|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Settlement:** | | **GIS Site Ref:**  **Pre-MIR Site Ref:**  **MIR Site Ref:** |
| **Site Name:** | **OS Grid Ref:** | **Site size (ha):** |
| **Source of site suggestion:** | **Site History (local plan and planning applications):** | |
| **Current Use:** | **Proposed Use:** | **MIR Status:** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Location Plan** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Photographs (if available)** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Water/Drainage constraints** | **SEA Topic** | **Sources of Information** | **Pre-Mitigation Score** | **Justification** | **Mitigation** | **Post Mitigation Score** |
| 1a | Could the site result in a change of status of a water body as identified in the [Scotland and Solway Tweed River](#water1) Basin Management Plan (RBMP) or may it have an affect on the actions being carried out by the North Highland, West Highland and Argyll Area Advisory Groups? | Water | Scotland’s River Basin Management Plan  [RBMP Interactive Map](http://gis.sepa.org.uk/rbmp)  http://gis.sepa.org.uk/rbmp/ | - - Development would have a significant negative impact on the status of one or more water bodies identified in RBMP  - Development would have a minor negative impact on the status of one or more water bodies identified in RBMP  0 = development is unlikely to have any significant effects on the status any water bodies  + development will have a small or local scale positive impact on the status of one or more water bodies identified in RBMP  + + development will have a significant or widespread positive impact on the status of one or more water bodies identified in the RBMP  ?? - Unknown |  |  | - - Development would have a significant negative impact on the status of one or more water bodies identified in RBMP  - Development would have a minor negative impact on the status of one or more water bodies identified in RBMP  0 = development is unlikely to have any significant effects on the status of any water bodies  + development will have a small or local scale positive impact on the status of one or more water bodies identified in RBMP  + + development will have a significant or widespread positive impact on the status of one or more water bodies identified in the RBMP  ?? - Unknown |
| 1b | To what extent will the proposal result in a direct physical impact on the water environment or provide opportunities to address historic impacts?  (for example result in the need for watercourse crossings or a large scale abstraction or allow the de-culverting of a water course) | Water | GIS  Site visit  Identify non RBMP water bodies | - - Development would have a widespread negative impact on the water environment and/or long term impact which mitigation can not address  - Development would have a localised minor negative impact on the water environment and/or medium term which would be difficult to mitigate  0 = Development is unlikely to have any significant effects on the water environment  + development will have a small or local scale positive impact on the water environment  + + development will have a significant or widespread positive impact on the water environment  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - Development would have a widespread negative impact on the water environment and/or long term impact which mitigation can not address  - Development would have a localised minor negative impact on the water environment and/or medium term which would be difficult to mitigate  0 = Development is unlikely to have any significant effects on the water environment  + development will have a small or local scale positive impact on the water environment  + + development will have a significant or widespread positive impact on the water environment  ?? = Unknown |
| 1c | For large scale development are there any private or public water supplies within 250m of the site which may be affected? | Water | SEPA  Environmental Health Colleagues | - - Development would have a widespread negative impact on private or public water supplies  - Development would have a localised minor negative impact on public or private water supplies  0 = Development is unlikely to have any significant effects on public or private water supplies  + development will have a small or local scale positive impact on private or public water supplies  + + development will have a significant or widespread positive impact private or public water supplies  ?? = Unknown  X - Not applicable |  |  | - - Development would have a widespread negative impact on private or public water supplies  - Development would have a localised minor negative impact on public or private water supplies  0 = Development is unlikely to have any significant effects on public or private water supplies  + development will have a small or local scale positive impact on private or public water supplies  + + development will have a significant or widespread positive impact private or public water supplies  ?? = Unknown  X - Not applicable |
|  | **Climate Change** | **SEA Topic** | **Sources of Information** | **Pre-Mitigation Score** | **Justification** | **Mitigation** | **Post Mitigation Score** |
| 2 | What is the sites overall impact in terms of carbon emissions? | Climatic factors | [Low Carbon Scotland](file:///\\NTPLHQ2\localplans\3_Caithness%20and%20Sutherland%20LDP\SEA\Resources\0115345%5b1%5d.pdf)  Site information  HwLDP  Policy 28 and 72  [Highland Wide Local Development Plan](http://www.highland.gov.uk/yourenvironment/planning/developmentplans/HighlandWideLocalDevelopmentPlan.htm) | - - 500+ houses or 20ha + of industrial or employment land. Proposal is significantly far from existing centres population or similar uses  - - Proposal will cause a significant increase in use of private car (Co2 emissions)  - development 50-499 houses or 3-19ha of employment/industrial land  - Proposal is far from existing centres of population and/ or similar uses  - Proposal will cause a minor increase in use of private car  0 = Small scale proposal 1-49 houses or less than 2ha of employment/industrial land  0 = Proposal located close to existing centres of population and/or similar uses  0 = Type of proposal is unlikely to have any significant impact on C02 emissions/ increased car travel  + Mixed use proposal (e.g. housing, employment and community uses) close to existing centres of population and/or similar uses, reducing car use and enabling use of active travel choices and use of public transport  + + Proposal for footpath, cycleway or open space that will encourage a significant reduction in use of private car |  |  | - - 500+ houses or 20ha + of industrial or employment land. Proposal is significantly far from existing centres population or similar uses  - - Proposal will cause a significant increase in use of private car (Co2 emissions)  - development 50-499 houses or 3-19ha of employment/industrial land  - Proposal is far from existing centres of population and/ or similar uses  - Proposal will cause a minor increase in use of private car  0 = Small Scale proposal 1-49 houses or less than 2ha of employment/industrial land  0 = Proposal located close to existing centres of population and/or similar uses  0 = Type of proposal is unlikely to have any significant impact on C02 emissions/ increased car travel  + Mixed use proposal (e.g. housing, employment and community uses) close to existing centres of population and/or similar uses, reducing car use and enabling use of active travel choices and use of public transport  + + Proposal for footpath, cycleway or open space that will encourage a significant reduction in use of private car |
| 3a | **[Flood Risk](#water3)**  Is the site thought to be at risk of flooding? | Water, climatic factors and human health | GIS  Site info  SEPA  Site visit | - - Most of the site (>50%) is within an area known to flood or within an indicative area of medium to high flood risk  - Some of the site (<50%)is within an area of known flooding or within an indicative area of medium to high flood risk  0 =Site is not located within an identified flood risk area and there is no known history of flooding  + Provision of SUDS or flood management plan could address local flooding issues  + + Provision of SUDS or flood management Plan could address widespread flooding issues  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - Most of the site (>50%) is within an area known to flood or within an indicative area of medium to high flood risk  - Some of the site (<50%)is within an area of known flooding or within an indicative area of medium to high flood risk  0 = Site is not located within an identified flood risk area and there is no known history of flooding  + Provision of SUDS or flood management plan could address local flooding issues  + + Provision of SUDS or flood management Plan could address widespread flooding issues  ?? = Unknown |
| 3b | Could development of the site impact the risk of flooding elsewhere? | Water and climatic factors | GIS  Site info  SEPA  Site visit | - - Development of the site would significantly increase the risk of flooding elsewhere  - Development of the site would result in a small increased risk of flooding elsewhere  0 = Development of the site would have no impact on flood risk elsewhere  + + Development of the site would result significantly alleviate existing flooding problems in the area  + Development of the site would result in minor alleviation of existing flooding problems in the area |  |  | - - Development of the site would significantly increase the risk of flooding elsewhere  - Development of the site would result in a small increased risk of flooding elsewhere  0 = Development of the site would have no impact on flood risk elsewhere  + + Development of the site would result significantly alleviate existing flooding problems in the area  + Development of the site would result in minor alleviation of existing flooding problems in the area |
| 4 | To what extent will the proposal have an impact on or likely to be affected by coastal erosion or natural coastal process? | Water and climatic factors | GIS  Site info  SEPA  [A guide to managing coastal erosion in beach/dune systems, SNH](http://www.snh.org.uk/publications/on-line/heritagemanagement/erosion/images/fig-1.gif)(see map)  http://www.snh.org.uk/publications/on-line/heritagemanagement/erosion/images/fig-1.gif  Site visit | - - The site is in an area of significant coastal erosion and/ or Will have a significantly negative impact on coastal erosion  - Site is in an area of minor coastal erosion and/ or Will have a minor negative impact on coastal erosion  0 = Proposal is close to coast but not thought to affect or be affected by coastal erosion  + Proposal includes mitigation to address local erosion issues  + + Proposal includes mitigation that will address widespread erosion issues  ?? = Unknown  X = not applicable, site is not close to the coast |  |  | - - The site is in an area of significant coastal erosion and/ or Will have a significantly negative impact on coastal erosion  - Site is in an area of minor coastal erosion and/ or Will have a minor negative impact on coastal erosion  0 = Proposal is close to coast but not thought to affect or be affected by coastal erosion  + Proposal includes mitigation to address local erosion issues  + + Proposal includes mitigation that will address widespread erosion issues  ?? = Unknown  X = not applicable, site is not close to the coast |
|  | **Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna** | **SEA Topic** | **Sources of Information** | **Pre-Mitigation Score** | **Justification** | **Mitigation** | **Post Mitigation Score** |
| 5a | To what extent will the proposal impact on [international designations –](#international) e.g. Special Area of Conservation /Special Protection Area/RAMSAR  **Note: If negatively affected then Habitats Regulations Appraisal will be required** | Biodiversity, flora and fauna | GIS  [SNH site link](http://gateway.snh.gov.uk/sitelink) details about why site is designated  http://gateway.snh.gov.uk/sitelink/ | - - development of site would have a likely significantly negative effect on a Natura 2000 site  - development of the site would have a minor negative effect on a Natura 2000 site  0 = Unlikely to be any impact on national or local conservation (including Geodiversity) sites due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + proposal will make a minor contribution to the enhancement of the integrity of a Natura 2000 site  + + proposal will make a significant contribution to the enhancement of the integrity of a Natura 2000 site  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - development of site would have a likely significantly negative effect on a Natura 2000 site  - development of the site would have a minor negative effect on a Natura 2000 site  0 = Unlikely to be any impact on national or local conservation (including Geodiversity) sites due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + proposal will make a minor contribution to the enhancement of the integrity of a Natura 2000 site  + + proposal will make a significant contribution to the enhancement of the integrity of a Natura 2000 site  ?? = Unknown |
| 5b | To what extent will the proposal impact on [other natural heritage designation](#otherdesignations)s – e.g. Site of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserve, and locally important designations such as LNRs and LNCS | Biodiversity, flora and fauna | GIS  [SNH site link](http://gateway.snh.gov.uk/sitelink) details about why site is designated  http://gateway.snh.gov.uk/sitelink/ | - - development of site would have a significant negative effect on the integrity of a national, local nature conservation designation or Geodiversity site or the qualities for which it has been designated  - development of site would have a minor negative effect on the integrity of a national, local nature conservation designation or Geodiversity site or the qualities for which it has been designated  0 = Unlikely to be any impact on national or local conservation (including Geodiversity) sites due to nature or scale of proposal  + proposal will have a minor positive effect on the condition of the feature(s) of the designated site  + + proposal will have a significant positive effect on the condition of the feature(s) of the designated site  X = N/A no designations apply  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - development of site would have a significant negative effect on the integrity of a national, local nature conservation designation or Geodiversity site or the qualities for which it has been designated  - development of site would have a minor negative effect on the integrity of a national, local nature conservation designation or Geodiversity site or the qualities for which it has been designated  0 = Unlikely to be any impact on national or local conservation (including Geodiversity) sites due to nature or scale of proposal  + proposal will have a minor positive effect on the condition of the feature(s) of the designated site  + + proposal will have a significant positive effect on the condition of the feature(s) of the designated site  X = N/A no designations apply  ?? = Unknown |
| 5c | To what extent will the proposal impact non designated interests, including woodlands in the Ancient, Semi Natural and Long Established Plantation Woodlands Inventory, Native Woodland, Tree Preservation Orders or other woodlands, hedgerows and individual trees of high nature conservation or landscape value or species rich grasslands | Biodiversity, flora and fauna | GIS  Site visits  [SNH Trees and Woodland Info and resources](http://www.snh.gov.uk/planning-and-development/advice-for-planners-and-developers/woodlands)  http://www.snh.gov.uk/planning-and-development/advice-for-planners-and-developers/woodlands/  [Forestry Commission Scotland](http://scotland.forestry.gov.uk/supporting/strategy-policy-guidance/native-woodland-survey-of-scotland-nwss)  http://scotland.forestry.gov.uk/supporting/strategy-policy-guidance/native-woodland-survey-of-scotland-nwss | - - development of site would result in significant loss of non designated interests  - development of site would result in minor loss of non designated interests  0 = Unlikely to be any impact on important trees or woodland due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + proposal will enhance non-designated interests  ++ proposal will significantly enhance non-designated interests  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - development of site would result in significant loss of non designated interests  - development of site would result in minor loss of non designated interests  0 = Unlikely to be any impact on important trees or woodland due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + proposal will enhance non-designated interests  ++ proposal will significantly enhance non-designated interests  ?? = Unknown |
| 5d | To what extent will the proposal impact protected species? e.g. bats, otters, red squirrel and badgers | Biodiversity, flora and fauna | [SNH site link](http://gateway.snh.gov.uk/sitelink) details about protected species  http://gateway.snh.gov.uk/sitelink/ | - - A protected species licence will require to be obtained in order for development to proceed  - Protected Species present but licence not required due to ability to mitigate  0 = Unlikely to be any impact on protected species due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + Proposal would lead to a minor enhancement in the connectivity of a habitat corridor or network for movement of wildlife, or of the quality of a BAP priority habitat  + + Proposal would lead to a significant enhancement in the connectivity of a habitat corridor or network for movement of wildlife, or of the quality of a BAP priority habitat  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - A protected species licence will require to be obtained in order for development to proceed  - Protected Species present but licence not required due to ability to mitigate  0 = Unlikely to be any impact on protected species due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + Proposal would lead to a minor enhancement in the connectivity of a habitat corridor or network for movement of wildlife, or of the quality of a BAP priority habitat  + + Proposal would lead to a significant enhancement in the connectivity of a habitat corridor or network for movement of wildlife, or of the quality of a BAP priority habitat  ??= Unknown |
| 5e | Are there any [geodiversity sites](#geosites) or wider geodiversity interests that could be affected by the proposal? | Biodiversity, flora and fauna | Environment Team  [Scottish geodiversity forum](http://scottishgeodiversityforum.org/feed)  <http://scottishgeodiversityforum.org/charter/>  [Northwest Highlands Geopark](http://www.northwest-highlands-geopark.org.uk/)  <http://www.northwest-highlands-geopark.org.uk/>  Lochaber Geopark  http://www.lochabergeopark.org.uk/ | - - development of site would have a significant negative effect on the integrity of a national or local geodiversity site or the qualities for which it has been designated  - development of site would have a minor negative effect on the integrity of a national or local geodiversity site or the qualities for which it has been designated  0 = Unlikely to be any impact on national or local geodiversity site due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + proposal will enhance a national or local geodiversity site  + + proposal will significantly enhance a national or local geodiversity site  X = N/A proposal is not located near a national or local geodiversity site  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - Would have a significant negative effect on the integrity of a national, local nature conservation designation or Geodiversity site or the qualities for which it has been designated    - development of site would have a minor negative effect on the integrity of a national, local nature conservation designation or Geodiversity site or the qualities for which it has been designated  0 = Unlikely to be any impact on national or local conservation (including Geodiversity) sites due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + proposal will help safeguard a national, local conservation or geodiversity site  + + Proposal will improve connectivity between local, national conservation or geodiversity sites  X = N/A proposal is not located near a national or local geodiversity site  ?? = Unknown |
| 5f | How will [habitat connectivity or wildlife corridors](#habconnectivity) be affected by the proposal – will it result in habitat fragmentation or greater connectivity? | Biodiversity, flora and fauna | [SNH site link](http://gateway.snh.gov.uk/sitelink) details about protected species/habitat  <http://gateway.snh.gov.uk/sitelink/>  [JNCC, info about BAPs](http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-5718)  <http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-5718>  [Scottish Biodiversity Forum](http://www.biodiversityscotland.gov.uk/)  http://www.biodiversityscotland.gov.uk/ | - - Proposal would significantly fragment a habitat corridor or network for movement of wildlife, or lead to a significant loss of BAP priority habitat  - Proposal would have a minor negative effect on a habitat corridor or network for movement of wildlife, or on a BAP priority habitat  0 = Unlikely to be any impact on habitat connectivity due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + Proposal would lead to a minor enhancement in the connectivity of a habitat corridor or network for movement of wildlife, or of the quality of a BAP priority habitat  + + Proposal would lead to a significant enhancement in the connectivity of a habitat corridor or network for movement of wildlife, or of the quality of a BAP priority habitat  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - Proposal would significantly fragment a habitat corridor or network for movement of wildlife, or lead to a significant loss of BAP priority habitat  - Proposal would have a minor negative effect on a habitat corridor or network for movement of wildlife, or on a BAP priority habitat  0 = Unlikely to be any impact on habitat connectivity due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + Proposal would lead to a minor enhancement in the connectivity of a habitat corridor or network for movement of wildlife, or of the quality of a BAP priority habitat  + + Proposal would lead to a significant enhancement in the connectivity of a habitat corridor or network for movement of wildlife, or of the quality of a BAP priority habitat  ?? = Unknown |
|  | **Site Deliverability/ Sustainability** | **SEA Topic** | **Sources of Information** | **Pre-Mitigation Score** | **Justification** | **Mitigation** | **Post Mitigation Score** |
| 6 | To what extent does the proposal utilise a sheltered position and provide opportunities for solar gain  Significant slope / changes in level? | Climatic factors | [HwLDP](http://www.highland.gov.uk/yourenvironment/planning/developmentplans/HighlandWideLocalDevelopmentPlan.htm) http://www.highland.gov.uk/yourenvironment/planning/developmentplans/HighlandWideLocalDevelopmentPlan.htmPolicy 28  [HwLDP Sustainable design sup guidance](http://www.highland.gov.uk/yourenvironment/planning/developmentplans/developmentplanpolicyguidance/sdg.htm)  Site visit  Site info | - - Very exposed, with no shelter from landscape or vegetation, north facing slope or over shadowed site  - Minor exposed site with minimal shelter from topography or vegetation. North west facing slope or flat site  0 = Partially sheltered sited by topography or vegetation. East or west facing slope or flat site. Opportunity to provide shelter belts etc.  + Minor sheltered by topography and vegetation south west or south east facing gradual slope  + + Sheltered by topography and vegetation, south facing, gradual slope  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - Very exposed, with no shelter from landscape or vegetation, north facing slope or over shadowed site  - Minor exposed site with minimal shelter from topography or vegetation. North west facing slope or flat site  0 = Partially sheltered sited by topography or vegetation. East or west facing slope or flat site. Opportunity to provide shelter belts etc.  + Minor sheltered by topography and vegetation south west or south east facing gradual slope  + + Sheltered by topography and vegetation, south facing, gradual slope  ?? = Unknown |
| 7a | Road network capable of accommodating traffic generated? |  | GIS  Council Transport Planning Officers | - - No opportunity to connect to existing road network and or Existing road network cannot accommodate extra traffic generated  - Proposal will put existing road network under strain  0 = Proposal would be easily accommodated by existing road network  + Proposal would not generate traffic or require a connection  + + Proposal would improve capacity on existing road network  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - No opportunity to connect to existing road network and or Existing road network cannot accommodate extra traffic generated  - Proposal will put existing road network under strain  0 = Proposal would be easily accommodated by existing road network  + Proposal would not generate traffic or require a connection  + + Proposal would improve capacity on existing road network  ??=Unknown |
| 7b | Are there any access constraints or opportunities? |  | Site visit  Site info  Council Transport Planning Officers | - - No opportunity to connect to existing road network and/ or Significantly constrained access to the site  - Limited opportunity/ large amount of work to connect with existing road network and/or -Constraint to access that can be mitigated  0 = Proposal in close proximity to utilise existing connections and access  + Opportunity to improve local access issues  + +Opportunity to significantly improve widespread access issues  ?? = Unknown |  |  | -- No opportunity to connect to existing road network and/ or Significantly constrained access to the site  - Limited opportunity/ large amount of work to connect with existing road network and/or -Constraint to access that can be mitigated  0 = Proposal in close proximity to utilise existing connections and access  +Opportunity to improve local access issues  + + Opportunity to significantly improve widespread access issues  ?? = Unknown |
| 8a | Is the site close to a range of facilities? Can these be accessed by active travel or public transport? | Climatic factors and human health | GIS  Site visit | - - Not within walking distance of any facilities or public transport links to facilities. No scope for future walking or public transport connections  - Not within walking distance of any facilities or public transport links to facilities. Some scope for future walking or public transport connections  0 = Proposal within reasonable walking distance to limited local facilities/public transport connections  + Within walking distance to frequent bus services to a range of destinations and a range of small shops including a convenience store. E.g. hairdressers, hot food take away (medium or small service centre)  + + Within walking distance of large service centre containing a wide range of large services such as supermarket, pub, restaurant, wide choice of shops, secondary school, railway station and bus services  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - Not within walking distance of any facilities or public transport links to facilities. No scope for future walking or public transport connections  - Not within walking distance of any facilities or public transport links to facilities. Some scope for future walking or public transport connections  0 = Proposal within reasonable walking distance to limited local facilities/public transport connections  + Within walking distance to frequent bus services to a range of destinations and a range of small shops including a convenience store. E.g. hairdressers, hot food take away (medium or small service centre)  + + Within walking distance of large service centre containing a wide range of large services such as supermarket, pub, restaurant, wide choice of shops, secondary school, railway station and bus services  ?? = Unknown |
| 8b | Education  Is there capacity in relevant primary school and secondary school? | Population and human health or material assets | GIS (catchment area)  [School roll forecasts](http://www.highland.gov.uk/yourcouncil/highlandfactsandfigures/schoolrollforecasts.htm)  http://www.highland.gov.uk/yourcouncil/highlandfactsandfigures/schoolrollforecasts.htm | - - primary and/or secondary school are at or over actual or forecasted capacity and there is no scope for an extension  - primary and/or secondary school are at or over actual or forecasted capacity but there is scope for an extension  0 = primary and/or secondary school have sufficient spare capacity to accommodate additional pupils arising from development  + primary and/or secondary school are under capacity and/or forecasted to be under capacity and development will help to sustain school/s  + + primary and/or secondary school are significant under capacity and/or forecasted to be significantly under capacity and development is needed to help sustain school/s  X = Proposal would not directly result in school pupils  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - primary and/or secondary school are at or over actual or forecasted capacity and there is no scope for an extension  - primary and/or secondary school are at or over actual or forecasted capacity but there is scope for an extension  0 = primary and/or secondary school have sufficient spare capacity to accommodate additional pupils arising from development  + primary and/or secondary school are under capacity and/or forecasted to be under capacity and development will help to sustain school/s  + + primary and/or secondary school are significant under capacity and/or forecasted to be significantly under capacity and development is needed to help sustain school/s  X = Proposal would not directly result in school pupils  ?? = Unknown |
| 9a | Proximity of site from physical constraints (e.g. electricity pylons or pipelines) and/or bad neighbour uses (e.g. quarry, wind farm, landfill site etc.) | Material assets | GIS  Site info  Site Visit | - - Significant servicing constraints such as overhead lines, or pipe lines that can not or would be very costly to mitigate  And/or significant “bad neighbour” constraints within or in very close proximity to the site, that would be incongruous to the development and would cause significant disturbance  - Some servicing constraints that could be mitigated and/or “Bad neighbour” nearby that is incongruous to the proposed use and could cause minor disturbance  0 = proposal is unlikely to be affected by physical or bad neighbour constraints due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + Scale of the proposal will address some localised constraints  + + Scale of the proposal means that widespread servicing constraints will be addressed  ?? = unknown |  |  | - - Significant servicing constraints such as overhead lines, or pipe lines that can not or would be very costly to mitigate  And/ or Significant “bad neighbour” constraints within or in very close proximity to the site, that would be incongruous to the development and would cause significant disturbance  - Some servicing constraints that could be mitigated and/or “Bad neighbour” nearby that is incongruous to the proposed use and could cause minor disturbance  0 = proposal is unlikely to be affected by physical or bad neighbour constraints due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + Scale of the proposal will address some localised constraints  + + Scale of the proposal means that widespread servicing constraints will be addressed  ?? = unknown |
| 9b | What level of work would be required to connect to a public water supply and waste drainage system? | Water/material assets | Site info  GIS  [Scottish Water](http://www.scottishwater.co.uk/assets/business/files/our%20services/asset%20planning%20docs/strategic_asset_capacity_development_plan_2012.pdf)  [Asset Capacity Search tool](http://www.scottishwater.co.uk/assets/business/files/our%20services/asset%20planning%20docs/strategic_asset_capacity_development_plan_2012.pdf) (need full post code or easting/northing info) links to Asset Capacity and Development Plan  http://www.scottishwater.co.uk/business/our-services/new-connections/asset-capacity-search | - - No viable connection to the water and/or waste water network and/or mains electricity  - Connection not available to the network but one may be viable  0 = Public water/waste water and mains connection available on site or within 200m of the site  + proposal will contribute a minor improvement to public drainage or sewerage issues  + + Scale of the proposal means that widespread drainage and sewerage issues will be addressed  ?? – it is unknown whether a connection will be available  X – the site use proposed does not require a connection |  |  | -- No viable connection to the water and/or waste water network and/or mains electricity  - Connection not available to the network but one may be viable  0 = Public water/waste water and mains connection available on site or within 200m of the site  + proposal will contribute a minor improvement to public drainage or sewerage issues  + + Scale of the proposal means that widespread drainage and sewerage issues will be addressed  ?? – it is unknown whether a connection will be available  X – the site use proposed does not require a connection |
| 9c | Is the site likely to be delivered within the LDP timeframe? (this will be influenced by the following constraints: ownership; physical, contamination, deficit funding or infrastructure) | Material Assets |  | - - Site is affected by major constraints which mean it is unlikely to be delivered within the LDP timeframe  - Site is affected by minor constraints which mean it is unlikely to be delivered in the early part of the LDP timeframe  0 = The site is free from major constraints and therefore likely to be capable of being delivered within the LDP timeframe  + The site is free from constraints and at an advanced planning stage (e.g. allocated in existing local plan and/or has planning permission) and therefore likely to be delivered in the near future  + + The site is currently under construction and likely to be completed within the LDP timeframe |  |  | - - Site is affected by major constraints which mean it is unlikely to be delivered within the LDP timeframe  - Site is affected by minor constraints which mean it is unlikely to be delivered in the early part of the LDP timeframe  0 = The site is free from major constraints and therefore likely to be capable of being delivered within the LDP timeframe  + The site is free from constraints and at an advanced planning stage (e.g. allocated in existing local plan and/or has planning permission) and therefore likely to be delivered in the near future  + + The site is currently under construction and likely to be completed within the LDP timeframe |
|  | **Human Health and recreation** | **SEA Topic** | **Sources of Information** | **Pre-Mitigation Score** | **Justification** | **Mitigation** | **Post Mitigation Score** |
| 10a | To what extent will the proposal contribute to the provision of open space, in terms of both quantity and quality? | Population and human health | GIS  HwLDP  Policy 74 and 75  [Greenspace Scotland](http://www.greenspacescotland.org.uk/audits-and-strategies.aspx)  <http://www.greenspacescotland.org.uk/audits-and-strategies.aspx>  [Green networks](http://www.snh.gov.uk/land-and-sea/managing-the-land/spatial-ecology/types-of-network/green-networks)  http://www.snh.gov.uk/land-and-sea/managing-the-land/spatial-ecology/types-of-network/green-networks/ | - - Proposal would have a significant negative impact on quality and/or quantity of open space  - Proposal would have a minor negative impact on the quality and/or quantity of existing open space  0 = Unlikely to have any impact on existing open space due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + Proposal would have minor positive impact on the quality and/or quantity of existing open space  + + Proposal would have significant positive impact on quantity and/or quality of green space  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - Proposal would have a significant negative impact on quality and/or quantity of open space  - Proposal would have a minor negative impact on the quality and/or quantity of existing open space  0 = Unlikely to have any impact on existing open space due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + Proposal would have minor positive impact on the quality and/or quantity of existing open space  + + Proposal would have significant positive impact on quantity and/or quality of green space  ?? = Unknown |
| 10b | To what extent will the proposal contribute to greater connectivity of open space? | Population and human health | GIS  HwLDP  Policy 74 and 75  [Greenspace Scotland](http://www.greenspacescotland.org.uk/audits-and-strategies.aspx)  <http://www.greenspacescotland.org.uk/audits-and-strategies.aspx>  [Green networks](http://www.snh.gov.uk/land-and-sea/managing-the-land/spatial-ecology/types-of-network/green-networks)  http://www.snh.gov.uk/land-and-sea/managing-the-land/spatial-ecology/types-of-network/green-networks/ | - - The proposal would have a significant negative impact on connectivity of open space and/or Proposal is far removed from access to open space/ access networks or there and/or there is no scope for improved connectivity of open space  - Proposal would fragment key access networks or open space and/or the proposal does not connect or relate well to existing access networks or green networks  0 = Utilises or is in close proximity to existing connections  + Improves/enhances green network connectivity, or key access network and/or improved access to open space  + + Proposal would significantly contribute to greater connectivity of open space  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - The proposal would have a significant negative impact on connectivity of open space and/or Proposal is far removed from access to open space/ access networks or there and/or there is no scope for improved connectivity of open space  - Proposal would fragment key access networks or open space and/or the proposal does not connect or relate well to existing access networks or green networks  0 = Utilises or is in close proximity to existing connections  + Improves/enhances green network connectivity, or key access network and/or improved access to open space  + + Proposal would significantly contribute to greater connectivity of open space  ?? = Unknown |
| 10c | To what extent will the proposal facilitate active travel (walking and cycling) comprising paths, cycle paths, coastal paths and rights of way? | Population and Human health or material assets | GIS  Core Path Team  http://www.highland.gov.uk/leisureandtourism/what-to-see/countrysideaccess/corepathplans.htm | - - proposal would result in significant adverse impacts to the existing path network, for example by resulting in the loss of a route or severing a route  - proposal would result in adverse impacts to the existing path network, for example by affecting the amenity of a route  0 = proposal will have no impact on the existing path network due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + proposal provides opportunity to link to the existing path network to reach a limited number of services and facilities  + + proposal provides significant opportunities to link the wider path network to reach a range of services and facilities  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - proposal would result in significant adverse impacts to the existing path network, for example by resulting in the loss of a route or severing a route  - proposal would result in adverse impacts to the existing path network, for example by affecting the amenity of a route  0 = proposal will have no impact on the existing path network due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + proposal provides opportunity to link to the existing path network to reach a limited number of services and facilities  + + proposal provides significant opportunities to link the wider path network to reach a range of services and facilities  ?? = Unknown |
|  | **Waste and natural resources** | **SEA Topic** | **Sources of Information** | **Pre-Mitigation Score** | **Justification** | **Mitigation** | **Post Mitigation Score** |
| 11a | Will the development utilise brownfield land? | Soils and material assets | GIS  [Buildings At Risk Register](http://www.buildingsatrisk.org.uk/)  http://www.buildingsatrisk.org.uk/  SVDLS | - - Development would create brownfield land  - Site development would ignore opportunities to make use of brownfield land  0 = Will not affect brownfield land due to the nature, scale or location of proposal  + Minor redevelopment of brownfield land  + + Significant/large scale redevelopment of brownfield land  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - Development would create brownfield land  - Site development would ignore opportunities to make use of brownfield land  0 = Will not affect brownfield land due to the nature, scale or location of proposal  + Minor redevelopment of brownfield land  + + Significant/large scale redevelopment of brownfield land  ?? = Unknown |
| 11b | Are there any contaminated [soils issues](#soils) on the site and if so, will the proposal reduce contamination? | Soils and material assets | GIS  SVDLS  Contaminated Land Database  Site Info  Site Visit | - - Large scale contaminated soil present onsite  - Potentially contaminated land or small amount of contaminated soil identified on site  0 = No record of contaminated soils on site  + Will remediate minor contamination or small scale contamination onsite  + + Will remediate significant contamination or large scale contamination  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - Large scale contaminated soil present onsite  - Potentially contaminated land or small amount of contaminated soil identified on site  0 = No record of contaminated soils on site  + Will remediate minor contamination or small scale contamination onsite  + + Will remediate significant contamination or large scale contamination  ?? = Unknown |
| 11c | To what extent will the proposal result in the loss of greenfield land? | Soils and material assets | Site visit  GIS | - - Large-scale use of Greenfield land  - Small scale use of greenfield land  0 = Site is not greenfield land  + Proposal will protect greenfield land on a local scale  + + Proposal will enhance the geodiversity of greenfield land  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - Large-scale use of Greenfield land  - Small scale use of greenfield land  0 = site is not greenfield land  + Proposal will protect greenfield land on a local scale  + + Proposal will enhance the geodiversity of greenfield land  ?? = Unknown |
| 11d | To what extent will the proposal allow for the reuse of an existing vacant building? | Cultural Heritage | [Buildings At Risk Register](http://www.buildingsatrisk.org.uk/)  http://www.buildingsatrisk.org.uk/  SVDLS | - - Development would result in vacant buildings  - Site development would ignore opportunities to redevelop existing buildings  0 = Will not affect vacant buildings due to the nature, scale or location of proposal  + Minor redevelopment of existing buildings  + + Significant/large scale redevelopment of existing buildings  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - Development would result in vacant buildings  - Site development would ignore opportunities to redevelop existing buildings  0 = Will not affect vacant buildings due to the nature, scale or location of proposal  + Minor redevelopment of existing buildings  + + Significant/large scale redevelopment of existing buildings  ?? = Unknown |
| 12a | To what extent does the proposal lead to a disturbance of carbon rich soils including peat/wetlands? | Soils and climatic factors | GIS  Peatlands and climate change mitigation  [SNH Carbon Rich Soil, Deep Pear and Priority Peatland Habitats](http://www.snh.gov.uk/planning-and-development/advice-for-planners-and-developers/soils-and-development/cpp/)  http://www.snh.gov.uk/planning-and-development/advice-for-planners-and-developers/soils-and-development/cpp/  Wetlands  [Scotland’s](http://www.soils-scotland.gov.uk/) Soils  http://www.soils-scotland.gov.uk/data/soil-survey | - - Will cause significant disturbance of carbon rich soils/wetlands  - Minor disturbance of carbon rich soils/wetlands  0 = unlikely to effect carbon rich soils including peat/wetlands due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + Small area of carbon rich soil/wetlands reinstated/restored  + + Large area of carbon rich soil/ wetlands reinstated/restored  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - Will cause significant disturbance of carbon rich soils/wetlands  - Minor disturbance of carbon rich soils/wetlands  0 = unlikely to effect carbon rich soils including peat/wetlands due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + Small area of carbon rich soil/wetlands reinstated/restored  + + Large area of carbon rich soil/ wetlands reinstated/restored  ?? = Unknown |
| 12b | To what extent does the proposal directly affect high quality agricultural soils or locally important croft land? | Soils | GIS, James Hutton layer  Crofting layer/Uniform  [Crofting Commission](http://www.crofting.scotland.gov.uk/)  http://www.crofting.scotland.gov.uk/ | - - Will cause a very significant loss of 3.1 or 3.2 agricultural land or locally important croft land  - Will cause a minor loss of 3.1 or 3.2 agricultural land or locally important croft land  0 = Site is not on high quality agricultural soils or croft land  + Gives small scale/local enhancement to 3.1 or 3.2 agricultural land or locally important croft land  + + Gives large scale management enhancement to 3.1 or 3.2 agricultural land or locally important croft land  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - Will cause a very significant loss of 3.1 or 3.2 agricultural land or locally important croft land  - Will cause a minor loss of 3.1 or 3.2 agricultural land or locally important croft land  0 = Site is not on high quality agricultural soils or croft land  + Gives small scale/local enhancement to 3.1 or 3.2 agricultural land or locally important croft land  + + Gives large scale management enhancement to 3.1 or 3.2 agricultural land or locally important croft land  ?? = Unknown |
| 13a | To what extent will the proposal help meet the Zero Waste Plan targets? | Material assets | [Scotland’s Zero waste plan](http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Environment/waste-and-pollution/Waste-1/wastestrategy)  http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Environment/waste-and-pollution/Waste-1/wastestrategy | - - Will have a significant negative effect on a waste handling operation or will cause a significant increase the amount of waste going to landfill.  - Will cause an increased amount of waste going to landfill  0 = No significant impact on the rates of recycling and amount of waste going to landfill  + Will facilitate sustainable waste management at a local scale  + + Will facilitate sustainable waste management at regional level  ?? = Unknown |  |  | --Will have a significant negative effect on a waste handling operation or will cause a significant increase the amount of waste going to landfill.  - Will cause an increased amount of waste going to landfill  0 = No significant impact on the rates of recycling and amount of waste going to landfill  + Will facilitate sustainable waste management at a local scale  + + Will facilitate sustainable waste management at regional level  ?? = Unknown |
| 13b | To what extent is the proposal in the vicinity of a waste management site and could therefore compromise the waste handling operation? | Material assets | GIS | - - Adjacent to waste management site and use proposed will have a significant negative effect on a waste handling operation  - In close proximity to waste management site and use proposed will have a minor negative effect on a waste handling operation  0 = No waste management sites nearby that could be compromised or use proposed will not affect any waste management site  + In close proximity to waste management site and is a complementary use  + + Adjacent to waste management site and is a complementary use  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - Adjacent to waste management site and use proposed will have a significant negative effect on a waste handling operation  - In close proximity to waste management site and use proposed will have a minor negative effect on a waste handling operation  0 = No waste management sites nearby that could be compromised or use proposed will not affect any waste management site  + In close proximity to waste management site and is a complementary use  + + Adjacent to waste management site and is a complementary use  ?? = Unknown |
| 13c | For potential suitable sites for waste management activities (includes allocations for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses) to what extent does the proposal comply with the Planning for Zero Waste section of Scottish Planning Policy? | Material assets | [Scotland’s Zero waste plan](http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Environment/waste-and-pollution/Waste-1/wastestrategy)  http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Environment/waste-and-pollution/Waste-1/wastestrategy | - - Proposal is wholly inconsistent with Zero Waste section of Scottish Planning Policy  - Proposal is partially inconsistent with Zero Waste section of Scottish Planning Policy  0 = site is not potentially suitable site for waste management activities  + Proposal is generally consistent with Zero Waste section of Scottish Planning Policy  + + Proposal is wholly consistent with Zero Waste section of Scottish Planning Policy  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - Proposal is wholly inconsistent with Zero Waste section of Scottish Planning Policy  - Proposal is partially inconsistent with Zero Waste section of Scottish Planning Policy  0 = site is not potentially suitable site for waste management activities  + Proposal is generally consistent with Zero Waste section of Scottish Planning Policy  + + Proposal is wholly consistent with Zero Waste section of Scottish Planning Policy  ?? = Unknown |
|  | **Landscape** | **SEA Topic** | **Sources of info** | **Pre-Mitigation Score** | **Justification** | **Mitigation** | **Post Mitigation Score** |
| 14 | **[Landscape Designated sites](#landscapedesign)**  To what extent will any designated sites be affected – including National Scenic Areas and Special Landscape Areas? | Landscape | GIS  [SNH National Scenic areas](http://www.snh.gov.uk/protecting-scotlands-nature/protected-areas/national-designations/nsa)  http://www.snh.gov.uk/protecting-scotlands-nature/protected-areas/national-designations/nsa/  HwLDP  Policy 57  Policy61  [Special Landscape Area Citations](http://www.highland.gov.uk/info/178/local_and_statutory_development_plans/213/supplementary_guidance_for_planning/13)  http://www.highland.gov.uk/info/178/local\_and\_statutory\_development\_plans/213/supplementary\_guidance\_for\_planning/13 | - - proposal is within or would affect a national or local designated landscape and would lead to a significant loss of or impact on the key features or qualities  - proposal is within or would affect a national or local designated landscape and would lead to a minor loss or impact on the key features or qualities  0 = nature, scale or location of proposal is unlikely to have any effects on designated landscapes  + Proposal offers minor or local enhancement to a national or local designated landscape  + + Proposal significantly enhances the qualities of a national or local designated landscape  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - proposal is within or would affect a national or local designated landscape and would lead to a significant loss of or impact on the key features or qualities  - proposal is within or would affect a national or local designated landscape and would lead to a minor loss or impact on the key features or qualities  0 = nature, scale or location of proposal is unlikely to have any effects on designated landscapes  + Proposal offers minor or local protection to a local designated landscape or the qualities of wildness in the area/isolated cost  + + Proposal enhances a degraded landscape character area and/or offers significant or widespread protection to a regional, local designated landscape  ?? = Unknown |
| 15a | [**Non designated landscape features and key landscape interests**](#nondesignlandscapedesign)  To what extent will the proposal affect features of landscape interest, including the distinctive character of the landscape and the qualities of wild land and unspoiled coast | Landscape | GIS  [SNH Wild Land](http://www.snh.gov.uk/protecting-scotlands-nature/looking-after-landscapes/landscape-policy-and-guidance/wild-land/mapping)  http://www.snh.gov.uk/protecting-scotlands-nature/looking-after-landscapes/landscape-policy-and-guidance/wild-land/mapping/ | - - proposal is of a scale or nature that would result in a significant negative effect on qualities of landscape interest  - proposal is of a scale or nature that would result in a minor negative effect on qualities of landscape interest  0 = location, scale or nature of proposal unlikely to have any effects on qualities of landscape interest  + Proposal offers minor or local enhancement to qualities of landscape interest  + + Proposal significantly enhances qualities of landscape interest  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - proposal is of a scale or nature that would result in a significant negative effect on qualities of landscape interest  - proposal is of a scale or nature that would result in a minor negative effect on qualities of landscape interest  0 = location, scale or nature of proposal unlikely to have any effects on qualities of landscape interest  + Proposal offers minor or local enhancement to qualities of landscape interest  + + Proposal significantly enhances qualities of landscape interest  ?? = Unknown |
| 15b | To what extent is the proposal within the capacity of the landscape to accommodate it? Such as current settlement boundaries, existing townscape and character of surrounding area? | Landscape | GIS  Site Visit  HwLDP  Policy 57  Policy61  Landscape Capacity Assessments  [SNH Landscape Character Assessment](http://www.snh.gov.uk/protecting-scotlands-nature/looking-after-landscapes/lca)  http://www.snh.gov.uk/protecting-scotlands-nature/looking-after-landscapes/lca/ | - - Development isolated and not in an existing settlement boundary and/ or Development of site would land lock other sites or impact on existing connectivity in a settlement and/or proposal fails to relate to current settlement pattern and density  - Development poorly orientated from key services or similar uses elongates settlement and/or Development segregated from existing settlement by barriers such as road, railway line river etc., which could not be or would be costly to mitigate and proposal partially relates to current settlement pattern and density  0 = Due to scale, nature or location proposal will have a very minimal impact on the landscape  + Well connected/ appears to round off settlement, currently accessible with scope for further access to improve integration and accessibility by a variety of modes of transport including foot/ cycle and proposal reinforces current settlement pattern and density  + + Well connected to existing settlement, could help address existing connectivity issues. Site accessible by a variety of modes of transport. Scope to freely permeate into existing settlement and proposal contributes strongly to the settlement’s sense of place in terms of pattern and density  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - Development isolated and not in an existing settlement boundary and/ or Development of site would land lock other sites or impact on existing connectivity in a settlement and/or proposal fails to relate to current settlement pattern and density  - Development poorly orientated from key services or similar uses elongates settlement and/or Development segregated from existing settlement by barriers such as road, railway line river etc., which could not be or would be costly to mitigate and proposal partially relates to current settlement pattern and density  0 = Due to scale, nature or location proposal will have a very minimal impact on the landscape  + Well connected/ appears to round off settlement, currently accessible with scope for further access to improve integration and accessibility by a variety of modes of transport including foot/ cycle and proposal reinforces current settlement pattern and density  + + Well connected to existing settlement, could help address existing connectivity issues. Site accessible by a variety of modes of transport. Scope to freely permeate into existing settlement and proposal contributes strongly to the settlement’s sense of place in terms of pattern and density  ?? = Unknown |
| 15c | To what extent will the proposal be visually intrusive? | Landscape | GIS  Site Visit  HwLDP  Policy 61 | - - Visually disruptive, incongruous and out of character to the surrounding landscape and/ or proposal would be visually intrusive in a valued or sensitive view  - proposal would be visually intrusive in wider general scenery  0 = unlikely to be any visual impact due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + proposal would lead to an improvement to an existing detracting feature in wider general scenery and/ or Type of proposed development fits well with existing development  + + proposal would lead to an improvement to an existing detracting feature in a valued or sensitive view e.g. by redevelopment of derelict /gap site and fits well into the surrounding landscape and land uses  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - Visually disruptive, incongruous and out of character to the surrounding landscape and/ or proposal would be visually intrusive in a valued or sensitive view  - proposal would be visually intrusive in wider general scenery  0 = unlikely to be any visual impact due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + proposal would lead to an improvement to an existing detracting feature in wider general scenery and/ or Type of proposed development fits well with existing development  + + proposal would lead to an improvement to an existing detracting feature in a valued or sensitive view e.g. by redevelopment of derelict /gap site and fits well into the surrounding landscape and land uses  ?? = Unknown |
|  | **Cultural Heritage** | **SEA Topic** | **Sources of Information** | **Pre-Mitigation Score** | **Justification** | **Mitigation** | **Post Mitigation Score** |
| 16a | To what extent will the proposal affect any [scheduled monuments](http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/index/heritage/searchmonuments.htm) or their setting? | Cultural heritage | GIS  [Historic Scotland Scheduled monument](http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/searchmonuments)  <http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/searchmonuments>  [Highland Council HER](http://her.highland.gov.uk/favicon.ico)  http://her.highland.gov.uk/  Site Visit  [RCAHMS (Canmore)](http://www.rcahms.gov.uk/canmore.html)  [Database](http://www.rcahms.gov.uk/canmore.html)  http://www.rcahms.gov.uk/canmore.html | - - Development of site would lead to loss or major alteration of components of a scheduled monument or its setting  - Development of site would have a minor negative impact on a scheduled monument and/or its wider setting  0 = Will not impact any locally important scheduled monuments due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + Proposal would result in minor renovation/regeneration of a scheduled monument and/or proposal will enable better access to a scheduled monument and/or minor enhancement of the setting of a scheduled monument  + + Large-scale redevelopment and reuse of a degraded scheduled monument and/or major enhancement of the setting of a scheduled monument  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - Development of site would lead to loss or major alteration of components of a scheduled monument or its setting  - Development of site would have a minor negative impact on a scheduled monuments and/or its wider setting  0 = Will not impact any locally important scheduled monuments due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + Proposal would result in minor renovation/regeneration of a scheduled monument and/or proposal will enable better access to a scheduled monument and/or minor enhancement of the setting of a scheduled monument  + + Large-scale redevelopment and reuse of a degraded scheduled monument and/or major enhancement of the setting of a scheduled monument  ?? = Unknown |
| 16b | To what extent will the proposal affect any locally important [archaeological site](http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/index/heritage/archaeology.htm)s?  ([www.rcahms.gov.uk/canmore.html](http://www.rcahms.gov.uk/canmore.html)) | Cultural Heritage | [Highland Council HER](http://her.highland.gov.uk/favicon.ico)  http://her.highland.gov.uk/  [RCAHMS (Canmore)](http://www.rcahms.gov.uk/canmore.html)  [Database](http://www.rcahms.gov.uk/canmore.html)  http://www.rcahms.gov.uk/canmore.html | - - Development of site would lead to loss or major alteration of components of a locally important archaeological site or its setting  - Development of site would have a minor negative impact on a locally important archaeological site and/or its wider setting  0 = Will not impact any locally important archaeological sites due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + Proposal would result in minor renovation/regeneration of locally important archaeological sites and/or proposal will enable better access to locally important archaeological sites and/or minor enhancement of the setting of a locally important archaeological site  + + Large-scale redevelopment and reuse a locally important archaeological site and/or enhancement of the setting of locally important archaeological site  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - Development of site would lead to loss or major alteration of components of a locally important archaeological site or its setting  - Development of site would have a minor negative impact on a locally important archaeological site and/or its wider setting  0 = Will not impact any locally important archaeological sites due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + Proposal would result in minor renovation/regeneration of locally important archaeological sites and/or proposal will enable better access to locally important archaeological sites and/or minor enhancement of the setting of a locally important archaeological site  + + Large-scale redevelopment and reuse a locally important archaeological site and/or enhancement of the setting of locally important archaeological site  ?? = Unknown |
| 16c | To what extent will the proposal affect any listed buildings and/or their [setting](http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/managingchange)? | Cultural heritage | GIS  [Historic Scotland listed buildings](http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/historicandlistedbuildings)  http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/historicandlistedbuildings  Pastmap | - - Development of site would lead to loss or major alteration of components of a listed building and/or its setting  - Development of site would have a minor negative impact on a listed building and/or its wider setting  0 = Will not impact any listed buildings due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + Renovation/regeneration of listed buildings lying empty/ at risk + and or proposal will enable better access to listed building and or minor enhancement of the setting of a listed building  + + Large-scale redevelopment and reuse of a listed building and/or enhancement of the setting of a listed building  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - Development of site would lead to loss or major alteration of components of a listed building and/or its setting  - Development of site would have a minor negative impact on a listed building and/or its wider setting  0 = Will not impact any listed buildings due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + Renovation/regeneration of listed buildings lying empty/ at risk + and or proposal will enable better access to listed building and or minor enhancement of the setting of a listed building  + + Large-scale redevelopment and reuse of a listed building and/or enhancement of the setting of a listed building  ?? = Unknown |
| 16d | To what extent will the proposal affect any Conservation Areas? (e.g. will it result in the demolition of any buildings or significant new development within a Conservation Area) | Cultural heritage | GIS  Site Visit  Site Info  Historic Environment team  [Highland Council Conservation areas](http://www.highland.gov.uk/yourenvironment/conservation)  http://www.highland.gov.uk/yourenvironment/conservation/ | - - Development of site would lead to loss or major alteration of components of a conservation area or its setting  - Development of site would have a minor negative impact on a conservation area and/or its wider setting  0 = Will not impact any conservation areas due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + Proposal will result in minor renovation/regeneration of a conservation area and /or will enable better access to a conservation area  + + Proposal will result in large-scale regeneration or a conservation area  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - Development of site would lead to loss or major alteration of components of a conservation area or its setting  - Development of site would have a minor negative impact on a conservation area and/or its wider setting  0 = Will not impact any conservation areas due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + Proposal will result in minor renovation/regeneration of a conservation area and /or will enable better access to a conservation area  + + Proposal will result in large-scale regeneration or a conservation area  ?? = Unknown |
| 16e | To what extent will the proposal affect any Inventory [Garden and Designed Landscape](http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/index/heritage/gardens.htm)? | Cultural heritage | GIS  Site Visit  Historic Scotland [Nationally important Gardens and designed landscapes](http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/index/heritage/gardens.htm)  http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/index/heritage/gardens.htm | - - Development of site would lead to loss or major alteration of components of a garden and designed landscape or its setting  - Development of site would have a minor negative impact on a garden or designed landscape and/or its wider setting  0 = Will not impact any garden or designed landscape due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + Proposal will result in minor renovation/regeneration of a garden and designed landscape and /or will enable better access to a garden and designed landscape  + + Proposal will result in large scale renovation/regeneration of a garden and designed landscape and /or will significantly improve access to a garden and designed landscape  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - Development of site would lead to loss or major alteration of components of a garden and designed landscape or its setting  - Development of site would have a minor negative impact on a garden or designed landscape and/or its wider setting  0 = Will not impact any garden or designed landscape due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + Proposal will result in minor renovation/regeneration of a garden and designed landscape and /or will enable better access to a garden and designed landscape  + Proposal will result in large scale renovation/regeneration of a garden and designed landscape and /or will significantly improve access to a garden and designed landscape  ?? = Unknown |
| 16f | To what extent will the proposal affect any [Inventory Historic Battlefield](http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/index/heritage/battlefields.htm)? | Cultural heritage | GIS  Site Visit  [Historic Scotland Battlefields](http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/index/heritage/battlefields.htm)  http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/index/heritage/battlefields.htm | - - Development of site would lead to loss or major alteration of components of a historic battlefield or its setting  - Development of site would have a minor negative impact on a historic battlefield and/or its wider setting  0= Will not impact any historic battlefield due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + Proposal will result in minor renovation/regeneration of a historic battlefield and /or will enable better access to a historic battlefield  + + Proposal will result in large scale renovation/regeneration of a historic battlefield and /or will significantly improve access to a historic battlefield  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - Development of site would lead to loss or major alteration of components of a historic battlefield or its setting  - Development of site would have a minor negative impact on a historic battlefield and/or its wider setting  0= Will not impact any historic battlefield due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + Proposal will result in minor renovation/regeneration of a historic battlefield and /or will enable better access to a historic battlefield  + + Proposal will result in large scale renovation/regeneration of a historic battlefield and /or will significantly improve access to a historic battlefield  ?? = Unknown |
| 16g | To what extent will the proposal affect any [World Heritage Sites](http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/index/heritage/worldheritage.htm)? (including proposed) | Cultural heritage | GIS  Site Visit | - - Development of site would lead to loss or major alteration of components of a World Heritage Sites or its setting  - Development of site would have a minor negative impact on a World Heritage Site and/or its wider setting  0= Will not impact any World Heritage Sites due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + Proposal will result in minor renovation/regeneration of a World Heritage Site and /or will enable better access to a World Heritage Site  + + Proposal will result in large scale renovation/regeneration of a World Heritage Sites and /or will significantly improve access to a World Heritage Site  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - Development of site would lead to loss or major alteration of components of a World Heritage Sites or its setting  - Development of site would have a minor negative impact on a World Heritage Site and/or its wider setting  0= Will not impact any World Heritage Sites due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + Proposal will result in minor renovation/regeneration of a World Heritage Site and /or will enable better access to a World Heritage Site  + + Proposal will result in large scale renovation/regeneration of a World Heritage Sites and /or will significantly improve access to a World Heritage Site  ?? = Unknown |
| 16h | To what extent will the proposal result in the [opportunity to improve access](http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/index/heritage/valuingourheritage.htm) to the historic environment? | Cultural heritage | GIS  Site Visit | - - Development of site would have a significant negative impact on access to historic environment features within or close by the site  - Development of site would have a minor negative impact on access to historic environment features within or close by the site  0 = Development would not affect access to the historic environment due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + Proposal will result in minor access improvements to the historic environment features within or close to the site  + + Proposal will result in significant access improvements to the historic environment features within or close to the site  ?? = Unknown |  |  | - - Development of site would have a significant negative impact on access to historic environment features within or close by the site  - Development of site would have a minor negative impact on access to historic environment features within or close by the site  0 = Development would not affect access to the historic environment due to nature, scale or location of proposal  + Proposal will result in minor access improvements to the historic environment features within or close to the site  + + Proposal will result in significant access improvements to the historic environment features within or close to the site  ?? = Unknown |