



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>	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

### Site BU036 – Land to the West of St Combs (Phase 1) – 26 homes

On behalf of Claymore Homes, support is given to the identification of bid site BU036 as an Officers' preference for the provision of 26 homes in the Main Issues Report and OP2 in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (DPLDP). However, objection is made to the boundaries of the site which are capable of being amended. This representation should be read in conjunction with the objection made to bid site BU035 adjacent and with the development bids submitted at the pre-MIR stage which demonstrate that this land is suitable for the development proposed.

The Council's assessment within the MIR raises a number of issues to which we wish to respond

#### **“The proposed site is well located in relation to the settlement and received permission for 19 homes in April 2018”**

The consent granted in April 2018 (Ref 2016/3203) was on land adjacent and does not form part of this bid. It may be that the indicative plan submitted with the original bid had the boundaries incorrectly plotted, but this should be amended going forward. The developer controls the adjacent land, which formed the overall bid (site BU035). Therefore, there is flexibility available to amend the boundaries of bid site BU036 to exclude the consented scheme adjacent, whilst ensuring there is sufficient land to develop the 26 units identified by Officers.

Although this site could be seen as an extension to the consented site, the developer is requesting bid site BU036 is allocated in addition to the 19 units on the adjacent site, not including the 19 units. Therefore, to avoid any confusion, between the two sites, there would be 19 units on the consented site to the east and 26 units on the BU036 site. This is the position taken forward in the DPLDP which is welcomed.

The text for the OP1 site in the PDLDP states that **“part of the land is overlapping with the OP2 site, therefore a masterplan should be agreed prior to commencement”**. Amending the boundaries to exclude the consented site would remove the need for this text and a masterplan and the text of the PDLDP should be amended to reflect this. The text for the OP2 site in the PDLDP makes reference to planning permission covering part of the site and should also be removed given that the bid site is separate from the consented site.

#### **“There may be a need for a second access point onto the High Street and main access point from the south”**

The consented development to the east is owned by the proposer of this bid. The layout of that development makes provision for access to the BU036 site. It is considered that a second point of access would not be required for the increase in houses off this access, as it is proposing less than 50 units, however, this can be discussed during the planning application process.

#### **“The site is suitable for development and given planning permission in principle granted for the site, therefore, the site shall be added to the next plan”**

As stated above, the site is separate from the consented site to the east and does not have planning permission in principle. It does however, form a logical area for further development. It can be accessed from the consented development, which makes provision for this in the layout submitted with that application.

Support is therefore given to the identification of the site as OP2 in the DPLDP but the boundaries should be amended to exclude the consented site to the east and increased to ensure adequate scope for the 26 units identified. Any text making reference to the planning permission in principle should be removed.

**Conclusion**

While the identification of the BU036 bid site for 26 units, as an Officer's preference in the MIR and as OP2 in the DPLDP is welcomed, it is important to establish that this does not form part of the consented site to the east.

The 26 units should be identified in addition to the 19 units permitted on that site and not part of that allocation. This is the position taken forward in the DPLDP which is welcomed. However, the boundaries of the BU036/OP2 site should be amended to exclude the consented site and increased to ensure adequate land is available for the 26 units proposed. This would remove the need for a masterplan and the text of the PDLDP should be amended to reflect this. Text references to the consent covering OP2 should also be removed from the Proposed Local Development Plan.