



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 type="checkbox"/>
	Strategic Environmental Assessment Interim Environmental Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Your comments

I am writing to you about the Local Development Plan (Main Issues Report) for Aberdeens/Aberdeenshire, and in particular regarding the proposed housing scheme (Ref: MR058). [REDACTED] owners of the land and house just to the west of the proposed development, [REDACTED].

First, let me say thank you to your planning officers, who presented the plan at a meeting with the Tarland Community Council on 11th March, and who fielded questions from the attendees. I thought the presentation was first class, and that you answered the questions very well..

I would like to raise a number of objections to the proposal (Ref: MR058) by the Church of Scotland. I summarise my major objections firstly, and then provide feedback on specific aspects of their proposal.

My main objections are as follows:

1. There is no clear market established for the proposed development, and the only element "in place" is the land owned by the Church of Scotland itself. There is: no actual developer under option; no market analysis or marketing; and no actual plan, sketch or otherwise. The proposal is woefully short in detail in almost all sections.
2. The proposed development will have a major impact on the character of the village to the east, and in particular the woodland aspect. This is particularly important given that the development would negatively impact on the woodland and historical aspects of the village, as seen from the historically important Tomnaverie Stone Circle. Also, the proposed development would extend the village to the east, and would initiate "ribbon development" in that direction.
3. The proposal is factually inaccurate in a number of important respects:
 - * Proximity to historical buildings and sites, i.e. Old Manse, Old Church (b. 1762) and historic graveyard
 - * Proximity and effect on a B-listed building (Kirklands of Cromar) which was sold to the owners by the Church with B listing in place (!)
 - * Understated flood risk, especially in the low lying parts of the site proximate to the Tarland Burn, which are subject to serious flooding
 - * Under-stated or ignoring of effect on infrastructure needs, and in particular: education provision and utilities
4. There has been no evident consultation with the local community regarding the proposed development.

Section by section points on the proposed development

Section 5. Ownership/Market Interest

No evidence of market interest in the proposed development.

Section 7. Planning History

They state under previous planning applications: N/A. The Church has previously applied for planning permission for part of the site adjacent to the Coull Road, namely to build a new Manse. This planning application was not approved.

Your comments (continued)

Section 8. Proposed Use

There are few details on the mix of house types proposed, and very few details on affordable housing provision.

Section 10. Natural Heritage

Although the site does not have any special natural heritage designations (to my knowledge), it is nevertheless an important part of the natural environment to the east of the village, and its present use (farmland), complements the woodland character of the village. Specifically, the site:

- * is adjacent to the Tarland Burn, an important natural feature of the Howe of Cromar

- * is adjacent to Kirklands of Cromar, with its mature trees forming a small wood

- * is adjacent to the woodland to the north of the Coull Road

and the proposed housing (20-30 houses) would impact negatively on the natural heritage of the village.

Under biodiversity enhancement, they proposers have appeared to have simply "ticked every box", with no actual details of these enhancements. This lacks credibility.

Section 11. Historic environment

No benefits identified for the historical environment by the proposers.

The proposal will negatively affect the historical environment in three ways (not acknowledged by the proposers);

- * The site is directly adjacent to a B-listed building, the Old Manse (now Kirklands of Cromar), built in 1840, and a fine and original example of a Church of Scotland manse in Aberdeenshire. [Indeed, the manse was sold to the current owners by the Church with the B listing in place!]

- * The site is adjacent to the old kirkyard (and ruined church) and associated graveyard

- * The site can be seen from the historically and archaeologically important Tomnaverie Stone Circle, and the development would have a huge effect on the current clear connection between the Circle and the Village, and specifically the woodland aspect of the village as seen from the Circle.

Section 13. Flood Risk

The risk is identified in the proposal but understated. There is a high risk of flooding along the Tarland Burn in the low lying southern part of the site. Indeed, the burn has been known to flood right up to the southern boundary of Kirklands of Cromar, and even up the drive at one point. It has flooded houses on Bridge Street a number of times.

Section 14. Infrastructure

It is simply not credible that a 20-30 housing development would not place increasing demands on infrastructure, and specifically the need for extra provisions in: education, both primary and secondary. No contact appears to have been made with the providers of services such as: education and transport, nor the various utility providers (water, waste management, gas, electricity, broadband, etc.)

Section 15. Other potential constraints

There are two existing overhead power lines crossing the site.

Section 17. Community engagement

There has been no consultation with the local community.