

Scottish Borders Council

Local Development Plan 2: Main Issues Report

Interim Environment Report

Appendix 8: SEA Assessment of the MIR Questions

SEA Assessment Criteria

Significantly Positive	Positive	Neutral	Adverse	Significantly Adverse
++	+	0	-	--

This Annex undertakes an assessment of the vision/aims and the main issues contained within the MIR, in order to identify whether any proposals will have significant effects upon the SEA Environmental Topics. This assessment uses a combination of assessment methods, tailored to what is being proposed within the MIR. The Annex is set out under the following main issues, to correlate and be read in conjunction with the MIR;

- Vision, Aims and Spatial Strategy
- Growing Our Economy
- Planning for Housing
- Supporting our Town Centres
- Delivering Sustainability and Climate Change Agenda
- Regeneration
- Settlement Maps

Vision, Aims and Spatial Strategy

The MIR sets out the vision and aims for the Scottish Borders, these are outlined below. PAN 1/2010 states that the SEA should assess the vision and broad terms, and consider any reasonable alternatives from a purely environmental perspective. The Scottish Borders forms part of the South East Scotland Development Planning Authority (SESPlan), covering Edinburgh and the South East of Scotland. The vision for the MIR is the same as the vision for the Proposed SESPlan and is outlined below:

“Sustainable growth has been achieved by carefully managing those assets that provide the most benefits and by making well designed, successful places where people can thrive. More people are able to afford a home in a place near where they work. A series of cross boundary transport projects have made travel by public transport easier and more people are cycling and walking to work. The economy continues to grow and the region remains an outstanding place to live, work and visit. Communities in the region are healthier and there is less inequality and deprivation.”

This vision will guide the development of the policies and proposals in the Local Development Plan. The MIR sets out a series of aims under the following headings; Communities, Growing Economy and Sustainability. The SEA assessment for the overarching vision and aims is set out below.

Communities

- Provide adequate land for mainstream and affordable housing
- Build sustainable communities which are attractive and distinctive
- Places to live in accordance with good placemaking and design principals
- Encourage better connectivity by transport and improve digital networks

Growing Economy

- Provide an adequate range of sites and premises for business/industrial sites
- Promote economic development opportunities along the railway corridor
- Promote the regeneration of town centres to make them vibrant and viable focal points within our communities
- Maximise and promote the Scottish Borders tourism potential and build strong visitor economy

Sustainability

- Protect and enhance the built and natural environment
- Promote development of brownfield sites
- Make provision for waste management
- Promote climate change adaption
- Protect key green spaces within built up areas
- Encourage better connectivity
- Extend and improve green network opportunities and links

The spatial strategy is set out in SESPlan and requires strategic growth in the Scottish Borders to be directed to three Rural Growth Areas (RGAs); in the Central Borders, Western Borders and Berwickshire. The MIR follows this overall spatial strategy set out within SESPlan.

Question 1: Do you agree with the main aims of the LDP2? Do you have any alternative or additional aims?

The preferred vision and aims are set out above and the associated SEA assessment is outlined below. There is no alternative vision or aims included within the MIR, however the MIR asks the question above and requests suggestions for any other alternatives. It should be noted that any other alternatives options put forward through the consultation process, if included within the Proposed Plan will be included within the Environment Report at that stage, in order to establish whether the proposals would have any significant effects upon the environmental objectives.

Significantly Positive	Positive	Neutral	Adverse	Significantly Adverse
++	+	0	-	--

Potential significant effects on the environmental objectives		
SEA Environmental Topic	Vision and Aims	Comments
Air	+	It is considered that by building sustainable communities, this will have a positive impact and provide better access to public transport, access to services/facilities and employment.
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	+	The sustainability aim includes the protection and enhancement of the natural environment. It is considered that this will have a positive impact on the environmental objectives.
Climate Factors	+	The sustainability aim includes promotion of climate change adaption, which will have a positive impact on the environmental objectives.
Cultural Heritage	+	The sustainability aim includes the protection and enhancement of the built environment and the growing economy aims include the promotion of regeneration of town centres to make them vibrant and viable focal points within our communities. It is considered that this will have a positive impact on the environmental objectives.
Landscape and Townscape	+	The sustainability aim includes the protection and enhancement of the natural environment. It is considered that this will have a positive impact on the environmental objectives.
Material Assets	+	The sustainability aims include the protection of key green spaces within built up areas, encourages better connectivity and extent/improvement of green network opportunities and links. It is considered that these aims will have a positive impact upon the environmental objectives.
Population & Human Health	+	It is considered that by building sustainable communities, this will have a positive impact and provide better access to public transport, access to services/facilities and employment.
Soil	+	The sustainability aim includes the promotion of brownfield sites. It is considered that this could provide for the remediation of existing contaminated sites. This would result in a positive impact on the environmental objectives.
Water	+	The sustainability aim makes provision for waste management. It is considered that this will have a positive impact on the environmental objectives.
Comments	It is considered that the vision/aims will have a positive impact on the environmental objectives.	

Growing Our Economy

Chapter 4 of the MIR outlines the main issues regarding 'Growing Our Economy' and sets out the preferred and alternative options. These options are outlined below, along with the SEA assessment where required.

1. Business and Industrial Land Policy ED1

Preferred Option: Business and industrial sites are placed within one or two new categories. The 'High Amenity Business' category seeks stringent promotion and retention of Class 4 uses. The second category would be 'Business and Industrial' which accommodates Class 4, 5 and 6 uses. For both these classes other high quality complimentary commercial activity may be acceptable as well as non-industrial business/employment generating uses if they enhance the quality of the business park as an employment location. For the second category employment generating uses other than Class 4, 5 and 6 can only be considered where a 'sequential test' has been found that no suitable alternative sites are available and other relevant policy criteria requirements are satisfied. The categorisation of all sites would be reassessed.

Alternative Options:

1. Remove all sites from categorisation and have a 'one size fits all' policy which seeks to encourage Use Classes 4, 5 and 6 but accepts that uses which are ancillary to, or complement, the overall business/industrial site could be acceptable
2. Retention of existing four categories of business sites but re-assess which category each site should fall within
3. Retention of the current policy position, with no change to the employment land hierarchy and categorisation

Question 2: Do you agree with the preferred option to retain the existing 'Strategic High Amenity' site categorisation and amalgamate the remaining categories? Do you agree with any of the alternative options including to retain the current policy position? Or do you have another alternative option?

The MIR asks the question above and requests suggestions for any other alternative options. It should be noted that any other alternative options put forward through the consultation process, if included within the Proposed Plan will be included within the Environmental Report at that stage, in order to establish whether the proposals would have any significant effects upon the environmental objectives.

Significantly Positive	Positive	Neutral	Adverse	Significantly Adverse
++	+	0	-	--

Potential significant effects on the environmental objectives					
SEA Environmental Topic	Preferred	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Comments
Air	0	0	0	0	It is considered that all approaches will have a neutral impact upon air
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	0	0	It is considered that all approaches will have a neutral impact upon biodiversity, flora and fauna
Climate Factors	0	0	0	0	It is considered that all approaches will have a neutral impact upon climate factors
Cultural Heritage	0	0	0	0	It is considered that all approaches will have a neutral impact upon cultural heritage
Landscape and Townscape	+	+	+	+	It is considered that all approaches will have a positive impact upon the landscape and townscape

Material Assets	0	0	0	0	It is considered that all approaches will have a neutral impact upon material assets
Population & Human Health	+	0	+	+	It is considered that the preferred approach and alternative options 2 & 3 will have a positive impact upon population & human health
Soil	0	0	0	0	It is considered that all approaches will have a neutral impact upon soil
Water	+	+	+	+	It is considered that all approaches will have a positive approach on water
Comments	This approach alters the current categorisation of sites and requires a 'sequential test' in respect of non-class 4, 5 or 6 uses. It is not considered that this approach would alter the SEA assessment	This approach removes all the categorisation of sites, however the principle of the approach remains unchanged. Therefore, the SEA assessment of the above topics, remains	This approach is to retain the current policy approach. However, would allow for the re-categorisation of the sites. Therefore, given there is no policy change proposed, the SEA	This approach is to retain the current policy position, with no change to the employment land hierarchy and categorisation. The SEA assessment remains the same as the LDP.	

	of the above topics, compared to the existing policy position.	the same as the LDP.	assessment remains the same as the LDP.		
--	--	----------------------	---	--	--

2. Additional Industrial and Business Land

Question 3: Do you think there are any settlements in which new or more business and industrial land should be allocated, and if so where?

It should be noted that the MIR does not include any site specific proposals at this stage, rather asks for any suggestions through the MIR consultation period. If any sites are submitted for consideration and ultimately taken forward for inclusion within the Proposed Plan, these will be included within the Environment Report at that stage, in order to establish whether the proposals would have any significant effects upon the environmental objectives.

3. Business and Industrial Land in Town Yetholm, Lauder and Kelso

Question 4: Do you have any suggestions for a potential area of land to be allocated in the vicinity of Town Yetholm, Lauder and Kelso for business use, and if so where?

It should be noted that the MIR does not include any site specific proposals within Town Yetholm, Lauder or Kelso, rather asks for suggestions through the MIR consultation period. If any sites are submitted for consideration and ultimately taken forward for inclusion within the Proposed Plan, these will be included within the Environmental Report at that stage, in order to establish whether the proposals would have any significant effects upon the environmental objectives.

4. Delivery of Business Land

Question 5: Have you any suggestions as to how allocated business and industrial land can be delivered more effectively?

The MIR does not set out any preferred or alternative suggestions, in terms of delivery of business land, rather invites comments through the MIR consultation process. If any proposals are submitted for consideration and ultimately taken forward for inclusion within the Proposed Plan, these will be included within the Environment Report at that stage, in order to establish whether the proposals would have any significant effects upon the environmental objectives.

5. Business and Industrial/Mixed Use Land (Additions)

Preferred Option: The preferred sites for business & industrial and mixed use are set out within this chapter

Alternative Option: The alternative sites for business & industrial and mixed use are set out within this chapter

The preferred and alternative options include proposals for; 6 business & industrial allocations, 4 mixed use allocations and 2 longer term mixed use allocations. The SEA assessments of these individual sites are included within Appendix 6 and the full site assessments are included within Appendix 5.

Question 6: Do you agree with the preferred option for the provision of additional business and industrial land/mixed use land in the LDP? Do you agree with the alternative option for mixed use land? Or do you have any other alternative options?

Planning for Housing

Chapter 5 of the MIR outlines the main issues regarding 'Planning For Housing' and sets out the preferred and alternative options. These options are outlined below, along with the SEA assessment where required.

1. Housing Land Supply Sites

Preferred Option: The preferred sites for additional housing, as set out within Chapter 5 of the MIR

Alternative Option: The alternative sites for additional housing, as set out within Chapter 5 of the MIR

The preferred and alternative options include proposals for 12 preferred allocations, 13 alternative allocations and 2 longer term allocations. The SEA assessments of these individual sites are included within Appendix 6 and the full site assessments are included within Appendix 5.

Question 7: Do you agree with the preferred options for additional housing sites? Do you agree with the alternative options? Do you have any other alternative options?

2. Housing in the Countryside

Preferred Option: Retain policy whereby there must be the existence of a building group of at least 3 houses from which a proposal must be considered an appropriate addition.

Alternative Option: Individual houses could be supported outwith building groups provided it is considered the design is of an exceptionally high standard and other policy requirements relating to appropriate setting, design and materials are satisfied.

Question 8: Do you agree with the preferred option for addressing proposals for housing in the countryside? Do you agree with the alternative proposal? Have you any other options which you feel would be appropriate?

Significantly Positive	Positive	Neutral	Adverse	Significantly Adverse
++	+	0	-	--

Potential significant effects on the environmental objectives			
SEA Environmental Topic	Preferred	Alternative	Comments
Air	0	-	In allowing housing outwith building groups, this will increase the number of houses within countryside locations, not necessarily located in sustainable locations. Therefore, this has the potential to result in increased car movements, which will result in increased omissions into the air.
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	0	It is not considered that the Housing in the Countryside preferred or alternative option will have any effect on the environmental objective.
Climate Factors	0	0	It is not considered that the Housing in the Countryside preferred or alternative option will have any effect on the environmental objective.
Cultural Heritage	+	+	The current Policy HD2 covers; conversions of buildings to a house, restoration of houses and replacement dwellings. The conversions part of the policy ensures that conversions are in keeping with the scale and architectural character of the existing building, therefore respecting the existing built and cultural heritage. Part D of the existing policy refers to the restoration of houses and that the siting and design must reflect and respect the historic building pattern and the character of the landscape setting. This ensures that any restorations to properties respect the built and cultural heritage. Part E of the existing policy refers to replacement dwellings and such

			<p>proposals must respect the historical building patterns and the character of the landscape setting, as well as being in keeping with the existing/original building in terms of its scale, extent, form and architectural character. This ensures that replacement houses respect the built and cultural heritage.</p> <p>Overall, the existing policy is considered to have a positive effect on the cultural heritage.</p> <p>The alternative option would not alter the sections of the policy in respect of conversions, restorations or replacement houses, therefore the alternative option would also have a positive effect on the cultural heritage.</p>
Landscape and Townscape	+	+	<p>The existing policy has a clear structure regarding the approach to certain types of building in the countryside, as a result it is considered this brings a positive score to the topic, because a knock-on-effect is that the landscape will benefit from an improved approach to development proposals.</p> <p>The alternative policy approach would also retain the above elements in respect of the conversions, restoration and rebuilding, therefore would also have a positive score.</p>
Material Assets	+	-	<p>The preferred option directs housing in the countryside to existing buildings groups of houses, unless it is for a conversion, restoration, rebuilding or has an economic justification. As a result, additional dwellings are sited near other dwellings and aims to encourage a sustainable pattern of development, in order to support existing services and facilities and to promote sustainable travel patterns. Therefore, the preferred option scores positively.</p>

			In respect of the alternative option, this moves away from directing housing towards existing building groups. Therefore, alternative policy is considered to have a negative effect on the material assets, as it has the potential to result in an increased number of houses located in areas which are not close to existing services or facilities.
Population & Human Health	0	0	It is not considered that the Housing in the Countryside preferred or alternative option will have any effect on the environmental objective.
Soil	0	0	It is not considered that the Housing in the Countryside preferred or alternative option will have any effect on the environmental objective.
Water	0	0	It is not considered that the Housing in the Countryside preferred or alternative option will have any effect on the environmental objective.

3. Removal of allocated sites

Question 9: Do you agree with the proposed existing housing allocations to be removed from the LDP? Are there any other sites you suggest should be de-allocated?

The MIR sets out a list of existing allocations proposed for removal, as set out within Chapter 5 of the MIR. The question seeks public opinion as to whether they agree with this, or whether there are any additional sites which should be considered for removal. If any proposals are submitted for consideration and ultimately recommended for removal within the Proposed Plan, these will be included within the Environmental Report at that stage. It is not considered that the removal of these sites would have any significant effects upon the environmental objectives.

Supporting Our Town Centres

Chapter 6 of the MIR outlines the main issues regarding ‘Supporting Our Town Centres’ and sets out the preferred and alternative options. These options are outlined below, along with the SEA assessment where required.

1. Core Activity Areas

Preferred Option: Retain core activity areas but apply a policy which allows a wider range of uses to be judged on a case by case basis depending upon the performance of the town centre in question.

Alternative Options:

1. Reduce the size of the Core Activity Areas
2. Remove the Core Activity Areas

Question 10: Do you agree with the preferred option? If so, what other uses do you think could be allowed within Core Activity Areas? Do you think existing core activity areas within town centres should be reduced in size, and if so where? Do you think existing Core Activity Areas should be removed altogether?

The SEA assessments for the preferred and alternative options are outlined below.

Significantly Positive	Positive	Neutral	Adverse	Significantly Adverse
++	+	0	-	--

Potential significant effects on the environmental objectives				
SEA Environmental Topic	Preferred	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Comments
Air	0	0	-	It is considered that the alternative option (2) would result in the potential loss of services within the town centre, as a result of the
Biodiversity, Flora &	0	0	0	

Fauna				removal of the Core Activity Areas. This could result in services becoming more dispersed, requiring more reliance on travel, therefore having a negative effect.
Climate Factors	0	0	0	
Cultural Heritage	0	0	0	
Landscape and Townscape	+	0	0	It is considered that the preferred approach to retain the core activity areas but apply a policy which allows a wider range of uses would encourage more diverse uses within the town centres, bringing the opportunity to regenerate or fill vacant and/or derelict units and land. This brings a positive effect on the townscape.
Material Assets	0	-	-	It is considered that the alternative option (1) would result in a reduced Core Activity Area and potential loss of services within the town centre. It is considered that the alternative option (2) would result in the potential loss of services within the town centre, as a result of the removal of the Core Activity Areas. This could result in services becoming more dispersed, requiring more reliance on travel, therefore having a negative effect.
Population & Human Health	++	-	0	It is considered that the preferred option would encourage an increased activity within town centres, bringing economic and quality of life benefits to Borders residents. In addition town centres are accessible by sustainable transport methods.

				<p>It is considered that the alternative option (1) would result in a reduced Core Activity Area and potential loss of services within the town centre.</p> <p>It is considered that the alternative option (2) would result in the potential loss of services within the town centre, as a result of the removal of the Core Activity Areas. This could result in services becoming more dispersed, requiring more reliance on travel, therefore having a negative effect.</p>
Soil	0	0	0	
Water	0	0	0	
Comments	<p>The preferred approach retains the core activity areas, however applies a policy which allows a wider range of uses to be judged on a case by case basis. It is considered that a more flexible approach will have positive effects upon the SEA topics of landscape & townscape and</p>	<p>This approach would reduce the Core Activity Area, however the policy remains the same. As a result of reducing the Core Area, this could result in the loss of retail units to alternative uses within any removed areas. This could result in the loss of services within town centres, having a</p>	<p>This approach would completely remove the Core Activity Areas, which would effectively remove the requirement for Policy ED4. This has the potential to result in the loss of retail and services within town centres within the Borders. This could result in an increased need to travel for these</p>	

	population & human health.	potential negative effect on the SEA topics; material assets and population & human health.	services. Therefore, having potential negative effects upon the SEA topics above.	
--	----------------------------	---	---	--

2. Retail Unit in Berwickshire

Question 11: Can you suggest any site options within central Berwickshire, preferably Duns, to accommodate a new supermarket?

The MIR is not suggesting any sites for consideration at this stage for the retail unit within Berwickshire. The MIR identifies within the 'Town Centres' section that there are concerns regarding leakage of retail spending outwith Berwickshire and it is considered a site for a new supermarket retail unit within central Berwickshire would help reverse this trend. Duns is considered an appropriately sized and located town to accommodate this use. If any sites are submitted for consideration and ultimately taken forward for inclusion within the Proposed Plan, these will be included within the Environment Report at that stage, in order to establish whether the proposals would have any significant effects upon the environmental objectives.

3. Developer Contributions

Question 12: Do you feel the requirement for Developer Contributions to be removed in full, or some town centres, within the Scottish Borders?

It is not considered that this topic affects any of the SEA topics.

Delivering Sustainability and Climate Change

Chapter 7 of the MIR outlines the main issues regarding 'Delivering Sustainability and Climate Change' and sets out the preferred and alternative options. These options are outlined below, along with the SEA assessment where required.

1. Sustainability and Climate Change

Preferred Option: The Council should continue to promote and support sustainability and climate change adaption. LDP policies and proposals should ensure they promote development in the interests of sustainable development and climate change.

Alternative Option: None

The MIR suggests that the preferred option is to continue to promote and support sustainability and climate change adaption, however does not put forward any changes to existing policy. Rather states that LDP policies and proposals should ensure that they promote development in the interests of sustainable development and climate change and welcomes any comments during the MIR consultation process. If any changes to existing policy are submitted for consideration and ultimately taken forward for inclusion within the Proposed Plan, these will be included within the Environment Report at that stage, in order to establish whether the proposals would have any significant effects upon the environmental objectives. It should be noted that Appendix 9 of the Environment Report contains the SEA assessment for the existing LDP policies.

Question 13: Do you support the preferred option? Are there any other matters relating to sustainability and climate change adaption which should be addressed?

2. National Park

Question 14: Do you support the designation of a National Park within the Scottish Borders? If so, which general area do you think a National Park should cover?

The MIR is not suggesting any sites for consideration at this stage, in respect of a National Park within the Scottish Borders. The MIR states within the 'Delivering Sustainability and Climate Change' section, that there is merit in posing a question on the proposition for a National Park, its possible boundaries and operational model through the MIR. Therefore, this does not require to be assessed against the environmental objectives at this stage.

Regeneration

Chapter 8 of the MIR outlines the main issues regarding ‘Regeneration’ and sets out the preferred and alternative options. These options are outlined below, along with the SEA assessment where required.

1. Redevelopment Sites

Preferred Option: The preferred sites to be allocated for redevelopment are set out in this chapter.

Alternative Option: None

It should be noted that areas are identified within the MIR for potential redevelopment opportunities. These sites have not yet been subject to a site assessment, or individual SEA assessment. If the sites are ultimately included within the Proposed Plan, a site assessment and SEA assessment will be undertaken and the findings/any mitigation requirements will be included within the Environmental Report at that stage. The assessment below considers more the wider policy approach to identifying potential redevelopment sites within the MIR and ultimately allocating such sites within the Proposed Plan, subject to full assessments.

Question 15: Do you agree with the proposed redevelopment sites to be allocated within the LDP2? Are there other sites within the Scottish Borders you feel should be included?

Significantly Positive	Positive	Neutral	Adverse	Significantly Adverse
++	+	0	-	--

Potential significant effects on the environmental objectives		
SEA Environmental Topic	Preferred	Comments
Air	0	
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	

Climate Factors	0	No significant effects identified.
Cultural Heritage	+	It is considered that the preferred option of identifying and promoting re-development opportunities across the Borders and for specific sites, brings the change to renovate and bring into use listed buildings and other culturally important sites.
Landscape and Townscape	+	It is considered that the preferred option would have a positive effect on the SEA objective, as identifying and promoting redevelopment options across the Borders gives rise to the potential for the townscape, and feasibly the wider landscape, to be improved as a result.
Material Assets	0	No significant effects identified.
Population & Human Health	+	It is considered that the preferred option will have a positive effect on the SEA objective, as it will improve the quality of Borders towns and provide greater choice in terms of housing, business or amenity land. As a result, there is a positive impact upon the SEA objective, due to positive quality of life change.
Soil	+	It is considered that the preferred option would have a positive effect on the SEA objective, as the redevelopment of existing buildings/brownfield sites would relieve the pressure on greenfield sites for development.
Water	0	No significant effects identified.

Settlement Maps

Chapter 9 of the MIR outlines the main issues regarding ‘Settlement Maps’ and sets out the preferred and alternative options. These options are outlined below, along with the SEA assessment where required.

1. Oxnam Development Boundary

One of the main issues identified within the MIR was the potential for a settlement boundary around Oxnam. A proposed settlement boundary has been included within the MIR and a SEA assessment of such a proposal has been undertaken in the table below. It should be noted that no alternative option has been included within the MIR. However, the question below invites potential alternative options to be submitted for consideration. If an alternative proposal is put forward and ultimately included within the Proposed Plan, a SEA for that proposal will be undertaken and included within the Environmental Report at that stage.

Question 16: Do you support the principal of Oxnam becoming a recognised settlement within the LDP? Do you agree with the proposed settlement plan and its boundaries?

Significantly Positive	Positive	Neutral	Adverse	Significantly Adverse
++	+	0	-	--

Potential significant effects on the environmental objectives		
SEA Environmental Topic	Oxnam Settlement Boundary	Comments
Air	0	
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	
Climate Factors	0	
Cultural Heritage	0	
Landscape and Townscape	0	
Material Assets	0	

Population & Human Health	0	No significant effects identified.
Soil	0	
Water	0	

2. Newcastleton Conservation Area

One of the main issues identified within the MIR was the reduction in the Core Frontage Area within the Newcastleton Conservation Area. A proposed reduction in the area has been included within the MIR and a SEA assessment of such a proposal has been undertaken in the table below. It should be noted that no alternative option has been included within the MIR.

Question 16 : Do you support the removal of the Core Frontage designation within the Newcastleton Conservation Area?

Significantly Positive	Positive	Neutral	Adverse	Significantly Adverse
++	+	0	-	--

Potential significant effects on the environmental objectives		
SEA Environmental Topic	Preferred	Comments
Air	0	No significant effects identified.
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	0	
Climate Factors	0	
Cultural Heritage	0	

It is considered that the removal of the core frontage area would have a neutral effect upon the wider Newcastleton Conservation Area. It is acknowledged that over time inappropriate replacement window types whose appearance deviates from traditional designs has considerably diluted the quality of this particular aspect of Newcastleton Conservation Area. This means that it would retain its Conservation status due to its unique layout but there would be a less stringent approach with regards to window replacements within the Core

		Frontage designation. Given the loss of the traditional window character within the area over years, it is not considered that the proposal would result in an adverse effect upon the SEA objective.
Landscape and Townscape	0	No significant effects identified.
Material Assets	0	
Population & Human Health	0	
Soil	0	
Water	0	