

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.

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

Your comments

Comments On Current Allocations:

- **OP1.** Has been very slow to deliver and has been allocated for many years. The indicated start of 200 homes in 2019 would currently appear extremely optimistic. Additionally, of the 2 permissions applied for the current approval was granted nearly over 2 years ago and will lapse in December 2019. The other application for 247 homes is currently in the final stages of obtaining planning permission through appeal and will therefore be some time in terms of delivery on site due the size, scale and infrastructure required for this size of development. The reporters indicated conditions will mean no houses can be occupied until the grade separated junction at the A90 is completed. This is a relatively recently identified issue in terms of development for Laurencekirk and OP1 has been allocated for many years and despite interest has failed to deliver in this time period.
- **OP2.** As the main issues report related to the Local Development Plan 2021. Figures used should be clear and representative of housing numbers for the plan period. Therefore, it is misleading to refer to this being a proposal for 210 homes if only 55 homes are likely to remain.

Comments On Current Preferred Options:

- **KN022.** Is out with current settlement boundary and is on prime agricultural land as KN114. While it is noted by the council that the community council has an aspiration for more affordable homes and self-build plots, as confirmed this has not been indicated as part of the proposals and therefore can only be presumed as not intended particularly as this type of development works on a very different financial model.
- **KN024.** This is a proposal for 10 homes and this has been changed within the main issues report to 20 to overcome the perceived density problem which is the main reason they have given in not favouring KN114. Which could be adjusted in the same manner. While it is noted by the council that the community has an aspiration for more self-build plots. This is not part of the proposal being presented and can only be presumed as not intended particularly as this type of development works on a very different financial model. There are access issues with this site which have been acknowledged but if this relates to road widening and visibility and potentially involves land in the ownership of others this has a high potential in delaying or indeed stop the site from being delivered with such doubt over the deliverability of a proposal and with a history in Laurencekirk of stalled or delayed allocations it would be preferable to allocate sites with an obvious deliverability.
- **KN073.** A site of mixed residential with industrial on such a small site with only residential or open countryside surrounding it raises obvious questions over the appropriate compatibility of uses. Due to the current position of the A90 grade separated junction proposals and the lack of final detailed design proposals mean the extent, accessibility and other aspects of this site cannot be adequately identified at this time and the site should not be considered for development until such time as the completion of the junction. Based on the current outline proposals the current access road is lost completely and replacement roads, in differing locations / possible land ownerships will be rising above the current area considerably to form the flyover. Also this area of ground is an ideal location for the required SUDS proposals relating to the new junction. Extending Laurencekirk beyond the Gaugers burn and the ancient woodland would have an impact on the wider landscape as these forms a natural boundary to the settlement. The potential of this are of ground cannot be established until the grade separated junction on the A90 is complete.



Site for Inclusion:

- **KN114. This is the only site proposing to address the community's aspirations in terms of self-build homes. The proposer has a proven track record in terms of delivery of this type of development while other previous allocations / developments have failed or suffered from significant delays. By admission in the report, this proposal is also well located in relation to the existing settlement and has good access to various modes of transport. All adding to its sustainability and low carbon criteria. With regard to the comment included about density, which would appear to be the main reason for not taking this proposal forward. The lower density of the proposals have been proposed as part of the successful delivery of the self-build model however in terms of land allocations the council can allocate an area for a the number of properties it sees fit and ultimately will be subject to detailed planning proposals. Diversity is important within settlements. Other preferred option sites with which the report has raised concern for the same reason have been adjusted in the preparation of the report according to the density preferred. An option which should have been put forward for this proposal but one which the proposer would be happy to consider and would address the concerns within the report relating to loss of prime agricultural land. With regard to the proposals and location of the Western link, we are not aware of any definite proposals relating to this and therefore there is nothing to say that this will be affected by the development of this site. This appears to relate to an idea of a future plan that may in all likelihood never be delivered, as many aren't. There is no current proposals/ detailed plans and no approach made to the relevant land owners about this and therefore no justification on limiting the use of ground on this basis or its use as a constraint. If there were designs in place these could easily be incorporated into the proposals as part of the design development of the allocation. It is considered that his site would be delivered progressively over time down the site over the term of the plan and if in the unlikely event that proposals for the road came forward during this time, they could also be easily incorporated at a later date. Equally as the proposed road is not currently designed this could be designed at the appropriate time to suit the existing settlement Laurencekirk as it will likely have to do elsewhere.**

The conclusion in the main issues report is somewhat misleading in terms of the current allocation within Laurencekirk as this does not account for the fact that 155 No Houses on OP2 are currently under construction and will therefore, as indicated, be complete by the time LDP 2021 will be in place. This will adjust the current allocation of houses from 1105 to 950. Even when ignoring the comments above the proposed new allocation therefore only total 1048 No Houses a reduction of 57 No Houses on the previous allocation and considerably less if incorporating the comment above. Even when altering the density of KN114 in line with the comments in the report and as done for other proposals this would only increase the allocation by 84 No houses and far more in line with the allocations for Laurencekirk previously.

On this basis without the inclusion of KN114 new allocations in Laurencekirk are significantly lower than the previous allocations in terms of house numbers. As Laurencekirk is a key settlement in the Drumlithie to Laurencekirk strategic growth area, which has been identified in needing to play a significant role in delivering strategic housing allowances as such and on this basis alone, the inclusion of KN114 would only be appropriate.