

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: X

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

## Your comments

### Summary Comment – Main Issues Report

Given that a new planning act with revised implementing regulations is anticipated later this year, now is **not** the time to introduce proposals for significant development in the countryside. Other reasons for this assertion include changes in housing demand driven by the energy sector slowdown and the completion of the AWPR. All three of these reasons provide a solid basis for acting prudently/conservatively this year. Accordingly, the Council is strongly encouraged to consider the following supplemental policy guidelines in preparing LDP 2021:

- 1) Defer inclusion of new larger scale housing developments (greater than 25 homes), with the objective of enabling regions and settlements to take the leadership role in shaping future developments in their areas, under the new planning act.
- 2) Include only smaller housing developments in the countryside that consolidate or improve previously approved developments; with special priority given to the following existing Council priorities:
  - a. Protect special environment
  - b. Shape countryside development
  - c. Preserve national heritage, landscape and historic environment
  - d. Rectify problems created by prior planning approvals

As a resident of Stonehaven, I will limit my comments to those local proposed developments in the Kincardineshire and Mearns area that I strongly support or oppose.

### Stonehaven Settlement

Firstly, I wish to comment on the “factual summary” introducing the proposed developments in the Stonehaven area.

- I **agree** that Stonehaven is an important sub-regional service centre and needs to be enhanced.
- I **agree** that a supermarket is needed, but **disagree** that the Ury site granted planning permission in principle, is the right site. This position is supported by the recent refusal of Tesco to consider a supermarket on the site.
- I **disagree** that Stonehaven should play an important role in delivering strategic housing allowances in the Aberdeen housing market area. Nearby new town of **Chapelton of Elsick** was approved to fill strategic allowances in his region (and the rate of development there is much slower than anticipated).
- I agree that the open spaces on the edge of town are vital to overall amenity of Stonehaven ... but am unsure what conclusion the reader is supposed to draw from the statement. ***If it means there is a need to keep them open spaces, then I agree. If it means the open spaces should be developed, then I strongly disagree.***

### KN 115, 116, 117, 118 & 119

I **oppose all** of these proposed developments in the proximity of the new AWPR/Fastlink roundabout connecting to the A90. It is too early to fully understand the traffic flow and patterns, given that it has only recently opened. None of the proposals should be endorsed at this time, and all should be excluded from LDP 2021.

### KN 50 & 51

I **oppose both** of these proposed Mains of Cowie developments on the hillside overlooking Stonehaven. The topography does not relate well to the town and it would be visually detrimental to the community of Stonehaven. Furthermore, it simply not needed to fill the strategic housing allowances in the Aberdeen housing market area (see Chapelton of Elsick comments above).

### KN 102 & 103

**I oppose both** of these proposed Ury Estate developments, which extend the footprint of the site currently approved for 205 houses, by a further 212 and 60 houses respectively. The argument that these should be considered an enabling development is not sound. Furthermore, there is simply not a need for this site to fill the strategic housing allowances in the Aberdeen housing market area (see Chapelton of Elsick comments above).

While the enabling development argument may have initially made sense back in 2003 ... it is clear that this exception (to houses in the countryside planning criteria) is not delivering the stated objective of converting Ury House into a top-class hotel/golf destination. Since the initial enabling development approval, the number of houses approved (for developer FM Group) within the Ury Estate has increased from 230 to nearly 500 (230 original + 90 North Lodge + 16 Glithno + 6 Home Farm + 130 Mackie Village). If 500 homes is not enough, where will it stop? There should be no extension of the enabling development at Ury without an enforceable master plan that will ensure completion of the current "indicative" plan.

#### **KN 86**

**I oppose** this proposed Ury Estate development, which extend the footprint of the site currently approved for 205 houses and subject to proposals KN 102 & 103, even further. The reasons for opposition are the same as for KN 102 & 103 above, another 150 houses would push the total from initially 230 to approximately 650 houses in the countryside. Furthermore, there is simply not a need for this site to fill the strategic housing allowances in the Aberdeen housing market area (see Chapelton of Elsick comments above).

The developer's failure to deliver the promised hotel and golf course, along with continuing proposals to build more houses, shows the real objective ... build as many houses as possible, while continuing to hold the carrot out for something special. Furthermore, this site is visually prominent and would adversely impact the rural character of the area and negatively impact the settings of Ury House and Stonehaven in general. The charade needs to be stopped.

#### **KN 87**

**I oppose** this proposed Ury Estate development, which would extend the 51 approved houses to 99. This is approximately doubling the number approved for the site, which means twice as many cars, residents, bicycles, dogs, etc. ... all in the same footprint, but in a greater density. Certainly, this is not the unique countryside home hamlet envisioned in the developers indicative master plan. This also seems inconsistent with the overall expectation of completing the vision of Ury House becoming a centrepiece for the overall hotel/golf course development. Hotel and golf guests would be driving through this denser neighbourhood to get to the hotel and gold HQ. This should raise real concern by councillors that FN Ury will never deliver on the promise. It is time for the council to "call their hand".

Other reasons for opposition are the same as for KN 86, 102 & 103 above, another 48 houses would push the total from initially 230 to approximately 700 houses in the countryside (see comments above). Furthermore, there is simply not a need for this site to fill the strategic housing allowances in the Aberdeen housing market area (see Chapelton of Elsick comments above).

#### **KN 016**

**I support** this proposed Ury Estate development, which is submitted by a ordinary resident who has repeatedly & systematically been ignored by the planning process and adversely impacted by the surrounding Ury House, Walled-in Garden, enabling housing development & other single lot developments by the FM Group over the past several years. Given what the Council has allowed the FM Group to do, it is shameful hypocrisy to use the same planning guidelines to deny this ordinary resident an opportunity to make the best of his circumstances ... and allow the big developer to roll over the planning guidelines to get what they want.

#### **KN 120, 121 & 122**

**I oppose all** of these proposed Mill of Forrest developments; which lack connectivity to Stonehaven, would negatively impact the heritage, landscape and historic environment, and is simply not needed to fill the strategic housing allowances in the Aberdeen housing market area (see Chapelton of Elsick comments above).



[Empty rectangular box for comments]

**Your comments (continued)**

[Empty rectangular box for comments]

