



E-mail  
(optional)



Doing things digitally is our preference. Tick the box if you are not happy to receive correspondence via email:

Tick the box if you would like to subscribe to the Aberdeenshire LDP eNewsletter:

## Fair processing notice

Please tick to confirm your agreement to the following statements:

By submitting a response to the consultation, I agree that Aberdeenshire Council can use the information provided in this form, including my personal data, as part of the review of the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan. This will include consultation on the Main Issues Report (including any subsequent Proposed Plan).

I also agree that following the end of the consultation, i.e. after 8 April 2019, my name and respondent identification number (provided to you by Aberdeenshire Council on receipt of your submission) can be published alongside a copy of my completed response on the Main Issues Report website (contact details and information that is deemed commercially sensitive will not be made available to the public).

The data controller for this information is Aberdeenshire Council. The data on the form will be used to inform a public debate of the issues and choices presented in the Main Issues Report of the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2021. It will inform the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan.

Aberdeenshire Council will only keep your personal data for as long as is needed. Aberdeenshire Council will retain your response and personal data for a retention period of 5 years from the date upon which it was collected. After 5 years Aberdeenshire Council will review whether it is necessary to continue to retain your information for a longer period. A redacted copy of your submission will be retained for 5 years beyond the life of the Local Development Plan 2021, possibly until 2037

### Your Data, Your Rights

You have got legal rights about the way Aberdeenshire Council handles and uses your data, which include the right to ask for a copy of it, and to ask us to stop doing something with your data.

If you are unhappy with the way that Aberdeenshire Council or the Joint Data Controllers have processed your personal data then you do have the right to complain to the Information Commissioner's Officer, but you should raise the issue with the Data Protection Officers first. The Data Protection Officers can be contacted by writing to:

- Mr Andrew Lawson, Data Protection Officer, Aberdeenshire Council, Business Services, Town House, 34 Low Street, Banff, AB45 1AY

If you have difficulty understanding this document and require a translation, or you need help reading this document (for example if you need it in a different format or in another language), please phone us on 01467 536230.



<b>Which document(s) are you commenting on?</b>	<b>Main Issues Report</b> Draft Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan <b>Strategic Environmental Assessment Interim Environmental Assessment</b> Other
---	---

### Your comments

**Please see attached PDF with my comments on the MIR and SEA - thank you.**

Your comments (continued)



Response from [REDACTED]

**Main Issues Report 2019 and Strategic Environmental Assessment of Bid Sites**  
with specific reference to  
**Kincardine and Mearns Appendix Part 2: KN 069 - 072, Banchory Devenick**

I very much welcome the Council's recommendation to classify the above development bids as 'not preferred', and this recommendation's consistency with the Aberdeen City and Shire's Strategic Plan, 2018.

***Shaping Development in the Countryside***

The fact that the development area is located in the current green belt demonstrates the Council's commitment to *"making no changes to the green belt policy at this time"* (MIR, Ch 5, *Shaping Development in the Countryside*, Main Issue 5). The unique character of Banchory Devenick is acknowledged in the Kincardine and Mearns Appendix Part 2: KN 069 - 072:

*"This area is important in terms of the landscape setting of the City, and the site would have a negative impact on the Aberdeen green belt and the City."*

Furthermore the Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA), Jan 2019, states that the KN 069 - 072 developments are *"Not Preferred due to being set within ancient woodland and it shall have a negative impact on the Green Belt."*

I am relieved to know that the preservation of green belt land is a key priority for the Council.

***Natural Heritage and Landscape***

The 'not preferred' recommendation is consistent with the two policies on *Natural Heritage and Landscape* (Ch 8):

*"Policy E1 Natural heritage which sets out protection for nationally and locally designated nature conservation sites, protected species and wider biodiversity and geodiversity."*

Banchory Devenick is widely recognised for its landscape beauty and wildlife population. The area is an essential habitat for variety of wildlife. Designated species identified in the NESBReC 'Notable species search' (survey undertaken in July 2018) identifies the following: bats, badgers, red squirrel, pine marten, otter, hedgehog; numerous birds including osprey, kingfisher, kestrel, barn owl, and over 30 other species.

*"Policy E2 Landscape protects landscape character as defined by Scottish Natural Heritage, and Special Landscape Character areas of local importance."*

Within the Banchory Devenick area The River Dee has a Special Area of Conservation status (SAC), and The Den of Leggart has a Local Nature Conservation Site status (LNCS). Both should be protected at all costs, and it is good to know that both Councils have made an important pledge specifically about the river (section 6.6, The Aberdeen City and Shire Councils' Strategic Plan 2018). The specific locations proposed in the KN 069 - 072 development bids would raise significant challenges re waste water treatment and drainage arrangements. I am please to see that the Council considers these as *"not acceptable at this scale nor so close to the River Dee Special Area of Conservation"* (Kincardine and Mearns Appendix Part 2: KN 069 - 072).

*“Policy E2 sets out a general presumption against development that would cause unacceptable effects on a landscape’s overall character and quality, and it expects developers to take account of the Landscape Character Assessments produced by Scottish Natural Heritage and the Special Landscape Areas designation developed locally and included in the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2017.”*

Tollohill Wood is acknowledged as a local nature conservation site. The specific locations proposed in the KN 069 - 072 development bids would encircle this wood. Views of Tollohill from the City, and views of Aberdeen City itself from Tollohill would be disrupted by the proposed developments. I am pleased to see that the Council’s ‘not preferred’ recommendation is consistent with these policies.

### **The Historic Environment**

The ‘not preferred’ recommendation is also consistent with the policies on **The Historic Environment** (Ch 9).

*“The historic environment includes listed buildings, scheduled monuments, archaeological sites, conservation areas, battlefields, and historic gardens and designed landscapes. It has an important role in the character of an area and the quality of life for the people who live there, and is an economic asset that should be valued.”*

Tollohill Braes are historically significant. These were the resting and camping place of the Covenanter army coming up Causey Mounth from the south before the Battle of Aberdeen in 1646. In excavating the site of the current car park to the Wood musket balls were found.

The Causey Mounth, an ancient drovers’ road constructed in the 12th century, is a designated ‘Heritage Path’ - see <http://www.heritagepaths.co.uk/pathdetails.php?path=24>

The specific locations proposed in the KN 069 - 072 development bids would destroy these historical features going far beyond having *“a negative effect on these sites.”* (ref. Policies HE1 and 2). I am pleased to see that the Council’s ‘not preferred’ recommendation is consistent with these policies.

### **Protecting Resources**

The ‘not preferred’ recommendation is also consistent with the policies on **Protecting Resources** (Ch 10).

*“The main purpose of the policy is to avoid harming or causing irreversible effects on unique and important land resources. ... trees and areas of woodland.”*

Within the Banchory Devenick there are areas of ancient woodland.

*“ ...These woodlands are already protected through the reference to woodlands with ‘significant ecological, recreational, historical, landscape and shelter value’ within the policy. Ancient woodlands are places where these tests are likely to result in a recommendation for refusal of planning permission, unless there are truly exceptional reasons.”*

The specific locations proposed in the KN 069 - 072 development bids would destroy these ancient woodlands. I am pleased to see that the Council’s ‘not preferred’ recommendation is consistent with these policies.

### **Other issues**

I cannot see in the MIR any policies concerning roads (maybe this is within another document?). The KN 069 - 072 development bids would necessitate *“substantial new road infrastructure”* and

*“significant upgrade to access to the A92(T) (formerly the A90) south of the Bridge of Dee (two new roundabouts)”* (ref. Kincardine and Mearns Appendix Part 2: KN 069 - 072).

It would appear that the AWPR has significantly reduced the volume of traffic on the A92 into Aberdeen from the south, easing pressure on the Bridge of Dee. I would hope that the proposed dual carriageway link road - A92 to B9077 - and the proposed upstream new bridge over the Dee into Garthdee - will now be deemed redundant. This proposed route would cut through greenbelt land, destroy woodland and forest tree planting undertaken by the Forestry Commission in recent years (at public expense), cross the ancient Causey Mounth Road, and pass close by the Den of Leggart woodland, effecting the habitat of many animals including family groups of roe deer that move frequently between the Den of Leggart woodland and Tollohill Wood. This would clearly go against all your policies I have identified earlier in my response.

One other issue raised in the Kincardine and Mearns Appendix Part 2: KN 069 - 072 concerns the *“insufficient primary and secondary school capacity for any homes in this location without immediate upgrades or new school provision”*. Banchory Devenick Primary School is the only one in the area, being a small, rural establishment of currently 34 pupils. KN 070 (Phase 2) proposed a new primary school that would need to cater for possibly 1,000 or more children (given the scale of the whole development - 1,300 homes). The Council’s recommendation to identify this as an issue of concern is welcomed - particularly as the proposed siting of the new school would be just south east of the Camphill community of Beannachar and close to its boundaries. This important educational community would be seriously affected by any development on its doorstep, disrupting the peace and quiet that its special needs students require to learn and live.

The **Conclusion** to the **Kincardine and Mearns Appendix Part 2** states:

*“Several bids propose a large number of homes in rural locations that do not provide a sustainable pattern of development, propose private sewage works that could impact on the River Dee Special Area of Conservation, result in the loss of trees/ancient woodland... .”*

I congratulate the Council’s fortitude in upholding important policies in order to keep Banchory Devenick, Aberdeenshire the fantastic place it is to live. Well done.

### **Strategic Environmental Assessment of Bid Sites**

This is a thorough assessment of the key environmental factors likely to be affected by the proposed developments **KN 069 - 072 Phases 1 - 4**. The overall and cumulative ‘negative’ and ‘significant negative’ effects on *air, water, climatic factors, biodiversity, landscape, material assets, cultural heritage* (even post-mitigation) cannot be ignored, with only *soil* and *human health* identified as neutral. The one positive is *population*. The SEA table states objective reasons for the bid to be deemed ‘not preferred’.