | | 4 | L |
| Is the proposal on greenfield or brownfield land? Does the proposal result in the loss of high quality agricultural land? | Material Assets and Soils | This is a greenfield site; however the land is not of high agricultural quality. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Are there any contaminated soil issues on the proposal and if so, will the option reduce contamination? | Material Assets and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is the proposal on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat? | Climatic Factors and | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| | Soils | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| | Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Geology | | .t | | 4 | i |
| Are there any national geodiversity sites that could be affected by the proposal? | | The site is remote from any of Orkney's national geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal? | | The site is remote from any of Orkney's local geodiversity sites and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Landscape | | | | | |
| To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations? | Landscape | The proposal is remote from the Hoy and West Mainland NSA or any local landscape designation. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? Such as current settlement boundaries, existing townscape and character of surrounding area? | Landscape | The proposal is located out with the town boundary and is visually separated from Kirkwall by the Towerhill and Berstanehill ridgeline. The proposal therefore has no visual connection with Kirkwall. | - | The settlement statement will provide guidance on siting, layout and design, in order | ? |
| To what extent will the proposal affect features of landscape interest, including the distinctive character of the landscape and the qualities of wild land? | landscape | Development of this proposal would be likely to alter the character of Berstane Wood. | - | to promote development that is sensitive to the local character of the landscape. | ? |
| Cultural Heritage | | | | | |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any scheduled monuments or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any locally important archaeological site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | The nearby Berstane House is included on the local Sites and Monuments List. | - | The settlement statement should highlight the presence of these sites. | 0 |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any listed buildings and/or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | Berstane Doocot which is category B listed is located to the SE, close to this proposal. | - | siles. | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Conservation Areas? (e.g. will it result in the demolition of any buildings) | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Service Infrastructure | | | | -L | |
| Are there educational or health facilities nearby? | Population | The Papdale Primary and Kirkwall Grammar Schools are within approximately 15-20 minutes walking distance. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space, or result in a loss of open space? | Population, human health or material assets | The proposal is unlikely to affect open space or connectivity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| | 1 | 1 | | | |
|--|---|--|----------|--|---|
| To what extent will development of the proposal affect core path links or other key access networks such as cycle paths, coastal paths and rights of way? | Population, human health, material assets or climatic factors | The proposal is unlikely to affect core path links or other key access networks such as cycle paths, coastal paths and rights of way. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is there any opportunity to enhance the green network through for example green infrastructure on site? | Population, human health or material assets | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Material assets | | ۱ | . | 4 | |
| Will development of the proposal minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does it re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover existing on-site materials / resources? | | Yes, new development would link into existing infrastructure and services. | + | N/A | + |
| Is the proposal in the vicinity of a waste management site and could its development therefore compromise the waste handling operation? | Human health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Deliverability/sustainability constraints | .i | ۰ | 4 | | |
| Will the proposal be delivered within the LDP timeframe? Are there any site servicing constraints, e.g. waste water treatment capacity? | Material assets | Waste water. | - | Private foul water drainage systems will be deemed acceptable for small scale developments, provided that they comply with the current LDP policy on waste water drainage. | ? |
| Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities - is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated? | Material assets and climatic factors | Development of this site would require major road improvements to Berstane Road and Berstane Loan in order to facilitate safe access. | | The requirement for major road improvements should be | 0 |

| | | highlighted in the settlement statement. |
|--|--|--|
|--|--|--|

| KIRKWALL | | te suggestion: response to the | Summary Description: Site 23 is located on the east side of the New Scapa Road. It is not adjacent to the town boundary as shown in the current LDP. It is included as Option 2 but not Option 1. This site has not been included in the Proposed Plan. | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|--|
| MIR SITE 23 | Site Size (ha): 12.64 | Current Use: Agriculture. | | | | | |
| Site assessment questio | n | Related SEA topic | Comment Information available – GIS/site visit? | Scoring pre mitigation | Mitigation | Scoring post mitigation | |
| Climate change | | | | | | | |
| Is the proposal close to a ran these be accessed by public | | Population and Human health | Site 23 is within 10 minutes walking distance from the hospital and health centre but it is not close to shops and other facilities. However, it is located on the route of the Kirkwall Town Service scheduled bus service. | + | N/A | + | |
| Is the proposal protected from | n prevailing winds? | | Higher land to the west of the Crantit Valley provides some shelter however the site remains quite open to the west. It is more sheltered from easterly winds. | - | The settlement statement will provide guidance on how to achieve benefit from shelter and solar gain | + | |
| Site aspect – does the proposolar gain? | sal make best use of | | The site has a westerly aspect and makes good use of solar gain from mid-day onwards. | + | through the form, orientation and design of buildings. | + | |
| Is the proposal thought to be could its development result i | | Water and | Site 23 is not considered to be at risk of flooding; however it is upslope from the | ? | Care is required with site drainage | 0 | |

| risk elsewhere? | Human Health | Crantit Valley to the west, which is at risk of coastal, fluvial and drainage flooding. Site is also steeply sloping. | | arrangements to ensure flood risk downstream is not exacerbated. Buffer zones will be required to small channels running along the site boundaries. This information should be included in the settlement statement. | |
|---|--------------|--|---|---|---|
| Could the development of the proposal help alleviate any existing flooding problems in the area? | Water | Unlikely, due to relatively steep gradients. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna | | <u>.</u> | | ۰ | |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any international or national biodiversity designation, e.g. SAC/SPA/Ramsar/SSSI? | | There is no connectivity between site 23 and any of Orkney's international and national designations. Its development is therefore unlikely to have any effect on their qualifying interests or their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any locally important designations such as LNRs or LNCSs. | | Site 23 is remote from any of Orkney's locally important designations and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect non designated features – e.g. trees, TPOs, hedges, woodland, species rich grasslands, | | Development of site 23 is unlikely to affect any non-designated features as it is currently managed for agriculture. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect Protected Species –e.g. bats, otters, etc.? | | Uncertain otters are known to frequent the nearby Crantit Canal and may use drainage ditches as access routes. | ? | The potential for otters to be present in areas close to waterbodies and drainage ditches is highlighted in the introduction to the settlement statements. | 0 |

| How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity? | | Vegetation on site is improved grassland and has limited ecological value. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| Water | ••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••• | · | | | |
| Could the option result in a change of status of a water body or significantly affect a designated water body as identified in the Scotland River Basin Management Plan? Can the proposal connect to the public foul sewer? | Water | Site 23 is some distance from the town boundary and the feasibility of connecting to the public sewer is uncertain. | - | Private foul water drainage systems will be deemed acceptable for small scale developments, provided that they comply with the current LDP policy on waste water drainage. | 0 |
| Could the proposal have a direct impact on the water environment (for example result in the need for watercourse crossings or allow the de-culverting of a watercourse? | Water | Unlikely | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Does the proposal avoid impact on Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs), i.e. are there any wetlands and boggy areas on the site? | Water and Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora | No | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| For large scale developments are there any private or public water supplies within 250m of the proposal which may be affected? | Water and Human Health | Highland Park Distillery sources water for the whisky distilling process from lagoons that are adjacent to site 17. | ? | Further analysis may be necessary in order to assess the likely effects of development on the lagoons. | ? |
| Soils | | | | | |
| Is the proposal on greenfield or brownfield land? Does it result in the loss of high quality agricultural land? | Material Assets and Soils | This is a greenfield site. Land on this site is classed as category 4_2 and is capable of producing a narrow range of crops. | - | N/A | - |
| Are there any contaminated soil issues on the proposal and if so, will the option reduce | Material Assets and | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| contamination? | Soils | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Is the proposal on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat? | Climatic Factors and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Geology | | | - | | |
| Are there any national geodiversity sites that could be affected by the proposal? | | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal? | | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Landscape | | | | | |
| To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations? | Landscape | The proposal is remote from, and will not affect, the Hoy and West Mainland NSA. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? Such as current settlement boundaries, existing townscape and character of surrounding area? | Landscape | Site 23 is outside the current Kirkwall town boundary and is surrounded by agricultural land. Any new development on this land would have no direct visual connection with the town. | - | The settlement statement will provide guidance on siting, layout and design, in order to promote | ? |
| To what extent will the proposal affect features of landscape interest, including the distinctive character of the landscape and the qualities of wild land? | landscape | The landscape character type for this area is described as Urban and Rural Development. The spire of St Magnus Cathedral is clearly visible throughout the Crantit Valley. | - | development that is sensitive to the local character of the landscape. | ? |
| | | There is no wild land in this area. | | | |
| Cultural Heritage | | | | . | |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any scheduled monuments or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| | landscape | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|-----|---|
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any locally important archaeological site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any listed buildings and/or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Conservation Areas? (e.g. will it result in the demolition of any buildings) | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Service Infrastructure | .i | | | L | |
| Are there educational or health facilities nearby? | Population | The hospital and Kirkwall Health Centre are nearby. | + | N/A | + |
| To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space, or result in a loss of | Population, human health or material | The proposal is unlikely to affect open space or connectivity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| open space? | assets | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|
| To what extent will development of the proposal affect core path links or other key access networks such as cycle paths, coastal paths and rights of way? | Population, human health, material assets or climatic factors | The proposal is unlikely to affect core path links or other key access networks such as cycle paths, coastal paths and rights of way. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is there any opportunity to enhance the green network through for example green infrastructure on site? | Population, human health or material assets | Uncertain. | ? | Any options for enhancement will be highlighted in the settlement statement. Further guidance is available in the Orkney Open Space Strategy. | ? |
| Material assets | | | | • | |
| Will development of the proposal minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does it re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover existing on-site materials / resources? | | Yes, new development would link into existing infrastructure and services. | + | N/A | + |
| Is the proposal in the vicinity of a waste management site and could its development therefore compromise the waste handling operation? | Human health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Deliverability/sustainability constraints | ••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••• | · | | | |
| Will the proposal be delivered within the LDP timeframe? Are there any site servicing | Material assets | Parts of the site are on steep gradients and may be relatively difficult to develop. | | The site statement should note the presence of the wind turbine. | ? |
| constraints, e.g. waste water treatment capacity? | | There is a wind turbine development already on site. This would effectively sterilise part of the site for residential development. | | | |
| | | Waste water? | | | |
| Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities - is the road network capable of | Material assets and | At this stage no vehicle access constraints | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| accommodating traffic generated? | climatic factors | have been identified. | | | |
|----------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|
|----------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|

| KIRKWALL | | te suggestion: response to the | Summary Description: Site 24 is located to the north of the Old Finst | | | t is not | |
|--|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|--|
| MIR SITE 24 | Site Size (ha): 18.78 | Current Use: Agriculture | adjacent to the town boundary as shown in the current LDP. Site 24 is included in Option 2 but not in Option 1. This site has not been included in the Proposed Plan. | | | | |
| Site assessment question | 1 | Related SEA topic | Comment Information available – GIS/site visit? | Scoring pre mitigation | Mitigation | Scoring post mitigation | |
| Climate change | | | | | | | |
| Is the proposal close to a range of f these be accessed by public transp | | Population and Human health | Site 24 is at more than 20 minutes walking distance from the town centre. However, it is located alongside the route of the Kirkwall Town scheduled bus service. | + | N/A | + | |
| Is the proposal protected from preva | ailing winds? | | The land slopes gently toward the N. Higher land nearby, including Wideford Hill, provides a degree of shelter from westerly and southerly winds. | + | The settlement statement will provide guidance on how to achieve benefit from shelter and solar gain | + | |
| Site aspect – does the proposal ma solar gain? | ke best use of | | Site 24 has a relatively open aspect and benefits from solar gain for most of the day. | + | through the form, orientation and design of buildings. | + | |
| Is the proposal thought to be at risk could its development result in addi risk elsewhere? | | Water and Human Health | Sunnybank Road has been affected by deep surface water flooding/overland flow on the boundary of the site in the past which may affect the site. | - | This information should be included in the settlement statement, along with | 0 | |

| | | Muddisdale and Pickaquoy areas downslope to the north are prone to flooding. FRA would be required to assess risk from surface water flooding/overland flow. Surface water map highlights parts of site which are likely to form channels during very wet conditions, and flooding has affected the boundary of the site and possibly the site itself in the past. | | the relevant policy requirements. | |
|--|-------|--|---|--|---|
| Could the development of the proposal help alleviate any existing flooding problems in the area? | Water | Uncertain. | ? | Potential to incorporate natural flood risk management techniques will be highlighted in the settlement statement. | ? |
| Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna | | | | | |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any international or national biodiversity designation, e.g. SAC/SPA/Ramsar/SSSI? | | There is no connectivity between site 24 and any of Orkney's international and national designations. Its development is therefore unlikely to have any effect on their qualifying interests or their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any locally important designations such as LNRs or LNCSs. | | Site 24 is remote from any of Orkney's locally important designations and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect non designated features – e.g. trees, TPOs, hedges, woodland, species rich grasslands, | | Development of site 24 is unlikely to affect any non-designated features as it is currently managed for agriculture. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect Protected Species –e.g. bats, otters, etc.? | | Otters are likely to use the nearby Muddisdale Burn and may also use drainage ditches in the area as access routes. | ? | The potential for otters to be present in areas close to waterbodies and drainage ditches is highlighted in the introduction to the | 0 |

| | | | | settlement statements. | |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|
| How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity? | | Vegetation on site 24 is improved grassland and has limited ecological value. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Water | • | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | • | |
| Could the option result in a change of status of a water body or significantly affect a designated water body as identified in the Scotland River Basin Management Plan? Can the proposal connect to the public foul sewer? | Water | A drainage ditch along the northern boundary of the site flows into the Muddisdale Burn which in turn enters the Peedie Sea which is classed as a heavily modified water body. The water quality of the Peedie Sea is high and its overall status is good. Site 24 is some distance from the town boundary and the feasibility of connecting to the public sewer is uncertain. | - | Private foul water drainage systems will be deemed acceptable for small scale developments, provided that they comply with the current LDP policy on waste water drainage. | ? |
| Could the proposal have a direct impact on the water environment (for example result in the need for watercourse crossings or allow the de-culverting of a watercourse? | Water | Unlikely. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Does the proposal avoid impact on Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs), i.e. are there any wetlands and boggy areas on the site? | Water and Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| For large scale developments are there any private or public water supplies within 250m of the proposal which may be affected? | Water and Human Health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Soils | | | | | |
| Is the proposal on greenfield or brownfield land? Does it result in the loss of high quality agricultural land? | Material Assets and Soils | This is a greenfield site. The land is identified as category 4_2 , capable of producing a narrow range of crops. | - | N/A | - |

| Are there any contaminated soil issues on the proposal and if so, will the option reduce contamination? | Material Assets and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
|---|----------------------------------|--|----------|--|----------|
| Is the proposal on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat? | Climatic Factors and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Geology | | ····· | • | | • |
| Are there any national geodiversity sites that could be affected by the proposal? | | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal? | | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Landscape | | ····· | <u>.</u> | | <u>.</u> |
| To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations? | Landscape | Site 24 is remote from, and will not affect, the Hoy and West Mainland NSA or any local landscape designation. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? Such as current settlement boundaries, existing townscape and character of surrounding area? | Landscape | Site 24 is outwith the town boundary. It is mainly bordered by agricultural land. Development of this site would have little visual connection with the town. | - | The settlement statement will provide guidance on siting, layout and design, in order to promote | - |
| To what extent will the proposal affect features of landscape interest, including the distinctive character of the landscape and the qualities of | landscape | The landscape character type for this area is described as Urban and Rural Development. | - | development that is sensitive to the local character of the landscape. | ? |
| wild land? | | Site 24 is on the lower slopes of Wideford Hill and any new development on the site would be visible from a number of areas. | | | |
| | | There is no wild land in this area. | | | |

| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any scheduled monuments or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
|--|--|---|---|-----|---|
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any locally important archaeological site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any listed buildings and/or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Conservation Areas? (e.g. will it result in the demolition of any buildings) | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Service Infrastructure | L | <u>ــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ</u> | | | |
| Are there educational or health facilities nearby? | Population | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space, or result in a loss of open space? | Population, human health or material assets | Development of site 24 would be unlikely to impact upon open space or connectivity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| To what extent will development of the proposal affect core path links or other key access networks such as cycle paths, coastal paths and rights of way? | Population, human health, material assets or climatic factors | The Muddisdale Path is adjacent to the northern boundary of site 24. | + | The settlement statement will highlight the presence of the core path, encouraging new development to link into it where possible. | + |
| Is there any opportunity to enhance the green network through for example green infrastructure on site? | Population, human health or material assets | Uncertain. | ? | Any options for enhancement will be highlighted in the settlement statement. Further guidance is available in the Orkney Open Space Strategy. | ? |
| Material assets | ••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••• | | | • | |
| Will development of the proposal minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does it re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover existing on-site materials / resources? | | Yes, new development would link into existing infrastructure and services. | + | N/A | + |
| Is the proposal in the vicinity of a waste management site and could its development therefore compromise the waste handling operation? | Human health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Deliverability/sustainability constraints | | 4 | L | L | i |
| Will the proposal be delivered within the LDP timeframe? Are there any site servicing constraints, e.g. waste water treatment capacity? | Material assets | There are two wind turbines on this site. These would effectively sterilise part of the site for residential development. Site 24 is some distance from the town boundary and the feasibility of connecting | ? | The settlement statement should highlight the presence of the wind turbines. Private foul water | 0 |

| | | to the public sewer is uncertain. | drainage systems will be deemed acceptable for small scale developments, provided that they comply with the current LDP policy on waste water drainage. | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities - is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated? | Material assets and climatic factors | Development of this site would impact not only on Sunnybank Road but also the A965 and Old Finstown Road, Wellington Street and High Street. | Any development proposals should include a detailed transport assessment and options for improvements to the roads infrastructure. | 0 |

| KIRKWALL Source of site suggestion: Submitted in response to the Call for Sites. | | Summary Description: Site 25 is located to the west of the existing settlement boundary, adjacent to the golf course. | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|--|--|------------------------------|------------|-------------------------------|
| MIR SITE 25 | Site Size (ha): 8.14 | Current Use: Agriculture | It is included in Option 2 but not Option 1. This site has not been included in the Proposed Plan. | | | |
| Site assessment questio | n | Related SEA topic | Comment Information available – GIS/site visit? | Scoring pre mitigation | Mitigation | Scoring post mitigation |
| Climate change | | | | | | |
| Is the proposal close to a ran these be accessed by public | | Population and Human health | No, however the site is on the Kirkwall town service scheduled bus route. | + | N/A | + |

| Is the proposal protected from prevailing winds? | | Wideford Hill provides shelter from westerly and south westerly winds but the site is very open to the north and east. | - | The settlement statement will provide guidance on how to achieve benefit from shelter and solar gain through the form, orientation and design of buildings. | 0 |
|---|---------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| Site aspect – does the proposal make best use of solar gain? | | The site has an easterly and northerly aspect. | 0 | | + |
| Is the proposal thought to be at risk of flooding or could its development result in additional flood risk elsewhere? | Water and Human Health | Sunnybank Road has been affected by surface water flooding / overland flow in the past. it is also possible that new development on site could increase pressure on downstream drainage systems, e.g. the Muddisdale Burn. | ? | The settlement statement should note the potential for development to increase pressure on downstream drainage systems. | 0 |
| Could the development of the proposal help alleviate any existing flooding problems in the area? | Water | Uncertain. There may be opportunities to identify natural flood management measures to slow the drainage of water downhill. | ? | Potential to incorporate natural flood risk management techniques will be highlighted in the settlement statement. | 0 |
| Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna | | | | | |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any international or national biodiversity designation, e.g. SAC/SPA/Ramsar/SSSI? | | There is no connectivity between site 25 and any of Orkney's international and national designations. Its development is therefore unlikely to have any effect on their qualifying interests or their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect any locally important designations such as LNRs or LNCSs. | | Site 25 is remote from any of Orkney's locally important designations and its development is unlikely to have any effect on their integrity. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect non designated features – e.g. trees, TPOs, hedges, woodland, species rich grasslands, | | Development of site 25 is unlikely to affect any non-designated features as it is currently managed for agriculture. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| To what extent will the proposal affect Protected Species –e.g. bats, otters, etc.? | | There is potential for otters to use a drainage ditch which extends along the eastern boundary of the site. | ? | The potential for otters to be present in areas close to waterbodies and drainage ditches is highlighted in the introduction to the settlement statements. | 0 |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| How will habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity? | | No, the land is currently managed for agriculture. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Water | | 4 | | | |
| Could the option result in a change of status of a water body or significantly affect a designated water body as identified in the Scotland River Basin Management Plan? | Water | Site 25 is some distance from the town boundary and the feasibility of connecting to the public sewer is uncertain. | - | Private foul water drainage systems will be deemed acceptable for small scale developments, | 0 |
| Can the proposal connect to the public foul sewer? | | | | provided that they comply with the current LDP policy on waste water drainage. | |
| Could the proposal have a direct impact on the water environment (for example result in the need for watercourse crossings or allow the de- culverting of a watercourse? | Water | Unlikely. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Does the proposal avoid impact on Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs), i.e. are there any wetlands and boggy areas on the site? | Water and Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| For large scale developments are there any private or public water supplies within 250m of the proposal which may be affected? | Water and Human Health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Soils | | | | ······································ | |
| Is the proposal on greenfield or brownfield land? Does it result in the loss of high quality | Material Assets and | This is a greenfield site where the land is classed as 4_2 capable of producing a | - | The site is adjacent to the existing town | 0 |

| agricultural land? | Soils | narrow range of crops. | | boundary, so its development considered a sustainable option. | |
|---|----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| Are there any contaminated soil issues on the proposal and if so, will the option reduce contamination? | Material Assets and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is the proposal on peatland and could the development of the site lead to a loss of peat? | Climatic Factors and Soils | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Geology | | | i | | |
| Are there any national geodiversity sites that could be affected by the proposal? | | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Are there any local geodiversity sites or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal? | | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Landscape | | • | | | |
| To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including NSAs and local landscape designations? | Landscape | Kirkwall and St Ola are not within the Hoy and West Mainland NSA. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Does the proposal ensure that development does not exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? Such as current settlement boundaries, existing townscape and character of surrounding area? | Landscape | Site 25 is adjacent to the town boundary and although the adjacent land is managed for agriculture there is scattered housing nearby. However the golf course separates it from other settlement in Kirkwall and this means it has little direct connection with the town. | - | The settlement statement will provide guidance on siting, layout and design, in order to promote development that is | - |
| To what extent will the proposal affect features of landscape interest, including the distinctive character of the landscape and the qualities of | landscape | The landscape character type for this area is described as Urban and Rural Development. | - | sensitive to the local character of the landscape. | ? |
| wild land? | | Site 25 is on the lower slope of Wideford | | | |

| | | Hill and as such, any new development would be very visible from many locations. | | | |
|--|--|--|---|-----|---|
| | | There is no wild land on this site. | | | |
| Cultural Heritage | | | | | |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any scheduled monuments or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any locally important archaeological site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any listed buildings and/or their setting? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Conservation Areas? (e.g. will it result in the demolition of any buildings) | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect any Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to affect the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Is development of the proposal likely to result in the opportunity to enhance or improve access to the historic environment? | Cultural heritage, & links with landscape | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |

| Service Infrastructure | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| Are there educational or health facilities nearby? | Population | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will the proposal affect the quality and quantity of open space and connectivity and accessibility to open space, or result in a loss of open space? | Population, human health or material assets | Development of site 25 would be unlikely to affect the adjacent Kirkwall Golf course. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| To what extent will development of the proposal affect core path links or other key access networks such as cycle paths, coastal paths and rights of way? | Population, human health, material assets or climatic factors | A core path follows the NW boundary of site 25. This path is also listed in the Catalogue of Rights of Way. | + | The settlement statement will highlight the presence of the core path, encouraging new development to link into it where possible. | + |
| Is there any opportunity to enhance the green network through for example green infrastructure on site? | Population, human health or material assets | Unlikely. Although the Kirkwall Urban Design Framework identifies the Muddisdale Path as a green network it is separated from site 25 by an agricultural field. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Material assets | ····· | ······································ | | ۰ | |
| Will development of the proposal minimise demand on primary resources e.g. does it re-use an existing structure or recycle or recover existing on-site materials / resources? | | Yes, new development would link into existing infrastructure and services. | + | N/A | + |
| Is the proposal in the vicinity of a waste management site and could its development therefore compromise the waste handling operation? | Human health | No. | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Deliverability/sustainability constraints | . | ۱ | | ۰ | |
| Will the proposal be delivered within the LDP timeframe? Are there any site servicing | Material assets | No likelihood of connecting into the public sewer. | - | | |

| constraints, e.g. waste water treatment capacity? | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| Are there any vehicular access constraints or opportunities - is the road network capable of accommodating traffic generated? | Material assets and climatic factors | Development of this site would impact not only on Sunnybank Road but also the A965 and Old Finstown Road, Wellington Street and High Street. | Any development proposals should include a detailed transport assessment and options for improvements to the roads infrastructure. | 0 |