

EIA Screening decision proforma

Business details			
Business reference number	[REDACTED TEXT]	Name	[REDACTED TEXT]
Main location code	[REDACTED TEXT]	EIA ID	2024-017

Proposed works details				
Location CPH	[REDACTED TEXT]	Type	Non improved / Semi natural / sensitive land	
Location name	[REDACTED TEXT]		Restructuring above thresholds	
Grid reference	NX617458		Drainage	
Nearest Town	Kirkcudbright		Irrigation	
Description of proposed works	Land restructuring in 6 fields. Levelling land to allow for the passage of large machinery during silage operations. Proposed operations are to strip back the topsoil, break and spread the rock, grade and level the ground, then reseed.			

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, NX/62490/47299 – A and B are within 25m of u40S (non-classified public road)
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
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
Does the proposed work involve infilling depressions or hollows with material not from the immediate area? (If yes consult with SEPA)	No
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)	NX/61336/45208, NX/61399/45468, and NX/61606/45274 all adjacent to the Bourge Coast SSSI. PastMap indicates unscheduled archaeology - Whitehill Canmore , and Manxman's Rock Canmore .
Does the project involve any Semi-natural / uncultivated / sensitive areas, or potentially effect any habitat, landscape, or wildlife species (If yes, consult with NatureScot)	Site visit confirmed majority of knowes have been limed and received applications of manure recently. Vegetation appears to be productive grasses but given time of year unable to confirm.
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)	Yes - NX/61496/45780 D, E, and F are close to a watercourse on the map. NX/62490/47299 A B and C are close to a watercourse on the map.

Check if proposals breach thresholds

The project as described exceeds 5000 cubic metres. There is potential for the knowes to be semi-natural, to which no threshold applies.
--

Check EIA tracker for previous projects at location
No previous projects.

Local Authority Planning consultation	
Our questions	N/A
Reply	N/A

Historic Environment Scotland / Local Authority Archaeologist consultation	
Our questions	Any issues from your organisations remit that would suggest a full EIA is required? [Site visit report and application sent for review]
Reply	<p>HES: We have reviewed the information provided and have not identified any potentially significant effects on the historic environment (for our interests which are; World Heritage Sites, scheduled monuments and their setting, category A-listed buildings and their setting, inventory gardens and designed landscapes, inventory battlefields and historic marine protected areas).</p> <p>D&G council Archaeologist: I can confirm that there are no historic environment grounds from our perspective that would require an EIA. The prehistoric fort above Manxman's Rock is assessed as being an asset of regional significance, but lies just outwith the boundary and is clearly separated by a dyke.</p> <p>Ideally an opportunity should be given to allow the outcrops to be checked for any prehistoric rock art prior to their removal, but that in itself would not justify requesting an EIA.</p>

NatureScot consultation	
Our questions	Any issues from your organisations remit that would suggest a full EIA is required? [Site visit report and application sent for review]
Reply	<p>We note that the proposal is to remove rocky knowes from 6 fields in order to increase silage production. NatureScot did not conduct a site visit and are providing this response in relation to the submitted material.</p> <p>Our initial observation is that whilst a lot of knowes are involved, the majority of these are low and will have been impacted over the years by the application of lime, farmyard manure and fertiliser. As a result of that treatment the biodiversity richness of these area is likely to have been lost.</p> <p>We have the following commentary specific to each of the fields:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NX/61606/45274. We could not discern any likely interest in the images supplied. We do not consider that further data needs gathered for this field. • NX/61336/45208. This field was not accessed by RPID due to the presence of stock and therefore we have little data to go on. The knowe here looks larger and rockier than the others and therefore we cannot comment on the biodiversity interest with the information to hand. We recommend a precautionary approach and that further data is gathered for this field. • NX/61399/45468. It is hard to assess these fully from the photographs taken during the winter but if RPID feel that the areas in this field will have been treated with fertilizer and silage and are improved then we have no concerns. • NX/61496/45780. We could not discern any likely interest in the images supplied and note that knowe labelled A is a borrow pit already. We do not consider that further data needs gathered for this field.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NX/61704/46068. Of the knowes identified in this field those which may have interest and need further data gathered include knowes labelled "e, f, g, i". We did not have concerns about the other knowes. • NX/62490/47299. Of the knowes identified in this field those that may have interest and need further data included are knowes labelled "a and b". If RPID are satisfied that knowe labelled "f" has been improved with fertiliser and manure we would accept that this and the remaining knowes in this field are not of concern. <p>In terms of Protected Species, we are aware that there are populations of Great Crested Newt just under 3km to the east and just over 3km to the north-west of the proposed area for restructuring. The current proposals are not removing water courses and are therefore unlikely to impact on breeding habitat. Great Crested Newt are likely to stay within 1km of their breeding site.</p> <p>We note the observation of RPIDs that the removal of a couple of knowes may undermine the drystone dykes that run over them. We would welcome proposals that would retain these dykes as landscape features in the longer term.</p> <p>The land lies within a Regional Scenic Area. We are aware that there are core path footpaths along the coastal edge and the removal of knolls in this area would impact in the visual amenity. The Council may have an opinion in respect of the removal of knolls on the Regional Scenic Area and in particular the view of these from the nearby core path footpath network. The proposal would remove a landscape feature by taking away natural rock at or near the surface and turning a field with texture into a flatter and less interesting landscape.</p> <p>Therefore, in terms of an Environmental Statement we are primarily concerned with receiving further information on the botanical interest for Field B, E and F and RPID should consider if they feel the knowes in field C are already improved. We would in addition welcome any other observations on species that can be gathered at the same time such as presence of birds, notable insects, amphibian, reptile or signs of mammals. Alternative habitats which could demonstrate no net loss of biodiversity and/or provide mitigation would need to be a component of any Environmental Statement.</p>
--	---

SEPA consultation	
Our questions	Do SEPA have any comments on the proposals (note RPID intend to contact the applicant and have them remove the knowes A, B and possibly C in NX/62490/47299 from the application as we concluded they are too close to the burn)? [Site visit report and application sent for review]
Reply	SEPA would agree with SGRPID's decision to contact the applicant and have them remove the knowes A, B and possibly C in NX/62490/47299 from the application given the very close proximity to the watercourse. We also believe it would be good to either remove from the applications Knowes D, F, G on map NX 61496/45780 or make reference to these in your response that they need to be extremely careful working the ground to avoid soil sediment causing pollution in the adjacent burn which is close but not as close as the knowes in NX62490/47299.

Scottish Forestry consultation	
Our questions	N/A
Reply	N/A

Outcome

Full EIA required?	YES		
Statement of reasons for decision	<p>Based on the feedback from SEPA and NatureScot, the proposals as submitted could have a significant effect on the environment, therefore a full Environmental Impact Assessment report is required.</p> <p>A proportion of the proposed areas would not have significant environmental impact. RPID will contact the customer to offer a detailed explanation of what aspects of this application led to it requiring a full EIA report.</p>		
Deciding officer	[REDACTED TEXT]	Countersigning officer	[REDACTED TEXT]
Date	09/04/2025	Date	10/04/2025

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