



EAST AYRSHIRE COUNCIL

# **Local Development Plan 2**

# Environmental Report

2024



Consultation Authority:	Site Ref (MIR):	Site Ref (LDP2): If applicable	Comments by Consultation Authority on Sites:	LDP2 Outcome:
<b>All settlements</b>				
SEPA	1-71 (All PIP sites)		We are satisfied that all of these 74 sites can be progressed to the Proposed Plan. We therefore consider the PIP sites brought forward <b>to be appropriate</b> . Please see the SEPA LDP spreadsheet for detailed flood risk, water environment, river basin management planning, and co-location comments.	SEPA's comments and flood risk maps have been taken into account in the SEA and site selection process. As outlined within their response, sites can be progressed into the LDP2.
<b>Auchinleck</b>				
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	1	AL-B1(O) (Partially)	The western part of site is located within the Dumfries House GDL. However, this part of the GDL has been physically and visually separated from the core of the GDL by the bypass. We would not object to the principle of development in this location, but would recommend increasing the planting around the site to reduce the visual impact of the development	Site allocated within LDP2 as business and industry development opportunity.
<b>Crosshouse</b>				
Transport Scotland (TS)	10	N/A	This development site is located some distance from the trunk road, however, the scale of development and ease of access via the A71 to the A77(T) Bellfield Interchange could impact on the safety and free flow of traffic on the trunk road. TS would need to understand any potential impact at Bellfield.	Site excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.
NatureScot	10	N/A	This is a very large, prominent site located west of Crosshouse, out with the settlement boundary. The site rises towards the centre at the country road running north-south with views to the site from both Crosshouse and Springside. Development of this site would result in significant adverse landscape and visual impacts, eroding the rural setting. It would also undermine the settlement boundaries as development would result in the coalescence of Crosshouse and Springside in North Ayrshire.  On the basis of the above, we consider that this site should not be allocated in the Local Development Plan 2.	Site excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	8: Holmes Farm,	CH-H2	Potential effects on traditional farm steading buildings on site have not been assessed. <a href="https://canmore.org.uk/site/203945/holm">https://canmore.org.uk/site/203945/holm</a>	Site allocated within LDP2 as residential development opportunity.

	Irvine Road			
<b>Darvel</b>				
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	14	N/A	This site is adjacent to GDL00252 Lanfine. Potential effects on the GDL have not been assessed. Our advice is that if taken forward, mitigation should ensure that development is not visible in views from house and core of the GDL.	Site excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.
Scottish Water	59	DA-H2	Stewarton WWTW does not serve this settlement. This development is in the catchment for Priestland ST 1 and a Growth Project will be required to provide sufficient capacity. It is strongly recommended that the developer contact Scottish Water as early as possible to discuss this development. There is sufficient water capacity at the WTW.	The site has been allocated as a residential development opportunity.
<b>Drongan</b>				
Scottish Water	15	DG-H2	Capacity is available at Drongan WWTW and a Growth Project will not be required.	Site allocated within LDP2 as residential development opportunity.
Scottish Water	16	DG-H1	Capacity is available at Drongan WWTW and a Growth Project will not be required.	Site allocated within LDP2 as residential development opportunity.
Scottish Water	17.1	N/A	Capacity is available at Drongan WWTW and a Growth Project will not be required.	Site(s) excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site(s).
Scottish Water	17.2	N/A	Capacity is available at Drongan WWTW and a Growth Project will not be required.	Site(s) excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site(s).
Scottish Water	17.3	N/A	Capacity is available at Drongan WWTW and a Growth Project will not be required.	Site(s) excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site(s).
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	18	N/A	Sites 3, 11, 70 and 18: These sites all have listed buildings within their boundaries. We are content with the principle of development on the basis that the listed building would be retained and that development would respect the setting of the building.	Excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.
<b>Fenwick &amp; Laigh Fenwick</b>				
Transport Scotland (TS)	21.1 & 21.2	N/A	There is potential for impact on the M77 interchange due to the proximity of the development access to the southbound off-slip; and in particular the lack of forward visibility for traffic on the slip road to right turning traffic on the	Site(s) excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site(s).

			B778. Limited opportunity for alternative access location; based on the site area indicated.	
Fenwick Community Council	21.1	N/A	This site has been designated as brownfield. This land has never been subject to development or any use other than agriculture. The land type should be reclassified as greenfield. The boundary drawn on this site includes part of the yard belonging to 75 Main Road. The owner of this premises has not and would not consent to their property being used for this development. Development of this site is for SuDS relating to the proposed development of 21.2, therefore all comments on site 21.2 apply to site 21.1 also	Site(s) excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site(s).
Fenwick Community Council	21.2	N/A	This site has been wrongly classified as brownfield and vacant. Apart from a brief re-purposing during the construction of the M77 it has always been farmland and has recently been used to graze sheep and to produce silage for winter feed. The access road is directly opposite the motorway off ramp creating a potential congestion point and safety hazard. Houses built on this site would be directly beside the motorway on ramp. • Noise pollution will be unacceptably high not only from the motorway, but also from vehicles accelerating to join it. • Air pollution and particulate levels will be very high, especially since the M77 is a main trunk route for HGV traffic. • The prevailing wind blows from the motorway over this site increasing noise and pollution This field acts as a green barrier/buffer between the Conservation area of the village and the adjacent motorway. The green belt that surrounds the village is critical to maintaining the rural characteristic of the village, building on this site would break that belt. Building on this site would have a negative visual impact on the adjacent conservation area, undermining its appearance and rural character. It should be noted that existing road noise is already a significant concern for residents of Main Road and there is a strong desire to see further tree planting along the motorway edge of this site to mitigate this.	Site(s) excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site(s).
Fenwick Community Council	22	N/A	This site is prime agricultural farmland located within the Rural Protection Area. There is no local evidence to support there ever having been a petrol station located on this site. Should this be proved otherwise, contamination of the land would be a valid concern. The site is located on a landmark hillside. Development of this site would have a detrimental and dominant visual impact on the landscape which would be out of character with the local area. Road access to this site from Kirkton Road narrows significantly after the junction with Raith Road with no public footpath. Road widening and footpath provision would require the unwelcome removal of long-established trees and would significantly change the character of this part of the village. Part of the site boundaries Glenraig Terrace which is	Site(s) excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site(s).

			privately owned and it is likely that no access would be available, reducing the opportunity for any development to integrate with the existing settlement. The site is also adjacent to the notorious accident blackspot and blind corner at the junction with Wyllieland Farm - additional traffic would be a concern	
Fenwick Community Council	23	N/A	This site comprises a flood plain for the majority of the site with a steep banking along its eastern extent. The steep banking is too steep to build on, and provides insufficient area for building at a high level. The majority of the land is low lying flood plain bounded by Fenwick Water and is subject to a high risk of regular flooding and river bank erosion. Furthermore, any changes to the topography of this land would increase the flood risk downstream within Raith Road and the surrounding residential area. Increased peak water flow will also increase the existing erosion problems downstream. Housing here would also increase the peak drainage flow into Fenwick Water which will exacerbate the flow and potential for flooding downstream. The image below depicts an equivalent piece of land less than half a mile upstream from the site on 4 th August 2020. [Images and commentary to images also provided]	Site(s) excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site(s).
Fenwick Community Council	44: Langside	FW-H1	This site is and historically has always been prime agricultural farmland – rather than being ‘vacant land’. The site adjoins the historic conservation area of Laigh Fenwick and forms part of the green space which so clearly defines the settlements of Fenwick and Laigh Fenwick. The site is in a prominent position on the main road through the village. Development of this site would be detrimental to the character of the conservation area and, in both size and scale, would be in stark contrast to the adjacent weavers’ cottages and the linear layout of Laigh Fenwick. The site is adjacent to Fenwick Bowling Club, formed in 1927, which raises significant concerns about potential detrimental impact on drainage and land movement. The Bowling Club is a highly valued village amenity with an attractive and well-maintained pavilion and prized green and should be protected.	Site allocated within LDP2 as residential development opportunity.
Fenwick Community Council	45: Waterslap Road	FW-F2(H)	This site is and historically has always been prime agricultural farmland – rather than being ‘vacant land’. The site adjoins the historic conservation area of Laigh Fenwick and forms part of the green space which so clearly defines the settlements of Fenwick and Laigh Fenwick. The site is in a prominent position on the main road through the village. Development of this site would be detrimental to the character of the conservation area and, in both size and scale, would be in stark contrast to the adjacent weavers’ cottages and the linear layout of Laigh Fenwick. The site is adjacent to Fenwick Bowling Club, formed in 1927, which raises significant concerns about potential detrimental impact on drainage and land movement. The	Site allocated within LDP2 as long-term residential site, and illustrates the direction of future growth.

			<p>Bowling Club is a highly valued village amenity with an attractive and well-maintained pavilion and prized green and should be protected. The land has been fallowed for many years and has evolved into an area of significant ecological importance. The natural habitat is home to a wide range of wild animals and nesting birds. The land is boggy and is attractive to a wide variety of native flora which have become well established over the years. There is no amenity greenspace in Laigh Fenwick with the exception of a very small play area in the Laigh Meadows development. This site has become a highly valued greenspace for local children and dog walkers and is very well used by residents thereby contributing to their health and wellbeing. Waterslap is a narrow, busy road providing access to Raith Road and to local settlements beyond. Due to on road parking by residents living in the terraced cottages, the road is effectively single lane and development of this site would further compromise access and congestion.</p>	
<b>Galston</b>				
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	47	RU-M2	<p>The effects on the historic environment assets on this site have been assessed as positive. Whilst we agree that there is potential for significant positive effects, this is very much dependant on the nature of development which is delivered, and there is also, without very robust mitigation in place, the potential for significant negative effects. Our comments at Appendix 1 provide more details on our view of this proposal.</p> <p><u>Further Detail on options:</u></p> <p>Loudoun Estate: We consider that in principle the site has the potential to accommodate a large scale tourist and leisure destination but that this would be dependent on the scale, design and layout of any proposals that may come forward and the resultant impacts on the GDL, the Castle and its setting. It would also be dependent on the development securing an acceptable outcome for the castle. Our view is that any enabling development on the site should first fund the works to secure the future of the castle, not the development of the tourist and leisure facility. Although we accept the castle could be part of a tourism facility, if enabling development funded the castle rather than the tourist and leisure facility, this would minimise the quantity of enabling housing required. This would reduce the impacts of housing development on the heritage assets at Loudoun. Furthermore, Scottish Ministers determined that the tourist and leisure facility should help fund the restoration of the castle. They gave as one of their reasons for refusal of</p>	<p>Site allocated within LDP2 as miscellaneous development opportunity, with associated site specific detailed Policy TOUR6 which outlines our expectations for the sensitive development of the site.</p>

			<p>planning permission in principle: ‘The separation of the proposed tourism leisure proposals from the proposed housing for enabling funding purposes is not acceptable.’ (Scottish Ministers’ decision letter, issued on 1 February 2019, <a href="http://www.dpea.scotland.gov.uk/CaseDetails.aspx?id=117269&amp;T=20">http://www.dpea.scotland.gov.uk/CaseDetails.aspx?id=117269&amp;T=20</a>) In the conclusions of their report at para 13.16 the Reporters stated: ‘we do not agree that policies Rural Area 4 and Res 13 have been drafted to prevent the consideration of any contribution from the wider tourism and recreation development in determining the scale of residential enabling development. This is because it would be illogical to ignore returns from the tourism and recreation development if the objective is to minimise the number of houses to be built.’ (DPEA Report, <a href="http://www.dpea.scotland.gov.uk/CaseDetails.aspx?id=117269&amp;T=20">http://www.dpea.scotland.gov.uk/CaseDetails.aspx?id=117269&amp;T=20</a>). We agree with this approach, which would reduce the number of houses required at Loudoun and therefore help reduce the impact of development on the GDL and the setting of the Castle.</p> <p><u>Preferred Option</u>                  We broadly agree with the preferred approach. However, we have two specific issues to raise with the approach. • We do not agree that stabilisation is an acceptable minimum for the castle. The use of ‘stabilise’ to us implies a short-term measure which could not be balanced against the impact of the development on the setting of the castle and GDL. We suggest that if this option is adopted, the wording is amended to read ‘...the possible levels of intervention required to secure the long-term future of the castle...’. Our view is that this amended wording would allow for a wider range of options. • Our second point is as raised above. We do not agree that the focus of the enabling development should be the tourism development. Our view is that any enabling development on the site should first fund the works to secure the future of the castle, not the development of the tourist and leisure facility.</p>	
<b>Hayhill</b>				
Scottish Water	26	N/A	Capacity is available at Drongan WWTW and a Growth Project will not be required.	Site excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.
<b>Kilmarnock</b>				

Transport Scotland (TS)	27	N/A	The isolated Sites 27, 31, 32 and 33 represent a significant scale of development that would seek to gain access to the M77 at Junction 8. The current standard of the M77 Junction 8 is considered to cater for a low flow of traffic. Operational concerns include intensification of traffic on the single lane northbound off-slip road, which includes queue back onto the M77, a lack of safety fencing with the M77 and direct slip road access for HGVs. Operational concerns also include intensification of traffic on the southbound off-slip road. Consideration of the traffic implications of these sites may require a step change from the current trunk road infrastructure provision.	Site 27 - Excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.
	31	N/A		Site 31 - Excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.
	32	KK-B6(O)		Site 32 – Southern most part of site 32 (which is contained within Kilmarnock settlement boundary is identified as business and industry development opportunity site.
	33	KK-F1(H)		Site 33 – Not allocated as a development opportunity site. However, is identified as a long-term housing site which illustrates the future direction for housing growth.
Transport Scotland (TS)	35	RU-B2(O2)	<p>Site 35 is the Future Growth Area 4 within the adopted LDP.</p> <p>Site 35 represents a significant scale of development that would seek to gain access to the A77 Bellfield Interchange. Operational concerns include intensification of traffic on current congested approaches to Bellfield roundabout and the potential for queue back of traffic onto the A77(T). Road safety measures have been implemented on the A77(T) southbound as an interim solution to queue back onto the trunk road, but the traffic implications of Site 35 are likely to require a step change from the current trunk road infrastructure provision.</p> <p>While the location is in proximity to the adjacent urban area it is bounded to the west by the A77(T) and to the north by the A76(T). Therefore infrastructure will be required to ensure that the site is able to be sustainably accessed in line with the NTS2 Sustainable Travel Hierarchy. Although the site includes an overbridge of the A77(T) to the south west, the lack of a crossing to the north west of the site will have significant implications for walking and cycling connections to the town centre and it is considered the site would promote the use of the private car contrary to SPP and NTS2.</p>	Site allocated as a business and industry development opportunity site.



Transport Scotland (TS)	49	N/A	Sites 49 and 50 represents a significant scale of development for the local area and has the potential to impact on the operation of the trunk road network at the A76(T)/ Ayr Road traffic signalised junction and at the A76(T)/ site access junction. Although located within the 30mph section of the trunk road, any proposals for the formation of a new junction with the A76(T) should be agreed with Transport Scotland prior to any future planning application.	Site 49 - Excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.
	50	N/A		Site 50 - Excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.
Transport Scotland (TS)	51	N/A	Site 51 for a rail halt – commented previously at ‘call for sites’ stage detailing SPP and need for a DPMTAG based appraisal.	Excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.
NatureScot	28	KK-H4	<p>This is a large site which is located out with the Kilmarnock settlement boundary. The site is disconnected from existing development and contributes to the rural setting of the surrounding area with rolling hills and a network of hedgerows throughout. Development of this site would be a significant extension to the urban character of Kilmarnock and would result in the coalescence of Kilmarnock and Crosshouse, undermining the function of the green belt/settlement boundary. We consider that this development should not be included in the Local Development Plan 2 as currently proposed.</p> <p>However, there may be capacity for development to the north of the B7081 in the southern part of the site following detailed assessment. Should this site be allocated, we consider that a masterplan approach would be appropriate, ensuring cohesion across the site as well as with existing and proposed development. Proposals should promote the integration of green infrastructure and networks offering multifunctional benefits which should be considered at the outset of the design process and align with the principles set out by Central Scotland Green Network Partnership (CSGN). There is an opportunity to enhance the habitat network through green networks and the incorporation of the existing hedgerows and semi-natural woodland. Safe and attractive active travel connections should be provided by proposals, ensuring they are integrated with the strategic network and provide sustainable transport options to both Kilmarnock and Crosshouse.</p> <p>Development should have active frontages with a positive interface to existing and proposed roads. Proposals should ensure a strong landscape framework is provided, incorporating the network of hedgerows and semi-natural woodland.</p>	Site allocated as a residential development opportunity site

NatureScot	29	N/A	This site is located on safeguarded open space on the banks of Kilmarnock Water as identified in the current Local Development Plan, therefore development of this site would result in the loss of amenity open space. It would also adversely affect the functions and amenity of the Kilmarnock Water corridor. The south-west corner of the site is identified as ancient and semi-natural woodland.	Excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.
NatureScot	33	KK-F1(H)	This is a large prominent greenfield site located out with the settlement boundary of Kilmarnock. The site contributes to the rural setting of the area and development here would result in significant adverse landscape and visual impacts. Development here would present a significant extension to the urban character of Kilmarnock and would set an unfortunate precedent for future development, eroding the rural setting and potentially leading to the coalescence of Kilmarnock and Kilmaurs.  On the basis above, we recommend that this site is not allocated in the Local Development Plan 2.	Not allocated as a development opportunity site. However, is identified as a long-term housing site which illustrates the future direction for housing growth.
Network Rail	35	RU-B2(O2)	Network Rail notes that the sites at Kirklandside, Bellfield (ref.35) and Bogwood Farm (ref.51) include proposals for a rail halt and park and ride facility (Bellfield only). We would seek to engage early with the Council in assessing the capacity of the rail service provision to cater for projected demand in travel in these locations. It is essential that these considerations form part of a Transportation Assessment associated with the sites. There is also a need to make clear that developer contributions are essential to ensure the delivery of such facilities and these projects should be identified in the revised supplementary guidance.	Site allocated as a business and industry development opportunity site.
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	27	N/A	Sites 27, 31 and 32: These sites are adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, LB12523 Rowallan Castle and GDL00333 Rowallan Castle. Whilst we consider that the principle of development on some of these sites is likely to be acceptable, it will require robust mitigation measures to be put in place to address potential negative effects. The cumulative effects of developing two or more of these sites should also be taken into account.	Excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	31	N/A	Sites 27, 31 and 32: These sites are adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, LB12523 Rowallan Castle and GDL00333 Rowallan Castle. Whilst we consider that the principle of development on some of these sites is likely to be acceptable, it will require robust mitigation measures to be put in place to address potential negative effects. The cumulative effects of developing two or more of these sites should also be taken into account.	Excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.

Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	32	KK-B6(O)	Sites 27, 31 and 32: These sites are adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, LB12523 Rowallan Castle and GDL00333 Rowallan Castle. Whilst we consider that the principle of development on some of these sites is likely to be acceptable, it will require robust mitigation measures to be put in place to address potential negative effects. The cumulative effects of developing two or more of these sites should also be taken into account.	Site 32 – Southern most part of site 32 (which is contained within Kilmarnock settlement boundary is identified as business and industry development opportunity site.
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	27	N/A	The assessment and mitigation does not recognise that these sites are adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, LB12523 Rowallan Castle and GDL00333 Rowallan Castle. Whilst we consider that the principle of development on some of these sites is likely to be acceptable, it will require robust mitigation measures to be put in place to address potential negative effects. The cumulative effects of developing two or more of these sites should also be taken into account.	Excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.
	31	N/A		Excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.
	32	KK-B6(O)		Site allocated as a business and industry development opportunity site.
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	33	KK-F1(H)	Potential effects on traditional farm steading buildings on site have not been assessed. <a href="https://canmore.org.uk/site/181269/grassmillside">https://canmore.org.uk/site/181269/grassmillside</a>	Site 33 – Not allocated as a development opportunity site. However, is identified as a long-term housing site which illustrates the future direction for housing growth.
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	35	RU-B2(O2)	Potential effects on historic environment asset on site have not been assessed. <a href="http://www.wosas.net/wosas_site.php?id=47390">http://www.wosas.net/wosas_site.php?id=47390</a>	Site allocated as a business and industry development opportunity site.
Fenwick Community Council	31	N/A	If developed this large greenfield site would join Fenwick and Kilmarnock together, while at the same time being completely isolated from the infrastructure economy and community of both Fenwick and Kilmarnock. This is a textbook definition of Urban Sprawl and Ribbon Development, and highlights the pressure for northwards expansion that the Meiklewood/Mossie Business & Industry zone has created. On its own, the site does not have a direct link with existing housing and would be dependent on the approval of further sites to be connected to Kilmarnock. The distance from Kilmarnock town centre is a concern and, with the road network favouring access to Glasgow, it is difficult to see how this site would contribute to the regeneration of Kilmarnock town centre and the local economy. Whilst the site has access to the northbound M77/A77, access to the M77/A77 southbound via Stewarton Road, Fenwick would be more problematic. The safety and sightlines of the M77 off/on ramps on Stewarton Road are already a significant cause for local concern and the additional traffic generated by a development of	Excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.



			this scale would put undue pressure on the road infrastructure and further compromise safe access by pedestrians/cyclists from Fenwick to the well-used A77 cycle path	
<b>Kilmaurs</b>				
Kilmaurs Community Council	36	KM-H4	<p>We would like to raise the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The adverse impact on the amenity of existing households</li> <li>The capacity of adjacent roads and junctions, especially with Main Street where traffic is regularly travelling at 50mph into, or leaving, the village. Sightlines are also a concern at this junction given the hill and parked cars.</li> <li>The local school is approaching capacity with the forthcoming development of 90 residential units on the Irvine Road.</li> </ul>	Site allocated as a residential development opportunity site
Kilmaurs Community Council	37	KM-H2 (Partial)	<p>We would like to raise the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The adverse impact of the proposal on the amenity of existing households</li> <li>The proposal to remove ‘the blaze’, which is an area of designated greenspace, accommodating children’s play equipment and football pitches; this area should be immediately withdrawn from the proposed allocation or an improved replacement provided, of the same or larger scale, and the same or better quality</li> <li>The capacity of Habbieauld Road and the railway bridge which is a major health and safety concern and will not be able to accommodate increased levels of traffic without major upgrades</li> <li>Kilmaurs Primary School is approaching capacity with the forthcoming development of 90 residential units on the Irvine Road.</li> </ul>	The eastern part of site 36 has been allocated as a residential development opportunity site (KM-H2).
Kilmaurs Community Council	38	N/A	<p>We would like to raise the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The speed of traffic entering the village at this location is excessive and sightlines will not be sufficient to safely accommodate a junction with the main road without traffic calming.</li> </ul>	Excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.
Kilmaurs Community Council	39	KK-M1	<p>We would like to raise the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The adverse impact of the proposed allocation on the amenity of existing households. The proposed allocation is located on an area of substantially higher ground than the adjacent houses where the ground floor of new houses would be level, or higher than the first floor of existing houses, resulting in serious impacts on the amenity of existing residents.</li> <li>Access to the proposed allocation is via an existing development where the junctions do not have the capacity to accommodate an increased level of</li> </ul>	The site 39 has been allocated as a residential development opportunity site (KM-H1), forming part of a larger site (formerly 305H).

			<p>traffic and no alternative access is available for a development of an increased scale, required by the allocation in LDP1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sunnyside Road and the railway bridge on Crofthead Road does not have the capacity to accommodate an increase in traffic levels, especially during peak times when it is already almost impassible with traffic.</li> <li>• The local drainage network is unable to cope with the current level of surface water runoff, flooding Crofthead Road, Hillmoss an Irvine Road in several locations during any period of prolonged rainfall, including under the railway bridge which is a through-road for children on their way to school.</li> <li>• The roundabout at Sunnyside Road and Townend cannot accommodate any increase in traffic and is in serious need of review in its current layout.</li> <li>• The school is approaching capacity with the forthcoming development of 90 residential units on Irvine Road.</li> </ul>	
Kilmaurs Community Council	40	KK-M1	<p>We would like to raise the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The adverse impact on the amenity of existing households.</li> <li>• Sunnyside Road and the railway bridge on Crofthead Road does not have the capacity to accommodate an increase in traffic levels, especially during peak times when it is already almost impassible with traffic.</li> <li>• The local drainage network is unable to cope with the current level of surface water runoff, flooding Crofthead Road, Hillmoss and Irvine Road in several locations during any period of prolonged rainfall, including under the railway bridge which is a through-road for children on their way to school.</li> <li>• The roundabout at Sunnyside Road and Townend cannot accommodate an increase in traffic and is in serious need of review in its current layout..</li> <li>• The school is approaching capacity with the forthcoming development of 90 residential units on Irvine Road.</li> </ul>	The site 40 has been allocated as a residential development opportunity site (KM-H1), forming part of a larger site (formerly 305H).
Sport Scotland	37	KM-H2	<p>This site would directly impact on a playing pitch and therefore The requirements of national (and local) policy in relation to the loss of outdoor sports facilities needs to be considered. We request that this requirement is referenced in the LDP.</p>	Site allocated as a residential development opportunity site
<b>Knockentiber</b>				
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	41	N/A	<p>Potential effects on historic environment asset on site have not been assessed. <a href="http://www.wosas.net/wosas_site.php?id=6451">http://www.wosas.net/wosas_site.php?id=6451</a></p>	Excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.

Mauchline				
Network Rail	51	N/A	Network Rail notes that the sites at Kirklandside, Bellfield (ref.35) and Bogwood Farm (ref.51) include proposals for a rail halt and park and ride facility (Bellfield only). We would seek to engage early with the Council in assessing the capacity of the rail service provision to cater for projected demand in travel in these locations. It is essential that these considerations form part of a Transportation Assessment associated with the sites. There is also a need to make clear that developer contributions are essential to ensure the delivery of such facilities and these projects should be identified in the revised supplementary guidance.	Excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	51	N/A	Potential effects on historic environment asset on /directly adjacent to site have not been assessed. <a href="https://canmore.org.uk/site/42705/mauchline">https://canmore.org.uk/site/42705/mauchline</a>	Excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.
Mauchline Community Council	49	N/A	Mauchline Community Council have no issue with the PIP sites put forward for consideration in the Mauchline area, however the development of these sites would put an increased strain on the village infrastructure. The requirement to address the following points would need to be included in any development plan associated with the Machline PIP sites:- 1. Sewage and drainage system. 2. A76 Road congestion and the need for a By-Pass, (especially with the proposed developoment in surrounding towns and villages) 3. Primary School capacity. 4. Surgery capacity. 5. The need for additional shops. 6. Pedestrian Access to proposed Rail Halt. 7. Recreation araes for all age groups. 8. Additional car parking. 9. Additional residential homes for the elderly. 10. Banking facilities required.	Excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.
	50	N/A		Excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.
	51	N/A		Excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.
New Cumnock				
Transport Scotland (TS)	56	RU-B3(O)	Clarification is sought on the site boundary indicated for Site 56, as this does not accord with the location of the application noted. Application 18/0348/PP (below) was refused by EAC on 19 <sup>th</sup> February 2020. Transport Scotland was consulted on the application and had no objection to the proposals, subject to conditions and advisory notes.	Site allocated as a business and industry development opportunity site
Rural Area (outwith settlement boundaries)				



NatureScot	3	RU-M1	<p>We consider these to have potential for significant environmental effects and recommend that they are not allocated.</p> <p>This is a brownfield site and we generally support the redevelopment of brownfield sites. However, it is also an important wildlife site with two nationally rare species and we do not consider development to be appropriate here. On this basis, we recommend that this site is not allocated in the Local Development Plan 2.</p>	The site has been allocated as a miscellaneous development opportunity.
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	3	RU-M1	Sites 3, 11, 70 and 18: These sites all have listed buildings within their boundaries. We are content with the principle of development on the basis that the listed building would be retained and that development would respect the setting of the building.	The site has been allocated as a miscellaneous development opportunity.
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	3	RU-M1	Barony Bing west of Auchinleck (11.2ha) This extensive former bing is known to be of considerable wildlife conservation interest and it has been surveyed by local naturalists and staff of the Coalfield Environment Initiative and the Scottish Wildlife Trust. This interest has been conveyed to East Ayrshire Council with the recommendation that the site should be included in the list of Local Nature Conservation Sites. The proposal that it be developed for business and industry would seriously damage the conservation value of the site and the Scottish Wildlife Trust strongly oppose this proposal	The site has been allocated as a miscellaneous development opportunity.
Sport Scotland	61	N/A	Land at Piperhill, south east of Sinclairston: It is proposed to develop this site for watersports and other outdoor activities. This would be welcomed -by sportscotland.	Excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	61	N/A	Scheduled monument SM5393 Auchencloigh Castle is within the boundary of this site, and robust mitigation measures to protect the scheduled monument and its setting would need to be put in place.	Excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	11	N/A	Sites 3, 11, 70 and 18: These sites all have listed buildings within their boundaries. We are content with the principle of development on the basis that the listed building would be retained and that development would respect the setting of the building.	Excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	52	N/A	Potential effects on historic environment asset on site have not been assessed. <a href="http://www.wosas.net/wosas_site.php?id=13460">http://www.wosas.net/wosas_site.php?id=13460</a>	Excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.
<b>Sorn</b>				
Scottish Wildlife Trust (SWT)	60	N/A	Although the site is within the village boundary it is also adjacent to a woodland strip that forms part of the River Ayr: Damhead to Nether Heilar LNCS. The	Excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.

			continuity of this riparian woodland is important to the integrity of the woodland habitat corridor that extends along a significant stretch of the River Ayr. House building here would have to take account of the need to maintain and enhance this woodland strip.	
<b>Stewarton</b>				
NatureScot	65	N/A	<p>This is a large, prominent and steeply sloping site which sits on the northern settlement edge from Cutstraw Road in the east, however, it is out with the settlement boundary. It is located adjacent to Site 12 (see our comments relating to this site).</p> <p>Development of this site would result in significant adverse landscape and visual impacts, particularly from Cutsburn Brae from the north and from Cutstraw Road from the east. Both on its own and in combination with Site 12, development of this site would also present a significant extension of the urban setting and would set an unfortunate precedent for further erosion of the rural setting. We consider that this site should not be allocated in the Local Development Plan 2.</p>	Excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.
NatureScot	66	N/A	<p>This is a prominent site located out with the settlement boundary which defines the landscape setting and gateway to Stewarton from the east along Cutstraw Road. The site is disconnected from Stewarton and also contributes to the rural landscape setting of the wider area. There is a band of semi-natural woodland in the south-west corner of site.</p> <p>On its own, and particularly in combination with Site 21, development of this site would lead to a significant urban extension to Stewarton, adversely affecting the rural landscape setting. We also consider that development would also set an unfortunate precedent for further development to the east of Stewarton, resulting in incremental erosion of the rural setting.</p> <p>On the basis of the above, we consider that this site should not be allocated in the Local Development Plan 2</p>	Excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	70	N/A	Sites 3, 11, 70 and 18: These sites all have listed buildings within their boundaries. We are content with the principle of development on the basis that the listed building would be retained and that development would respect the setting of the building.	Excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.

Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	65	N/A	Potential effects on historic environment asset on site have not been assessed. <a href="http://www.wosas.net/wosas_site.php?id=69182">http://www.wosas.net/wosas_site.php?id=69182</a>	Excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	70	N/A	Potential effects on listed buildings on site have not been assessed. <a href="http://portal.historicenvironment.scot/designation/LB41079">http://portal.historicenvironment.scot/designation/LB41079</a>	Excluded from LDP2. Not allocated as a development opportunity site.





East Ayrshire Council  
Comhairle Siorrachd Àir an Ear

Development Planning and Regeneration  
Opera House, 8 John Finnie Street, Kilmarnock, KA1 1DD  
Email: [localdevelopmentplans@east-ayrshire.gov.uk](mailto:localdevelopmentplans@east-ayrshire.gov.uk)

Designed and produced by East Ayrshire Council Design Section ©2024