

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: I AGREE box won't tick

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.

| | | |
|---|---|--------------------------|
| Which document(s) are you committing on? | Main Issues Report YES | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Draft Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan YES | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Strategic Environmental Assessment Interim Environmental Assessment | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Other | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Your comments

I would like to highlight a few points about the MIR and LDP.

MIR

1 – This document calls Newtonhill a town and we are a village. I would like this to be corrected please because it is inaccurate and might have implications for planning regulations.

2 – Newtonhill is an increasingly large community, but has strong village identity and spirit. We are at the limits of what can be absorbed in terms of houses without amenities and infrastructure. I am strongly opposed to any further housing allocations in the vicinity of Newtonhill (KN100, KN101). I would like to see all future housing allocations for the zone be focused on Chapelton, where there is space and plans for communities, infrastructure and for amenities such as schooling and healthcare which will benefit Newtonhill and Muchalls.

3 – I am strongly opposed to any measure that will cause the coalescence of Newtonhill and Muchalls. Similarly, with Newtonhill and East Cammachmore. These should remain separate. I would like to see the ground between these communities protected from development, to have the boundaries of each settlement confirmed and to perhaps have more measures undertaken in these areas to protect existing houses from the risk of flooding, rising water table, coastal erosion, etc. I wonder if planting trees and shrubbery in some of these areas might be beneficial? I would like to see the Pheppie and Elsick Burns protected. They have had a shocking amount of damage via the AWPR construction with waste being discharged into them.

4 – I would like to see the land between the railway line and the coast protected from all development. This area needs to be preserved against coastal erosion and to ensure that heritage and tourism walks and trails can make careful use of the natural beauty of the area. With the decline in oil and gas, those industries are particularly important as potential sources of economic survival for our communities in the future.

5 – I strongly disagree with the language in the MIR which places a burden on Newtonhill to fulfil strategic growth. Why does any more housing growth have to happen here? Why not at Chapelton, where there are allocations for thousands of houses and which has a masterplan for amenities and infrastructure? The MIR also highlights the lack of amenities and green space for Newtonhill, so housing allocations are in direct opposition to those issues which negatively impact on our community. The MIR is rather contradictory in this regard – N & M must not coalesce except when we need them to in order to fulfil housing type – all of which is moot considering how small Chapelton is currently and how slowly it is growing, when we need it to continue to grow and be successful for the benefit of our smaller communities.

One housing need that COULD be accomplished here (the only one that I think is fitting here) is for the council to explore buying properties that are languishing on the market and converting them to council tenant properties. We all know why developers salivate over Newtonhill and that's because we have a disproportionately higher house price than other settlements in this corridor. We cannot sell the houses currently on the market here, so it does not meet common sense to keep building here. I see Chapelton is now offering affordable homes, which shows that every type of house that is needed can be found there.

6 – A further argument against more housing development locally is seen in the overcrowding of present amenities. Currently, the school is close to capacity and the traffic at the school run effectively closes off that part of the village. Our village is simply lacking the space in nursery or primary schooling places as well as in the road infrastructure for the current level of demand. The main roads in and around the village were not built with this volume of traffic in mind and it makes our roads dangerous and overcrowded. Parents are not willing to let their kids walk to school because of the level of danger and this compounds the issue of congestion further. Access to



Portlethen Medical Practice is significantly harder now with the pressures from the massive expansion at Hillside. Seeing the wider context of hundreds of houses being built in Stonehaven (already passed planning approval) and the proposed hundreds more at Hillside and Stonehaven has severe implications for demand on nursery, primary and secondary schools as well as on local healthcare and infrastructure.

In conclusion, I am broadly in support of council objectives to move us to a more environmentally friendly way of life, particularly if that opens up the train station here and improves our bus services. I would like to see a bigger network of integrated walk and cycle paths with the region, particularly coastal routes and particularly things that will improve the health of our communities, which will preserve our natural heritage and which might potentially help develop local economic opportunities via tourism.

I am strongly opposed to any further local housing allocations outwith Chapelton. I would like to see Chapelton prioritised in housing plans between Stonehaven and Hillside so that the town can become a success and so that we can benefit from the schools, businesses, medical practice that are tied to its development. I would like to see all housing zones mentioned in the MIR removed from the final LDP – for Newtonhill, Muchalls and East Cammachmore. I would like to see OP1 – the area being appealed by Barratt – removed from the LDP if their appeal fails.

Your comments (continued)