

Issue 62 Balmedie

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
57	Ms Ceri Kindley
209	Mr Stuart Gove
248	Lippe Architects + Planners
315	Belhelvie Community Council
342	Mr & Mrs John & Carol Cooper
373	case CONSULTING Limited on behalf of West Balmedie Estate
402	Halliday Fraser Munro on behalf of ANM Group Ltd & CHAP Group Ltd
446	DM Hall on behalf of B & J Dawson
462	Fiona Main
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
508	Bancon Homes Ltd
605	Mr Kevin Main
794	Norr on behalf of Stewart Milne Homes
796	Norr on behalf of Stewart Milne Homes
805	SEPA
862	Ms Susan Edwards
888	Mr Ewan Murray
920	Ms Emma Paterson
1004	Mrs Brenda Griffin
1009	Historic Environment Scotland

2. Issues

General

The respondent fully supports the Vision and Planning Objectives for Balmedie as described in the Main Issues Report (402).

A respondent seeks the removal of protected status for the small strip of woodland to the rear of Woodlands, site P2 (209).

A respondent recommends that the Plan should identify a site for the new primary school, to address the problem stated in the Vision for Balmedie (315).

A respondent considered that the roads in Balmedie would not cope with any additional development (1004). While another stated that all development should be restricted until implementation of the Scottish Water growth project (805).

A respondent has complained regarding the lack of replacement tree planting located between their property to the south of Balmedie and the A90 (57).

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has noted that a Scottish Water growth project is required, however they understand there is no firm date for the growth project (805).

Bid FR077 / Existing Site – OP1

There was a general objection to the inclusion of this site from one respondent (57).

The respondent identified an error in the supporting text for OP1 in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) as there is reference to 'R1' being used for access to the site, however 'R1' is a reserved site for community facilities in the village (402).

This response sought the change in allocation of OP1 currently in the Local Development Plan 2017 to 80 houses and 11ha of mixed use commercial development (Use Classes 1, 4, 5, 6 and 7). The inclusion of retail provision on the site would meet an identified need in Balmedie and will take advantage of the improved trunk road networks thereby minimising any impacts on the core of Balmedie (402).

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) has suggested a joint development brief is prepared for this site and site OP2 (bid FR124), with green infrastructure providing informal access routes into and between Balmedie Country Park, Local Nature Conservation Site (LNCS) and Balmedie. In addition, it is requested that natural heritage impacts should be mitigated and key opportunities for natural heritage and landscape enhancement is identified in the Plan including integration of green infrastructure reinforcing landscape character within future development (506). The site is located adjacent to a coastal Special Landscape Area (SLA), therefore due cognisance needs to be taken of special landscape qualities (506).

Bid FR124 / Existing Site – OP2

The respondent supports the increase in the housing allocation on OP2 to 220 houses (402).

SNH has requested that a site brief is prepared jointly with the adjacent OP1 with green infrastructure providing informal access routes into and between the neighbouring Balmedie Country Park, Local Nature Conservation Site (LNCS) and the main settlement of Balmedie. In addition, natural heritage impacts should be mitigated and key opportunities for natural heritage and landscape enhancement should be identified in the Plan (506).

The respondent highlights that the site is located adjacent to a coastal SLA therefore due cognisance needs to be taken of special landscape qualities (506).

Respondent 57 has a general objection to this site (57).

Existing Site – OP3

There has been an objection to the housing development proposed for Menie Estate. The respondent is of the view that applicants have not complied with the Scottish Ministers' conditions and environmental management advice (862).

Bid FR022

The respondent is supportive of the inclusion of bid FR022 which should be included in the Plan as a mixed use allocation for up to 500 houses, primary school, community facilities, and employment land. The site would have direct connectivity to the settlement through the grade separated junction. This site would not have any adverse traffic impacts on Balmedie unlike bids to the north which have to be accessed via Old Aberdeen Road. In addition, the site has access to Balmedie Waste Water Treatment Plant and the new trunk water main. Allocation of this site would address the shortfall of homes in the area to maintain a minimum 5 year effective housing land supply (373).

However, another respondent considered that this site was not appropriate for development due to its disconnected location west of the A90 (794).

SNH has recommended that consideration of this site should form part of a capacity assessment to inform future management of housing sites in and around Balmedie. The Plan should take account of the recent Aberdeen Landscape Study to avoid coalescence of these main population centres. If considered, a site brief should incorporate key principles of place-making, connect in character and informal access routes to the settlement of Balmedie, retain woodland and incorporate green infrastructure (506).

Another respondent raised concerns regarding the potential impact this site would have on the setting of the Scheduled monument The Temple Stones, stone circle to the North East of Potterton House (1009).

Bid FR079 and FR080

It is considered that these sites should be deleted from the Plan. The site is only accessible from Old Aberdeen Road (315, 373, and 920).

SEPA has commented that a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) may be required for bid FR079 due to the presence of a small watercourse which has been historically straightened. A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse which should be positively integrated into the development. Enhancement of the watercourse through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated (805).

Bid FR089

Respondents do not support FR089 as a future opportunity site as there is no existing or potential connectivity/active travel with the existing settlement and topographical

constraints restrict potential access points. It is considered that the A90 (T) provides a substantial visual and physical barrier between the site and the village. (315, 373, 506, 794).

There is disagreement with the Officers' assessment that there are 'multiple potential environmental and social benefits of the site', as these are not explained nor made apparent (315, 373). SNH is of the view that due to the higher ground, in open landscape, the impacts [on the landscape] are likely to be significant (506). This site cannot deliver the six qualities of successful places due to its location and will fail to deliver a quality place (794).

Another respondent suggested that this site should only be considered for development following the completion of the development at Balmedie South (OP1/FR077 and OP2/FR124) (402).

SNH has recommended that consideration of this site should form part of a capacity assessment to inform future management of housing sites in and around Balmedie and Potterton. Given the proximity of the City/Shire boundary this should take account of the recent Aberdeen Landscape Study to avoid coalescence of these main population centres. If considered, a site brief should incorporate key principles of place making, landscape character and informal access routes to the settlement of Balmedie, retain and enhance connectivity of the area of semi-natural woodland to the north east of the site and incorporate green infrastructure (506).

SEPA has identified that a Flood Risk Assessment may be required due to the presence of watercourses running through the site which have been historically straightened. Buffer strips will be required adjacent to the watercourses which should be positively integrated into the development. Enhancement of the watercourses through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated. In addition, the developer will have to cross the A90 to connect to the sewage works. Logistics of this should be clarified with Scottish Water as the AWPR has changed the road layout, and connection to the network may be complicated by this and any limitations/additional developer costs highlighted in the Plan. It is unlikely SEPA would be able to authorise any temporary private treatment works due to the proximity to the bathing beach (805).

Historic Environment Scotland has raised concern for potential significant impact on the setting of Scheduled monument SM3277 (Hare Cairn). Restricting development to the east (next to the road) may help mitigate impact (1009).

However, respondent 508 is supportive of allocating FR089 for immediate release (2021-2031) to meet the shortfall of housing due to constraints on the Menie site. It would be a positive contribution to Balmedie providing a primary school and other services and facilities (508).

Bid FR103

Respondents are of the opinion that capacity for this site should be reduced to 5 or 6 homes given its size and the possible requirement for each plot to have private drainage arrangements (315, 342, 373, and 1004). It has been suggested that the site is reduced to 10 houses (888), whilst other respondents consider that 27 houses is an unacceptable overdevelopment of the site (462, 605).

Concerns about the safety of the single track access road with no pavements or street lighting, have been raised by respondents (342, 462, 605, 888, and 920). Other respondents identified that the road cannot be widened as it would require the felling of trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order (888, 920).

Another respondent is of the view that development on this site would cause irreversible and irreplaceable impact on existing wildlife, and erode the natural beauty and character of the area (462).

A respondent stated that this site should be co-ordinated with proposed bid FR116 in order to deliver a phased released, rigorously designed scheme (796).

It has been highlighted by SEPA that a Flood Risk Assessment may be required due to the presence of a small watercourse which has been historically straightened. A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse which should be positively integrated into the development. Enhancement of the watercourse through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated (805).

Bid FR116

Respondents have expressed objections to the allocation of Bid FR116. It has been identified that bid FR116 is designated as coastal zone, where there is a presumption against development (315, 373, 462, 506, 605, 888). This site would adversely impact on wildlife, the special landscape area, the dunes system and character of the area (462, 605, 888 and 1004).

Respondents had concerns about the large scale of development with substantial adverse impacts on the existing settlement, including potentially more than 20 years of construction traffic (315, 373, 506, 888, and 1004). Several respondents had concerns that this site is associated with site OP3 resulting in one large sprawl of development (373, 888, 920). Respondents are of the view that the site is not required to meet housing targets in the forthcoming period or the following Local Development Plan (888, 920).

It is also considered that development would have unacceptable traffic impacts, including on Old Aberdeen Road (315, 462, 888). It would require substantial road infrastructure to connect into the AWPR (605, 888, and 462). A respondent is particularly concerned regarding the impact this site would have on traffic in addition to the 550 houses on the Menie Estate (315). One respondent considered that the

access road to Shady Neuk Gardens was not suitable to access this scale of development and the road could not be widened due to trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order (888). A comprehensive traffic mitigation scheme is delivered to avoid any adverse impacts on the existing settlement of Balmedie (315).

A respondent has stated that there is no connectivity to the existing settlement, with an area of land between the bid site and Balmedie that prevents integration (315, 888).

It was highlighted by a respondent that development would result in the loss of a significant area of prime agricultural land where it has not been demonstrated that the economic and social benefit outweighs the loss of the asset (888). Furthermore, education constraints would need to be addressed (605,462, 888).

SNH has identified that careful consideration is required with regard to how this site would relate to the surrounding development as it appears to be leading to coalescence and large scale suburban development. A strategic design framework is recommended to set out the capacity of the area in order to determine a sense of place and scale, land for development and detailed design and consideration of natural heritage issues, with significant enhancement measures required. There is also a possible need for a recreation management plan (506).

There was a view that this site should only be considered for development following the completion of development at Balmedie South (OP1/FR077 and OP2/FR124) (402). However, a respondent sought to have the site allocated within the next Local Development Plan. The site is located within the Energetica Strategy area where quality of design and development and quality of life are aims for delivery. It would deliver a community campus, a secondary school and primary school, sports facilities, and a health centre (796).

The respondent is of the view that the site possesses unique landscape capacity characteristics which endow it with a particular sense of identity. An ecological park will enhance the attractiveness of this location and provide benefits for the wider amenity of the area (796). In addition, the site would meet the housing density target of the Strategic Development Plan (796).

In support of this site, the respondent states that they have a solution to access, with traffic on the Old Aberdeen Road being significantly below the theoretical capacity. There is a viable access solution (796). The respondent commits to ensuring that the site is to be delivered without any impact on the interests at the Special Protection Area (SPA) at the nearby Ythan Estuary and other environmental concerns (796).

SEPA has identified that a Flood Risk Assessment may be required due to the presence of watercourses running through the site which have been historically straightened. Buffer strips will be required adjacent to the watercourses which should be positively integrated into the development. Enhancement of the watercourses through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated (805).

Bid FR128

Respondents have sought the inclusion of this site for commercial or retail uses and consider that due to its elevated position, noise from the A90 precludes housing. Furthermore, the site is accessible since the new A90 interchange junction (446, 794).

Bid FR148

Respondents considered that coalescence of existing small hamlets should be avoided to maintain rural landscape character and avoid over development (506, 794).

Another respondent proposes a new long term (reserved) site for employment retail and housing development to the Northwest to provide cohesion with sites FR079, FR080, FR089 and FR116 (248).

The inclusion of a new site for housing is proposed to the south of FR089 (446).

3. Actions

General

We do not propose to remove the protective status of site P2. The site is protected to conserve the woodland setting of the village as part of the green network for the village. Land protected for green network does not always mean to allow public access or to function as public open space. It can be protected for the ecological value and to prevent fragmentation of a woodland habitat. It is noted that the respondent has been maintaining and improving the site to protect the setting of their house and enjoyed as a woodland. Retaining the protected status of the land does not conflict with the respondent's use of the land and the Council's intent to retain and protect the woodland from inappropriate development in order to conserve the setting of the area.

With regard to additional allocations, in accordance with the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan sufficient additional housing and employment land allocations are identified in the Aberdeen Market Area. It is considered that Balmedie has an appropriate amount of land identified for housing and employment to meet local needs during the Plan period.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) does not propose to include a specific allocation for a school. Aberdeenshire Council's Education and Children's Services are a stakeholder in the preparation of the Proposed LDP and have advised that, in the first instance, they would seek to extend or reconfigure the existing primary school, alongside a wider strategic approach to primary school education in south Formartine. However, we are committed to continuously engage with Aberdeenshire Council's Education and Children's Services on the capacity of Balmedie Primary School.

Services and Infrastructure

Scottish Water would be required to initiate a growth project once development meets their five growth criteria.

With regard to the replacement tree planting along the A90, this is not a matter for the LDP process. Any issues regarding the A90 should be directed to Transport Scotland.

Bid FR077 / Existing Site – OP1

With regard to the changes sought to OP1 allocation, as identified in the Main Issues Report, these align with our proposed amendment to this allocation to allow 80 homes, 11 hectares of employment land, mixed commercial land, retail and hotel and a single Masterplan for Sites OP1 and OP2.

The respondent had correctly identified that the reference to R1 in the Draft Proposed LDP refers to the reserved land for new community facilities, and not the trunk road works. Reference to this will be removed from the allocation summary.

With regarding to green infrastructure, the Proposed LDP requires the development to provide green links to the wider green network of open space within Balmedie and Balmedie Country Park. As such no further action is required.

For consistency with other Settlement Statements in the LDP we do not agree that the “Natural and Historic Environment” section of the Settlement Statement should be amended to include “Balmedie is located within the Coastal Special Landscape Area”, as the settlement itself is not included within the boundaries of the ‘North East Aberdeenshire Coast’ Special Landscape Area designation.

Bid FR124 / Existing Site – OP2

With regard to green infrastructure, the allocation summary within the Draft Proposed LDP requires the development to provide green links to the wider green network of open space within Balmedie and Balmedie Country Park. In addition, the requirement for a Masterplan to be prepared for Site OP1 and OP2 is stated within the allocation summaries. As such no further action is required.

Existing Site – OP3

The respondent raised objection to the planning application rather than the principles of the land use. The LDP process cannot address the issues and complaints of current planning applications. As the site has an extant planning approval, the site should remain allocated within the Plan. No action is required.

Bid FR022

We maintain that the site is not a suitable extension to Balmedie at this time. We do not propose taking forward any sites to the west of the A90. This site on its own is too far detached from Balmedie’s current built form to be considered as a logical extension to the settlement, at this time. Furthermore, in accordance with the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan sufficient additional housing land allocations are identified in the Aberdeen Housing Market Area. It is considered that Balmedie has an

appropriate amount of land identified for housing to meet local housing needs during the Plan period.

Bid FR079 and FR080

In the interest of clarity and certainty in developing allocated sites within the LDP, sites reserved for future development will not be identified within the Proposed LDP. No action is required.

Bid FR089

In the interest of clarity and certainty in developing allocated sites within the LDP, sites reserved for future development will not be identified within the Proposed LDP.

Furthermore, in accordance with the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan, sufficient additional housing land allocations are identified in the Aberdeen Housing Market Area. It is considered that Balmedie has an appropriate amount of land identified for housing to meet local housing needs during the Plan period. No action is required.

Bid FR103

Whilst it is recognised that the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan sets a housing density at 30 houses per hectare, we would agree that a lower density of houses would be more appropriate for this location. The existing single track access road is constrained due to the trees that exist on the side of the road that contribute to the character of the area. In addition, the FR103 site would be an extension to the existing Shady Neuk development, as site FR116 is not being brought forward at this time. A high density of development would not be in keeping with the character and setting of the adjacent development and this rural location. While a development of 15 houses would be more appropriate in achieving a balanced development in this location, road access could not be delivered to allow the site to be developed. Considerable widening would be required.

Bid FR116

We maintain our position that site FR116 could be a viable development site in the longer term, subject to infrastructure issues being resolved. However, it is considered that Balmedie has an appropriate amount of land identified for housing to meet local housing needs during the Plan period. In the interest of clarity and certainty in developing allocated sites within the LDP, sites reserved for future development will not be identified within the Proposed LDP. However, this site could be considered within future plans. No action is required.

Bid FR128

We maintain our position that this site not suitable for housing at this time. It is acknowledged that the respondent considers the site would be suitable for commercial or retail uses due to its location near the A90. In isolation, the site is not a logical extension to Balmedie's built form and would have a significant adverse impact on the rural character of the wider area. This site could only be considered if other sites on

this side of the A90 were being brought forward. However, at this time, development is better placed to the north and south of Balmedie, on the east side of the A90. No further action is required.

Bid FR148

We maintain our view that this site is not suitable for residential development. Hill of Keir is a small cluster of approximately 18 houses. Hill of Keir does not meet the criteria as a settlement in the LDP as it does not provide any services or facilities. The proposed site would result in an unsustainable community that would depend on private cars to obtain services and facilities within Balmedie. The site is too large for the 21 houses proposed, thus potentially promoting a development that would fail to meet the 6 criteria of successful place making and the principles of the Energetica Framework. No further action is required.

Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

A number of changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed LDP on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below

4. Recommendations

1. Modify the Vision to reflect the local community's concerns regarding vehicle speeding within the town, provision for cycling, availability of a site for education, and lack of youth facilities.
2. Re-allocate existing site OP1 (bid FR077) for 80 homes, 11 ha employment land, mixed commercial land, retail and hotel, and amend allocation summary to replace "Access to the site will be achieved through trunk roadworks completed on the R1 site and via Eigie Road." with "Access to the site will be taken via Eigie Road."
3. Retain existing site OP3.
4. Remove bid FR103 for 15 homes.
5. Remove references to the Future Opportunity sites at FOP1, FOP2 and FOP3 and FOP4.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed, subject to the amendment of the maps to reflect the current road layouts, the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.

3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 63 Barthol Chapel

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
363	Mr George Bruce
487	Mr Phil Booth
554	Mr Robert N Barker
735	Ms Jane Barker
775	Ms Laura Watt
776	Mr Martin Watt
805	SEPA
1047	Mr & Mrs Katherine & Roger Williams

2. Issues

Housing allocation, with an “infill” style approach is welcomed (1047).

There are concerns regarding the Village Green in terms of parking, access, landscaping, functionality, also raised (1047) maintenance (363, 1047).

Extra car parking for the church should be considered on site FR059 (1047).

There are concerns on the entire allocation in terms of access to the site and the capacity of surrounding roads (363, 487, 554, 735, 775, 776) amenity, drainage, need for the development, (775, 776) loss of sites currently under a protected designation, ecological impacts (735) landscape, and lack of public transport (554, 735). The informal recreation area already exists with limited community benefits from development of the site and new routes to school (554).

Land ownership is disputed, with the tree belt and school grounds included within the proposed site (363, 487, 554).

The capacity of the school roll is disputed (487, 554.)

Additional tree planting should be provided (487).

The development constitutes potential ribbon development (363, 554).

SEPA has identified that a Flood Risk Assessment may be required due to the presence of the Burn of Keith which has been historically straightened. In addition, a buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse (805). SEPA note there is no reference to waste water drainage in the Draft Local Development Plan. Due to difficult site conditions a single WWTP of sufficient capacity and of a standard that can be adopted by Scottish Water will be a requirement (805).

3. Actions

The protected designation should remain in place around the school grounds and tree belt to protect existing amenities and ecology, the site boundary should be revised to suit and maintain this protection if required. Additional text shall be added to the Settlement Statement to ensure that increasing the quality of this area should be a requirement from the development.

Technical matters such as access, drainage, public transport as well as landscaping and/or visual impact can all be addressed through an appropriate application submission. Similarly, an appropriate submission would allow for sufficient car parking meaning no net impact upon the wider area. Maintenance of any open space (village green area) could be dealt with through a factoring agreement, if included within an application.

The proposal is not considered to pose any risk of ribbon development, any addition would reflect the character of the village and represent a natural addition.

4. Recommendations

1. Add to 'Services and Infrastructure' section of the Settlement Statement "Flood risk: there is no waste water treatment works drainage for Barthol Chapel. A single Waste Water Treatment Plant of sufficient capacity is required to serve all properties within the development and shall be of a standard that can be adopted by Scottish Water."
2. Site FR059 should be retained and allocated as OP1 with the boundary altered to take cognisance of the existing school grounds and existing woodland to ensure protection/retention.
3. Add to OP1 allocation summary: "A Flood Risk Assessment may be required due to the presence of the Burn of Keith which has been historically straightened. A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse which should be positively integrated into the development. The buffer strip will need to allow sufficient space for restoration of the Burn of Keith. Enhancement of the watercourse through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated."

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.

3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 64 Belhelvie

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
315	Belhelvie Community Council
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
795	John Handley Associates Ltd on behalf of Scotia Homes Ltd
805	SEPA
962	Graham + Sibbald on behalf of Leith Properties (Aberdeen) Ltd

2. Issues

General

One respondent was of the view that a site for a community centre should be identified and reserved within the settlement boundary or within bid sites in order to facilitate the community aspiration for this, as expressed in the Vision statement in the Main Issues Report and Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) (315). The respondent has also expressed concern regarding the increase in the capacity of bid sites FR131 and FR024 from 40 to 90 homes. They consider a lower capacity would be more consistent with the scale of the existing settlement (315).

It has been suggested that the names of existing sites OP1 (bid FR131) and OP2 (bid FR024) are swapped for clarity and consistency with the LDP 2017 preparation (795).

Existing OP1 site (East end of Park Terrace)

The OP1 allocation for 10 homes has been removed from the Draft Proposed LDP 2021. Planning permission for 14 homes at this site was granted on 1 April 2019 and a 'S75' has been signed. Therefore this allocation should be reinstated in the LDP 2021 (315).

Bid FR024

SNH has stated that site briefs should reinforce settlement identity with a focus on clearly established settlement boundaries given the pressures of large-scale change at Balmedie and Potterton (506).

One respondent has supported this site on the basis that it is effective and viable, meets local housing needs and is a logical extension to the settlement. The site has a range of access points, good connectivity with paths networks and public transport. Furthermore, surface water flooding can be addressed through drainage improvements within the site. Current capacity issues at Balmedie Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW) will be improved if required. At 1.88ha the site can accommodate 49 units with open space and landscaping to enhance biodiversity (795).

SEPA has highlighted that the site is adjacent to activities which are regulated by them under a Waste Management License, Pollution Prevention and Control (PPC) Permit or Controlled Activities (CAR) License. There may be co-location issues and advice should be sought from Environmental Health on the compatibility of these sites with existing adjacent regulated activities (805).

In addition, SEPA has noted that there is a quarry located less than 500m from the site resulting in possible noise and dust issues. A suitable buffer should be provided in line with Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) requirements between the licensed sites and the proposed development. This may impact the developable area available (805). SEPA has also requested that the two ponds on site should be positively integrated into the open space requirement for the development and that all development is restricted until implementation of a Scottish Water growth project is completed (805).

Bid FR025

SNH has highlighted that the site is adjacent to an area of semi natural ancient woodland as long established plantation origin (506).

Bid FR131

One respondent has supported this site and the increase in housing numbers from 15 to 41 (962).

SNH has stated that site briefs should reinforce settlement identity with focus on clearly established settlement boundaries given pressures of large scale change at Balmedie and Potterton (506).

SEPA has highlighted that the site is adjacent to activities which are regulated by them under a Waste Management License, Pollution Prevention and Control (PPC) Permit or Controlled Activities (CAR) License. There may be co-location issues and advice should be sought from Environmental Health on the compatibility of these sites with existing adjacent regulated activities (805).

In addition, SEPA has noted that there is a quarry located less than 500m from the site resulting in possible noise and dust issues. A suitable buffer should be provided in line with SPP requirements between the licensed sites and the proposed development. This may impact the developable area available (805).

3. Actions

General

With regard to the community aspiration for a community centre, the Draft Proposed LDP includes a reference to the community's aspiration for this. In addition, there is a site identified as R1 reserved for a future community centre. No further action is required.

The housing numbers proposed reflect the density of new housing development across Aberdeenshire to ensure the most efficient use of the land in order to deliver a good mix of housing type and size. The housing numbers are indicative and are dependent on the road layout, open space provision and drainage infrastructure. We do not propose to amend the housing numbers or site boundaries of these sites.

Existing site OP1 (East end of Park Terrace)

This allocation was proposed to be removed in the Draft Proposed LDP as the site was constrained in the Housing Land Audit 2018. However, since the site was granted full planning permission in March 2019 for the erection of 14 houses, this site shall be retained within the Proposed Local Development Plan as OP1.

Bid FR024 and Bid FR131

Logical numbering of these sites is appropriate.

The proposed site brief for each of these sites in the Draft Proposed LDP states that “The design of the homes should be in keeping with the other nearby residential properties and the character of the village”. However, the allocation summary will be amended to include appropriate boundary treatments to establish a strong settlement boundary for Belhelvie.

Regarding the quarry and waste management site, Aberdeenshire Council’s Environmental Health Team have confirmed that there are no co-location issues. In addition, it is considered that the distance between the quarry and the proposed allocated sites provides an adequate buffer. Therefore, the quarry and waste management site will not impact on the allocation or developable area of the allocation.

With regard to Scottish Water infrastructure, the need for a Growth Project shall be included in the Settlement Statement.

The ponds within this site FR024 are located on the southernmost part of the site. It is considered appropriate to incorporate these features into the open space provision as an opportunity to enhance biodiversity. This will be reflected in the allocation summary.

Bid FR025

We maintain our position that this site is not a suitable extension to the settlement. The site is not well connected to the existing settlement due to the woodland. As there are other, more suitable sites, this site is not being brought forward at this time. No further action is required.

4. Recommendations

1. Amend ‘Services and Infrastructure’ section to state: “There is insufficient capacity at Balmedie Waste Water Treatment Works to treat all sites allocated at Balmedie, Belhelvie, Newburgh and Potterton. Scottish Water will initiate a

growth project, should demand from committed development exceed available capacity.”

2. Retain existing site OP1 (East end of Park Terrace) for 14 homes.
3. Allocate Bid FR131 for 41 homes as OP2 and adjust settlement boundary accordingly.
4. Allocate Bid FR024 for 49 homes as OP3 and adjust settlement boundary accordingly.
5. Include the following text within the allocation summary for bid FR131 “As the site is at the edge of the settlement, landscaping should be utilised along the southeast and east boundaries to soften the impact of the development on the surrounding countryside and to define the settlement boundary.”
6. Include the following text within the allocation summary for bid FR024: “As the site is at the edge of the settlement, landscaping should be utilised along the south and east boundaries to soften the impact of the development on the surrounding countryside and to define the settlement boundary”.
7. Include the following text within the allocation summary for bid FR024: “There are two ponds located at the southernmost part of the site. These ponds should be retained and positively integrated into the design layout as part of the open space provision.”

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 65 Berefold

1. List of Respondents

None.

2. Issues

No issues were raised in respect of Berefold.

3. Actions

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

There are no protected areas or allocations in Berefold.

4. Recommendations

1. Remove Berefold from the Local Development Plan.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendation at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 66 Blackdog

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
28	Robert Lamb Architectural Services Ltd on behalf of Mr Ricky Greenhowe
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
603	Scott Hobbs Planning on behalf of Ashfield Land (Aberdeen) Limited
977	Graham + Sibbald on behalf of Leith Properties (Aberdeen) Ltd
805	SEPA

2. Issues

It was requested that the settlement boundary be amended at the southwest corner of Blackdog as the AWPR has divided the site making it almost useless for its original purpose (28).

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) supported the statement that the community aspires to provide a cycle link to Balmedie. They requested that the cycle link be included in the list of Services and Infrastructure which developers will be expected to make contributions towards. They also requested that the section Natural and Historic Environment should note the proposed marine extension to the Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA for feeding terns (506).

One respondent is generally supportive of the proposed settlement Vision for Blackdog within the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP). However, they believed that the Settlement Statement did not go far enough and omits reference to the town centre status. The Proposed LDP should also be updated to show the extent of the town centre (603).

Existing Site – OP1

The respondent is supportive of site OP1 and states the text is accurate (603).

SNH agreed with the Main Issues Report that housing on site OP1 would make this a destination rather than just part of the AWPR infrastructure. They suggested that the recently completed Aberdeen Landscape Study comments that capacity work at Balmedie and Potterton should be taken into account to facilitate a holistic proactive approach to management of change across this whole coastal area (506).

SEPA has highlighted that this site would require a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). In addition, buffer strips would be required adjacent to the watercourses which should be positively integrated into the development. Enhancement of the watercourses through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated (805).

SEPA questions the need to upgrade Strathbathie Waste Water Treatment Works as they believe it is being under-utilised and may not require upgrade as an increase in flow is likely to improve performance (805).

Bid FR113

A respondent sought the allocation of this site as a defined town centre for Blackdog to reflect the planning permission for this area. The respondent considered the statement suggesting that only existing and functional town centres can be listed is flawed and contrary to Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) that requires that emerging town centres should be identified in the Proposed LDP (603).

Bid FR057

A respondent promoted the inclusion of bid site FR057 within the Proposed LDP, disagreeing with the conclusions within the MIR that the site is in an undesirable location due to its significant expansion into the countryside and its detrimental impact on the landscape setting around Blackdog. The role of the AWPR as a transport corridor is fully recognised and the purpose of the proposed development is to provide service facilities for users of the transport corridor and to provide a safe and convenient place for drivers to rest and refuel. Road infrastructure (A90 and AWPR) acts as a physical barrier and separates the land from the wider countryside area. Sufficient landscaping through the provision of a landscaping plan could be specified as a policy requirement (977).

3. Actions

The proposed marine extension to the Ythan Estuary, Sand of Forvie and Meikle Loch Special Protection Area (SPA) could extend the existing SPA by approximately 1.5km to the south towards Aberdeen. The extension to this SPA is still pending and therefore the request to include it in the Settlement Statement for Blackdog is premature at this time. No direct action is required and Policy E1 Natural Heritage would provide suitable protection to such a site from development.

While comments from SNH regarding the “Aberdeen Landscape Study” are noted, its findings were taken into account in the identification of the Spatial Strategy for this area, but as no new development sites are proposed for Blackdog its relevance is limited.

Existing Site – OP1

With regard to the request that the cycle link should be included as a developer contribution these can only be made under strict terms of Circular 3/2012 “Planning Obligations and Good Neighbour Agreements”. Contributions towards a cycle path between Blackdog and Balmedie is not considered to be necessary to make the development acceptable. Therefore, contributions cannot be sought from developers. However, the community aspirations for a cycle link to Balmedie has been included in the Settlement Statement. No actions are required for site OP1.

The Draft Proposed LDP recognises that an FRA is required for this site. However, it is considered appropriate to amend the text to include buffer strips and enhancement of the watercourse within the allocation summary.

Bid FR113

At present this area of land is undeveloped greenfield land. It is acknowledged that this site is part of a larger area (site OP1) that has Planning Permission in Principle for mixed used development, a town centre, retail, leisure, businesses (Use Class 3) and industrial (Use Class 4, 5 and 6). However, the matters specified in the condition of this permission are still to be submitted. Therefore, there is no justification to identify the indicative land uses of the current planning permission within the Proposed Local Development Plan (Proposed LDP). This area of land, at present, does not function as a town centre as it provides no facilities or services that would usually be found within a town centre.

The agreed Masterplan and the Planning Permission in Principle are material considerations when determining a potential future application. The principles established in these documents are reflected within the Blackdog Settlement Statement that require the “Future development of the site should seek to develop in line with the agreed Masterplan”. The provision of a town centre is sufficiently safeguarded at present without specific inclusion within the Proposed LDP.

Bid FR057

It is not considered necessary to amend the settlement boundary at the south-west corner of Blackdog at bid FR057. This area of land is part of the greenbelt and functions well for its purpose. Inclusion of this site within the settlement boundary of Blackdog could potentially result in “infill” development and unjustifiable loss of greenbelt land. NESTRANS have advised they do not foresee a need for roadside services in this location.

It is maintained that this site is undesirable. The site is separated from the settlement and its existing and proposed services by the A90. The site is not considered to reflect the existing pattern of development and the direction of growth approved under current planning consents. It would require a large area of undeveloped land, currently designated as greenbelt, to accommodate the development. This would have a detrimental impact on the landscape setting around Blackdog and is not something that can be adequately mitigated by strategic landscaping. In addition the site is not considered to be “physically separated by the rest of the greenbelt allocation and wider countryside area by existing road infrastructure”. The land immediately to the south is also undeveloped greenbelt land within the boundaries of Aberdeen City and therefore, on the ground, the site does not appear to be “physically separated” from the wider countryside.

It is noted that the respondent’s desire is to develop this site to provide service facilities for users of the transport corridor and provide a safe place for drivers to rest and refuel. However, such services could be delivered within the existing allocation. It is noted

that there is a fuel station location less than 1km south of the site. As such, this is not sufficient justification for the removal of the greenbelt designation to accommodate new development.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

A number of changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed LDP on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below.

4. Recommendations

1. Modify the Vision within the Settlement Statement to reflect the aspirations as expressed in early consultation by local stakeholders, including the Community Council.
2. Add the following text to site OP1 allocation summary “Buffer strips will be required adjacent to the watercourses which should be positively integrated into the development. Enhancement of the watercourses through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated”.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 67 Collieston

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
506	Scottish Natural Heritage

2. Issues

The respondent requested that the section 'Natural and Historic Environment' should note the presence of the Sands of Forvie National Nature Reserve close to the south west of Collieston (506).

3. Actions

The Natural Heritage policies within the Local Development Plan requires that planning applications include an assessment to ensure that development does not have significant adverse effects on nationally designated sites and that the overall integrity of those sites are not compromised. It is considered to be reasonable to identify the national nature reserve located close to Collieston as well as the international designations.

4. Recommendations

1. Amend the Settlement Statement 'Natural and Historic Environment' section to include "The Sands of Forvie Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the Forvie National Nature Reserve is situated to the south-west of the settlement.."

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendation at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 68 Cultercullen

1. List of Respondents

None.

2. Issues

No issues were raised in respect of Cultercullen.

3. Actions

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

Cultercullen has a range of brownfield sites within its boundary. A number of changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below.

4. Recommendations

1. Amend the Vision in the Settlement Statement noting that the community believe that incentives should be provided to encourage the development of brownfield sites.
2. Protect the school and its recreation ground, and the landscaping to the east of Greenfields.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations, subject to the amendment of the maps to clarify that the designated open space was protected within the settlements, at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 69 Cuminestown

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
310	Mr & Mrs Graham & Susan
340	Ryden LLP on behalf of Mr Robert Ironside
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
805	SEPA

2. Issues

Concern regarding flood risk was raised, particularly in defining the developable area (310, 805). A Flood Risk Assessment is required (805). Drainage constraints need to be resolved (310) but can be overcome (340). There is a need to support local services (310).

Existing Site – OP1

The removal of the constrained OP1 site is welcomed (310, 340).

Bids FR038 and FR039

A respondent would like to see affordable housing promoted as well as care over layout/design. Additional landscaping would be desirable (310).

Bids FR038 and FR039 were supported (340, 506), conditional on ecological benefits along Teuchar Stank being realised and incorporated into any scheme, alongside an appropriate development pattern and links to recreation (506). Bids FR038 and FR039 should be combined. FR038 can be built out in a single phase, at a higher density (up to 70 units) and has sufficient room for a buffer strip (340).

There was no justification for the statement that part of the FR038 site may be constrained until 2031 (340).

It is considered that FR039 can be accommodated into the existing development pattern (340).

3. Actions

Existing site OP1

There is support for the removal of site OP1 as it is constrained.

Bid FR038 and FR039

Bids FR038 and FR039 can fill the potential gap in housing supply following removal of constrained OP1. These should be combined as a single allocation (40+20 = 60 units) to increase flexibility and co-ordination in delivery, which would assist in overcoming

delivery pressures and accommodating flood risk associated with the site. Given flooding constraints with the site, it is not considered appropriate to increase the allocation. Focus on accommodating ecological interest across the site should be retained, as well as the provision of a generous buffer strip.

Technical issues such as access, flooding, drainage, links to recreation and additional landscaping would be addressed through an appropriate planning application, as would affordable housing requirements. Similarly added flexibility through a single allocation as well as an appropriate planning application should ensure that aspects such as design/layout can be successfully accommodated in terms of respecting the character of the area and integrating with the characteristics of the site.

Statement that part of the site may remain constrained until post 2031 is based upon development/build rates and lack of finance or developer to pursue the site(s). This is considered to be realistic but should not represent a hindrance or obstacle to the allocation in the Proposed Local Development Plan.

4. Recommendations

1. Remove existing OP1 site for 50 houses as it remains constrained.
2. Combine FR038 and FR039 into a single site to increase flexibility and coordination of delivery to account for the characteristics of the site for a development of 60 homes.
3. Seek a Flood Risk Assessment and retain the ecological focus for FR038 and FR039.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 70 Daviot

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
312	John Wink Design on behalf of Mr John Forrest
396	John Wink Design on behalf of Mr Mark Young
804	Meldrum, Bourtie and Daviot Community Council
846	Meldrum, Bourtie and Daviot Community Council
876	Woodland Trust Scotland
805	SEPA

2. Issues

Respondents agreed with all of the Officers' recommendations in the Main Issues Report (MIR) (804, 846).

Existing Site – OP1

SEPA noted that there is no reference to waste water drainage in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) for Daviot. It is therefore presumed that there is sufficient capacity at the Sewage Treatment Works for this development of 8 houses (805).

Bid FR081

Ancient woodland should be excluded from the site boundary and an additional buffer added (876).

Site FR100

A respondent indicated that plots the subject of bid FR100 would be served by individual treatments plants to cover drainage, 3 additional units would not appear out of context despite separation from the settlement (396).

Bid FR101 and FR102

Ancient woodland should be excluded from the site boundary and additional buffer added (876). It was highlighted that the bid was for 12 units, not 37 as stated in the MIR and an appropriate housing mix can be provided. The prime agricultural land designation is acknowledged, at roughly 17% of the sites, but not suitable for farming (312).

3. Actions

The support on the proposed actions highlighted in the MIR is welcomed. All woodlands of long established origin (ancient woodland) require to be protected. No response was received to the exclusion of site FR018 from the Proposed LDP.

We acknowledge that FR101 is only for 12 units rather than the stated 37, but this is gross under-delivery on the site which can accommodate many more homes than this low density. On revision our standard calculation is that the 1.4ha site could accommodate 35 homes at 25 homes per hectare.

Prime agricultural land is a resource that requires to be conserved, and as stated in Scottish Planning Policy should be conserved unless absolutely necessary.

With regard to capacity within the sewage treatment works, Scottish Water has confirmed that there is sufficient capacity for the houses allocated within site OP1. In accordance with the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan sufficient additional housing land allocations are identified in the Rural Housing Market Area. It is considered that Daviot has an appropriate amount of land identified for housing to meet local housing needs during the Plan period.

The conclusions of the MIR are appropriate, no further allocation in the settlement is required. There are existing growth and permissions in place to support services while not adversely impacting upon drainage or education constraints.

A number of changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed LDP on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below.

4. Recommendations

1. Modification to the Vision for the settlement is promoted to reflect community aspiration.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendation at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 71 Ellon

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
242	Lippe Architects + Planners on behalf of CHAP Group Ltd
330	Ms Vivienne Wallace
405	Ms Glenda Simpson
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
508	Bancon Homes Ltd
515	Ryden LLP on behalf of Stewart Milne Homes
516	Ryden LLP on behalf of Stewart Milne Homes
517	Ryden LLP on behalf of Stewart Milne Homes
552	Ms Myra Fearnside
562	Scotia Homes Ltd
586	Mr Trevor Mason
660	Dr Barrie Seddon
805	SEPA
905	Ellon Community Council
1009	Historic Environment Scotland

2. Issues

General

Concern was raised regarding potential traffic impacts of a bridge over the Ythan and general road capacity for future development in Ellon (330).

The respondent generally supports the plan for homes provided there are affordable homes and recreational areas delivered (586).

It is considered that if any development is going to have a visual impact in some way, the assumption is that developers would be encouraged to reduce the impacts of their developments. There must be consideration in all cases for the town's infrastructure, including school provision, medical centres and water/waste treatment. All these must be expanded as the town grows and should not be considered a reason to hold back on development (905).

Within the Settlement Statement in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) the respondent recommends that the sixth planning objective should be reworded to say 'Preserve and enhance the amenity of the settlement, including its greenspace.' However, the statement in the Draft Proposed LDP that states greenspace will be protected and enhanced with new green networks identified, is welcomed (506).

Flood Risk

SEPA has advised that there may be surface water flooding issues from overland flow coming from the steep land above Ellon. This risk should be discussed within the Council's Flood Risk and Coastal Protection Team (805).

Existing Site - OP1 / Bid FR090

Concern has been raised that any further development of Ellon away from Cromleybank will have issues of connectivity, being split by either the A948, A90, Golf Course (north) or the Buchan-Formartine way (905).

There are also concerns regarding the scale of allocations in Ellon (515, 552). The 980 home site at Cromleybank has not started (515, 552). This allocation is not challenged, but the expectation of delivering 980 houses by 2031 is questioned (508). Another respondent considers that this site would alter the character and sense of place associated with Ellon. The proposals risk urbanisation and overdevelopment (515, 552). If only 386 units are proposed to be built by 2025 the site is not delivering the number of homes to meet the housing requirement in the Strategic Development Plan (515).

A preference that Cromleybank is developed ahead of other larger housing developments has been expressed. However, if the delays are ongoing for the foreseeable future, then having other sites developed first would be appropriate (905).

A respondent has objected to the proposed road being included as part of bid FR090. The road will infringe on residential privacy and increased noise. The development of the road will destroy woodland on the edge of Hillhead Road. Development will have a detrimental impact on wildlife. The Council should consider re-routing the proposed road. There are concerns that the road will create an infill opportunity to the north (405, 506, 552).

Another respondent requested that the proposed road be located further away from the Bredero properties, and the junction relocated further along the A920. In addition, noise reducing measures should be considered including the choice of materials for the road surface, speed limits, and planting of hedges and trees (552). Furthermore, it has been highlighted that Site FR090 includes, and is adjacent to, a small area of woodland listed in the Scottish semi-natural woodland inventory, but noted that a development framework has been agreed for this site (506, 552). Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) suggest that a site brief should also be developed to ensure a coherent sense of place is developed for a development of this scale (506).

The link road (southern bypass) would be the preferred addition which should relieve some of the traffic from the town centre and reduce congestion at bridge traffic lights. An ideal scenario would be to also have vehicular access across the Ythan River adjacent to Boatie Tams Bridge (905).

A respondent considered the proposed vehicular bridge and east/west links for the site not viable, and that the site is not a readily available and unconstrained site given its failure to provide any housing since its allocation in 2012 (515).

The statement about active travel is welcomed, but it is suggested by SNH that this should be 'required' rather than 'promoted'. The expectation for connectivity to the rest of the Ellon green network is also welcomed and SNH recommend that site briefs for the development should set out the green network within it and its connections outward (506).

Development on this site would put huge strain on already stretched resources in the town, including the doctor surgery and Ellon Academy. Amenities and services need to be improved before development could come forward (552, 905).

It was highlighted that existing site OP1 is subject to frequent flooding and it is identified as a floodplain (660, 905). The floodplain area was suggested as a protected area or parkland to match the parkland (Glebe Field) set on the opposite north bank of the River. However, it is considered this plan is not being recognised and this risks the building of houses on the floodplain (660).

The respondent supports retention of OP1/ bid FR090. It has been highlighted that discussions have been taking place with relevant infrastructure providers including Scottish Water, Transport Scotland, and the Council's Education Service to bring this site forward (562).

Support is given to site OP1/bid FR090 from another respondent. The new academy/community centre already in this location, therefore developing this site would reduce the sense of remoteness the academy current has from the town (905).

Historic Environment Scotland has raised concerns about the potential effect on Listed building LB31110 (Cat A) Old Bridge of Ellon as a result of development of site OP1. There is a need to address preservation of the bridge and its immediate setting including associated flood risk management (1009).

Existing Site - OP2

There is a desire to see the OP2 Former Ellon Academy sites developed in such a way that they enhance Ellon and provide the best available economic options for the town. Consolidation and expansion of the Council Offices within Ellon is welcomed. The new health centre is also welcomed as the existing facility does not have the capacity for the expanding town, and this central location would be beneficial to many (905).

However, the respondent would like to ensure that the intended developments are required and are not done just to make use of the sites. The respondent would prefer they remain undeveloped until a sound and feasible use is found for them (or in part), even it means waiting for a more favourable economic environment. To enhance the 'civic' space feel, various units could be included that function as public rentable spaces

for parties/functions, pop-up shops for community organisations or for youth club type venues that may be more appropriate and accessible (being town centre) than those available at the Community Campus. In addition, the respondent considers that for site 2, care would need to be taken to ensure that the area is seen as accessible for non-residents to pass from Golf Road or the woodlands to access the town centre, Health Centre or Ellon Castle Gardens (905).

The 'Ellon Now Ellon New' project should be consulted on the appropriate uses for the town before any decision is taken. In addition, there should be adequate parking to support the sites and their specific purposes, to ensure surrounding residents are not disadvantaged (905).

Existing Site - OP3 / Bid FR011

SEPA has identified that a Flood Risk Assessment will be required for this site due to the watercourse along the western boundary that has been historically straightened. A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse which should be positively integrated into the development. The buffer strip needs to allow sufficient space for restoration of the burn. Enhancement of the watercourse through re-naturalisation and removal of redundant feature should be investigated (805).

Existing Sites - OP4 and BUS

It is believed that business development options should be retained in the Plan in the event of an upturn in the economy (905). Increasing the size of the roundabout at A90 junction or creating slip roads may be required, and the respondent notes there are still a number of sites undeveloped within the BUS site which should be progressed before OP4 is developed (905).

SEPA has identified that the BUS site has a flood risk and therefore a Flood Risk Assessment is required. It is also requested that a buffer strip is required adjacent to the watercourse which should be integrated positively into the development (805).

Bid FR031

A respondent queries the need for further housing in Ellon. Cromleybank is a previously allocated site that has still not been built (330).

SEPA agrees the recommendation to not take bid site FR031 forward. The riverside and associated woodland with other habitats provide important green corridors for the area (506).

Others object to the development of site FR031 due to the potential adverse impact on Ellon Town Centre (330, 586). The development of this site would be less accessible than Ellon's town centre and would increase traffic from the west side of town and create more parking problems (586).

SEPA has highlighted concern about the development of this site due to its historical significance being in close proximity to Waterton Castle, together with flooding risks

associated with being a riverbank site. The current character should be maintained as an important feature of the local landscape. SEPA also recommend that this site is protected as green land (905).

However, other respondents have objected to the failure of the Main Issues Report to identify site FR031 for mixed use development (515, 516). This site is considered to be well located for retail and leisure uses, and has a sustainable location for the introduction of housing (516). The respondent suggests that 150 residential units should be transferred from the FR090, which demonstrates the suitability and capability of that site to accommodate a mixed use development.

In support of the development of site FR031 the respondent states that the site has features that provide distinctive character, creating an attractive landscape setting for the housing proposed. A landscape assessment concludes that retail development would result in a higher magnitude of change for key landscape and visual receptors, and the lower height and finer grain of a mixed use development would create a more appropriately scaled development that responds to existing built character and a lower magnitude of landscape impact. It is not accepted that retail is the most appropriate use for site FR031. A mixed use development is a more logical and appropriate solution for the site than purely retail. A mix of uses would ensure a sustainable development would be delivered within close proximity to services and employment areas, with less reliance on the private car. The prospective developer commits to future investigations in relation to waste water and water supply, and does not consider this an impediment to development (516).

Whilst one respondent stated that there is no additional road infrastructure required for site FR031 (515), another respondent states that a Transport Impact Assessment would be required and contributions to mitigate the development would be delivered (516).

Bid FR032

SEPA has highlighted that a Flood Risk Assessment is required for this site due to the presence of the Ythan and other small water courses. Buffer strips will be required adjacent to the watercourses which should be integrated positively into the development. The buffer strips will need to allow sufficient space for the River Ythan to follow its natural course. The smaller watercourses have been historically straightened. Enhancement of these through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated (805).

There is support for the continued inclusion of FR032 for Retail (Class1) and Leisure Facilities (Class 11). Ellon has capacity to accommodate a retail park, reinforced by the conclusions of the Town Centre Health Check 2011. However, housing should be introduced on the site to provide a mixed use development (517, 905). It is argued that introducing housing on the site will support the proposed retail and leisure uses, as well as create a sustained mixed use development with less visual impact (as detailed in the respondent's Landscape Assessment submitted with comments) (517). The site has suitable transport links to support the site for a range of uses. The respondent

acknowledges that the constraints regarding surface water flooding, waste water treatment and water supply can be overcome and should not be considered as impediments to development. Traffic measures and access feasibility assessment due to the site's location within the A920 and A90 corridors would be assessed at the planning application stage. There is also agreement that existing trees and mature wooded areas should be retained, and that buffer strips should be provided adjacent to the Ythan River and Broomie's Burn (517), as noted by SEPA.

Other respondents have objected to site FR032 due to the impact on Ellon town centre (330, 586). The site is less accessible than Ellon's town centre and would increase traffic from the west side of town and create more parking problems (586).

Bid FR063 and Bid FR064

One respondent has supported bids FR063 and FR064 as they feel that these sites can deliver the planning strategy for the Aberdeen to Peterhead SGA and Energetica Corridor, and can plug any housing deficiencies for addressing a low completion rate for houses noted in the Aberdeenshire Council's Monitoring Statement (2017-2018). The exclusion of this site is unjustified and there are anomalies and inconsistencies with assessments made in comparison with site FR092. The respondent considers site FR063 would fit within the landscape setting and the proposed landscaping would not have a detrimental impact on the setting of Ellon. Landscaping will lessen their visual impact and provide a setting for the proposed cemetery (242).

Another respondent is of the opinion that site FR063 is an opportunity to improve the golf course to attract more visitors to the town (586).

Another respondent has mixed views on these sites due to their remoteness from Ellon. However, with suitable foot/cycle infrastructure, particularly along the A948 and onto the Buchan-Formartine Way, the development could be seen as being part of Ellon. It should also be taken into consideration that Auchterellon and Meiklemill both have single road access from the housing estates into the town centre. However, the Cromleybank site remains the preferred site for development before other larger housing developments are progressed (905).

The respondent does not consider that co-location to the proposed cemetery is not desirable, as stated in the Main Issues Report. Although cemeteries tend to be located on the outskirts of towns, they are often overtaken by development and soon become within town boundaries e.g. Castle Road Cemetery (905).

Bid FR075

The respondent had no issue with this site being developed provided that these houses would implement suitable drainage/sewage facilities (905).

Bid FR076

The respondent had no issue with this site being developed provided that these houses would implement suitable drainage/sewage facilities (905).

Bid FR084

The respondent had no issues with this development remaining in the Plan provided that the development is carefully landscaped to fit in with the existing low-density housing surrounding it (905).

Bid FR092

Respondents did not support the allocation of Site FR092. The decision to reserve site FR092 is flawed as the Main Issues Report says nothing positive about the site as it is located beyond the A948 which acts as a physical boundary for the settlement, and would be more prominent and not fit in with Ellon or any landscape features (242, 506, 905). This site should not be reserved to plug any deficiencies within existing housing allocations, as there is no indication how this site can be delivered (242).

SNH has stated that if site FR092 is developed, this area would change the current boundaries of the settlement and potentially open up other areas to the north of Ellon for development. The gentle rising of the land would make this site a challenge to develop without incurring significant landscape and visual impacts. The location responds awkwardly to the existing settlement centre and further accentuates the need for unsustainable forms of car based travel and access to the core services of Ellon. If the site was taken forward, there should be a site specific brief demonstrating integration with Ellon in terms of greenspace and active travel routes, with protection and enhancement of the woodland (506).

In addition, a respondent had concerns regarding the impact on the busy bypass. Speed restrictions would need to be considered or the road would need to be re-classified (905).

A respondent has requested that FR031 should be allocated instead of site FR092 as it is well related to the existing settlement, contained by existing development, and would not extend the settlement boundary (516).

SEPA has stated that a Flood Risk Assessment may be required due to the presence of Broomie Burn on the eastern boundary which has been historically straightened (805).

3. Actions

General

With regard to general traffic impacts on the bridge over the Ythan and general road capacity within Ellon, this issue has been taken into consideration when planning for Ellon. Cromleybank is the largest proposed residential allocation for Ellon and transport links have been one of the matters which have delayed its implementation. The proposed development plan promotes active travel as opposed to use of private cars, with connections to existing path and green corridor networks being encouraged. No further action is required.

The support for new homes is acknowledged, provided there are affordable homes and recreational areas as required by development plan policies, and landscape impacts are addressed. Whilst we welcome the statement proposed for the Vision for Ellon within the Settlement Statement on protection of greenspace, policies also require that greenspace is protected and enhanced with new green networks identified.

Flood Risk

With regard to flooding, the flood risk identified within the Settlement Statement for Ellon in the Draft Proposed LDP has identified the flood risks which have been taken into account in assessing potential development sites including minor amendments which will be taken forward into the Proposed LDP. Through Flood Risk Assessment (as promoted by SEPA) layout design should not include development within areas at risk from flooding.

Existing Site - OP1 / Bid FR090

It is noted that no respondents have challenged the allocation of site OP1/FR090, however there are concerns regarding the ongoing delay in delivering the site. It remains the view that Ellon is a major service centre and is a key settlement in the Aberdeen to Peterhead Strategic Growth Corridor for the provision of new houses. Therefore, Ellon is a suitable settlement to sustain significant, appropriately managed growth for housing and employment land. With regard to location, the proposed site is considered to be suitably sited within the valley to minimise visual impacts on the wider area. In addition, the development improves the balance of development within Ellon, ensuring the key features such as the town centre and Ythan River remain centrally situated and accessible to all.

With regard to the timing of the development, this is not something that can be controlled. The Planning Service continues to work with developers in order to deliver the Local Development Plan.

It is proposed to reserve land for a potential link road to the west of Ellon from the B9005. The potential link road will be required to ensure the local road network provides the necessary capacity to accommodate east to west traffic by-passing the town and facilitate the development of site OP1. It is very unlikely that the route for this road will be shown as anything other than indicative at this stage, and outwith the settlement boundary. Development within the area of land between the defined boundary and the indicative road would be contrary to the Plan. Impacts would be managed as part of any planning application.

With regard to active travel, it is agreed this is required and not just promoted. As such amending the wording of the Settlement Statement to reflect this is proposed.

With regard to comments made on the strain that new development will place on resources within the Ellon, such as the Doctor's surgery and Ellon Academy, it should be noted that Local Development Plan policy requires developers to make contributions towards the provision of necessary infrastructure. However, the Settlement Statement

within the Draft Proposed LDP has identified there is a requirement for a new primary school within site OP1 and that all residential development make contributions towards a new health centre at Ellon. The development of site OP1 could make significant contributions towards services within Ellon.

While site OP1, may overlap with an area at risk from flooding, these areas can be incorporated into any development as areas of open space that contribute to the connectivity of the green network and creating an opportunity to enhance biodiversity. This would result in a visually appealing development that allows suitable, safe access and enjoyment of Ellon's key feature, the Ythan River. In any case, the Settlement Statement for site OP1 identifies that a Flood Risk Assessment, Water Impact Assessment and a Drainage Impact Assessment will be required which will inform the layout design for this site. No further action is required.

Likewise, we are content that impact on listed structures can be avoided by good layout, siting and design. No further action is required.

Existing Site - OP2

The comments provided by respondents are detailed and as such would be better placed as a response to any proposed Masterplan or planning application. It is acknowledged that there is a local desire to redevelop the site for appropriate mixed uses is generally supported and as such there is no further action required.

Existing Site - OP3 / Bid FR011

It is agreed that Site OP3 requires to have a detailed Flood Risk Assessment associated with it and an appropriate buffer strip adjacent to the existing watercourse. However, the text should be amended to also include the requirement to restore the burn and encourage enhancement of watercourse through re-naturalisation.

Existing Sites - OP4 and BUS

The support for site OP4 is acknowledged. The requirement to investigate the option for access to the site has been addressed within the Settlement Statement. While it is acknowledged that there are vacant plots within the BUS site, the LDP cannot ensure the completion of one site before the release of another when both sites are deemed appropriate for development.

With regard to Flood Risk, the proposed Settlement Statement for Ellon identifies the BUS site as being in a 1 in 200 year flood risk area. The Settlement Statement requires that a "detailed Flood Risk Assessment will be required to accompany any future development proposals for these sites and an appropriate buffer strip will be required adjacent to the existing watercourse". No further action is required.

Bid FR031

Bid FR031, as proposed, is not considered to be an appropriate addition at this time. The development of this site is considered to have a negative impact on the landscape character of this area. This site, at present, is considered to contribute positively to the

natural green network along the River Ythan and protecting the setting of Boat of Fechil Croft, its outbuildings and boathouse, which are 'B' Listed Buildings. The site to the north has been identified as suitable for retail and leisure uses. Development of this site for residential use may place restriction on the deliverability and operation of the existing CC1 site in the same location. No further action is required.

Bid FR032

The inclusion of this site for retail and leisure uses is generally supported as a reflection of the CC1 allocation in the current Plan. There is no concern regarding the impact on Ellon's Town Centre as the existing retail units within Ellon's Town Centre are generally small and therefore places restrictions on the town's ability to attract larger comparable stores to the settlement. Retail use of this site would encourage larger retailers to the settlement. In any event, proposed Policy B2 Town Centres promotes a "Town Centre First" principle and any developer must demonstrate that the proposal will not have a significant adverse impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre, when making a planning application.

A mix of residential development, retail and leisure uses is not recommended for this site. There is concern that the residential use places restriction on the deliverability and operation of the site and has the potential to limit the scale of retail and leisure uses sought. No action is required.

With regard to flooding, SEPA has identified that that a Flood Risk Assessment is required for this site. As such the text within the Settlement Statement for this allocation is required to be amended accordingly.

Bid FR063 and FR064

It is maintained that these sites are undesirable. It is considered that these sites are not appropriate as an extension of Ellon at this time. These sites would breach the brow of the hill, resulting in a prominent, exposed site that breaches Ellon's natural landscape capacity.

The respondent is of the opinion that the proposed cemetery to the north would improve the landscape setting of this area, allowing for appropriate infill development to occur. The position is retained that it is appropriate to locate a cemetery away from houses due to the sensitive nature of the land use. Commonly active cemeteries are located out with settlements to avoid the potential for construction works to disturb mourners (or mourners to disturb adjacent dwellers). The development of houses would be more intrusive on the wider landscape than any structure associated with a cemetery. As such the siting of a cemetery outwith the settlement boundary for Ellon does not justify infill development that is likely to have a detrimental impact on the setting of Ellon. No action is required.

Bid FR075 and FR076

These sites are not considered appropriate for development. These sites are not a logical extension and are physically detached from the settlement by agricultural fields.

Development of these sites would have a negative impact on the rural landscape character. It is recommended that these sites are not allocated within the Development Plan.

Bid FR092

It is agreed that the development of this site would have significant adverse impacts on the landscape of the area. Development of this area would breach the brow of the hill resulting in a prominent development from all approaches to Ellon. The A948 functions as a bypass for the settlement and presents a physical barrier to achieve safe pedestrian access to the School and other services and facilities within Ellon. As such this site should not be included in the Plan.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

A number of changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed (LDP) on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below.

4. Recommendations

1. Modify the Vision to include the community's concern about a lack of choice for places for social contact in the town centre, and desire for the development of public transport modes for commuting to Aberdeen.
2. Amend the 'Flood Risk' section to take into account BUS2.
3. Retain existing site R1 for a cemetery on the A948 at Yonderton.
4. Include new Reserved Land designation for a potential link road to the west of Ellon from the B9005.
5. Amend the allocation summary for site OP1 (bid FR090) to read: "Sustainable communities are to be encouraged, and key to this will be active travel. Permeability within the development for active travel is required, and connectivity to the rest of the Ellon green network is expected in this development with opportunities existing to link into the path network along the river."
6. Add to the allocation summary for existing site OP3 (bid FR011) the following text: "The buffer strip needs to allow sufficient space for restoration of the burn. Enhancement of the watercourse through re-naturalisation and removal of redundant features should be investigated."
7. Amend the allocation summary for CC1 (bid FR032) to include: "A Flood Risk Assessment will be required", and add "Buffer strips will be required adjacent to the watercourses which should be integrated positively into the development. The buffer strips will need to allow sufficient space for the River Ythan to follow its natural course. Enhancement through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated."

8. Do not allocate Bid FR092.
9. Amend Ellon settlement map to show an indicative route for the southern bypass for the town from the B9005 to the A920 at Wineburn.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019, with the additional recommendation that sites FR063 and FR064 be included in the settlement statement for Ellon.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and agreed not to allocate bids FR063 and FR064 in the Proposed LDP.
3. At their meeting of 29 October 2019, Formartine Area Committee considered bid sites FR063 and FR064 on the basis that there had been circulated a report dated 10 October, 2019 by the Director of Infrastructure Services which advised the Committee of the recommendations adopted by the Infrastructure Services Committee (ISC) on the two sites, on the basis of late information provided by the Transportation Service as part of the Development Planning and Management Transport Appraisal Guidance Traffic Assessment. At their meeting, Formartine Area Committee agreed that the Committee: -
 - a) Express their dissatisfaction at the lateness of the comments provided by the Transportation Service and lack of opportunity for Formartine Area Committee to comment ahead of consideration by Infrastructure Services Committee;
 - b) Maintain support for the inclusion of sites FR063 and FR064 within the Local Development Plan;
 - c) Request that the appropriate decision-making body give fresh consideration of the officer recommendations in relation to sites FR063 and FR064 in light of the comments provided today by Formartine Area Committee;
 - d) Request that a report come forward to the Formartine Area Committee to update on the progress being made to identify improvements between the A90, Tipperty, the Toll of Birness and the roads linking these; and
 - e) That any further reports relating to the inclusion of sites FR063 and FR064 refer only to the new transportation information that has been provided.
4. At their meeting of 28 November 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of the Formartine Area Committee of 29 October 2019, following their consideration of the response received from Transportation regarding bids FR063 and FR064, which was received following the meeting of Formartine Area Committee on 10 September 2019 and reported as a late paper to ISC on 3 October 2019. Infrastructure Services Committee agreed to uphold the decision of ISC at its meeting on 3 October 2019, not to recommend to

Aberdeenshire Council bid sites FR063 and FR064 for inclusion in the Proposed Local Development Plan.

5. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Members considered proposals for the inclusion of bid sites FR063 and FR064 at Auchterellon Farm, Ellon in the Proposed Local Development Plan. Members voted as follows – 29 for the motion that the Council reinstate sites FR063 and FR064 in to the Proposed Local Development Plan 2020, and 52 for the amendment that the Council not include bid sites FR063 and FR064 in the Proposed Local Development Plan 2020. Five Members declined to vote.

The amendment was carried, and the Council agreed not to include bid sites FR063 and FR063 at Auchterellon Farm, Ellon in the Proposed Local Development Plan 2020.

Issue 72 Fintray

1. List of Respondents

None.

2. Issues

No issues were raised in respect of Fintray.

3. Actions

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

No changes to the proposal to delete Fintray from the Local Development Plan settlement list were received.

4. Recommendations

1. Remove Fintray from the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendation at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 73 Fisherford

1. List of Respondents

None.

2. Issues

No issues were raised in respect of Fisherford.

3. Actions

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

No objections were raised to the proposal to remove Fisherford from the Local Development Plan.

4. Recommendations

1. Remove Fisherford from the Local Development Plan.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendation at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 74 Foveran

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
121	Ryden LLP on behalf of Mr Graham Brown
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
565	Halliday Fraser Munro on behalf of Harper & Cochrane Ltd
805	SEPA
1020	Strutt & Parker on behalf of Mr Ian Ross

2. Issues

General

Foveran sits in the heart of the Energetica and Strategic Growth Area, and is therefore ideally located for investment and development (565).

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) has requested that within the 'Services and Infrastructure' section of the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) reference is made to green infrastructure and active travel routes to promote connectivity to other settlements and amenities in the vicinity. SNH has also suggested that the Masterplan for sites in the village should consider OP4/bid FR066, OP5/bid FR067 and OP6/FR067, and highlight green infrastructure and active travel routes (506).

The sites which have been identified as an Officers' preference would add 280 homes to the existing village during the next Plan period and would extend the current village to the south and west. It is considered that the proposed allocation of these sites solidifies the Council's aspirations for growth in Foveran and confirms the focus on new housing development, with associated employment uses in this accessible location during and beyond the LDP period (1020).

Existing site - OP1

SEPA has stated this site may require a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse which should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of watercourses through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated. The Draft Proposed LDP uses former text "growth project has been initiated at Blairythan Terrace septic tank". Scottish Water should confirm if the growth project has taken into account all the sites identified in this LDP. Development will be restricted until this upgrade is operational due to the Foveran Burn not having dilution capacity (805).

Existing site - OP2

SEPA has confirmed that they have no concerns regarding flood risk due to the site boundary being set back from the watercourse and the land being quite steep. The request for an FRA could be deleted if the Council's Flood Risk and Coastal Protection Unit agree. A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse on the northern boundary which should be integrated positively into the development.

Enhancement of these through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated (805).

Existing site OP3 / Bid FR065, Bid FR066, and Bid FR067

No comments were received on any of these three sites and the recommendations contained in the Main Issues Report for 36 homes, 20 homes and 49 homes are maintained.

However, bid FR067 cannot take access down through the current C class road and would be dependent on a new access to be formed to the south east of the site, passing through bids FR065 and FR066. As there remains third party land in the intervening land the delivery of this site must be questioned and in hindsight it has been recommended that it is not included in the Proposed Local Development Plan.

Bid FR109

It is considered that development of this site would result in the coalescence of Foveran and Rashierieve, which are two distinct settlements each with their own characteristics (121).

However, another respondent was of the view that this site will provide an opportunity to deliver strategic housing and employment allowances to contribute towards transforming the wider area into a high-quality lifestyle, leisure and global business location as part of the Energetica corridor. A 41 hectare site would extend the settlement in a planned manner for 1,000 to 1,200 homes in a mixed use development area, including 3ha for commercial or community use and 4ha for employment use. This is adjacent to the AWPR which is considered to act as an appropriate boundary for future growth aspirations. The site has a good relationship with the village core and is well connected and complements the existing residential development in the village. The respondent is not aware of any issues with waste water in the area and highlights the different assessment of FR067 located immediately adjacent to the site. Development on prime agricultural land would be permitted where it is required to meet an established housing need. The respondent considers that this site exhibits significantly more potential to deliver new homes in the future with fewer impacts than might be expected elsewhere within the Strategic Growth Area (1020).

Bid FR142 and FR143

Inclusion of these sites within the LDP has been sought as they enhance the vision expressed through the Westfield and Ardgill Masterplan 2013. The sites offer the potential to enhance the settlement's role as a service centre and create a well-connected, mixed use focal heart to the village that is currently lacking. The development would not 'create an unnatural extension to the north'. There is already an existing commercial hub at Westfield. These bid sites propose giving this a more central, diversified role by creating a mixed-use village centre (565).

The respondent has disagreed with the comments within the Main Issues Report that stated development on FR142 and FR143 could have a 'potential implication' on the existing road network. The existing local road network has been significantly improved following the opening of the Balmedie - Tipperty dual carriageway (A90) as part of the AWPR work (565). A Scottish Water Growth Project has been initiated

and the “waste water hotspot” should not be a barrier to the development of bid FR142 and FR143 (565). The respondent also considers that bids FR142 and FR143 should be assessed separately as they are different proposals and uses (565).

Bid FR142

The respondent has promoted bid FR142 (Foveran North phase 1) for 150 houses, village centre (retail / nursery) and community uses (potential school relocation / sports centre / playing fields) over a 13.8ha site as the next phase of development in Foveran. The existing retail offer at Westfield can serve the existing and future Foveran Community. This site offers the opportunity to further expand and diversify the range of facilities and services within Foveran to meet the aim of it becoming a ‘proper’ connected village with a mix of uses and associated community benefits. The Main Issues Report (MIR) assessment fails to mention and assess the proposed community and commercial uses that form part of the LDP bid. (565).

The MIR has highlighted that this bid site is prime agricultural land, however the respondent does not see the difference between this bid site and the sites identified as preferred options that are also prime agricultural land. It is claimed that the loss of this prime land can be justified (565).

Another respondent agrees with the comments in the MIR in relation to this site and states that the site would have a significant detrimental impact on the existing character, both of the settlement and surroundings, given that the landscape is largely flat with open views (1020).

Bid FR143

The respondent seeks to address that the scale of development proposed for this site was 140 homes and not 410 as referenced in the MIR (565).

The respondent continues to promote bid FR143 as a potential second phase, strategic reserve housing site that would take the form of infill development between FR142 and existing commercial development at Enerfield (OP1 / BUS). The allocation of this land as a second phase reserved residential site would safeguard the delivery of the overall vision for Foveran (565).

However, another respondent is in agreement with the comments in the MIR for this site. The site would have a significant detrimental impact on the existing character, both of the settlement and surroundings, given that the landscape is largely flat with open views (1020).

3. Actions

General

It is acknowledged that Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) identifies the need to significantly enhance green infrastructure networks, particularly in and around cities and towns. The Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) contains policies and settlement statements that promote active travel, the formation and enhancement of green networks, and improved access to open space within Aberdeenshire’s towns. However, Foveran is not a city or a town. While the Aberdeen City and Shire

Strategic Development Plan (ACSSDP) states that the LDP will play a key role in identifying existing and proposed new green networks and enhancement of existing networks, it does not state that green networks are required between all the settlements within Aberdeenshire. No “green network” annotation is provided for the area around Foveran in the ACSSDP. No further action is required.

A Masterplan for the delivery of bid sites FR066, FR067 and FR082 would not be required. The layout, design and connectivity within the settlement are issues that can be addressed with the submission of a planning application. No action is required on this matter.

Existing Site - OP1

Within the Settlement Statement for Foveran, the requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment for this site has been identified within the proposed LDP. There is agreement with the statement that “A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse which should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of these through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated.” This statement shall be included in the statement for Site OP1.

With regards to the Scottish Water Growth projects, Scottish Water would be required to initiate a growth project once development meets their five growth criteria. As part of this process the Scottish Water Drainage infrastructure will be upgraded to take account of all allocated sites. The current growth project will not take account of future, unallocated development sites. No further action is required.

Existing site – OP2

SEPA’s comments are noted and the suggested text will be included in the allocation summary. In order to identify all constraints within the site that impact on potential layout design, it is agreed that it is appropriate to include “A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse on the northern boundary which should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of these through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated” to the statement for site OP2.

Existing site OP3 / Bid FR065

No comments were received on the potential change of use of this land from 1.5ha employment land to 36 homes.

Bid FR066

No comments have been received on the preference in the Main Issues Report to allocate Bid FR066 for 20 Homes.

Bid FR067

No comments have been received on the preference in the Main Issues Report to allocate bid FR067 for 49 Homes.

Bid FR109

It is maintained that bid FR109 is not a suitable extension to Foveran at this time. In accordance with the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan (ACSSDP) sufficient additional housing land allocations are identified in the Aberdeen Housing Market Area. It is considered that Foveran has an appropriate amount of land identified for housing to meet local housing needs during the Plan period. This site cannot be successfully delivered with connectivity to the existing settlement until existing site OP3 and bid sites FR066 and FR067 have been brought forward.

In addition, the extent of the FR109 site would result in the undesirable coalescence of Foveran and Rashierieve. The bid site is intersected by the A90(T) and as such does not offer a logical and cohesive extension to the existing settlement. As this time the proposed allocations total 245 houses on other sites are considered to be appropriate growth for Foveran, while being significant for a small settlement located within the Strategic Growth Corridor. No further action required.

Bid FR142

It is maintained that this site is not a suitable extension to Foveran at this time. In accordance with the ACSSDP sufficient additional housing land allocations are identified in the Aberdeen Housing Market Area. It is considered that Foveran has an appropriate amount of land identified for housing to meet local housing needs during the Plan period.

Taking into account the existing built form of Foveran, developing a site on the opposite side of a public road is not considered a logical extension to the settlement, especially when other sites are more appropriate. The site is not centrally located to Foveran and therefore makes for a poor choice in delivering a "village centre". The existing businesses at the former Westfield Farm have been established through farm diversification and reuse of redundant farm buildings. This does not justify developing a planned "village centre" and residential development at this location. No further action is required.

Bid FR143

It is maintained that this site is not a suitable extension to Foveran at this time. In accordance with the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan sufficient additional housing land allocations are identified in the Aberdeen Housing Market Area. It is considered that Foveran has an appropriate amount of land identified for housing to meet local housing needs during the Plan period. In addition, this direction of development for Foveran would create an unnatural extension to the north, which would erode the character and built form of the settlement.

Bid FR143 is not recommended for allocation or reserved for development in the Proposed LDP.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

Changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed LDP on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below.

4. Recommendations

1. Amend the Vision to include the community's desire to see no more houses built in the village until a replacement school has been built.
2. Add the following text to the allocation summary for existing site OP1: "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse which should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of these through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated." at the end of the statement for site OP1 South of Westfield Farm.
3. Add the following text to the allocation summary for existing site OP2: "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse on the northern boundary which should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of these through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated".
4. Re-allocate existing site OP3 / bid FR065 for 36 homes
5. Allocate bid FR066 for 20 homes.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 75 Fyvie

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
292	Mr Gordon Duncan
1008	Savills on behalf of The Fyvie Estate
1009	Historic Environment Scotland
1011	Savills on behalf of The Fyvie Estate
805	SEPA

2. Issues

It was considered that an alleged historic battlefield in the area should not preclude development within the settlement at either bid sites FR125 and FR126, and there are other examples where this has happened elsewhere (292, 1008, 1011). However, Historic Environment Scotland have identified potential cumulative impacts upon the historic battlefield through potential development, with adverse impacts upon appreciation of the site and its landscape (1009).

It was noted that development would support local services and schools (292, 1008, 1011). Flooding issues in the settlement require to be addressed (292).

The description is incorrect as the Post Office has closed (292).

SEPA highlights that there is limited capacity at the Fyvie Waste Water Treatment Works so any development will require a growth project (805).

3. Actions

The reference to the Post Office in the Vision statement should be removed.

There are competing interests with regard to preserving the historic battlefield. While the importance of the national battlefield is not to be dismissed, there is a strong case for an allocation to be made in the village to promote its vibrancy and vitality. Other potential locations for development to support services in Fyvie (at Woodhead and St Katherines) have proved to be very difficult to support. Site FR125 could be seen as a logical extension to the form of the village and is likely to have the least impact on the perception of the area as a national battlefield site. Thirty homes should be considered for this site with strict interpretation of the need to conform to the variety of house styles found in Peterwell Road and access through a new protected area to the north of the burn adjacent to the B9005.

4. Recommendations

1. Remove reference to the Post Office in the Settlement description.
2. Allocate FR125 for 30 homes as a new allocation OP1.
3. Identify the small triangular field on the south west corner of the site, north of the B9005 and adjacent to bid FR125 within the allocation. This land should be “Reserved” once development has been completed.
4. Include the following text into the ‘Services and Infrastructure’ section “There is limited capacity at Fyvie Waste Water Treatment Works to treat all sites allocated. Scottish Water will initiate a growth project, should demand from committed development exceed available capacity.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 76 Garmond

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
310	Mr & Mrs Graham & Susan Neal
805	SEPA

2. Issues

General

One respondent wishes to see infill building done in a sensitive manner, to not impinge on the amenity of other properties (310).

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has noted that the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) states there is no public waste water treatment in Garmond. This is incorrect. Scottish Water should confirm the capacity status of the existing septic tank and any capacity issues should be highlighted in the LDP (805).

3. Actions

General

Design policies require all development to safeguard, where possible, amenity of surrounding buildings.

Services and Infrastructure

Confirmation has been sought over the status of public waste water drainage in the settlement and the text relating to treatment in Garmond should be modified.

4. Recommendations

1. The status of waste water disposal will be confirmed with Scottish Water and wording adjusted in the Settlement Statement accordingly.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendation at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.

3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 77 Kirkton of Auchterless

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
805	SEPA
815	John Wink Design on behalf of Mr Raymond Porter

2. Issues

Support was expressed for allocating bid FR137, on the basis that it would support local services, and strategic landscaping will ensure overdevelopment does not occur. The respondent acknowledged the loss of prime agricultural land, but recognised that there are limited opportunities for expansion without this loss. It was not considered that the site would be out of place in the context of the existing settlement and any issues could be resolved at the design stage (815).

With regard to bid FR114 and FR115, SEPA have questioned the sewage capacity to accommodate these sites (805).

SEPA has also requested that if site FR115 is brought forward that the allocation summary includes that “A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse on the northern boundary of the site which should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of the watercourse through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated.” In any case SUD’s will be required for all new development (805).

3. Actions

Site FR137 is detached and no appropriate justification has been provided for its inclusion. It is not considered to be an appropriate development site.

With regard to sewage connection, Scottish Water has confirmed that there is limited capacity in the St Donan's Cottages septic tank to serve bid FR114. However, if site FR115 was also brought forward a growth project would be required. We do not propose to bring forward site FR115 at this time.

A number of changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below.

4. Recommendations

1. Modification of the Vision and the descriptions of sites R1 and R2 to reflect the aspirations of the community.
2. Extend the settlement boundary to the extent of FR114 to allow infill development of 2 homes.
3. Reserve bid FR144 for a car park.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 78 Methlick

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
33	Ryden LLP on behalf of Neil & Sarah Purdie
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
697	Mr & Mrs Brian & Anita Thomson
720	Mr Wayne Gray
729	Mr Peter Dowswell
805	SEPA
856	Taylor Design Services on behalf of Mr John Catto
876	Woodland Trust Scotland
1009	Historic Environment Scotland
1014	Mr & Mrs Hugh & Elizabeth Stuart

2. Issues

General

Respondents have stated that there is no requirement for additional houses within Methlick (697, 1014) citing education constraints and concerns that local services are diminishing while housing is being promoted (697).

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has highlighted that Waste Water Treatment capacity issues are apparent and there is a need for a Scottish Water growth project (805).

Bid FR014

Respondents raised concerns with this site, highlighting potential impacts upon wildlife (1014), lack of sewer capacity (729, 1014), significant issues with the topography/slope of the site being inappropriate (729, 1014) which could subsequently restrict access and cause issues in terms of earthworks (506, 729, 1014). Related to this, impacts upon privacy of neighbours are highlighted (697, 1014). It was also stated that the site would not fit in with the general pattern of development in the vicinity, and that the expansion of the site is only proposed given historical support and that the nature of the site will not provide for a range of housing (729). Wider concerns including drainage, site runoff and water pollution (729), also flood risk (697, 729).

Regarding other aspects, the need to ensure there is no adverse impact upon ancient woodland results from any development has been highlighted (729). Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) believe that the buffer zone between the site and the woodland needs to be enhanced (506). It has also been stated that the drystone dyke should be restored along the roadside (729).

From a wider perspective, respondents have also contended that the allocation of the site would be contrary to the Strategic Development Plan (SDP), that there is no need for housing in the settlement and no education capacity (729).

SEPA has noted that the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment text is not aligned with requirements in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) (805).

In support of the site, one respondent stated they welcomed the site's inclusion, highlighting that there were no infrastructure constraints, the site can be accommodated into the school roll, and drainage can be successfully implemented. Maintenance and enhancement of woodland would be proposed and the site is accessible from bus routes. The site is considered to provide a mix of housing to fit demand (33).

Bid FR034 / Existing Site – OP1

SNH and Historic Environment Scotland have agreed that the Inventory Garden/ Designed Landscape will require a sensitive approach to design (506, 1009).

SEPA has noted that the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment text is not aligned with requirements stated in the Draft Proposed LDP (805).

Bid FR040

A respondent has raised concerns that the site represents more than the settlement needs in terms of proportionate growth (856)

SEPA has noted that the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment text is not aligned with requirements in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (805).

A respondent has commented that different parts of the site would allow for different styles of housing and would represent an asset to the settlement in terms of choice and growth (720).

Bid FR046

A respondent has stated that nearby ancient woodland should be protected and impacts upon this considered with any new development (876).

SNH has noted that the steep gradients mean the site would be challenging to develop without significant landscape and visual impacts (506).

Bid FR047

A respondent has contended that the site should be included, citing previous support and stating that it represents a sensible extension to the existing settlement core (856).

It has been stated that the development can be incorporated into the site gradient and that there are no impacts upon ecology, furthermore impacts could be assessed through the application process anyway (856).

SNH has note that the steep gradients mean the site would be challenging to develop without significant landscape and visual impacts (506).

3. Actions

General

Across Aberdeenshire there is a need for a modest number of homes, as obligated by the Strategic Proposed Development Plan.

Services and Infrastructure

Scottish Water infrastructure and any associated growth projects require to be considered in detail for the settlement. Housing allocations are relatively modest and could help support services within the settlement. Scottish Water would be required to initiate a growth project once development meets their five growth criteria. No action is required.

Bid FR014

A number of the concerns raised could be addressed through a detailed planning application, issues such as drainage, access, range of housing, impacts upon woodland and potentially education. The site has an implemented consent for which the site extension allows a more rational development pattern.

However, the topography of the site and associated impacts are significant. Neighbouring sites have not been preferred for this reason and given the steepness of the site, and probable significant cut and fill operations required alongside any associated landscape and visual impacts associated with building further up and back on the slope, there are significant concerns with the expansion of this site to incorporate further housing. As such the extension to this site should not be supported. Existing site OP2 should be removed from the LDP and retained as white land within the settlement boundary.

The text relating to flood risk would also require to be amended as requested by SEPA.

Bid FR034 / Existing Site – OP1

This is a currently allocated site. Specific reference requires to be made to protecting sensitive features such as the Inventory and Designed Landscape. The flood risk text would also require to be amended as requested by SEPA.

Bid FR040

The claim that the settlement cannot accommodate a modest development in this area is not supported, especially given the likely non-delivery of existing site OP2. The site is too big for the 12 homes sought and only the area east of Summerbrae Croft should be included in the Plan. The flood risk text would also require to be amended as requested by SEPA.

Bid FR046

No action is required, as the site is not considered appropriate for inclusion for reasons given in the Main Issues Report (that it would have significant landscape impacts and could impact on protected species), and there is no public support for its inclusion.

Bid FR047

No action is required, as the site is not considered appropriate for inclusion for reasons given in the Main Issues Report (that it would have significant landscape impacts and could impact on protected species) and there is no public support for its inclusion.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

A number of changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed LDP on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below.

4. Recommendations

1. Modify the Vision to reflect the community aspiration to have an outdoor multi-use games area, the desire for small housing developments with housing for older people and start up homes for young people, and that the community do not consider there is a need for business land allocations or additional wind turbines.
2. Amend text under 'Flood Risk' and within allocation summaries in accordance with SEPA requirements.
3. No material change is proposed to the existing site OP1 (Bid FR034).
4. Allocate the eastern part of bid FR040 for 14 homes.
5. Remove the existing OP2 allocation but make no change to the settlement boundary due to the existing implemented Planning consent.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019, with the exception of recommendation 4 which should be amended to "that bid site FR040 be allocated for 12 houses" and the additional recommendations for the inclusion of reference to existing site FR014 and the inclusion of sites FR046 and FR047 in the settlement statement.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 79 Newburgh

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
423	Ryden LLP on behalf of Stewart Milne Homes
460	Ryden LLP on behalf of Stewart Milne Homes
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
805	SEPA

2. Issues

General

One respondent has stated that there is no clarity on the scale of housing land required for the settlement with regard to achieving the requirements of the Strategic Development Plan, and highlights its strategic location for delivering housing in the Energetica Corridor (423).

Flood Risk

SEPA has advised that the text “Parts of Newburgh are in an area potentially vulnerable to flood risk as identified by the National Flood Risk Assessment. Flood Risk Assessments may be required” should be added to the Settlement Statement. SEPA also advise that the BUS site, as well as site OP1, may require a Flood Risk Assessment due to the presence of a small watercourse along the southern boundary. This is similar to site OP2 which may also require a Flood Risk Assessment due to historic downstream flooding – mitigation measures would also require to be set out. For all sites, a buffer strip adjacent to this watercourse would also be required along with the enhancement of the watercourse itself (805).

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has also highlighted that there are constraints with waste water provision and that private treatment works are unlikely to be acceptable due to the proximity to the bathing beach (805).

Bid FR028

A respondent has confirmed support for the inclusion of the bid site, stating that infrastructure provision can be shared, landscaping can be added along the boundary to create a welcoming gateway to the settlement, that the benefits of developing outweigh any loss of agricultural land, traffic issues in the settlement can be alleviated and similarly that there would be no adverse impacts on the A90/B9000 road junction – this and other matters such as education contributions could be addressed under a planning application (460).

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) has stated that a site brief is required to address placemaking principles (506)

SEPA considered that the constraints within the site should be better described. There are known flooding issues downstream and so it should be covered in any Flood Risk Assessment. Furthermore, it should be outlined that any Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) should also be robust as a result of this specific constraint. A buffer strip and watercourse enhancement, alongside appropriate flood mitigation would also be welcomed (805).

Bid FR029

One respondent has objected to the labelling of a small portion of this site as a “Future Opportunity Site” in the Proposed Local Development Plan, stating that this is not consistent with the Main Issues Report, stating that this portion of the site forms an important element, watercourse buffer and natural first phase of the wider site. It is also stated that the site would take access from the B9000, rather than the A975 as stated (460).

SNH has stated that a site brief is required to address placemaking principles (506).

SEPA considered the constraints within the site should be better described. There are known flooding issues downstream and so it should be covered in any Flood Risk Assessment, furthermore it should be outlined that any SUDS system should also be robust as a result of this specific constraint. A buffer strip and watercourse enhancement, alongside appropriate flood mitigation would also be welcomed (805).

Bid FR027

A single respondent has stated that the site is considered to be suitable for 80 houses and should therefore at least be identified for future development given it's logical location, the fact that there would be no landscape setting impact, an area that floods can be included as open space, the loss of prime agricultural land is not significant in a wider context, there would be no impacts upon protected species as informed by a 2012 Report and the site is required to provide a relief road for the settlement, which is considered to outweigh any negatives. Furthermore it is stated that access is not a constraint and that education constraints could be overcome as could reservations from the community (423).

3. Actions

General

It is accepted that the contribution that individual settlements make to the housing land supply has not yet been identified. This will be included in a separate Appendix in the Proposed Local Development Plan.

Flood Risk

The request made by SEPA for additional text to be added to the Settlement Statement is considered appropriate and should be included in the Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP).

Services and Infrastructure

Reference should be made to the issues concerning waste water provision in the Settlement Statement, as requested by SEPA.

Bid FR028

As noted above flood risk and waste water constraints will be identified in the Settlement Statement. Placemaking requirements should also be added, potentially in the form of a Masterplan requirement, including the provision of a local distributor road to the north edge of the site. It is agreed that education provision and specific transport/access issues can be addressed through a detailed planning application. The need for site briefs to address placemaking principles is accepted for this and all undeveloped sites.

At 11ha the site could accommodate 275 homes, not the 124 originally proposed. This is a very significant extension to Newburgh and could be phased into the town in the next Local Development Plan, post 2031. No future Opportunity sites are to be included in the Proposed Local Development Plan.

Bid FR029

As noted above flood risk and waste water constraints will be identified in the Settlement Statement. Placemaking requirements should also be added, potentially in the form of a Masterplan requirement that includes the provision of a local distributor road to the north edge of the site. It is agreed that education provision and specific transport/access issues can be addressed through a detailed planning application.

The splitting of this site is appropriate. At 6.5ha the site could accommodate 160 homes, not the 50 originally proposed. This should be amended and included within the wider allocation as per the Main Issues Report. A holistic approach to the delivery of the site, given the constraints present, is considered to be the appropriate way forward.

The site description and outline should be amended to include a better description of flooding and drainage constraints as well as cognisance of the need to protect and enhance the resident watercourse. Placemaking requirements should also be added, potentially in the form of a Masterplan requirement. The text should also be updated to state the correct access road (B9000).

This bid site should be allocated for a development of 160 houses.

Bid FR027

This site should not be included. The justification presented by respondents is not considered to outweigh the site constraints present. Issues such as flooding are of concern, the justification that the part of the site that floods could be Open Space is not accepted. Education, access and Prime Agricultural Land concerns are still apparent. The provision of a bypass in this location in the short term is not supported and thus is

not considered to be appropriate justification in terms of allocating this site. In addition, the community wish to see expansion to the west, which is reflected in the preferred sites – and so this southern site is not appropriate at this time.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

A number of changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below.

4. Recommendations

1. Modify the Vision to reflect that there is local community support for new development being located to the west of the settlement, but no support for the scale of development required to justify a by-pass.
2. Add the following text under 'Flood Risk': "Parts of Newburgh are in an area potentially vulnerable to flood risk as identified by the National Flood Risk Assessment. Flood Risk Assessments may be required".
3. Update 'Strategic drainage and water supply' to include reference to waste water constraints.
4. Allocate bid FR029 for 160 houses for immediate development. The allocation summary should make reference to flood risk, drainage, watercourse and placemaking requirements, and state the correct access road (B9000).
5. Amend settlement boundary to accommodate the single unit identified in bid FR093, rather than allocating the site specifically.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019, however with recommendation 1 amended to read "and the community aspiration of a future by-pass" instead of "but no support for the scale of development required to justify a by-pass".
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 80 Oldmeldrum

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
54	Ms Kerry Marr
245	Lippe Architects + Planners on behalf of Kirkwood Homes
246	Lippe Architects + Planners on behalf of Mr E Simmers
247	Lippe Architects + Planners on behalf of Mr E Simmers
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
712	Mr & Mrs Paul & Lindsay Baron
800	Scotia Homes Ltd
804	Meldrum, Bourtie and Daviot Community Council
805	SEPA
820	John Wink Design on behalf of Mr Alan Whiteford
841	John Handley Associates Ltd on behalf of The Church of Scotland General Trustees
846	Meldrum, Bourtie and Daviot Community Council
860	Mr Richard Bice on behalf of Ms Sandra Sim
876	Woodland Trust Scotland
894	Mr & Mrs Paul & Pamela Gray
963	Halliday Fraser Munro on behalf of Mr G Webster
1009	Historic Environment Scotland

2. Issues

General Issues

Care should be taken throughout to protect wildlife, and there are traffic impacts on the A947, including pedestrian interactions (894). Improvements are needed to education and healthcare through Developer Contributions (54, 846).

One respondent disputes the need to provide further housing (860) and further retail development (894) in the settlement. Bungalows and affordable housing are required (846).

SEPA consider that significant waste water capacity issues, may limit delivery and any future development is considered premature (805).

Existing Site – OP2

Objection was made to the continued allocation of this site as it is not deliverable and is detached from the settlement. The site should remain as open space/strategic landscaping (246, 247).

Bid FR012

Respondent expressed support for the Officers' recommendation ("not preferred") for bid FR012 (804, 846).

Bid FR061

Concerns are raised over the increased density of the site (963), lack of public transport (894), traffic/road safety/parking impacts including on A947 (712, 860, 894), and wildlife impacts (860, 894). There are also perceived to be education constraints (860). The site extends outwith the boundaries of the existing settlement (894, 860) and existing sites to be built out first (860). Development of this site would erode the sense of place in the area (860). Woodland should be protected and tree planting enhanced (876).

Development should be allocated alongside FR062 for added co-ordination (804, 846). SNH require a site brief to ensure biodiversity measures are identified, including protecting the adjacent woodland (506).

Bid FR062

Concerns were raised over the increased density of the site (963), lack of public transport (894), traffic/road safety/parking impacts including on A947 (712, 860, 894), and wildlife impacts (860, 894). There were also perceived to be education constraints (860). The site extends outwith the boundaries of the existing settlement (894, 860) and existing sites to be built out first (860). Development of this site would erode the sense of place in the area (860). There is a conflict with ancient woodland (876).

The site should be allocated alongside FR061 to ensure a co-ordinated approach (245, 846) and support is given for 200 houses on the site as this delivers housing, community benefits and is constraint free (245). It offers the same advantages as bid FR061. There is no need for an eastern bypass, as confirmed by the Council. It offers an extension to the amenity ground which has community support. Education constraints can be addressed through the planning application and developer contributions (245).

Bid FR068

Development would support the settlement (894). It should be for housing only, employment would be incongruous (846).

Historic Environment Scotland (HES) raised concern that there would be an impact upon the Barra Battlefield. Landscape impacts should be considered alongside cumulative and archaeological information (1009). SNH believed that biodiversity measures and enhanced green infrastructure would be required (506). There were conflicting views presented on the density of the site, with one respondent voicing concerns over the increased density (963), while another supports an increase (246).

Bid FR069

This allocation supports the settlement (894) and helps meet housing need (800). An increased allocation is welcomed (800). The provision of a transport interchange is supported (800), and should be secured early (804, 846). The waste water constraint can be resolved by 2021 (800). SNH believed that biodiversity measures and enhanced green infrastructure will be required (506).

Bid FR073

Support was expressed for the Officers' recommendation not to include this site (804, 846).

Bid FR083

Two respondents supported the allocation of this site (247, 804) and two respondents consider it should be released for immediate development as deliverable and accessible (247, 846). It fits well with the overall pattern of development (247).

HES are concerned that there would be an impact upon the Barra Battlefield (54, 1009). Landscape impacts should be considered alongside cumulative and archaeological information (1009). SNH note that it relates poorly to the settlement and that careful siting and design would be required for expansion of the settlement here. A Development Brief will be required to provide meaningful open space in this part of the settlement (506).

Bid FR088

This site should be allocated for 10 houses or as stated, bungalows. It is sustainable, deliverable and has previously been supported (804, 846, 963).

Bid FR110

Support was expressed for the allocation of bid FR110. It was considered that the site should be brought forward as all neighbouring land is already developed and so it would relate well to the settlement (804, 846).

HES raised concern that there would be an impact upon the Barra Battlefield. Landscape impacts should be considered alongside cumulative and archaeological information (1009).

Bid FR111

Support was expressed for the allocation of bid FR111 in order to provide a bypass (804, 846). SNH note that it provides the opportunity to create a welcoming entrance to the settlement (506).

HES were concerned that there would be an impact upon the Barra Battlefield and other adverse archaeological impacts. Landscape impacts should be considered alongside cumulative and archaeological impacts (1009). SNH advised against development on the lower slopes of the Hill of Barra and required green infrastructure along the burn, biodiversity measures, and active travel routes from the site (506).

Bid FR119

It was believed that development would support the settlement (894). The Proposed Local Development Plan is not clear on the status of community facilities and this needs clarified (841).

There were concerns over drainage and potential flooding, access and safety on this site (54). Further concerns over the proposed density and overdevelopment of the site are voiced (804, 841, 846) and concerns raised over education provision (54, 804, 846). The site should include a school (804, 846) and community facilities should remain allocated (841). SNH believed that the site should include greenspace and avoid overdevelopment (506).

The requirement for two access points should be removed (841).

Bid FR135

Support was expressed for the Officers' recommendation not to include bid FR135 (804, 846). However, it represents a natural extension to the settlement and can create a desirable place. It would represent wider expansion alongside neighbouring bid sites. Prime agricultural land is not a reason to prohibit development (820).

Bid FR136

Support was expressed for the Officers' recommendation not to include bid FR136 (804, 846).

3. Actions

General issues

General points made about the protection of wildlife and traffic impacts are standard issues resolved through the Development Management process. Education contributions are very difficult to articulate at the moment with the rate of development dictating the scale of education requirement that should be provided. NHS Grampian have advised us of immediate needs for healthcare across Aberdeenshire, but this does not include additional provision at Oldmeldrum at this time. Provision of bungalows would be market led and not something that we can specifically request on individual sites within the Plan. However policies within the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan request that developers deliver a good balance of house types.

In accordance with the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan sufficient additional housing land allocations are identified in the Aberdeen Housing Market Area. It is considered that Oldmeldrum has an appropriate amount of land identified for housing to meet local housing needs during the Plan period.

With regard to the request made by SNH to ensure that adequate provision is made for biodiverse open space, policies are also in place that require all development to enhance biodiversity and provide adequate public open space.

Waste water capacity issues relate to the water flows in the Meadow Burn and its ability to provide sufficient dilution to the added flow. This is a serious threat to future development in Oldmeldrum. Other than the existing allocated sites development may need to drain to the north east rather than into watercourses to the south. There is no immediate solution available for this issue. Only bid sites FR012, FR061, FR062, and FR135 are likely unaffected by this significant constraint. On allocated sites, solutions require to be agreed with Scottish Water through a growth project once development meets their five growth criteria.

Bids FR083, FR110 and FR111

Three of the sites in Oldmeldrum (bids FR083, FR110, and FR111) are within the designated National Battlefield site, and on this we agree with Historic Environment Scotland that these should not come forward, despite the views of the Community Council to the contrary. Bid FR083 in particular is incongruous and in a poorly related location with regard to the settlement as it is physically and visually detached.

Bids FR068, FR069, and FR119

Sites FR068, FR069, and FR119 are all sites currently within the Local Development Plan and identified as deliverable. We note the concern of Historic Environment Scotland on the allocation of the FR068 site but its context within the existing bypass lends itself to development. The suggestion that a section of the OP2 site should be retained as undeliverable open space would conserve part of the battlefield in perpetuity. Site FR119 is subject to a current planning application, which the Proposed Local Development Plan will respect. Comments made against the development of this site reflect the planning application currently being addressed, and not the long-established principle of development on the site. Likewise bid FR069 has a live consent but an alternative proposal is being submitted to increase the density of the development.

Bid FR088

Bid FR088 is an old quarry site which was considered at the LDP Examination on a previous Local Development Plan and dismissed. Providing a safe route to school from this site would prove very difficult and could lead to road safety issues. We do not propose to allocate this site, at this time.

Bid FR012

Bid FR012 is currently part of the Oldmeldrum Golf Course. Development of this site at this time would be detached from the current settlement. We do not propose to allocate this site, at this time.

Bids FR061 and FR062

Bids FR061 and FR062 could provide opportunity for a private sewage treatment works draining to the Den of Gownor and ultimately the Raxton Burn. The scale of the proposal for FR062 represents significant underdevelopment and a revised proposal is

promoted that restricts the land take at this time rather than increasing the size of the site and subjecting Oldmeldrum to significant new development. While the constraints identified are not inconsiderable, they are either resolvable through developer obligations or represent a misunderstanding of the likely impacts, particularly at the junction of Park Crescent and the A947, where road safety risks have been overstated by respondents. Loss of prime agricultural land is inevitable on all extensions to Oldmeldrum. FR061 and FR062 should not be promoted as a single entity to allow for better co-ordination and flexible approach to delivery. This would run the risk of promoting development that was not in scale with the needs of the community in the Plan period.

Bid FR135

Bid FR135 is currently detached from the settlement and will be for some years before the OP4/FR069 site is constructed. It is not, yet, a natural expansion to the town.

Bid FR073 and FR136

Bid FR073 and FR136 are rural sites that have no external support and are not favoured by the Community Council.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

A number of changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (Draft Proposed LDP) on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below.

4. Recommendations

1. Significant modifications are proposed to the settlement Vision to reflect community aspiration. Other minor changes are promoted to improve readability.
2. Take cognisance of waste water constraints in Oldmeldrum and highlight this for all developments.
3. Continue to pursue existing and preferred sites; bid sites FR068, FR069, and FR119 should be retained, with the addition of the new site FR061 to provide 146 homes.
4. Add to allocation summary for Site OP4 "A buffer is required along the eastern boundary to protect the trees along the boundary".

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019, with recommendation 4 to include the wording "and the encouragement to develop the context of a masterplan to encompass FR062 (already including the entirety of bid site FR061) as a whole, on the basis

of the work being phased". The Committee agreed the additional recommendation to be included "that additional developer contributions be sought in respect of the core path network for bid site FR119".

2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 81 Pitmedden and Milldale

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
148	Ryden LLP on behalf of Claymore Homes
149	Ryden LLP on behalf of Claymore Homes
150	Ryden LLP on behalf of Claymore Homes
266	Aurora Planning Limited on behalf of Pitmedden Property Limited
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
539	Stuart Milne Homes
540	Stuart Milne Homes
673	Udny Community Council
805	SEPA
854	Grant & Geoghegan on behalf of Mr & Mrs Murray
874	Udny Community Trust Ltd. (UCTL)
882	David Murray Associates
1009	Historic Environment Scotland

2. Issues

General

The respondents were generally supportive of the objectives on the Main Issues Report (MIR). The "Imagine Udny" Community Action Plan and Spatial Report was published February 2019 by Planning Advice Scotland. The Community Action Plan Report provisions the Vision and Strategy within which the community could move forward with these ideas. Priorities are central to village interventions; the creation of a new Community Hub; redevelopment of the existing Quarry site as a recreational park; development of new green spaces linking in with the existing paths network; a new Pitmedden green; traffic management measures to improve public safety and amenity; repurposing the village hall; upgrading of the football pitches; new community school; and a new gateway into the settlement. Any development around Pitmedden and Milldale should support these priorities (673, 874, 882). In addition, it is considered that further development should be located to the south of the village (673).

A respondent disagrees that Pitmedden and Milldale are seen as separate settlements, as the community see this as a single entity (874).

A new site is proposed to the north of Bonnyton Road and east of B999 to allow one home to be delivered on the site. A community garden or allotment could be included as part of the site (854)

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA understand there is limited capacity at Pitmedden Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP), therefore a growth project with Scottish Water will be required. This should be reflected in the Settlement Statement (805).

Existing Site - OP1

SEPA has stated that a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) may be required due to the presence of a small watercourse on the northern boundary that has been straightened.

A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse which should be integrated positively into the development. The buffer strip will need to allow sufficient space for restoration of the watercourse. Enhancement of these through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated (805).

Existing Site - OP2

SEPA has stated that an FRA will be required due to the fluvial flood extent on the lower edges of the site. Buffer strips will be required adjacent to the watercourses surrounding the site which should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of these through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated (805).

Bid FR006

The identification of bid FR006 as a reserved site is welcomed by a respondent. The site's designation as prime agricultural land is not considered to be an impediment to development as the benefits to habitats and core paths outweigh the loss of agricultural land. It is requested that the boundaries of sites FR006 (identified as FOP1 in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan) and FR007 require to be flexible to ensure that a high quality, well designed efficient development can be provided (148).

However, it is considered that this site could accommodate 355 homes (148 and 149). The respondent is of the view that there is an imbalance in housing numbers between the two sites (FR006 and FR007) and it may be appropriate to consider the two sites under a Masterplan approach to allow flexibility (149).

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) has requested that the site brief should take cognisance of the gently sloping landform to avoid significant landscape and visual impacts, setting out how biodiversity benefits would be achieved and showing green linkages to the surrounding area and maintaining and enhancing existing tree belts to provide a mature structure for future development. In addition, the site brief should include pedestrian routes through to Udney Castle Estate (506).

SEPA has identified a well on the site. An assessment of this well will be required and suitable mitigation put in place to ensure no pollution to ground water. There may have been a natural watercourse emanating from this well which is now culverted. Deculverting and enhancement of this watercourse should be investigated. In addition, buffer strips will be required adjacent to the watercourses in and around the site and should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of these through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated (805)

Historic Environment Scotland (HES) has stated that this site will impact on views from the Category 'A' Listed building at Udney Castle (1009).

There has been an objection to bids FR006 and FR007 on the grounds that a number of protected species have been found within these sites. The site would require a second access on to the B9000 that would involve the removal of woodland. These sites are visually prominent. It is recognised that site topography would create challenges for delivering a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS). The respondent is of the view that better sites exist elsewhere (540).

Bid FR007

The development of a new village hall or "community hub" on the FR007 site as a replacement for the existing village hall is supported (673, 882).

The allocation of 100 houses is supported by a respondent (149). Another respondent notes the increase in housing on this site to 110 houses and has raised concerns regarding sufficient space for a new community hub and potentially a new school (874).

It is the view of a respondent that space could be made over for allotments within this site (149).

SEPA has stated that buffer strips will be required adjacent to the watercourses surrounding the site which should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of these through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated (805).

Bid FR008

It is considered that this site to be constrained for the development of a community hall and reservation should be removed (150, 874). However, a respondent considers that bid FR007 is the preferred option for a community hub (874), with another of the view that the village hall could be located on bid site FR006 (150). The land should be allocated for 5 houses (150).

Bid FR094 and FR095 / Existing Site - BUS1

The recommendation not to reallocate BUS1 for housing or for a mixed use development has been contested (266). The respondent considers the site to be well connected to the settlement with safe access to local services and facilities. The site was previously deemed an appropriate location for [employment] development. Sensitive design and layout would ensure any development would not have any more of an impact on the setting of the designed landscape than the current employment use allocation, and indeed there is the potential to positively enhance the historic setting in a way that business development alone is unlikely to do (266).

It has been stated that the owner has not been able to secure a tenant for business use (for the new warehouse on the site), and is seeking a mixed use allocation, stating that an element of residential development would make a small scale commercial development (farm shop or start up business units) more viable (266).

The respondent has highlighted policy that places importance on giving priority to development of brownfield land, and that Officers have accepted that an existing

brownfield site should remain vacant making no contribution to the sustainability of the village, whilst large greenfield sites are allocated (266).

The respondent has noted the proposed change in designation on previously allocated employment land BUS2, to a revised allocation for 10 homes and business land, but does not consider that this site to be more favourable for residential development than bid FR094/FR095 (266).

SEPA has stated that an FRA may be required for this site. Text should be included to state the requirement of an adequate buffer along the watercourse which should be integrated positively into the development (805).

HES has identified that development of this site could have a potential impact on the views from and setting of the Category 'A' Listed Building LB15925 (Great Garden, Pitmedden House) and Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape (1009).

Bid FR096

HES has identified that development of this site could have a potential impact on the views from and setting of the Category 'A' Listed Building LB15925 (Great Garden, Pitmedden House) and Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape (1009).

SNH is of the view that this site has the potential to significantly impact on the setting of this nationally protected designed landscape and relates poorly to the existing settlement core (506).

Another respondent has given their support to this site above bids FR006 and FR007. The site would not have a detrimental impact on the setting of the village and would help strengthen the defensible boundary of the settlement. There will be no requirement for tree removal to accommodate development. In addition the site is within walking distance to the primary school (539).

Bid FR107

This site is now under construction for an agricultural shed, so is no longer a viable bid site (874, 882).

Bid FR108

The site fits with the community aspirations for development to the south of the village (882). The respondent considered that Prime Agricultural Land on this site can be set aside and as a form of compensation, a proportion of the public open space could be made over for allotments (874, 882).

Bid FR132 and FR133

SNH is in agreement that these sites are beyond the settlement boundaries, and encourages the coalescence of the two settlements (506). In addition, it is considered that the steeply sloping ground will increase the landscape and visual impact (506).

However, another respondent has promoted bid FR133 for development, stating it is not ribbon development but rather a new designed landscape comprising development on both sides of the B999. The site is not excessively steep and a

simple cut and fill operation would suffice to accommodate small scale business. The site conforms to the community's aspirations for local employment. In addition, a new footpath would provide connectivity to Pitmedden and Milldale (882).

3. Actions

General

The current LDP includes a statement within the Services and Infrastructure section that seeks developer contributions towards facilities that serve the community in Pitmedden and Milldale or towards facilities in the wider catchment area at Oldmeldrum. These may be identified in the Community Plan or relevant Community Action Plan. However, the efforts that have gone into preparing the Community Action Plan are recognised in Imagine Udney. It is considered appropriate to acknowledge the communities' aspirations within the Settlement Statement. In addition, it is proposed to identify the village green as shown within the Community Action Plan, protect the former quarry for recreational purposes, and include the provision of a community hub within bid site FR007 in line with the aspirations of the community. However, the existing primary school is operating within capacity and is not expected to reach capacity within this Plan period. Therefore, there is no requirement to replace or extend the school at present.

With regard to the proposed new site (Bonnyton Road and east of B999) , it is considered this site is not a suitable extension to Pitmedden at this time. The allocation of a 2.8 hectare site for a single house, with community garden or allotments, is of a density that is too low for the site to be allocated to make a significant and positive contribution to Pitmedden. In addition, the inclusion of this site for development does not conform with the built pattern for Pitmedden. This site may be considered for residential development should site bid FR096 be allocated in future plans. No further action is required at this time.

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has identified there is limited capacity in the Pitmedden Waste Water Treatment Plant. Scottish Water has confirmed that a growth project will be required for Pitmedden, as well as a Drainage Impact Assessment for new sites. Scottish Water's position will be reflected in the Settlement Statement.

Existing Site - OP1 and Bid FR008

The Settlement Statement and site brief currently make reference to flooding and the potential requirement of an FRA for this site. However, the request for a buffer strip along the watercourse shall be added to the site brief text as requested.

In addition, it is noted that bid site FR007 is the preferred site for a community hall/hub by the Udney Community Trust Ltd. However, there is no confirmation that a Community Hall will be delivered on site FR007 and while there is merit in protecting the land immediately southeast of Haddo Medical Centre for Community use, the existing OP1 site should also be retained for this potential use. This site will be identified as having potential for brownfield development when an alternative site is delivered. A new allocation can protect the land in bid FR007 as open space and if need be, part of the community hub or to extend the medical centre.

Existing Site - OP2

It is agreed to include the requirement for an FRA and buffer strips to be included within the site brief as requested by SEPA.

Bid FR006

The general support for this site as a reserved site is acknowledged. It is maintained that development of this site would provide a significant extension to Pitmedden. Careful consideration would be required to ensure ecological and historical interests would not be adversely impacted on as a result of development on this site. The issues regarding location of the well on site and the requirement for buffer strips along the watercourse have also been noted. This site is considered to be a logical extension to the settlement, however at present it is not considered essential to significantly extend Pitmedden. It is considered that Pitmedden and Milldale has an appropriate amount of land identified for housing to meet local housing needs during the Plan period. No further action is required.

Bid FR007

The support for this site is acknowledged. The concerns regarding the ability to accommodate 110 houses and a community hub is valid. Therefore, it is recommended that the housing numbers be reduced to 100 to accommodate the potential community hub.

With regard to provision of allotments, all developments over 50 houses must have at least 40% open space. Allotments can contribute to achieving the required open space within the Plan should there be demand.

The need for buffer strips adjacent to the watercourse is noted and the site brief shall be updated to reflect this, as requested by SEPA. This may also have an impact on the capacity of the site for development.

Bid FR015

No comments were received on bid FR015 and it remains supported for 10 homes and a BUS designation.

Bid FR094 and FR095 / Existing Site - BUS1

The view is maintained that the site is not well related to the settlement as it is situated approximately 125 metres north of the settlement boundary for Pitmedden. A residential development would be isolated from the main settlement, resulting in a development that conflicts with the built pattern of Pitmedden.

The respondent made a case that they have been unsuccessful in securing tenants for the approved warehouse on the BUS1 site, and seeks alternative development. While the respondent refers to the site as a brownfield opportunity site, not all the BUS1 site is brownfield. If the site was removed from the Plan, the landowner could develop the brownfield elements on the site for small scale employment or residential use. It is considered that small scale development of the brownfield land would be more appropriate for this site and would leave the Greenfield element of site BUS1 undeveloped to act as a buffer between any development and Pitmedden Gardens. The removal of a business land allocation of this size will not impact on the overall employment land supply.

Bid FR096

It is maintained that while the proposed site is well related to the existing settlements and provides an opportunity to improve links to Pitmedden Gardens, the site is given a high level of protection as a Designed Landscape for Pitmedden House.

Development of this site could significantly impact on the setting of the Pitmedden House. Therefore the site will remain unallocated for development.

Bid FR107

The position is maintained that this site is not suitable for development.

Bid FR108

Support for this site is acknowledged. However, at present there are other more appropriate sites identified to meet the local housing needs, and no additional sites are required at present. No further action is required.

Bid FR132 and FR133

It is maintained that these sites are not an appropriate addition to the settlement as this time. This area currently presents an attractive entrance to Pitmedden with an open aspect which will be enhanced by the community park proposed to the west. Development of this site would have an adverse impact on the character of the area and is therefore unsuitable for development. No action is required.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

A number of changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed LDP on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below.

4. Recommendations

1. Add the following text to Vision: "The Community Action Plan, Imagine Udney sets out the aspirations of the community. They include New Community Hub, Central Village Intervention, new and improved path network, enhancement of greenspaces, a new village green, repurposing of the village hall, and new gateways into the settlement."
2. Modify text under 'Strategic drainage and water supply' to state: "An upgrade to the Waste Water Treatment Works at Pitmedden is required to support development. Scottish Water will initiate a growth project once one development meets their 5 growth criteria. A Drainage Impact Assessment is required for all development sites. A water impact assessment will be required for development to mitigate impact on Raitshill Pitmedden Service Reservoir."
3. Add a new protected land designation to the south of the settlement, between the Bronie Burn and B999 "For the creation of a community park".
4. Add a new protected land designation to the south of the settlement at Allathan quarry "For the creation of a recreational park".
5. Protect land immediately southeast of Haddo Medical Practice for community use.

6. Remove BUS1 from the Settlement Statement.
7. Amend the Flood Risk section of the Settlement Statement to include reference to site OP2.
8. Retain existing site OP1, with the undeveloped part of the site OP1 reserved for a community hub, with the caveat that should a site be provided elsewhere in the village this site should revert to a brownfield development opportunity. Remove reference to community facilities from OP1 site brief.
9. Retain existing site OP2 and amend allocation summary to include the following text: "A Flood Risk Assessment will be required due to the fluvial flood extent on the lower edges of the site. Buffer strips will be required adjacent to the watercourses surrounding the site which should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of these through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated".
10. Allocate bid FR007 for "100 homes and a community Hub".
11. Add the following text to allocation summary for bid FR007: "The community would wish that the community hub should be designed to deliver a multipurpose hall for purposes such as sports, event space, accessible office space and library".
12. Add the following text to allocation summary for bid FR007: Land south west of Pitmedden "Buffer strips will be required adjacent to the watercourses surrounding the site which should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of these through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated".
13. Allocate bid FR015 for 10 homes and BUS land to the south.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed to accept the community plan as proposed by the Udney Development Trust, covering bid sites FR108, FR007, FR132 and FR133, as the settlement statement for Pitmedden and Milldale, with officers to further discuss the proposals in early course with the Trust; and to remove the reference to "Milldale" in the settlement statement title.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and agreed not to allocate bids FR132 and FR133 in the Proposed LDP. The Committee also agreed that part of bid FR006 be allocated in the Proposed LDP. The allocated part of FR006 should be incorporated into the adjacent bid FR007 site already recommended for inclusion.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan

2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 82 Potterton

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
3	Mr & Mrs Peter Watt
315	Belhelvie Community Council
486	Stewart Milne Homes
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
529	Ryden LLP on behalf of CHAP Group (Aberdeen) Limited
532	Ryden LLP on behalf of CHAP Group (Aberdeen) Limited
536	Ryden LLP on behalf of CHAP Group (Aberdeen) Limited
553	Stuart Milne Homes
595	Lippe Architects + Planners on behalf of Barratt Homes
792	Sirius Planning on behalf of FCC Environment
805	SEPA
876	Woodland Trust Scotland

2. Issues

General

A respondent is generally concerned that the scale of proposed allocations to be included in the Plan is excessive and at odds with the Vision for the settlement (315). There is no clarity in the scale of development required for Potterton and if the preferred site provides an accurate reflection of the level of housing required for Potterton as set by the SDP (532, 536).

A misprint in the Main Issues Report has been highlighted. The Gourdiepark development is west of the B999, not east (529, 536).

A view has been given that Potterton provides excellent access to strategic transport links north and south with direct access to the existing employment opportunities and amenities associated with the Bridge of Don Retail Park and Denmore Industrial Estate (532).

The preferred sites provide no community facilities or services to address the planning objectives contained within the Vision (532).

A greater scale of development would help Scottish Water to plan for wider growth and assist in infrastructure provision (595).

Bid FR037

It is considered that this site should be formally identified as Strategic Reserve Land as envisaged by the Strategic Development Plan (486). They consider that the site would not have a detrimental impact on the landscape character of Potterton. Respondents are of the view that there are no infrastructure constraints, and the site would provide a village green and deliver affordable housing (486, 553).

Another respondent does not support reserving site FR037B to avoid giving the site any premature development plan status and to allow the community to reflect further on the longer-term growth of the settlement (315).

SEPA has identified that a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) may be required due to fluvial flood risk from Blackdog Burn which has been historically straightened. A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the burn and should be integrated positively into the development. The buffer strip will need to allow sufficient space for restoration of the watercourse. Enhancement of these through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated (805).

Bid FR104

It is the opinion of the respondents that this site is remote from the Post Office/shop and bus routes. Access to the site cannot be delivered without demolition of the existing community Resource Centre, and a second access is not achievable due to land control issues. The site is not deliverable (486, 553). Another respondent considered this site to be prominent and would have an adverse impact on the local road network (595).

The respondent did not support reserving this site (315).

Bid FR105

Support is given for the Officers' assessment of the site in the Main Issues Report (MIR). It would be difficult to integrate into the wider village and its viability is questioned (486, 553).

Bid FR106

Respondents did not support this site as it is detached from the village with no footpath and is a considerable distance from facilities. In addition, the site is adjacent to ancient woodland and has ecological value. There are better alternative sites (486, 553).

Bids FR120

It is considered that the site has excellent access to strategic transport links to the north and south, and it is located less than 3km from employment opportunities at Bridge of Don. A residential-led mixed-use development that would be a significant contribution to the identified planning objectives of Potterton (529).

This site would provide community facilities (including a primary school) for new and existing residents. Re-routing the B999 through the site would significantly improve the

sense of place, creating an attractive new gateway approach to the village, improving connectivity and road safety (529).

The respondent is of the view that the main reason for not allocating this site is the perceived landscape character impact of developing Potterton to the west, however existing landscape characteristics are already established through existing housing to the west of the village. This site would fit comfortably with the surrounding landscape and built form (529).

It was acknowledged by the respondent that this site is within the green belt, however this should not be considered to be a barrier to development. The MIR settlement strategy for Potterton has an identified need for growth. All bid sites in Potterton are on green belt designated land (529).

Bids FR121 and FR122

Sites FR120, FR121 and FR122 would introduce a scale of development which would be detrimental to the village. It would remove significant land from the green belt (486).

A respondent is supportive of site FR121 and FR122 as an allocation for development, in the short term. This site could accommodate a residential led mixed-use development that would make a significant contribution to the settlement. This site would create a more cohesive traditional village with opportunities for new community uses and services. There is no evidence that this site would have adverse impacts on landscape character, this site is not visible from 800 metres away (532). In addition, this site would mitigate any impacts on the primary school, by reserving an area for a new primary school and via developer obligations (532, 536).

The respondent considered that retail use on bid FR121 would not create road safety issues on the B999 and disagreed with the suggestion that the orientation of the village would change (532).

The respondent stated that the green belt around Potterton should not be seen as being a barrier to development (536).

Another respondent was of the view that bid FR120, FR121 and FR122 would have a detrimental impact on the setting of the settlement and would be detrimental to the existing scale and character of the village (3, 315, 595). In addition, the primary school is at capacity (3).

Bid FR123

One respondent considered this site a brownfield opportunity that would provide much needed services and niche retail outlets as well as providing potential employment uses and tourism use development to facilitate the Energetica vision of creating an internationally recognised location for businesses operating within niche markets (792).

Bid FR140

Respondents do not consider that developers have fully considered the viability of the proposal. It is detached from the village and outwith reasonable walking distance to the amenities. The site's location and bias to the AWPR will result in residents being physically and psychologically detached from the village. The site should not be taken forward. There is an ancient woodland which has ecological value. The site should not be taken forward into the Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) (486, 553).

SNH has stated that the site boundary in the Main Issues Report is drawn to exclude an area of ancient woodland. However, in the Draft Proposed LDP the boundary includes that woodland. The proposed LDP states that the woodland should be retained and go towards the allocation's open space provision. It is requested that protection and enhancement of the woodland, including connectivity with surrounding habitats, is included in the site brief (506).

The recognition of ancient woodland adjoining site FR140 and the requirement to consider it in the design/layout of the development is welcomed by Woodland Trust Scotland. Additional native tree planting should be encouraged to minimise potential adverse effects on woodland (876)

Respondents are generally supportive of Officer's views on the allocation of bids FR140 and FR141 (315, 595). Site FR141B is promoted. Development of only 172 units on sites bid FR140 and Bid FR141a over a 10-year period would only provide for 5 years land supply, and the addition of FR141B would increase that to 8 years. 237 homes are a more realistic and acceptable proposition (595).

In support of this site, the respondent has submitted a transportation report that concludes that the sites are well positioned to connect to the existing footpath and local road network, encourage cycling and directly connect to the AWPR at Blackdog through an upgraded C class road (595). In addition, the site is not in a prominent location in terms of landscape impact. Full allocation of these sites would be able to help with the delivery of education improvements (595).

Bid FR141A

Respondents did not support reserving this site (315, 553). This site is not in close proximity to the services within the settlement. The site also includes ancient woodland which has ecological value (553).

SEPA has stated that a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) is required as surface water affects a large part of the site. A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse on the western boundary of the site which should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of this straightened watercourse through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features will require to be investigated (805).

Bid FR141B

The respondent supported the inclusion of FR141B as allocations in the Plan (315).

Another respondent is not in support of this allocation. This site is not in close proximity to the services within the settlement. The site also includes ancient woodland which has an ecological value (553).

3. Actions

General

With regard to housing numbers, the number of houses required for Aberdeenshire are defined in the Strategic Development Plan (SDP). The SDP allocates housing numbers to the broader areas known as the Aberdeen Housing Market Area and the Rural Housing Market Area. The SDP does not specify housing numbers to particular settlements. However, the SDP does identify strategic growth corridors located along the main transport routes and these are areas where development will be focused. Potterton is located within the Aberdeen to Peterhead Strategic Growth Area. In addition, Potterton is a commuter village for Aberdeen. As such, it is considered that Potterton remains ideally situated for measured, significant, sustainable development.

The misprint within the Main Issues Report is acknowledged.

Bid FR037

It is maintained that this site is not brought forward at this time. It is considered that development of site FR037B could have a detrimental impact on the character of the settlement, eroding the openness and obscuring the character of the Manse and Church buildings (the settlements' few traditional buildings) from the southern approach to Potterton on the B999.

With regard to bid FR037A, the view is maintained that this site is not a preferred location for housing at this time. Development would have an adverse impact on the open character and approach to the settlement from the south.

Bid FR104

While it is noted that several respondents did not support the allocation of this site, the view is maintained that the site is appropriately sited for long term future development. Development in this location reflects the existing pattern of development, retaining the village hall more centrally within the settlement. Development on this site would be less predominant in the landscape than other bid sites. However, inclusion of this site at this time would result in a very significant increase in the number of homes in the village and we do not propose to promote this bid in the Proposed LDP.

Bid FR105

The comments are noted. The position is maintained that this site is unsuitable for development. No further action required.

Bid FR106

The comments are noted. It is not proposed to allocate this site in the Proposed LDP. No further action is required.

Bids FR120, FR121 and FR122

Whilst comments in support of these sites are noted, the position is maintained that these sites should not be allocated within the Proposed LDP. The majority of the settlement is located on the east side of the B999. Placing services and facilities to the west of the B999 would divide the settlement with the potential for road and pedestrian safety issues. The B999 should continue to function as a road that passes by Potterton and not through it, retaining Panmure Gardens as the main road through the settlement. There are other, more suitable sites for Potterton to grow that better reflect the built form of the settlement and retain cohesion.

Bid FR123

The position is maintained that this site is not suitable for housing at this time. It is acknowledged that the respondent considers the site would be suitable for commercial or retail uses due to its location near the A90. This site is not a logical extension to the Potterton built form and would have a significant adverse impact on the rural character of the wider area. The respondent promotes this site as having the ability to promote services, facilities and employment uses, however these are uses that can be delivered within the existing allocations at Blackdog, should there be demand. No further action is required.

Bid FR140

The view is maintained that this site is an appropriate extension to Potterton. The site offers a natural extension to the village for residential development. The AWPR allows for improved access to this side of the village without bringing excessive traffic through the village. The site is located close to local businesses and public transport. In addition, there is existing footpaths that allows for access to the sports field and the local shop. This site should be allocated in the Proposed LDP.

With regard to the provision of a site for new community facilities, Bid FR140 could accommodate such facilities. The site is considered to be well connected to the rest of the settlement, with a good footpath network that leads from the west of the settlement via the playing fields to the "Steading" public house and Bid FR140, as well as existing footpaths from the eastern part of the settlement.

Bid FR141A

It has been highlighted that this site was not included within the Draft Proposed LDP, despite being a preferred site. This site is considered to be part of bid FR140 as it would bring similar benefits and can be potentially delivered as one. It is therefore recommended that this site be brought forward for development. It is considered appropriate to request a Masterplan for the delivery of the two sites, together with a proposal to enhance biodiversity, protect ancient woodland and deliver connectivity to the existing settlement.

The request made by SEPA for text to be including in the Settlement Statement is considered appropriate, and the stated requirements should be included in the Proposed LDP.

FR141B

This site is considered to be a logical extension to the future development of the settlement. However, this site will not be brought forward at this time. It is considered that there are sufficient additional housing land allocations identified in the Aberdeen Housing Market Area. It is considered that Potterton has an appropriate amount of land identified for housing to meet local housing needs during the Proposed Plan period.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

A number of changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed LDP on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below

4. Recommendations

1. Amend the Vision to highlight the community's desire for a new community hall and small business units near to the existing business land.
2. Allocate bid FR140 and bid FR141A for 172 homes and Community Facilities, and include in the allocation summary the requirement for a Masterplan for delivery of this site.
3. Include the following text in the allocation summary for bid FR140/FR141A: "A Flood Risk Assessment is required as surface water affects a large part of the site. A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse on the western boundary of the site which should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of this straightened watercourse through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features will require to be investigated".

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019, with the additional recommendation to allocate bid site FR141B, and the development of a Masterplan for the delivery of this site. The committee also agreed that the additional recommendation be added that reference to a health centre at Balmedie be removed from the narrative and plans.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.

3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 83 Rashierieve

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
121	Ryden LLP on behalf of Mr Graham Brown
251	Mr John Forbes
805	SEPA
1020	Strutt & Parker on behalf of Mr Ian Ross

2. Issues

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has highlighted that Rashierieve has no public Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW). SEPA should be consulted over any waste water proposals. The preference would be for a single adoptable Waste Water Treatment Works serving OP1 site with the capacity for SR1 to connect at a future date (805).

Land to North of Rashierieve (Part of Bid FR109)

One respondent has objected to the failure to extend the settlement boundary of Rashierieve northwards to include land lying to the north of the A975 as an opportunity site for development. The land is now detached from the main farm unit by the new dual carriage way and is no longer viable for farming purposes. The site is suitable for residential led mixed used development and would round off the existing settlement and consolidate it. It has good road and public links to Balmedie, Ellon, Peterhead and Aberdeen. Residential development would support the strategic aims for Rashierieve and provide housing in proximity to the existing and proposed employment uses. It would be efficient use of land left over from roads construction which has no other beneficial use and will enhance Rashierieve as a "place" (121).

The respondent also considered that development would comply with the advice of Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) by enabling high quality development and making efficient use of land to deliver long term benefits to the public. In addition, the site benefits from being within the Energetica Corridor (121).

In support of this site, the respondent has stated that there is no flood risk at this site. There is scope to connect to the local drainage system at Foveran, or provide a private drainage system if required (121).

Existing Site - OP1 / Bid FR129

There has been support given to bid FR129 as a preferred site (251, 1020). However, there is a request for an amendment to the allocation to allow a minimum of eight "Live Work" plots on the bid site. An allocation for mixed-use development would allow for flexibility of design (251).

Two respondents state that a Flood Risk Assessment may be required (121, 805). SEPA would require a buffer strip adjacent to the watercourse on the southern boundary of the site which should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of this straightened watercourse through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features will require be investigated (805).

Existing Site - SR1 / Bid FR109

The respondent is of the view that this site is not free of flood risk (121)

The Council should allocate the area currently identified as SR1 and extended it by 5ha as part of bid site FR109. The quality and capability of the land has been diminished by the construction of the AWPR which has also severed the land from its wider agricultural unit. It would result in a coherent approach to delivery of employment land in this area and support a concentration of uses to enable Rashierieve and Foveran to become a strategic location for employment within the Energetica Corridor (1020).

3. Actions

Services and Infrastructure

It is considered appropriate to amend wording to reflect the waste water treatment issues, as identified by SEPA.

Land to North of Rashierieve (Part of Bid FR109)

Rashierieve, while included as a Settlement Statement within the proposed Local Development Plan, does not have a settlement boundary. Rashierieve is a small grouping of four houses, car sales garage, a vet referral and engineering company. This grouping does not have a community function at present and therefore does not meet the criteria of a "settlement" within the Local Development Plan. It is not the intention to amend the Plan to give Rashierieve a defined settlement boundary. As such a settlement boundary cannot be extended.

With regard to allocating the site as a residential led mixed use, the site shall not be taken forward. This site is not considered an appropriate addition to Rashierieve at this time as the site is detached from the grouping by the A975. In accordance with the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan sufficient additional housing land allocations are identified in the Aberdeen Housing Market Area. It is considered that Rashierieve has an appropriate amount of land identified for housing to meet local housing needs during the Plan period. No action is required.

Existing Site - OP1 / Bid FR129

The suggested amendment to this allocation to eight live/work residential units is agreed. However, it is maintained that the boundary to site OP1 is retained.

In addition, the allocation summary for the site will be updated to include reference to waste water treatment and the provision of a buffer area at the water course as suggested.

Existing Site - SR1 / Bid FR109

It is maintained that bid FR109, or part thereof, for employment use is not an appropriate extension to Rashierieve. A development of this size is not in keeping with the scale and character of Rashierieve and its surrounding area. Bid FR109 site would result in the undesirable coalescence of Foveran and Rashierieve. The bid site is intersected by the A90(T) and as such does not offer a logical and cohesive extension to the existing settlement. No further action is required.

4. Recommendations

1. Update wording under 'Strategic drainage and water supply' to identify the preference for a single adoptable WWTW serving OP1 site with the capacity for SR1 to connect at a future date.
2. Re-allocate existing site OP1 for 8 live/work residential units.
3. Amend the allocation summary for OP1 to state that connection to public Waste Water Treatment Works should be sought, if unfeasible a single adoptable Waste Water Treatment plant serving this site will be required, and add the text "Flood Risk Assessment may be required. A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse on the southern boundary of the site which should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of this straightened watercourse through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features will require be investigated".

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019, with recommendation 2 to include text "noting that this number had been promoted by the developer themselves".
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 84 Rothienorman

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
292	Mr Gordon Duncan
1083	Eleanor Alexander Architect Ltd on behalf of John Farquharson
805	SEPA

2. Issues

General

There are major flooding issues within the settlement that will need to be addressed prior to new development (292).

SEPA understands there is limited capacity at Rothienorman Waste Water Treatment Plant so a developer will be required to initiate a growth project with Scottish Water in order to develop the full site (805).

Bid FR026

No comments were received for site FR026, and it is promoted for 12 homes.

Bid FR033 and Bid FR112

Technical constraints such as drainage and access associated with FR033 and FR112 can be overcome through the application process, with consultees already involved (1083).

SEPA has requested the allocation summary for bid FR033 should include a requirement for a buffer strip adjacent to the Black Burn (805).

Bid FR056

SEPA has identified that a Flood Risk Assessment may be required for this site. In addition they have requested that the allocation summary include reference to a buffer strip adjacent to the watercourse on the eastern boundary of the site (805).

3. Actions

The preferred sites should continue to be pursued in order to provide Rural Housing Market Area housing at a location with good services and amenities. Cognisance does need to be drawn to flooding and drainage issues however, with this referenced and solutions required in any allocations.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

A number of changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below.

4. Recommendations

1. Modifications are proposed to the settlement Vision to reflect the aspirations of the community.
2. Allocation of bid FR026 should be made for 12 homes.
3. Allocation of bid FR112 should be made for 40 homes highlighting within the development brief that solutions to drainage, flooding and access constraints will be required in the allocation summary for these sites.
4. Amend the Flood Risk section of the Settlement Statement to include, "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse on the eastern boundary of the site which should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of this straightened watercourse through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features require to be investigated" for the BUS site (bid FR056).

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019 with the exception of recommendation 3.
2. The Committee agreed to the removal of the recommended inclusion of bid site FR112.
3. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
4. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 85 St Katherines

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
292	Mr Gordon Duncan
838	Baxter Design Company (Old Deer) Ltd on behalf of H P Sleigh & Son
805	SEPA

2. Issues

Respondents expressed support for bid FR098 on the basis that development would bring essential infrastructure improvements, as well as support to facilities within the settlement and surrounding area. Planning permission exists for part of the site. Landscape impacts are not apparent and can be mitigated through resolution of a planning application. Employment land provision would be beneficial to the settlement. Bid site can be further expanded in the future (838). The site is not overly car reliant with bus services available (292, 838)

A single Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP) of sufficient capacity to accept waste water from all properties within the development and can be adopted by Scottish Water will be a SEPA requirement. It is unlikely SEPA would approve any proposal for single individual waste water discharges (805).

3. Actions

No comments were received regarding site FR091.

The scale of bid site FR098 is not considered to be appropriate for addition at this time. Development of 35 homes and business use would result in inappropriate growth of St. Katherines, where there are no services to support such a development. It is difficult to see what infrastructure could be provided that would benefit existing residents. Even if landscape impacts can be mitigated it is unlikely that a housebuilder would find 35 houses in this location as a viable project, and its support would not represent the right development in the right place.

In line with SEPA's comments the text within the Settlement Statement will be amended accordingly.

4. Recommendations

1. Retain existing OP1 and do not allocate any further land at this point.
2. Amend the Services and Infrastructure section to include "A single Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP) of a standard that can be adopted by Scottish Water,

with capacity for all properties within the development will be a SEPA requirement.”

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019, with the additional recommendation of the inclusion of bid site FR098 in the settlement statement.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 86 Tarves

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
141	Ryden LLP on behalf of Michael Mountford & Iain Mathers
558	Norr on behalf of JoAnne Gracey
805	SEPA
944	Tarves Community Council

2. Issues

General

It has been contended that there is no need for further development in the settlement, with 140 houses already allocated proving sufficient (944).

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has highlighted that Scottish Water should be contacted early in the planning process to ensure that waste water capacity is available, and not initiate a growth project (805).

Existing Site – OP1

One respondent has advised that this site has an extant planning permission for 113 houses granted on appeal, which should be reflected in the text (558).

Bid FR009

One respondent has supported the inclusion of this site for 13 houses, commenting that education constraints can be resolved through an application, as can the requirement for a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS). Furthermore, the respondent contends that this is a brownfield site and confirms the ability to deliver within the Plan period (141). The brownfield nature of the site has been contested, and the respondent has stated that the land is naturalised after a temporary storage use (944).

Bid FR0027

It has been stated that bid FR002 is not required for the settlement, albeit this is not a proposed site in any case (944).

Other sites

One respondent considered there should be inclusion of a further development site of 72 houses within the Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP), however the identity of the site is not divulged and this does not accord with any proposal (558).

3. Actions

General

The scale of development proposed in the village is noted.

Services and Infrastructure

The request by SEPA regarding waste water treatment capacity is noted. Text should be amended in the Settlement Statement accordingly.

Existing Site – OP1

Text within the allocation summary should be updated to reflect the extant planning permission (Appeal Decision) for 113 houses (APP/2018/1262).

Bid FR009

This site should be allocated and reference to brownfield development removed to avoid confusion and contradiction with previous decisions. It is agreed that education and drainage issues can be dealt with through specific planning applications. The inclusion of 13 houses is also appropriate.

Other sites

No further new development sites are considered appropriate for inclusion.

Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

A number of changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed LDP on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below

4. Recommendations

1. Amend text under 'Strategic drainage and water supply' to state the developer requirement for early engagement with Scottish Water.
2. Update the allocation summary for existing site OP1 to reflect extant planning permission.
3. Retain existing site OP1.
4. Retain existing site OP2.
5. Re-allocate existing site OP3 as a housing allocation for 19 homes as per bid FR058.
6. Allocate Bid FR009 for 13 homes without reference to any potential as "brownfield" land.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019, with the exception of recommendation 6 which the committee agreed site FR009 to be removed. Additionally, the committee agreed that recommendation 3 should be amended to read “re-allocate existing site OP3 as a housing allocation for 19 homes as per bid FR058, developed to match the design of houses lying to the east of the site”.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 87 Tipperty

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
204	John Handley Associates Ltd on behalf of Shell UK Limited
805	SEPA

2. Issues

Bid FR070 and Bid FR071

One respondent has advised that sites FR070 and FR071 both fall within the consultation zone for the Shell NGL Pipeline system, but no reference has been made to this within the Main Issues Report text. It was suggested that text is amended to advise of the pipeline consultation zone and the relevant considerations required for any proposals as a result (204).

SEPA has advised that approximately 50% of the FR070 site is at risk from flooding from the Tarty Burn. It is stated that a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) would be required prior to allocation, or the site should be reduced and amended to exclude the flood risk areas. An FRA would also be required for any planning application. The poor physical condition of the burn will need to be addressed and it is stated that efforts should be made to enhance it, possibly by allowing it to realign, which may take up as much as 50% of the development site. It was also stated that no waste water issues have been identified, but that there are no facilities in Tipperty, and this would require to be addressed in any proposals (805).

SEPA has indicated that an FRA would be required prior to allocation, or the site should be reduced and amended to exclude the flood risk areas to avoid an objection from a statutory consultee. An FRA would also be required for any planning application (805).

3. Actions

Bid FR070 and Bid FR071

These bid sites should be included in the plan for 0.76 ha and 1.7ha of employment land. Health and safety concerns regarding employment sites are less onerous than for Housing Sites as the density of occupation of land is frequently quite low.

The text for both proposed FR070 and FR071 sites should highlight the significant flooding issues, while both sites should have their boundaries amended to exclude the areas at risk from flooding on the SEPA flood maps. The need for further FRAs should also be highlighted.

Furthermore, the presence of the Shell NGL Pipeline consultation zone should also be highlighted, with additional commentary on the need to liaise with HSE.

Reference will also need to be made to the lack of any public Waste Water Treatment facilities in the vicinity.

All other bid sites should not be included in line with the Officers' recommendations in the Main Issues Report.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

A number of changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed LDP on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below.

4. Recommendations

1. Allocate bids FR070 and FR071 for 0.76 ha and 1.7ha of employment land.
2. Amend site boundaries of FR070 and FR071 to exclude areas at risk from flooding as shown on the SEPA flood maps.
3. For both FR070 and FR071 allocation summaries, include reference to the need for a Flood Risk Assessment, the location of the sites within a pipeline consultation zone and associated requirements add reference to the need for consideration of waste water treatment solutions.
4. Retain the BUS site in the village, with boundaries redrawn to reflect the current extent of land currently used for business uses.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 88 Turriff

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
112	Mr & Mrs Dave & Marion Rothwell
241	Lippe Architects + Planners on behalf of Harbro Ltd
243	Lippe Architects + Planners on behalf of Mr E Morrison
244	Lippe Architects + Planners on behalf of Mr E Morrison
313	John Wink Design on behalf of Mr Kevin Davidson
398	Halliday Fraser Munro on behalf of Messrs Paterson & Rennie
413	Savills (UK) Ltd on behalf of Macbain Family
426	Mr Kevin Davidson
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
805	SEPA
876	Woodland Trust Scotland

2. Issues

General Issues

The ancient woodland should be protected and extra planting provided (876). The planning objectives for the settlement are generally supported, but the text for site OP1 is too detailed (398). Market constraints and lack of services in the settlement remain concerning (112).

SEPA understand the Turriff Waste Water Treatment Plant has very limited capacity and certainly does not currently have capacity for all developments identified in the Local Development Plan (805).

Existing Sites

The existing site BUS2 should not be removed as it is partially built out and is next to an existing development site (244).

SEPA confirm an FRA for site OP2 is not required as the burn is unlikely to pose a risk being in a deep gorge. However, a buffer strip will be required, adjacent to the Burn of Knockiemill, which should be integrated positively into the development (805).

Bid FR001

SEPA has identified that a Flood Risk Assessments (FRA) may be required for this site. A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the Colly Stripe which runs through the site and should be integrated positively into the development. The buffer strip will need to allow sufficient space for restoration of the straightened and partially culverted Burn. Enhancement through re-naturalisation and de-culverting. This will require to be investigated (805).

Bid FR005

SEPA have confirmed they will not require an FRA as the burn is unlikely to pose a risk being in a deep gorge. However, a buffer strip will be required, adjacent to the Burn of Knockiemill, which should be integrated positively into the development (805).

Bid FR020

SNH believed that bid FR020 requires further landscape and visual consideration as it sits outside the settlement on north facing slopes with poor relationship to the existing settlement (506).

This site appears to meet SEPA cemetery guidelines. However, it will require a 10m buffer from a field drain to the south west of the site (805).

Bid FR030

SEPA are pleased to note that a buffer is required around the spring (805).

Bid FR074

A respondent has requested that bid FR074 should be allocated in the Proposed Local Development Plan (Proposed LDP), as it was previously allocated and represents an opportunity to support local housing need, support local services, is sustainable and constraints can be overcome (241).

Bid FR078

A respondent has requested that bid FR078 should be allocated in the Proposed LDP. The simplification of allocation wording contained in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan is welcomed (398). The woodland should be protected, as it is irreplaceable (876).

SEPA would welcome the addition of "Enhancement of any straightened watercourses through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features will require to be investigated for this site" (805).

Bid FR085

A respondent has requested that bid FR085 should be allocated in the Proposed LDP. The respondent was of the view that the site is not considered detached from the settlement, given there are allocations up to the boundary with and adjacent to the site. Houses form part of the urban fabric of the settlement (243).

Bid FR127

The respondent is of the view that bid FR127 should be brought forward immediately for 50 houses (413).

Bid FR134

An objection has been raised to bid FR134 due to visual and sustainability concerns (241). SNH believe that further consideration of the site within the landscape is

required as it relates poorly to the settlement (506). However, two respondents believe that the site can be delivered to meet housing need and add to the sense of place and good design. Landscaping can be secured through a planning application (313, 426).

SEPA notes the request for a Flood Risk Assessment (805).

3. Actions

Existing sites

BUS2 extends beyond the Morrison's Motors Yard and the area considered for removal is currently used for car and caravan storage. It should remain in the Proposed LDP.

Bid Sites

Bid FR020 should not be taken forward for housing due to landscape/visual concerns and its poor relationship to the settlement. It should be retained as a preferred site for a cemetery.

Other preferred sites should continue to be supported, with cognisance of relevant ecological and landscape concerns noted where necessary. Specifically, protection of woodland on FR078 and further landscape and visual considerations noted for FR134.

The logic behind including FR085 is sound, albeit premature until neighbouring sites have been built out. At present the site is physically detached from the existing settlement.

No comments were received on the preferred bids of FR003, FR004, and FR030, and FR086.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

A number of changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed LDP on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below.

4. Recommendations

1. Modify the Vision within the Settlement Statement to reflect the aspirations as expressed in early consultation by local stakeholders, including the Community Council.
2. BUS2 should be retained in its entirety. Sites OP3 and OP4 should be removed.
3. Site OP1 should be retained, with the option of subdivision according to the approved Masterplan.
4. FR086 should be identified as an opportunity site for 40 homes.

5. Bid sites FR001, FR086 and FR134 should be taken forward to the Proposed Plan for 27 homes and 40 homes respectively.
6. Do not include the housing element of FR020 in the Proposed Local Development Plan.
7. Specific reference to tree protection should be made to development on bid FR078.
8. Specific reference to landscape and visual issues, alongside other ecological factors should be made for FR134.
9. Remove reference to Flood Risk Assessments from site OP2.
10. Amend allocation summary for Site OP2 to state "A buffer strip will be required, adjacent to the Burn of Knockiemill, which should be integrated positively into the development".
11. Amend allocation summary for site OP1 to include "Enhancement of any straightened watercourses through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features will require to be investigated."

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 89 Udney Green

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
805	SEPA
874	Udney Community Trust Ltd. (UCTL)

2. Issues

Vision

It has been identified that text stating that there is no public transport is incorrect as there are bus services available (874).

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has advised that whilst the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) states that a “Growth Project has been Initiated”, this is however noted as being older text and it was suggested that Scottish Water comment on the status of this and the associated capacity (805).

Existing Site – OP1

The retention of site OP1 has been considered appropriate (874).

3. Actions

Vision

Text should also be updated in order to remove the erroneous statement regarding the lack of public transport options.

Services and Infrastructure

Confirmation should be sought regarding the status of the Scottish Water growth project to better inform the Proposed Local Development Plan.

Existing Site – OP1

Support for retaining this site is noted.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

Changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed LDP on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below

4. Recommendations

1. Update Vision text to accurately reflect public transport options.

2. Seek confirmation from Scottish Water concerning growth project status and reflect this under 'Strategic drainage and water supply'.
3. Retain existing site OP1 for 15 homes.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 90 Udney Station

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
372	Case Consulting Limited on Behalf of Irvine Christie
429	Halliday Fraser Munro on behalf of Mr Ian Marr & Claymore Homes
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
805	SEPA

2. Issues

Services and Infrastructure

The existing Local Development Plan states that a growth project has been initiated, however the growth project is not complete (805).

Existing Site OP1/ Bid FR138

The existing OP1 site has been previously refused planning permission and has been unsuccessful at appeal on the grounds of insufficient access arrangements onto the Udney Station to Cultercullen public road (372).

Bid FR021

One respondent considered that this site should be allocated to substitute for the existing OP1 site. They further considered that the allocation of this site would contribute to maintaining a 5 year effective land supply later in the Plan period, as the existing OP1 site would not contribute homes until at least 2023-2024. In addition, the allocation could maintain local services including an existing public transport service. This site is not prime agricultural land or part of a viable agricultural unit and it is well connected to the settlement (372).

Another respondent states that FR021 would have an adverse landscape impact and double the size of village (429). Scottish Natural Heritage consider that the large size of the development would reduce cohesion of the existing small settlement extending development outwith the subtle confines of the broad hill land to the east, and recommends the majority of the site should be left undeveloped (506).

If this site is taken forward a site brief would be required to avoid development extending over the whole site, retain the existing settlement boundary. Protection should be given to the adjacent semi-natural woodland, to provide for biodiversity enhancements and landscaping (506).

Bid FR139

One respondent is in support of bid site FR139 as an extension to site OP1 to deliver a design that fits better with the existing settlement (429). Extension to allocated land should be identified as future housing land rather than entirely new sites. At present

OP1 is not conducive to creating a high quality layout due to the constraints imposed by the shape of the site. Site FR139 would deliver employment land; significant open space, footpath network with links to the Formartine and Buchan Way; a good mix of house types with appropriate phasing that would meet future housing needs; and affordable housing (429).

3. Actions

Services and Infrastructure

Information received from Scottish Water advises that a growth project is underway and is due for completion in 2021. While the completion of these works is in line with the adoption of the Local Development Plan additional text should be included to refer to this date.

Existing Site – OP1

While there has been no objection received to this site, the comments on previous refusal of planning permissions, and a successful appeal decision and access issues is acknowledged. It is maintained that site OP1 is an appropriate extension to the settlement. However, it would appear that the difficulty in delivering this site is due to the difficulty in providing an appropriate design layout for the site incorporating employment land. There is no evidence that the employment land element of OP1 has attracted any interest. The removal of the requirement for employment land could result in the delivery of a well-designed residential layout which integrates with the existing village. The removal of the requirement to provide employment land on this site does not preclude the delivery of community facilities, home and work proposals and small convenience shops on this site, should they be required.

Bid FR021

It is maintained the development of the site is very large in scale and would be a prominent extension to the settlement when there has not been a need identified. The existing OP1 site and current brownfield site within the settlement will deliver the number of houses over the next 10 years that is appropriate for a settlement of this size.

Bid FR139

It is maintained the development of the site would constitute overdevelopment of the village in a relatively short period of time. The existing OP1 site and current brownfield site within the settlement will deliver the number of houses over the next 10 years that is appropriate for a settlement of this size.

In accordance with the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan sufficient additional housing land allocations are identified in the Aberdeen Housing Market Area. It is considered that Udney Station has an appropriate amount of land identified for housing to meet local housing needs during the Plan period.

4. Recommendations

1. Minor modifications are proposed in the Vision to reflect community aspirations. The settlement Vision statement should be amended from “The planning objectives for the settlement are to meet local housing and employment land needs. Another objective is to support existing services and facilities.” to “The planning objectives for the settlement are to meet local housing and support existing services and facilities.”
2. Modification should be made to the infrastructure text to acknowledge the completion of a Scottish Water Growth project by 2021.
3. No new allocations or designations are recommended.
4. Remove “and 1ha of employment land” from site OP1 allocation within the Proposed LDP.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 91 West Pitmillan

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
805	SEPA
1020	Strutt & Parker on behalf of Mr Ian Ross

2. Issues

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has stated that whilst there is no Waste Water Treatment Works at the settlement, there is one at a neighbouring settlement 1.4km away and that the preference would be for everything to connect into that single sewerage system. This was also stated as being the case for existing site OP1 (FR118) (805).

Bid FR117

Concerns were raised by one respondent, stating that development would lead to an adverse landscape impact, adverse impact upon Prime Agricultural Land and would have access constraints. Additionally, there are reservations about air quality, climatic factors and soil impacts (1020).

SEPA has stated that a buffer strip adjacent to the watercourse running through the site will be required, similarly the watercourse should be enhanced and positively integrated into any development (805).

Bid FR118 / Existing Site – OP1

SEPA has advised that there is no Flood Risk Assessment requirement from SEPA for this site. Furthermore, it is stated that a buffer strip adjacent to the watercourse running through the site will be required, similarly the watercourse should be enhanced and positively integrated into any development (805).

3. Actions

Services and Infrastructure

Further clarity on solutions with regard to waste water treatment is required in order to provide added certainty for any developers and an optimal solution for the site moving forward. Confirmation over connection options and progress should be sought from Scottish Water.

Bid FR117

Site FR117 should not be included in the Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) at this point in time. It may be suitable for future development but this can be assessed after site FR118 has progressed. The concerns regarding environmental and visual

impacts could be better assessed at that point, furthermore the scale of the site appears out of context with the settlement.

Bid FR118 / Existing Site – OP1

The requirement to enhance and integrate the watercourse in the area should be stated in the allocation summary.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

Changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed LDP on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below.

4. Recommendations

1. Seek further clarity on a waste water treatment solution and reflect the current status under the 'Services and Infrastructure' section of the Settlement Statement.
2. Do not allocate bid FR117.
3. Retain existing site OP1 (bid FR118) and amend the allocation summary to include reference to requirements to enhance and integrate the watercourse.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 92 Woodhead

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
292	Mr Gordon Duncan

2. Issues

A single respondent commented that they agreed with the conclusions drawn regarding proposed new sites and the resultant omission of all bid sites, advising that water supply, drainage, waste water and public transport constraints are all present (292).

3. Actions

No change required.

4. Recommendations

1. No change is required.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendation at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 93 Ythanbank

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
805	SEPA
857	Taylor Design Services on behalf of M G Leslie & Son
876	Woodland Trust Scotland
1009	Historic Environment Scotland

2. Issues

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has noted that there are no waste water treatment facilities available in the settlement and that a single adoptable facility should be pursued. Investigation into groundwater pollution should also be highlighted (805).

Bid FR048 and Bid FR049

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) has commented that bid sites FR048 and FR049 are physically and visually detached from the linear settlement as well as being positioned on a hill which contributes to the wider landscape character of the area. It is stated that significant landscape impacts would result (506).

One respondent supports the inclusion of the non-preferred bids FR048 and FR049 stating that these should be reconsidered as waste water impacts can be mitigated, as can negative impacts upon woodland and archaeological sites. Furthermore, the sites would provide community facilities (woodland walks) for the settlement and the site is not constrained by pipelines (857).

Woodland Trust Scotland has identified the ancient woodland present to the south of FR048 and FR049 (876), whilst Historic Environment Scotland has welcomed the fact that these are not preferred owing to the presence of a Scheduled Monument and potential impacts upon its setting (1009).

3. Actions

Services and Infrastructure

Waste water capacity issues are acknowledged and should be highlighted in the Settlement Statement.

Bid FR048 and Bid FR049

There are no further actions regarding bid FR048 and FR049 as it is maintained that these sites should not be included. The sites are physically and visually detached from

the settlement, do not fit in with the linear pattern of development and would have numerous adverse impacts including environmental, historical, visual, and in terms of drainage.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

Changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below.

No comment was made regarding the inclusion of bid site FR019, and it is proposed to allocate this site for 5 homes. This is an increase from 4 homes that were proposed in the bid submission. For consistency across the Proposed LDP only developments of 5 homes or more are proposed to be allocated in settlements.

4. Recommendations

1. Modify the Vision to reflect the community's desire to limit new housing over the next 10 years, to encourage good design to retain the village's character, and to highlight that affordable housing is an issue.
2. Update text under 'Strategic drainage and water supply' to reflect that a single adoptable waste water treatment facility should be pursued, and investigation into ground water pollution may be required.
3. Retain existing site OP1 as a partially developed site for 10 homes.
4. Allocate bid FR019 for 5 homes.
5. Redraw the settlement boundary to incorporate the extents of recent development on the southern side of the B9005.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 94 Formartine Landward

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
315	Belhelvie Community Council
376	case CONSULTING Limited on behalf of M & C Simmers
449	Colin Thompson Architect on behalf of Graham Watson
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
511	Colin Thompson Architect on behalf of Graham Watson
577	Whitecairns Estates Ltd
604	Baxter Design Company (Old Deer) Ltd on behalf of Mrs V Fowlie (landowner)
673	Udny Community Council
868	Mr & Mrs Howard & Linda Kershaw
874	Udny Community Trust Ltd. (UCTL)

2. Issues

Bid FR036, Drum Of Wartle

There is support for this site for employment uses on the basis that the site is small-scale and could promote start up units. The site is located away from houses and will not have a detrimental impact (449, 511).

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) has requested that if this site was considered further, measures should be included in the Local Development Plan (LDP) to avoid encroachment and adverse impacts to adjacent woodland (506).

Bid FR023, Hattoncrook

Having reviewed the Officers' assessment in the Main Issue Report, a reduced site has been proposed to accommodate a much smaller development. The respondent considers the area is entirely outwith the pipeline corridor safety zone. The revised site should be identified as an allocation in the LDP 2021 (376).

In support of this site the respondent proposes a new Waste Water Treatment Plant to serve the site and the existing adjacent development. In addition, there are no records of protected species within the site boundary, and the respondent considers that the development would not be visually intrusive, and is within 100m from a bus stop (376).

However, another respondent has expressed concern regarding the scale of development proposed (673, 874).

Bid FR016, Whitecairns

A respondent has welcomed the Officers' assessment that the site relates well to the settlement and considers that the site would be seen as a modest extension to the existing group of houses with no adverse impact upon the existing settlement or wider countryside. The site is well served by public transport and within easy cycling distance to Dyce. In addition, there are solutions available to resolve the education and drainage constraints (868).

Bid FR097, Whitecairns

There is disagreement with the Officers' assessment ("not preferred" site). One respondent supports this site for 20 homes as there is viable private drainage solutions and the site could be integrated into the landscape (315). Another respondent was of the view that Whitecairns would benefit from development to promote the desire for small businesses as well as residential areas (577). The site is accessible due to the proximity of the AWPR (577, 604).

Another respondent promotes this site as being suitable for residential and business land. They are of the view that education constraints can be resolved and the site could deliver a safer bus route (604).

3. Actions

Bid FR036, Drum Of Wartle

The position is maintained that allocating this site for employment purposes would promote development in an unsustainable location. However, we recognise the need to support sustainable economic development in remote rural locations. This site is located within the Rural Housing Area therefore there may be scope for small scale employment development under Issue 10 Shaping Rural Development in the Countryside.

However, landscape impact remains a concern. It is noted that those who promote this site for development suggest landscaping to mitigation impacts. However, landscaping is not the solution to making a development acceptable. Sensitive design, along with appropriate landscaping would be assessed as part of the planning application process considered through the application of rural development policies. No further action is required.

Hattoncrook and Whitecairns

Allocations for development that would more than double the size of these settlements are not justified as they would have a detrimental impact on the wider landscape and setting of the settlements. However, there may be scope for small scale development under Issue 10 Shaping Rural Development in the Countryside and Main issues 8 Organic Growth. This policy may potentially allow a qualifying settlement to grow by 20% of the size of the settlement, which is a reasonable expansion. No further action is required.

4. Recommendations

There are no recommendations.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendation at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.