

EIA Screening decision proforma

Business details			
Business reference number	[REDACTED TEXT]	Name	[REDACTED TEXT]
Main location code	[REDACTED TEXT]	EIA ID	2025-029

Proposed works details				
Location CPH	[REDACTED TEXT]	Type	Non improved / Semi natural / sensitive land	No
Location name	[REDACTED TEXT]		Restructuring above thresholds	Yes
Grid reference	NX/42375/55474		Drainage	No
Nearest Town	Wigtown		Irrigation	No
Description of proposed works	Removal of dykes, and clearance of areas of gorse dotted along line of dykes, as per email.			

Initial check (LPIS, PastMap etc)	comments
Are any significant earthworks proposed within 25m of a railway or classified road? (If yes refer customer to LA planning department, and reject screening application)	No, only removal of surface stone from tumble down (condition E & F) dykes.
Does the project involve creating new tracks, or any other action that would require planning permission or approval from LA planning, or fall under Forestry EIA regulations? (if yes refer customer to LA planning or FS, and reject screening application)	No new tracks are to be created.
Does the proposed work involve removing earth/rock from farm unit? (If yes refer customer to LA planning and SEPA, and reject screening application)	No, removed stones from the dyke would be kept on the holding to repair other dykes in the future.
Does the proposed work involve infilling depressions or hollows with material not from the immediate area? (If yes consult with SEPA)	No restructuring of knowes has been proposed.
Check designations and cross compliance layers, and PastMap. Are there monuments close to the proposed works? (If yes consult with HES for scheduled monuments, and LA archaeologist for non-scheduled monuments)	No concerns on cross compliance layers, and only a milestone on the road is nearby on PastMap, which would not be affected by the proposed works.
Does the project involve any Semi-natural / uncultivated / sensitive areas, or potentially affect any habitat, landscape, or wildlife species (If yes, consult with NatureScot)	No, the fields are currently managed as 2 parcels (this would remain the case). The fields are managed with fertiliser, harrowing etc. to maintain productive grassland.
Does the project potentially effect the water environment, pose a pollution risk, or potentially have any other effects under SEPAs remit? (if yes consult with SEPA)	The proposed work would have no impact on the water environment.

Check if proposals breach thresholds	
Yes, over 500 metres of dyke to be removed	

Check EIA tracker for previous projects at location	
Previously granted 350 metres of dyke removal under XC guidance, same holding, different field.	

Local Authority Planning consultation	
Our questions	N/A
Reply	

Historic Environment Scotland / Local Authority Archaeologist consultation	
Our questions	N/A
Reply	

NatureScot consultation	
Our questions	Due to the length of dyke removal that has been requested, Nature Scot will be consulted to confirm if they have any objection or cause for concern.
Reply	<p>NatureScot position:</p> <p>The fields for the proposed dyke removal contains 1200m of linear habitat which create distinctive landscape features, there are some areas of associated scrub adding to the biodiversity interest. There would be a loss to biodiversity and landscape character from the proposal without any mitigation. There is insufficient detail on proposed mitigation within the report to give confidence that sufficient attempt has been made to minimise the losses to biodiversity and landscape. Our advice to RPID is therefore, that an Environmental Statement needs to be prepared for this land. We would be happy to advise in more detail on the Scope of an Environmental Statement if requested.</p> <p>The majority of the land impacted is described and managed as improved pasture albeit it has an older sward. Without a detailed assessment of the site and an appropriate time of year it is impossible to determine if there are any sensitive grasslands in the project area. However, it is NatureScot's opinion that the historical management undertaken at the site, checks of the NBN data and the report provided by RPID allow us to be satisfied that there is no significant species in the grassland areas. We consider that the fields are sufficiently far enough away from the nearest known Great Crested Newt site that they need not be considered. That assumption would change if at any stage Great Crested Newt are discovered within 2 kilometres of the land.</p> <p>We would welcome proposals which offer replacement habitat elsewhere on the farm to compensate for biodiversity and landscape losses of the 1200m of boundary features and associated wildlife. Mitigation could identify where dykes will be bolstered and gaps in hedges to be closed. We would also welcome clarity of where any removed stone will be used to restore linear features elsewhere on the holding. The farmer may wish to consider opportunities for areas of the farm that could be managed for nature such as areas of wetland, buffer zones to Carsegowan Moss SSSI, or small areas of woodland planting. It would be helpful in the ES to clarify that the hawthorne is not being removed.</p>

SEPA consultation	
Our questions	N/A
Reply	

Scottish Forestry consultation	
Our questions	N/A
Reply	

Outcome			
Full EIA required?	YES/NO		
Statement of reasons for decision	Based on the feedback from NatureScot, alongside the breached EIA threshold value, a full EIA will be required should this project still be intended to go ahead.		
Deciding officer	[REDACTED TEXT]	Countersigning officer	[REDACTED TEXT]
Date	15/05/2026	Date	21/5/26

Acronyms:

EIA Environmental Impact Assessment
 FS Forestry Scotland
 HES Historic Environment Scotland
 LA Local Authority
 LPIS Land Parcel Identification System
 SEPA Scottish Environmental Protection Agency