

# East Ayrshire Local Development Plan 2

## Housing Site Appraisal Methodology


### **Appendix 5** (Ward 5 – Kilmarnock South)

Revision 14/06/2022

## Appendix 5 – Ward 5 (Kilmarnock South)\*

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Sub HMA	Rank (of 230)	Score % of TOTAL	Recommendation
KK-X33	Kilmarnock	Ayr Road	Kilmarnock & Loudoun	127	59	Not allocate
KK-H2		Bridgehousehill		103	63	Allocate
KK-X34		Caprington Golf Course		112	61	Not allocate
KK-H9		Maxholm		34	71	Allocate
KK-X35		Treesbank		227	48	Not allocate
KK-H14		Treesbank (Alt)		167	56	Allocate

**\*N.B.** Changes have been made to the scoring of several sites to account for inaccuracies identified after this document was published on **23/05/2022**. These changes have resulted in slight adjustments to the scoring presented in the table above and in a number of sections below.



This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on the behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office (c) Crown copyright.  
 Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. East Ayrshire Council. 100023409.

KK-X33		Kilmarnock			Ayr Road					
Outcome		Not allocate								
Site Ref	KK-X33	Site name	Ayr Road			Settlement	Kilmarnock			
Ward	5	Area (ha)	14.5	Indicative Capacity	404	Sub HMA	K&L			
LDP1 Ref	003MXD	PIP Ref		MIR Ref		CfSI Ref				
Stage 1										
Proximity to settlement		Significant Flood Risk		SPA/SAC/SSSI		Ancient/Native Woodland		Site capacity		
Yes		No		No		No		No		
Stage 2										
Meets spatial strategy	Contribution To Spatial Strategy	Programmed in Housing Land Audit	Marketability score	Planning consent for housing	Interest expressed at Call for Sites	Length of time allocated	Examination report 2016 comments	Site viability and marketability	Recreation value of site	Open space & recreation value
2	2/5	1	5	1	1	2	5	15/30	5	5/5
Flood risk	Biodiversity	Capability for Agriculture	Land and water contamination	Heritage Assets	Landscape Character & Townscape	Coal mining risk assessments	Non-absolute constraints	Distance to primary school	Distance to secondary school	Distance to health centre or GP
2	2	5	5	5	2	1	22/35	2	1	1
Distance to EAC TC/NC (P-LDP)	Distance to bus stop	Distance to train station	Previously developed land	Urban/rural classification	Distance to key town centres	Carbon and peatland	Visual amenity	Landscape study	Sustainability of location	TOTAL SCORE
2	2	1	5	5	5	5	5	2	36/60	80/135
Ranking										
Overall Rank		127/230	Ward Rank		4/6		Settlement Rank		41/51	
Stage 3										
Interest in the development of the site in question has not been forthcoming since its allocation as part of LDP1 and it was not considered to be a suitable site for residential development as a consequence of its detachment from other areas of housing by the existing industrial area. It was therefore considered that the site, currently allocated for a mix of uses including residential, should be deallocated. However, the site in question will remain within the Kilmarnock settlement boundary and the principle of development therein will be considered acceptable in principle, subject to assessment against the policies of LDP2.										

KK-H2		Kilmarnock			Bridgehousehill					
Outcome		Allocate								
Site Ref	KK-H2	Site name	Bridgehousehill			Settlement	Kilmarnock			
Ward	5	Area (ha)	23.8	Indicative Capacity		200	Sub HMA	K&L		
LDP1 Ref	321H	PIP Ref	PIP30	MIR Ref		121MIR	CfSI Ref	CfSI29		
Stage 1										
Proximity to settlement		Significant Flood Risk		SPA/SAC/SSSI		Ancient/Native Woodland		Site capacity		
Yes		No		No		No		No		
Stage 2										
Meets spatial strategy	Contribution To Spatial Strategy	Programmed in Housing Land Audit	Marketability score	Planning consent for housing	Interest expressed at Call for Sites	Length of time allocated	Examination report 2016 comments	Site viability and marketability	Recreation value of site	Open space & recreation value
2	2/5	5	5	5	5	1	5	26/30	5	5/5
Flood risk	Biodiversity	Capability for Agriculture	Land and water contamination	Heritage Assets	Landscape Character & Townscape	Coal mining risk assessments	Non-absolute constraints	Distance to primary school	Distance to secondary school	Distance to health centre or GP
5	2	2	5	5	1	1	21/35	2	1	1
Distance to EAC TC/NC (P-LDP)	Distance to bus stop	Distance to train station	Previously developed land	Urban/rural classification	Distance to key town centres	Carbon and peatland	Visual amenity	Landscape study	Sustainability of location	TOTAL SCORE
2	5	1	1	5	5	5	2	1	31/60	85/135
Ranking										
Overall Rank		103/230	Ward Rank		2/6		Settlement Rank		32/51	
Stage 3										
Planning Permission in Principle to develop the site for around 150 homes was granted in 2020 and the site is programmed in the 2020 Housing Land Audit to deliver homes beyond 2025. Given the proven effectiveness of the site, it was therefore considered appropriate to allocate it in LDP2.										



KK-X34		Kilmarnock		Caprington Golf Course						
Outcome		Future Housing Growth								
Site Ref	KK-X34	Site name	Caprington Golf Course			Settlement	Kilmarnock			
Ward	5	Area (ha)	16.0	Indicative Capacity	208	Sub HMA	K&L			
LDP1 Ref	320H	PIP Ref		MIR Ref	150MIR	CfSI Ref				
Stage 1										
Proximity to settlement		Significant Flood Risk		SPA/SAC/SSSI		Ancient/Native Woodland		Site capacity		
Yes		No		No		No		No		
Stage 2										
Meets spatial strategy	Contribution To Spatial Strategy	Programmed in Housing Land Audit	Marketability score	Planning consent for housing	Interest expressed at Call for Sites	Length of time allocated	Examination report 2016 comments	Site viability and marketability	Recreation value of site	Open space & recreation value
2	2/5	1	5	1	5	1	5	18/30	5	5/5
Flood risk	Biodiversity	Capability for Agriculture	Land and water contamination	Heritage Assets	Landscape Character & Townscape	Coal mining risk assessments	Non-absolute constraints	Distance to primary school	Distance to secondary school	Distance to health centre or GP
2	2	2	5	5	5	1	22/35	2	1	1
Distance to EAC TC/NC (P-LDP)	Distance to bus stop	Distance to train station	Previously developed land	Urban/rural classification	Distance to key town centres	Carbon and peatland	Visual amenity	Landscape study	Sustainability of location	TOTAL SCORE
2	2	1	5	5	5	5	2	5	36/60	83/135
Ranking										
Overall Rank		112/230	Ward Rank		3/6		Settlement Rank		36/51	
Stage 3										
A submission requesting that the site should continue to be allocated in the Local Development Plan was made as part of the call for sites exercise and the site was proposed to be the potential location of a Simplified Planning Zone (SPZ) in the Main Issues Report. The owner of the site stated that development of the site would result in a logical urban expansion of Kilmarnock and would meet the effectiveness tests of PAN 2/2010. Nevertheless, the site has been allocated since 2010 and no major application for residential development has been forthcoming in that time. It was considered that other sites in Kilmarnock & Loudoun would be more likely to help East Ayrshire meet its housing land requirements during the LDP2 period. On that basis, it was considered that the site should not be allocated in LDP2 and that it should be removed from the settlement boundary. Nevertheless, the site performed relatively well against the criteria above and it is proposed that the site should be identified as a Future Housing Growth area to be considered for potential allocation as part of the preparation of LDP3.										

KK-H9		Kilmarnock			Maxholm					
Outcome		Allocate								
Site Ref	KK-H9	Site name	Maxholm			Settlement	Kilmarnock			
Ward	5	Area (ha)	11.0	Indicative Capacity	300	Sub HMA	K&L			
LDP1 Ref	148H	PIP Ref		MIR Ref		CfSI Ref				
Stage 1										
Proximity to settlement		Significant Flood Risk		SPA/SAC/SSSI		Ancient/Native Woodland		Site capacity		
Yes		No		No		No		No		
Stage 2										
Meets spatial strategy	Contribution To Spatial Strategy	Programmed in Housing Land Audit	Marketability score	Planning consent for housing	Interest expressed at Call for Sites	Length of time allocated	Examination report 2016 comments	Site viability and marketability	Recreation value of site	Open space & recreation value
5	5/5	1	5	5	1	1	5	18/30	5	5/5
Flood risk	Biodiversity	Capability for Agriculture	Land and water contamination	Heritage Assets	Landscape Character & Townscape	Coal mining risk assessments	Non-absolute constraints	Distance to primary school	Distance to secondary school	Distance to health centre or GP
2	5	5	5	5	5	1	28/35	2	1	2
Distance to EAC TC/NC (P-LDP)	Distance to bus stop	Distance to train station	Previously developed land	Urban/rural classification	Distance to key town centres	Carbon and peatland	Visual amenity	Landscape study	Sustainability of location	TOTAL SCORE
2	5	2	1	5	5	5	5	5	40/60	96/135
Ranking										
Overall Rank		34/230	Ward Rank		1/6		Settlement Rank		19/51	
Stage 3										
<p>The site in question was allocated in LDP1 and was partly the location of Council housing that has since been demolished. An application for permission to undertake residential development was approved in late 2019. Despite some questions as to the progress of the site as detailed during the 2021 Housing Land Audit preparation process, the consent granted indicates that the site may be effective and it was therefore considered appropriate to allocate it in LDP2.</p>										

KK-X35		Kilmarnock			Treesbank					
Outcome		Not allocate								
Site Ref	KK-X35	Site name	Treesbank			Settlement	Kilmarnock			
Ward	5	Area (ha)	44.0	Indicative Capacity		400	Sub HMA	K&L		
LDP1 Ref	317H	PIP Ref		MIR Ref			CfSI Ref			
Stage 1										
Proximity to settlement		Significant Flood Risk		SPA/SAC/SSSI		Ancient/Native Woodland		Site capacity		
Yes		No		No		Yes		No		
Stage 2										
Meets spatial strategy	Contribution To Spatial Strategy	Programmed in Housing Land Audit	Marketability score	Planning consent for housing	Interest expressed at Call for Sites	Length of time allocated	Examination report 2016 comments	Site viability and marketability	Recreation value of site	Open space & recreation value
2	2/5	5	5	1	1	1	5	18/30	5	5/5
Flood risk	Biodiversity	Capability for Agriculture	Land and water contamination	Heritage Assets	Landscape Character & Townscape	Coal mining risk assessments	Non-absolute constraints	Distance to primary school	Distance to secondary school	Distance to health centre or GP
2	1	2	1	2	2	1	11/35	2	1	1
Distance to EAC TC/NC (P-LDP)	Distance to bus stop	Distance to train station	Previously developed land	Urban/rural classification	Distance to key town centres	Carbon and peatland	Visual amenity	Landscape study	Sustainability of location	TOTAL SCORE
2	2	1	1	5	5	5	2	2	29/60	65/135
Ranking										
Overall Rank		227/230	Ward Rank		5/6		Settlement Rank		51/51	
Stage 3										
<p>The site in question has been subject to developer interest for a number of years. A pre-application consultation was held in 2019 and the site is listed as a site in the Council’s Strategic Housing Investment Plan (SHIP) 2021-2026 with an intention to develop 100 affordable units. Nevertheless, development of the site presents a number of difficulties, including impact on woodland, including specimens covered by Tree Preservation Order (TPO) and ancient woodland, the setting of the Category B listed Treesbank House and its curtilage and various other constraints. The site is somewhat isolated and is not within easy walking distance of services and facilities in rest of Kilmarnock. A number of applications for Planning Permission in Principle (PPP) have subsequently been withdrawn, indicative of the heavy constraints to which the site is subject. It was therefore proposed that the easternmost portion of the site should be allocated in LDP2 but that the problematic western part should be deallocated. The western portion will remain within the settlement boundary and may be appropriate for development in future subject to the successful completion of dwellings in the easternmost part of the site.</p>										



KK-H14		Kilmarnock		Treesbank (Alt)						
Outcome		Allocate								
Site Ref	KK-H14	Site name	Treesbank			Settlement	Kilmarnock			
Ward	5	Area (ha)	12.9	Indicative Capacity	269	Sub HMA	K&L			
LDP1 Ref		PIP Ref		MIR Ref		CfSI Ref				
Stage 1										
Proximity to settlement		Significant Flood Risk		SPA/SAC/SSSI		Ancient/Native Woodland		Site capacity		
Yes		No		No		No		No		
Stage 2										
Meets spatial strategy	Contribution To Spatial Strategy	Programmed in Housing Land Audit	Marketability score	Planning consent for housing	Interest expressed at Call for Sites	Length of time allocated	Examination report 2016 comments	Site viability and marketability	Recreation value of site	Open space & recreation value
2	2/5	1	5	1	1	5	5	18/30	5	5/5
Flood risk	Biodiversity	Capability for Agriculture	Land and water contamination	Heritage Assets	Landscape Character & Townscape	Coal mining risk assessments	Non-absolute constraints	Distance to primary school	Distance to secondary school	Distance to health centre or GP
5	2	2	5	2	2	1	19/35	2	1	1
Distance to EAC TC/NC (P-LDP)	Distance to bus stop	Distance to train station	Previously developed land	Urban/rural classification	Distance to key town centres	Carbon and peatland	Visual amenity	Landscape study	Sustainability of location	TOTAL SCORE
2	5	1	1	5	5	5	2	2	32/60	76/135
Ranking										
Overall Rank		167/230	Ward Rank		6/6		Settlement Rank		45/51	
Stage 3										
The Treesbank site as currently allocated in LDP1 is subject to a number of significant constraints. However, development in the location detailed above was considered less problematic and, if sufficiently close to existing built development, could tie in relatively well. It was therefore proposed that a reduction in the area of the site be applied, so as to avoid the areas of woodland, proximity to the listed Treesbank House, substantial flood risk and other constraints. Whilst the capacity of the site as proposed would be somewhat lower than the 400 suggested for the original site, its location and characteristics were considered preferable and, as a consequence, it is considered appropriate to allocate the site in LDP2. The western portion will remain within the settlement boundary and may be appropriate for development in future subject to the successful completion of dwellings in the easternmost part of the site.										