

Issue 153 Aboyne

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
12	Mr & Mrs Pamela & Eric Green
109	S Ferguson
182	Mr Ewan Stewart
184	Ms Myra Stewart
188	Mr Hamish Forbes
217	Ms Kim Hosgood
268	Dinnet & Kinnord Estate on behalf of J M M Humphrey
269	Dinnet & Kinnord Estate on behalf of Marcus Humphrey Educational Trust
281	Dr Rob Brooker on behalf of Aboyne Academy Parent Council
298	Mr Gavin Jones
420	Mr David Younie on behalf of Birse and Ballogie Community Council (B2C2)
465	Mr John Findlay Ryden LLP on behalf of Cabardunn Development Company Limited and Dunecht Estates
506	Mr Darren Hemsley on behalf of Scottish Natural Heritage
573	Ms Ashleigh Wilson A B Roger and Young Ltd on behalf of Mr J Dukes & N Duncan
730	Mr Simon Blake on behalf of Kemsley Green (Phases 2A and 2B) Residents' Association
772	Mr Andrew Fyfe on behalf of Mid Deeside Community Council (MDCC)
805	SEPA
941	Mr Arthur Knight
957	Mr William Mitchell
1043	Mr & Mrs Mark & Kerry Hammond
1054	Ms Julie Cruickshank

2. Issues

General

Concern was raised that there is a lack of service capacity within Aboyne in relation to the proposed population increase (109). An impact assessment should be undertaken of the proposed development to assess the effect on general local infrastructure (730, 1054).

Concern was raised that there is an oversupply of housing in Aboyne and no need for additional allocations (188, 217, 1043) with one respondent noting that there is an

oversupply specifically of housing that is not low cost (12). The MIR for Marr states that there is not a need for further allocations in Aboyne (1043).

More space is needed in both Aboyne Primary School and Aboyne Secondary School and the community centre needs to regain a community priority (109). There is a shortage of local facilities for clubs and organisations (772) as well as a lack of accessible facilities and amenities: this is a concern for the young (1054). Improvements to the paths network and parking capacity are also required (1054).

A more holistic approach needs to be taken in Aboyne considering the implications of considerable recent planned and possible development in the village before any piecemeal expansion of the village is considered (772).

Vision

One respondent notes that the lack of accessible facilities and amenities is identified in the settlement vision (1054).

Aboyne is a village and not a town (772).

One respondent stated that the statement made by Aberdeenshire Council that community desire is driving the planning objectives outlined is misplaced and unsubstantiated and that there was no meeting held in Aboyne by the Local Authority to establish community desire, or to assess local need (298).

Flood Risk

SEPA has requested that the rewording of the text in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) under “a small watercourse runs along the boundary site OP1. A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) may be required” is changed to “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).

With regard to OP2, SEPA has requested that should extant permission expire, an FRA may be required (805).

SEPA has requested that a buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as a positive feature of the development at bid site MR020. The watercourse appears to have been historically straightened. The opportunity for channel realignment and restoration as part of the development should be investigated (805).

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has highlighted that the progress of the growth project and delivery date should be verified with Scottish Water to ensure there is adequate capacity at the public waste water treatment works for the developments (805). Any development would require

developer contributions to education provision and lack of facilities for the young is of particular concern (1054).

Existing Sites

One respondent commented that development to the west of the Tarland Road has increased flooding risk from site OP1 and it is insufficient to just assess risk of flooding within this area given the clear evidence of inadequate infrastructure (772).

Bid MR020

Concerns have been raised with regards to the landscape and visual impacts resulting from development of the site (1054). The site would be out of keeping with the character of the village (941, 957, 1054). The development of the site would be prominent from the south and west (730, 1054). The development would alter the profile of Aboyne as a flat village (182, 184). Development would result in the loss of woodland that is a wildlife habitat and is frequently used for recreational use (182, 184).

If allocated, Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) has stated that as the site extends up the lower slopes to a local landform, which contributes to the immediate northern setting of Aboyne, in order to reduce the extent of landscape and visual impacts, development should be concentrated to the south on the lower flatter ground (506).

It was suggested by SNH that a site brief should be included to ensure development is adequately linked to the core path network, national cycle network and that the development incorporates suitable biodiverse open space ensuring enhancement/connectivity with existing woodland (506).

One respondent noted that they were against the allocation of the site (182).

Concerns have also been raised in terms of unsuitable access to the site through existing sites (730). Balnagowan Drive was identified as an unsuitable and unsafe main access for a large development (941, 957, 1054). The Tarland Road is insufficient to provide access and second access from the A93 is required for the site (772, 957). Concerns have been raised with regards to increase in traffic and congestion (573, 1054). The development would have an adverse impact on residential safety (772, 1054), local air pollution and congestion (772). The distance of the site from the village centre would result in increased car usage and exacerbate current car parking issues in the village centre (772).

Concern was raised regarding the detrimental impact the development would have on infrastructure such as roads, drainage and recreational amenities (182). Drainage from the development would add to the existing issues of capacity in Aboyne (941, 957, 1054), as retention basins have been shown to be inadequate and unable to stop localised flooding in the area of Tarland Road (730, 1054). Concerns regarding water management were also raised (957, 1054).

There is no demand for housing in addition to the sites already allocated (957). One respondent was opposed to the site as a reserved site as it would not meet any other planning objectives other than meeting housing needs – it would not support local facilities and does not provide opportunity for employment leading to an increase in commuting (772). Concern was raised regarding education provision within the community (772), which would require developer contributions to education (1054).

Bid MR028

One respondent recommended that Birsemore should be identified as a settlement in the Proposed LDP with provision made for further development, and the site allocated for 13 homes either during the Plan period, or as a reserved site for mid-term review on the grounds that it comprises a cohesive group of approximately 40 homes, is larger than many settlements presently identified in the Local Development Plan, and is distinctly separate and detached from Aboyne (465). The respondent supports the site as a preferred option (465).

The site is set in a secluded location and that the visual impact would be confined to the immediate vicinity as mature woodland bounds the site, with an established residential area to the north making the site capable of accommodating low density private residential development in keeping with the character of the area (465).

Concerns were cited regarding the detracting from the rural character and amenity of the area as a result of development at the site (12, 188, 217, 420, 1043). Potential impacts were identified on local habitat and wildlife (12, 188, 217, 420, 1043), and water quality of the River Dee and Queen's Loch (420). Concern was raised over the flood risk from Queen's Loch (12).

Current infrastructure would be insufficient to support the proposed development (420). Concern was also raised regarding the impact on the infrastructure at Aboyne Academy and the effect on the school roll (281), although one representation considered school capacity issues could be satisfactorily addressed through developer obligations (465).

It was identified by one respondent that Birsemore has its own waste water treatment works with capacity and it would be prudent to use this spare capacity before development elsewhere (465).

Concerns regarding access issues were raised and whether the developer has the right to convert the entrance of the field was also noted (420). Road safety issues at Feuars Road and the B976 junction were raised (420), as well as visibility issues at the road junction (12). One respondent acknowledged that road access is an issue, however noted that the access visibility is a pre-existing problem for properties in Birsemore (465).

There is other land available at Castle Park and Tarland Road to meet demand close to services and facilities (12).

SNH recommended that if the site were to be allocated, links to the core path network should be provided (506).

Bid MR054

Supportive comments were received from one respondent stating that the site could be screened from the west (573). Additionally, it was noted that the site could be developed without dominating the area, and with little impact on the safety and quality of life of existing residents, dependent on traffic and waste management solutions (730, 941, 1054). Support was also received for the site as it would deliver affordable housing (573).

Access was mentioned, with support of the site as it has direct access onto the A93 (573) and is on a public transport route (573). The site should have direct access onto the A93, with no vehicular access to Site OP1 (941, 1054). Concerns were raised regarding traffic and water management (1054). Increased parking capacity is required (1054). The site would require developer contributions to education (1054). A respondent commented that improvements to the paths networks was required (1054) although another respondent was supportive of the site as it has three separate accesses to the core path network (573).

Concerns were raised regarding drainage capacity; specifically relating to the installation of a drainage system not adding further load to the existing inadequate drainage system (730, 941, 1054).

One respondent was opposed to the development of the site due to issues associated with flooding, road access, traffic issues, lack of employment opportunities, education or for a lack of provision of leisure and recreation facilities (772).

SNH raised concern that the site is physically divorced from the settlement and would lead to ribbon development along the A93 (506). The site would contribute to adverse impacts on the settlement setting and character of the local area – SNH disagrees with the Officer assessment of the site that suggested heavy screening could mitigate against the impacts on the character of the local area (506).

SNH recommends that if the site is allocated, links to the core path network are provided, as well as protection of woodland and connectivity (506).

Bid MR081

Support was received of the Officers' assessment of the site (772).

The proposal to alter the settlement boundary was also supported with suggestion to include both MR081 and the adjacent property within the settlement, with further recommendation that the area to the south of bid site MR081 also be included within the settlement boundary (268).

New site- Golf Course Road

The respondent recommended a new opportunity site that should be identified for development in the long term on Golf Course Road. There are no provisions in the title deeds to restrict development or access on that land (269).

3. Actions

General

The concerns relating to existing amenities/facilities and infrastructure and potential impacts from new development are noted. It is asserted that new development should have positive impacts where possible and seek to contribute to the amenities of the town.

Supply of housing in Aberdeenshire is set by the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan. Aboyne has an appropriate amount of land identified for housing to meet local housing needs during the Plan period according to its size and the levels of demand expressed.

The concern that there is an oversupply of housing that is not low cost is noted. All development shall be required to contribute towards affordable housing provision, in line with Scottish Planning Policy.

Vision

It is noted that one respondent's disagreed with how the statements in the Vision were arrived at. Consultation is undertaken in accordance with the agreed Development Plan Scheme for the production of the LDP and there is satisfaction that the community have had sufficient engagement opportunities in this process. Review of the Vision statement to be included within the Proposed LDP is ongoing and should account for comments received. Evidence on the Place Plan exercise was gathered and provided to the Planning Service by the Marr Area Community Planning Team.

It is acknowledged that one respondent notes that the lack of accessible facilities and amenities is identified in the settlement vision.

Flood Risk

Text should be amended to reflect the comments from SEPA for existing site OP1 and OP2.

It is acknowledged that SEPA's request for a buffer strip is to be included as a feature of the development at bid site MR020. However, in light of the recommendations to not have Future Opportunity sites, as discussed under "Issue 8 Shaping Homes and Housing", this site is not recommended to be brought forward as an allocation. As such no action is required.

Services and Infrastructure

Information received from Scottish Water has confirmed that there is limited capacity available at Aboyne. As is normal in such cases Scottish Water would be required to initiate a growth project once development meets their five growth criteria.

Scottish Water identifies the need for a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) at site OP1. The DIA requirement will be included in the allocation summary for the site.

As stated in the MIR, contributions towards education capacity would be required for all development sites and would be assessed at a planning application stage.

Existing Sites

Comments received regarding flooding concerns are noted. As stated by SEPA, the text for existing site OP1 should be amended to require a buffer strip adjacent to the watercourse.

Bid MR020

In light of the recommendations to not have Future Opportunity Sites (FOPs), as discussed under "Issue 8 Shaping Homes and Housing", this site is not recommended to be brought forward as an allocation. The comments suggesting that there is no demand for housing in addition to the sites already allocated is noted and it is agreed that there is not currently a justification to release such a large number of homes as indicated by the 'reserved' (FOP) MIR recommendation.

Noted is the comments raised, including from SNH, regarding the landscape character impact and impact on the character of the village as well as drainage concerns.

It is acknowledged that the concerns regarding access and transport impacts such as road safety, pollution and congestion. While there is no control over workers living locally, any potential employment opportunities in site OP1 would be in close proximity to the site.

Bid MR028

Positive comments are acknowledged suggesting that the site would have limited visual impact and it is capable of accommodating low density private residential development in keeping with the character of the area. It is felt that the hamlet of Birsemore is small and that the proposed site would represent a significant extension of the group. Detraction from the rural character and amenity of the area are noted, as well as the impact on local habitat and the water quality of the River Dee and Queen's Loch.

Current infrastructure would be insufficient and a number of constraints still operate including foul drainage and road access issues. The proposal is for 13 homes, when the capacity of the private system is only 10 homes and therefore the spare capacity would still be insufficient.

It is maintained that bid MR028 should not be allocated in the Proposed LDP as it is not considered to be the right development in the right place. It is not considered that it is appropriate for Birsemore to be identified as a settlement given its strong links with Aboyne.

Bid MR054

It is acknowledged the concern from SNH that the site would be located outwith the settlement boundary and would contribute to adverse impacts on the character of the local area and contribute to ribbon development. It is maintained that heavy screening would need to demonstrate that it could adequately mitigate against the impact on the character of the area – specifically as the site is in the Dee Valley Special Landscape Area.

The level of support is acknowledged for this bid site, with comments stating that the site could be screened, with development having little impact on the area and residents and benefits recognised from potential affordable housing.

The comments regarding the provision and improvements to core path networks and protection of woodland are acknowledged. Access, parking, traffic and drainage issues raised have all been noted. It is noted that one respondent agrees with the assertion that the site would require developer contributions. Issues regarding flooding, employment and impact on leisure and recreation facilities have been noted.

However, the position is maintained as per the MIR that there is no justification to release the large number of homes proposed by this development at this time.

Bid MR081

Support of the Officer's recommendation to alter the settlement boundary is noted.

With regard to the respondent's recommendation to include both MR081 and the adjacent property within the settlement boundary, it is agreed that the adjacent property should be included within the settlement boundary – however the extent of the area to the south of the site recommended by the respondent to be included within the settlement boundary is considered unnecessary.

New Site – Golf Course Road

The site has been proposed in this consultation, which was not included in the MIR document itself. While this new proposal is not unknown, and is a circumstance recognised by Circular 6/2013, it is noted that the public have not had an opportunity to assess this bid site. In addition, the rigorous assessment undertaken of other sites has not been completed to determine suitability or environmental impact.

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 stakeholders.
2. Update 'Services and Infrastructure' and 'Flood Risk' of the Settlement Statement to reflect the latest information received.
3. Update areas of protected land including the golf course as forming part of the green network and to recognise its importance in providing a setting to the settlement.
4. Amend allocation summary for existing site OP1 to include a statement on buffer strips/enhancement of watercourse and the requirement for a Drainage Impact Assessment.
5. Amend allocation summary for existing site OP2 to include the requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment should planning permissions be subject to change.
6. Amend settlement boundary to incorporate bid site MR081 and adjacent property within the settlement.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 17 September 2019 with the additional recommendation to consider extending the settlement boundary to include the area that was subject to planning application APP/2018/1857 (adjacent to MR081).
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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 154 Alford

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
285	Aurora Planning Limited on behalf of David Kenwright
286	Aurora Planning Limited on behalf of David Kenwright
332	Lady Harriot Tennant
337	Mr Lysander Tennant
345	John Wink Design on behalf of KNC Groundworks
351	Mrs Kirstie Forbes-Sempill
367	Ms Alice Wallace
406	KNC Groundworks
421	Professor Bill Slee
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
514	Structor Ltd
617	Ms Sophia Tennant
618	Mr Mark Tennant
805	SEPA
951	Shepherd and Wedderburn LLP on behalf of Mr Mark Tennant
1009	Historic Environment Scotland

2. Issues

General

Following rapid expansion of the settlement, respondents consider there should be no further growth. Concerns include strain on essential services and infrastructure such as water and waste water, the increased need for car journeys for commuting, and impact on tourism due to suburbanisation (332, 337, 351, 367, 421, 617). In agreement with the MIR, a period of time is needed to consolidate and react to delivery of existing allocations (332, 618).

There is a particular concern regarding Alford as a commuter town, and it is considered there are insufficient local employment opportunities (617). Housing should be restricted to local need where it is provided for local employment (421). It is also considered that increased car reliance conflicts with the Council's position on climate change (351), and a more comprehensive approach is needed going forward to ensure resilience around a fading oil and gas sector (421).

Respondents do not favour development eastwards beyond Castle Road which is considered a logical boundary (332, 617) and in order to avoid encroachment on valuable farm and/or recreational land (332, 351, 951), and visual impact on the Howe

of Alford landscape (332, 617). It is also considered that there would be a breach of policies on natural heritage and landscape (351). The setting of Balfluig Castle should be respected and tourism generally (367, 617).

Respondents are concerned that planning decisions are not focussed on improving the attractiveness of town centres, with dissatisfaction that in spite of recent housing and population growth in the settlement, the High Street is quiet and shops are struggling (332, 337). The interests of the community and environment are not sufficiently considered in bringing forward proposals for Alford (351).

Vision / Planning Objectives

There is agreement with the planning objectives stated in the Main Issues Report (MIR) in relation to protection of historic assets and supporting community services and facilities (337, 951).

It is agreed that development should not compromise the existing character and sense of community which has been severely eroded by the extent and nature of development to date (337).

There is support for the Officers' recommendation to not include MR015 and MR042 which uphold these objectives (332, 337, 617).

Flood Risk

SEPA has advised that text relating to Alford being in an area potentially vulnerable to flooding should be removed (805).

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has noted that the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) uses the former text which stating that the Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW) are "at capacity but a growth project has been initiated". Progress of the growth project and delivery date should be verified to ensure there is adequate capacity at the public waste water treatment works for the developments (805).

Existing Site – OP1

It is considered that this site offers considerable potential for alternative community uses such as social/low cost for younger people housing or housing for the elderly due to its proximity to the town centre, as it is currently surrounded by residential and amenity uses. There are better sites for employment use (421).

The respondent considers the site has poor access and has highlighted a specific road junction safety concern off School Road. In this respect, there is concern that advice from road safety experts is not being heeded, and contradicting previous traffic management decisions. Development of the 'Men's Shed' and allotments has intensified pedestrian use, and compounds access problems. The respondent urges the Council to reconsider the bid such that only a limited range of employment-creating

and commercial uses are permitted to keep commercial vehicle activity to a minimum (421).

Another respondent has objected to OP1 on the basis of site layout, with concerns about road safety, access, junctions and circulation (including for commercial vehicles). The location of employment buildings and structures impacting on the amenity of adjacent properties is also a concern, and that there has been no notification for any proposed site layouts (514).

SEPA has advised that a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) may be required. A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as a positive feature of the development. Enhancement of the watercourse through renaturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated (805).

Existing Site – OP3

SEPA has advised that due to the presence of a small watercourse running through the site an FRA may be required. A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as a positive feature of the development. Enhancement of the straightened watercourse through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated.

Existing Site – OP4 / Bid MR043

One respondent has supported the allocation of this site as recommended by Officers, but has disagreed that the proposed density of the bid site is low and should be reduced in size. They are concerned that reducing the site size and increasing the density would risk the development being out of keeping with the surrounding area, and result in less quality green space and affordable housing which would be contrary to the aspirations of the Draft Proposed LDP. However, should the density be increased, it is accepted that this would make more efficient use of the land, but the site should remain the same with the indicative number of units increased. The respondent is however committed to delivery of at least 25% affordable housing as part of the early phases of the development, and the respondent supports the wording of the Draft Proposed LDP with regard to integration with the existing settlement, pedestrian connections including woodland paths (286).

There is a concern over statements in the Draft Proposed LDP with regard to the requirement for a significant landscape buffer to the west and a buffer strip along the watercourse. It is argued that the indicative Masterplan submitted with the bid shows landscaping as an integral feature of development throughout, and that this was approved as part of a planning application reference APP/2005/2835. The respondent is concerned that wording in the Draft Proposed LDP opens the door to future planning applications stipulating disproportionate requirements, in particular with regard to the landscape buffer to separate development from the core of the battlefield. It is considered this is inappropriate as there is uncertainty regarding the location of the battle and that much of the area is built on. Wording regarding the requirement for

buffer areas should be removed or reworded to refer to an appropriate buffer, the size of which to be determined through a masterplan or planning application (286).

The respondent has disagreed with the MIR in that contribution towards a school extension would be required for this development, and that there is uncertainty regarding road connections, water, and waste water drainage capacity. There is a new school community campus and school roll forecasts would have been taken into account when the site was allocated. Furthermore, road access solutions were proposed in the bid submission, and there is a new water main. It is considered that waste water treatment is the only infrastructure constraint, but there is willingness to address this (286).

The respondent has agreed with the Officers' assessment that development of MR043 is likely to follow on from completion of OP3, and that marketability is unlikely to hinder its delivery. There is also agreement with the MIR that the development would not impact on the historic [core] of the battlefield, however the respondent is willing to look at opportunities to recognise and celebrate the historic environment in the public realm, as suggested in the MIR (286).

With regard to the MIR statement that there is no masterplan, development framework or planning application in place, the respondent highlights that there is Planning Permission in Principle for residential development that was implemented as the planning application covered existing site OP3. As OP3 is currently being marketed, the next logical site for development in the settlement is OP4/MR043 (286).

Another respondent has expressed concern that the Officers' assessment does not take adequate account of impact on the historic environment and issues related to roads and waste water drainage (351), and the site should not be included as it is situated in the battlefield site (617).

SEPA has stated that should extant permission expire an FRA may be required. Enhancement of the straightened watercourse through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated (805).

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) has recommended a site brief to ensure that the development is adequately linked to the core path network, and that the development incorporates suitable biodiverse open space, active travel to services and community facilities (506).

Existing Site – OP5

Respondents have objected to this site primarily due to urbanisation of the countryside including landscape and visual impact, impact on the cultural and historic environment (in particular Balfluig Castle and the Battle of Alford battlefield), and impact on wildlife (332, 337, 351, 617, 951). It is considered that this development represents urban sprawl of the settlement which has been developer led, rather than taking a considered planning approach (337).

There has been no enforcement of landscaping obligations on this site, and OP5 is used as a car park for public events. The site should be removed as it was unfairly allocated by the Reporter in 2017 (617).

Bid MR015

In objecting to the Officers' recommendation ("not preferred"), it has been highlighted that the MIR does not make it clear that bid MR022 which seeks to protect land covers the extent of MR015 (for 250 homes/retail/community) (351, 617, 618).

Historic Environment Scotland (HES) has stated that the development has potential to erode the wider landscape setting of Balfluig Castle (1009).

SNH has agreed with the landscape justification for 'non-preference' of site MR015, but if allocated, recommends a site brief to ensure that the development incorporates suitable biodiverse open space, and provision for active travel to the core path network, services and community facilities (506).

Bid MR022

Respondents considered that bids for protective status should override bids for development (351) and this site should be allocated to safeguard the setting of the 'A' listed Balfluig Castle (617).

HES consider that this site would safeguard against erosion of the wider landscape setting of Balfluig Castle (1009).

SNH has agreed with the landscape justification presented by Officers for this site (506).

Bid MR042

One respondent has contested the Officers' assessment of this site ("not preferred"), and considers the site should be identified as a future opportunity site to align with the Proposed Strategic Development Plan which supports the allocation of strategic reserve of housing land for the period 2033 to 2040 (285).

The respondent has highlighted that the site has been promoted as an extension to existing site OP4 on the basis that a masterplan could then be prepared for the combined area to ensure a well planned and sustainable approach, and that new development is deliverable at the appropriate time, in phases. The size of the site should be seen as a strength. With regard to traffic implications, it is argued this would be the case with any level of development and solutions are identified to minimise the impact. Furthermore, it is considered that there is good proximity to the town centre, so reducing car dependence (285).

Regarding impact on the battlefield, as this extends across a significant area and there is uncertainty regarding the battle, the respondent considers a proportionate approach

should be taken, and the bid proposer would be open to looking at opportunities to recognise and celebrate this historic environment (285).

Regarding infrastructure constraints, the respondent does not consider waste water, water and education capacity as being constraints to development, and it is highlighted that substantial contribution has already been made by the bid proposer to new infrastructure and community facilities in the settlement (285).

There is however opposition to development of this site, and the arguments presented in the MIR for this being “not preferred” are supported, and considered to be sufficient to rule out further consideration of this site (351).

HES has identified a particular concern about MR042 being in the vicinity of the battle site where there are possible archaeological remains and potential significant cumulative impact in conjunction with bids MR043 and MR049. If allocations do go forward, impact on the battlefield’s special qualities, key landscape characteristics, cumulative impacts, and mitigation/enhancement should be considered (1009).

SNH has agreed with the landscape justification presented by Officers for MR042. But if allocated, a site brief is recommended to ensure that development incorporates suitable biodiverse open space. Provision for active travel to the core path network, services and community facilities is also required (506).

Bid MR049

There has been support given to the proposal, which the respondents inform has been revised to extend the developable area from 5,500 m² to 12,100 m² on the advice of Planning Officers. This would provide approximately 24 small business units (345, 406). As such, the bid proposer has submitted a revised plan with a supporting statement for the extended site (345).

There has been support for the site in providing local employment opportunities without the need for long commutes to larger towns. Although not currently within the settlement boundary it is considered the site is in close proximity to the town centre, and the proposer would be willing to explore opportunities to extend footpaths to provide a safe commute to the business park and reduce car reliance. Open space and strategic planting would be included to ensure the site does not feel overdeveloped. It is considered that the development would not be out of place due to existing industrial unit/yard/shed adjacent and within the site (345, 406).

SNH has highlighted the need to ensure provision for active travel to the site from the town, recommending a link to the adjacent core path (506).

3. Actions

General

Concern regarding the level of growth the settlement has been recently experiencing is acknowledged.

Vision/ Planning Objectives

The comments received in support of the planning objectives for the settlement are acknowledged.

Flood Risk

Text should be amended to reflect the comments from SEPA.

Services and Infrastructure

Information received from Scottish Water confirms a growth project has been initiated. The latest information will be contained within the 'Services and Infrastructure' section of the Settlement Statement.

Existing Site – OP1

The issues raised and the preferred uses for the site are noted. There is satisfaction that the current allocation for a mixed use (homes, employment and community uses) maintains the opportunity for a range of options to be explored. Matters such as roads, design and amenity will be assessed against the relevant policies as part of the planning application process.

The allocation summary will be amended to include statements to reflect information received including that on flood risk/buffer strips. The site boundary will also be amended to remove the area to the west that is completed (Men's Shed and allotments).

Existing Site – OP3

As development has commenced for this allocation it should remain within the LDP until it is built out. The allocation summary will be amended to include statements to reflect information received including that on flood risk/buffer strips should planning permissions be subject to any amendment.

Existing Site – OP4 / Bid MR043

For reasons set out in the MIR, and having given consideration to comments received including from SNH and SEPA, it is maintained that bid MR043 should remain allocated in the Proposed LDP. It is considered satisfactory that the existing site area remains appropriate. However, it is considered appropriate for part of the developable area to be used for both integrated landscaping and a substantial landscape buffer. There are relatively low levels of development within the core of the Battle of Alford battlefield designation situated to the west of the site, therefore, it is considered that a landscape buffer is appropriate to reduce the visual impact on both the setting of the settlement and on the landscape characteristics associated with the battlefield.

There is no evidence of planning permission APP/2005/2835 having been implemented by the developer at existing site OP3 as this was built under the latter permission APP/2008/1895. The allocation summary can therefore be subject to change as where considered necessary and appropriate.

In light of SEPA's comments, a buffer strip for the watercourse has not been requested and will not be a requirement within the allocation summary. The allocation summary can be updated to reflect the comments raised on flood risk, biodiverse open space and paths/active travel. Matters such as appropriate developer contributions, roads, landscaping including its size/type, and path connectivity would be assessed as part of the planning application process.

Existing Site – OP5

The objections to the allocation of this existing housing site are acknowledged. It would not be appropriate to remove a new allocation for the LDP 2017, that has a recently approved Masterplan (October 2018) and is an 'effective' site within the Housing Land Audit with a programmed delivery during the lifetime of the Proposed LDP. In terms of landscaping, as the site has no planning permission there is no requirement for landscaping to have been planted at this current time. It is expected that, in accordance with the agreed Masterplan, any planning application will include a landscape buffer to be delivered as part of the proposal.

Bid MR015

For reasons set out in the MIR (compromise of the visual approach to the village and impact on Balfuig Castle), and having given consideration to comments received including from HES and SNH, it is maintained that bid MR015 should not be allocated in the Proposed LDP.

Bid MR022

For reasons set out in the MIR (impact on Balfuig Castle), and having given consideration to comments received including from HES and SNH, it is maintained that bid MR022 should not be allocated/designated for protection in the Proposed LDP. We acknowledge the support for this bid, however, development proposals within this area would be subject to assessment against built heritage policies that seek to protect listed buildings including their setting. As any proposals would be outwith the settlement boundary they would also be assessed against rural development criteria, impact on landscape and prime agricultural land amongst other policies, placing further restrictions in this area.

Bid MR042

For reasons set out in the MIR primarily in relation to the scale and impact on the battlefield designation, and having given consideration to comments received including from HES and SNH, it is maintained that bid MR042 should not be allocated in the Proposed LDP.

Bid MR049

The support received for this bid site including a proposed extension to the site area is acknowledged. Given that no objection has been received for this site and that an extended site area would provide additional opportunities in a suitable location, it is agreed that a larger site area should be taken forward. For reasons set out in the MIR, and having given consideration to comments received including from SNH, it is maintained that bid MR049 should be allocated in the Proposed LDP. It is agreed that the allocation summary should include requirements for path connectivity where possible.

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 stakeholders. Add text to the Vision to include references to smaller/affordable homes, accessibility, and encourage improvement/vibrancy to spaces and facilities.
2. Update 'Natural and Historic Environment' of the Settlement Statement to recognise the close proximity of Balfluig Castle.
3. Update 'Services and Infrastructure' and 'Flood Risk' of the Settlement Statement to reflect the latest information received.
4. Update areas of protected land.
5. Amend allocation for existing sites OP1 and OP2 to remove the area built out and update the allocation summary to include SEPA comments.
6. Amend text on flood risk for existing sites OP3 and OP4 should planning permissions be subject to change.
7. Update the allocation summary for existing site OP4 (bid MR043) to include statements on opportunities to recognise the historic environment through the public realm, FRA, landscaping/ open space and path connectivity.
8. Allocate bid MR049 with an extended area for 1.2ha employment land. The allocation summary for the site should include a statement for the provision of small-business units and path connectivity.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 17 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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 155 Banchory

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
19	Nestrans
20	Mr Andreas Christophersen on behalf of Andrew Sharples
24	Ms Vanessa Harpley
26	Mr Jason Thompson
27	Mrs Jane Nicholson
29	Mr Alan Nelson
30	Mr Will Sturt
31	Mrs Giulia Walker
32	Mr William Nicholson
35	Mr Andrew Strachan
36	Mr Ken Sutherland
38	Ms Anna Bisset
41	Ms Angela Meakins
42	Mr & Mrs David & Pamela McGregor
43	Mr & Mrs Gillian & Robin Williamson
44	Ms Doris Smith
45	Mrs Louise Meston
46	Mr Alan Meston
47	Mr Joseph McGregor
48	Ms Ria Corbett
51	Mrs Emma Christie
52	Ms Lauren Shepherd
55	Mr Colin Anderson
56	Mr Mark Simpson
58	Mr David Simon
59	Mrs Victoria MacLeod
69	Ms Jane Innes
70	Mr Malcolm Taberner
71	Ms Ashleigh Sturt
72	Ms Sharon Kirk
74	Mr Alistair Punt
75	Ms Jennifer Morrison
77	Mr & Mrs A & P Brady
78	Mr Joseph Leiper

79	Ms Lisa Taylor
85	Mr Craig Duffy
86	Mr Barry Corbett
87	Mrs Ria Corbett
92	Ms Dawn Mutch
93	Mr & Mrs Claire & Michael Davidson
96	Ms Sandra Wright
101	Mr Jack Duncan
102	Mr Neil Booth
103	Mr Marty Haynes
105	Ms Maddie Thurlow
106	Mr Thomas Gray
107	Ms Parricia Harris
116	Mrs Janie Spencer
117	Dr Margaret Duncan
118	Ms Kelly Brazewell
119	Mrs Adeline Bruce
120	Mrs Sharon Hauxwell
122	Mr Neil Booth
123	Mr & Mrs Nicky & Andy Hessel
124	Mr Ron Mudie
125	Mr Ron Mudie
131	Ms Jacqueline Howes
132	Drumoak School Council
133	Ms Jane Williamson
134	Mr Robert Trythall
136	Mr Greg Michalski
139	Mr Robert Mutch
153	Mr Kenneth Watson
158	Mr Graham Paterson
159	Mrs Claire Paterson
160	Mr Ian McDonald
161	Mrs Sylvia McDonald
162	Mr John Paterson
164	Banchory Paths Association
166	Ms Linda Taberner
168	Ms Vicki Cleal
171	Mrs Sheila Sandilands
180	Zander Planning Ltd on behalf of Ediston Real Estate

181	Mrs Rebecca Scott
189	Ms Megan Fowler
190	Mr Paul Mason
192	Ms Vanessa Harpley
196	Ms Miranda Bolton
201	Mr & Mrs Nick & Heather Hall
202	Mr Mark Hagger
206	Mr John Wilson
208	Mr Kevin Harper
216	Mr Alan Chesterman
220	Mr David Bisset
225	Mr Stephen Hegarty
227	Ryden LLP on behalf of Westhill Developments (Brodiach) Ltd
228	Ryden LLP on behalf of Westhill Developments (Brodiach) Ltd
239	Mr Alastair Reid
252	Ms Miranda Bolton
253	Ms Carole Mills
256	Ms Debbie Dunning
275	Ms Caroline Reid
290	Banchory Community Council
294	Mr Chris Bradshaw
297	Banchory Stonehaven Athletics Club
309	Mr James Ian Wood
311	Mr Dave Gilmour
319	Mrs Kathleen Twomey
322	Mr & Mrs Morrice
324	Mrs Diane Smitton
327	Mr C L Stockdale
328	Mrs Elizabeth Stockdale
329	Mrs T McGilton
331	Ms Kath Richards
335	Ms Mary Milne
336	Ms Jennifer Bruce
338	Ms Zoe Mason-Alkins
343	Mr & Mrs Flett
344	Ms Jackie Wilson
348	Ms Katya Ezhova
349	Ms Elisha Browett
353	Ms Catherine Twomey

354	Ms Joy Crofts
356	Mrs Anna Burnett
357	Mr Mike Crofts
358	Mrs Marjory Burnett
359	Mr H J Mallen
360	Mr & Mrs Anna And Scott Burnett
361	Ms Rebecca Glansbeek
362	Mr & Mrs Rod & Christie Dallas
364	Ms Angela Ollerhead
375	Ms Johannes Glansbeek
388	Mr Colin Wilson
389	Mr Charlie Rumbles
404	Ms Vicki Duncan
415	Ms Maureen Gibson
416	Mr James Finlayson
418	Ms Alison Smart
435	Halliday Fraser Munro on behalf of MacTaggart & Mickel Homes Ltd
439	Mr Bob Elder
445	Mr Bob Elder
451	Ms Kath Richards
452	Ms Kath Richards
489	Mr & Mrs B McLoughlin
492	Mr H Mallen
493	Mr & Mrs John H And Elizabeth B Allen
494	Mr H Mallen
495	Friends of Durris Primary and Crossroads Nursery
498	Ms Sarah Shrive
499	Mr Ian Chapman
500	Ms Jane Elder
502	Mr Michael Adams
505	Mr & Mrs John & Katrina Morton
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
520	Bancon Homes Ltd
521	Bancon Homes Ltd
522	Bancon Homes Ltd
538	Ms Geraldine Hegarty
542	Mr Michael Maughan
549	Ms Charlotte Hegarty
551	NHS Grampian

557	Mr Stewart Hutcheson
569	Ryden LLP on behalf of Forbes Homes Limited
570	Ms Aileen Salway
581	CHAP (Holdings) Ltd
611	Mr & Mrs Robert & Julie Harpley
621	Mr Stuart Wright
624	Mrs Brid Pert
625	Derek Thomson
626	Heather Thompson
628	Mr Alexander Grant
633	Mr Michael Paterson
635	Ms Jenny Smith
636	Mr Kevin Riach
637	Mr Iain Abernethy
638	Mr Mike Smith
642	Mr Jonathan Milne
645	Ms Elizabeth Milne
646	Mr Roddy Charles
647	Mr Graham Peter
649	Mr Duncan Davidson
650	Mr Hugh McGarvey
651	Mr Andrew Richards
653	Ms Melissa Coutts
654	Mr Robbie Coutts
655	Mr Gary Coutts
659	Mr David Starbuck
661	Mr Neil Birse
662	Mr David Smith
663	Mr Roger Jamieson
664	Ms Shelagh Marr
667	Mr Alisdair Harrison
669	Mr Mark Wood
670	Ms Fiona Griffin
671	Mr Roger Findlay
674	Mr Graeme Davidson Chairman of Banchory Community Football Club
675	Mr Christopher Gunn
676	Mr Seb Curtis
678	Mr Simon Tweedie
680	Mr Scott Cobban

681	Mr Mats Fredrik Olsson
682	Mr David MacWilliam
684	Mr Kevin Grant
685	Mr & Mrs Morag and Donald Clark
686	Ms Jane Davidson
687	Mr & Mrs Morag and Donald Clark
688	Mr Barry Corbett
689	Ms Shona Grant
691	Ms Yvonne Morrison
692	Mr & Mrs John Larkin
694	Mr Iain Adams
695	Mr Brian Morrison
700	Mr Keith Morrison
704	Mr David Halliday
705	Mr Roger Eames
710	Ms Louise Cameron
714	Ms Alisha Rees
715	Ms Nicola Mitchell
716	Ms Katrina Hood
717	Mr & Mrs C Welsh
718	Mr Kevin Mitchell
719	Ms Michelle McAlpine
721	Mr Bruce Skinner
722	Ms Helen Noble
724	Dr Emma Metcalfe
726	Ms Valerie Chapman
727	Ms Naomi Smith
731	Feughdee West Community Council
732	Ms Sue Paterson
733	Ms Alexandra Wilowska
734	Ms Dawn Mutch
736	Mr David Berrisford
737	Mr Alan Sealy
738	Ms Sarah Farrow
739	Mr & Mrs Annabelle & Rob Macleod
740	Mrs Annabelle Macleod
741	Mr Edward Jamieson
743	Mrs Annabelle Macleod
744	Ms Kate Parton

745	Mrs Annabelle Macleod
746	Ms Louise Mitchell
747	Mr Keith Mitchell
748	Ms Rita Wiseman
749	Mr Dean Wiseman
750	Ms Shaheen Salaripour
751	Ms Gillian Smith
753	Mr Keith Sim
754	Mr John Parton
756	Mr Stephen Thomson
759	Mr James Pirrie
761	Mr Paul Geddes
762	Ms Lynne Docherty
763	Ms Joanna Clark
764	Mr Stephen Paterson
766	Ms Karen Fowlie
774	Ms Deirdre Sibson on Behalf of Finn Sibson
777	Ms Carol Stewart
784	Mr John Macfarlane
786	Mr David Ellis
801	Mr Ewen Simpson
802	Ms Joyce Simpson
805	SEPA
807	Mr Gary Archer
808	Ms Julia Davies
809	Mr Robert Moore
824	Strutt and Parker on behalf of North Banchory Coy
825	Strutt and Parker on behalf of North Banchory Coy
826	Strutt and Parker on behalf of North Banchory Coy
827	Strutt and Parker on behalf of North Banchory Coy
828	Strutt and Parker on behalf of North Banchory Coy
842	Mr Anthony Makin
844	Mr Stuart Ruddiman
847	Ms Tanya Heath
848	Ms Doreen Cameron
849	Mr Mark Tasker
850	Mr Graham Nelson
859	Ms Rosemary Harrison
861	Ms Moira Garden

863	Ms Holly Smith
866	Mr Andrew Smith
871	Mr Ross McAlpine
872	Mr Andrew Smith
876	Woodland Trust Scotland
880	Ms Jayne Christie
881	Sir/Madam I.J. Collins
884	Ms Suzanne Pirrie
887	Mr Ewen Alexander
895	Dr Neil Gibson
897	Mr Stephen Carter
899	Ms Lorna Alexander
900	Mr Duane McAvoy
903	Ms Claire Slater
904	Mr Mark Slater
916	Ms Rachel Knox
917	Halliday Fraser Munro on behalf of Luther Farm Services
918	Mrs K Gibson
934	Mr & Mrs Morag & Graeme Coutts
935	Ms Vanessa Holmes
940	Ms Shirley Watt
943	Ms Jacqueline Bell
948	The Kindness Family
958	Mr Fred Williams
961	Mr Scott Forbes
964	Ms Kerry Scott
968	Mr & Mrs Graham & Jodene Bird
973	Mr Peter Macdonald
974	Mr Peter Dunlop
975	Mr Stuart Brazewell
976	Mr & Mrs James & Karen Lomax
979	Ms Vicki Cleal
981	Mr Kenneth Davies
982	Mr Colin Macleod
983	Banchory Academy Parent Council
985	Ms Harriet Eames
986	Ms Dominique Williams
987	Mr David Butler
990	Ms Laura Ballantyne

993	Ms Karen Warren
994	Mr Ian Rendall
997	Crathes, Drumoak & Durris Community Council
1000	Mrs Angela MacKinnon
1001	Ms Sally Berrisford
1002	Mr Roderick MacKinnon
1015	Ms Sarah Chesterman-Barnett
1018	Ms Kirsi Gibson
1030	Ms Corinne Ogilvie
1031	Mr & Mrs Anthony & J Russell
1032	Mr & Mrs Finlayson
1037	Mr Regis Lechatellier
1038	Mr Bill Miller
1040	Mr Tony Brown
1041	Mr Paul Evans
1042	Ms Sarah Garden
1052	Mr Ewan Garden
1058	Dr Colin Harris
1061	Mr Andrew Garden
1081	Mr Neil Valentine

2. Issues

Vision / Objectives

A number of amendments to the Vision within the Settlement Statement were requested. These included: 'Corsee Hill' should be 'Scolty Hill' (69, 309); the retention of "*no additional major new development are proposed*" (987); greater prominence on the support for retail and associated facilities for a greater mix of units in the town centre (136, 493); support for the small and medium business in areas at risk (750); recognition of the importance of the conservation of wildlife habitats and woodland (331, 451, 452, 750); and, the last sentence should be reworded to include "*...facilitating on-road cycling where necessary..*" (505). There was support for Vision statements on retail, footway and cycle path provision (136). It was queried how the Deeside Way could be used for greater connectivity throughout the town (849, 1040). There was disagreement that the town is "thriving" due to the number of vacant retail sites (493, 880, 916, 961) and that Scolty Hill is of importance to the Banchory community when areas to the north/east are used more (849).

The planning objectives were supported (136, 849, 958, 986) but more specific detail on each one is required (136). Further objectives or amendments requested were; that the settlement should be more positively marketed as a potential business centre (136); the aim should be to regenerate the town centre rather than to protect and enhance the role and attractiveness of the town (961); include the protection of natural environment (331, 451, 452, 635); and minimising climate change which are noted in the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) but not considered in the MIR (635)

Effort should be focused on improving the High Street (216, 353, 362, 415, 505, 651, 849, 916, 948, 1001). The centre is too spread out, lacks cohesion and facilities are in need of an upgrade (216). Due to the decline of retail in the settlement's High Street, the Planning Service should work with landlords to convert units to other uses (133). Car parking fees should be removed from car parks and traffic should be diverted or no parking zones and traffic calming installed as part of developers funding improvements to infrastructure (216, 505).

Protected Land

Respondents requested that all current green network/conservation areas and protected land should remain in the Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) (70, 916, 961). One respondent requested that all woodland within and surrounding the settlement should be protected for biodiversity and amenity (189). Protected land P7 and P9 should be maintained as landscape buffers as they provide a buffer between Loch of Leys Local Nature Conservation Site (LNCS) and Hill of Banchory, provide local amenity, recreation, outdoor learning and protect wildlife (131, 225, 361, 375, 538, 549, 741, 850, 863, 866, 895, 975, 1030). This protected land should be extended and joined with the landscape buffer and green network in the area immediately north of R3 and BUS1 to add a protected buffer to the development of OP2 (290, 624, 964, 1030). One respondent requested that Loch of Leys should be safeguarded for posterity as the habitat of protected species (290, 1030). The Tree Preservation Order (TPO) over areas MR056 and MR062 should be given an additional protected status in line with Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) to protect environmental resources (38) and the TPO made permanent (153). The meadowland adjacent to Corsee Wood and the area of MR041 should be protected for amenity and to conserve the woodland (124, 624).

The allotments, arts centre and surrounding areas were highlighted as an important community amenity and retention of this was requested (863, 975). One respondent expressed that land needs to be allocated to facilitate outdoor learning in natural spaces within walking distance of education facilities (570).

Flood Risk

SEPA has requested that "*Parts of Banchory are in an area potentially vulnerable to flood risk as identified by the National Flood Risk Assessment. Flood Risk Assessments may be required*" is added to the Settlement Statement. In addition, SEPA has noted there are inconsistencies in relation to flood risk in that OP1 are not included under the general flood risk text. See below under 'existing sites' for other inconsistencies identified by SEPA (805).

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has noted that the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) uses former text "*limited capacity at Banchory WWTW and growth project will be initiated*". This needs to be updated as the Scottish Water Banchory growth project has been initiated. Progress of the growth project and a delivery date should be verified with Scottish Water to ensure there is adequate capacity at the public waste water treatment works (WWTW) for the developments in Banchory and the other settlements that the WWTW serves (805).

Settlement boundary

One representation requested that the settlement boundary should be amended for consistency to include the gardens of the properties Mosscroft and Norwood Lodge at Upper Lochton East in Banchory (20).

One respondent highlighted that permissions for infill development at the property of Woodfield should be included within the extended allocation of OP3, the site of the Cowshed Restaurant should be included within OP2 and objects to the MIR as there has been a failure to allocate the curtilages of these properties within the allocations (827).

Spatial Strategy for Banchory

A small number of representations were not against development but expressed that it should be limited to consider the huge increase in population that has taken place and it should be at a sensible rate (290, 624, 750, 850). There was support for the MIR recommendations including the proposed areas for development (70, 1040). Comments requested that there should be an emphasis on smaller homes and affordable homes including homes for older people, rentable, social and sheltered housing (731, 737, 750). Development was supported where it supports the settlement as a tourist destination (201).

The views of the community need to be taken on board in a planning forum for Banchory (139). One representation considers there to be a conflict of interest between land ownership, developers and political figures for most or all of Hill of Banchory (916).

Demand

A significant number of representations have raised an issue of an excessive housing land supply, with concerns relating to matters such as overdevelopment, the number of properties for sale, a lack of need (particularly due to the decline in the oil industry and the settlement is not within a strategic growth area) (59, 105, 116, 136, 171, 196, 216, 252, 329, 359, 388, 439, 445, 492, 493, 500, 649, 667, 682, 692, 717, 727, 732, 737, 744, 764, 766, 808, 859, 880, 881, 948, 968, 974, 981, 987, 1001, 1030). One representation expressed that development should be restricted to brownfield sites only (737). One representation expressed that the need for homes is only from those who are profiting from development (59). One respondent noted that the Reporter

concluded for Sandlaw farm (Auchattie) that there was ample land already available to build on in the Banchory area for the foreseeable future (309).

Growth pattern

There was support for a more spatially balanced approach to development (362, 849, 1001) such that growth to the west and south to place the High Street at the centre of the settlement and embrace the River Dee (362, 849). Development in the east of the settlement should be discounted for not balancing the settlement and impacting on the town centre (849) although, this view was countered as the area avoids issues of road safety, amenity and wildlife impact (171). Other representations were against development to the south and welcomed the MIR recommendations acknowledging the protection of the Special Landscape Area (SLA), environmental and community value (309, 502, 624, 1081). One representation does not support further development to the north and west of the settlement (964). Housing needs to be in locations that are not car dependent to support the town centre (362, 505, 1001). New facilities should also be balanced across the west and east sides of the settlement (136).

Respondents were concerned regarding the balance of development and maintaining/preserving the settlement's rural character, the features that attract tourists, natural boundaries, protection of woodland, green space, wildlife and its habitat, and recreational areas. The woodland was noted as important to the community, and development should be consistent with the settlement visions/objectives to protect open space, woodland and the attractiveness of the area (56, 59, 71, 106, 118, 119, 124, 131, 136, 139, 192, 196, 216, 252, 290, 329, 331, 338, 343, 353, 362, 388, 415, 439, 445, 451, 452, 494, 500, 557, 570, 624, 651, 667, 670, 704, 717, 737, 766, 859, 863, 964, 968, 974, 975, 976, 987, 1015, 1040). One respondent noted that not enough value was given to natural woodland by bid proposers as replacement planting would not replace their value to wildlife, CO2 sinks and recreation (70). Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) agree with the landscape justification for the non-preference of sites (506). One respondent highlighted that existing and new development is bland and unappealing (1031).

Impact on amenities

There was a significant concern raised relating to the pressure of development on local infrastructure, servicing, facilities and amenities as a result of ongoing growth with improvements required before additional development. Particular issues were relating to the capacity/condition of education and health facilities but representations also had concerns with the size of sports facilities, water, sewage, public transport, the lack of facilities for the size of the settlement, and the impact of growth on tourism and the town centre (31, 43, 48, 58, 59, 86, 87, 102, 106, 116, 122, 124, 136, 171, 192, 216, 252, 290, 329, 338, 343, 353, 359, 361, 362, 375, 388, 415, 439, 445, 492, 494, 611, 624, 651, 659, 667, 670, 682, 692, 704, 717, 732, 736, 737, 744, 750, 764, 808, 809, 849, 850, 859, 880, 948, 964, 968, 974, 986, 1001, 1015). The increasing population and lack of adequate community/education facilities impacts on local crime and anti-social behaviour (59, 196, 252, 1001). Developers should demonstrate their commitment to the community by providing infrastructure and facilities and it is unclear if infrastructure

would be provided to support an increasing housing stock (216, 494, 976). One representation welcomed any measures that would improve infrastructure, services and town centre features (216).

Transport

Traffic would be greatly increased by more development causing congestion, road safety issues, and damage to the roads (171, 196, 252, 309, 329, 362, 388, 445, 494, 651, 667, 670, 704, 737, 738, 859, 974, 976). Increased development would add to pollution (119, 309, 329, 738). One representation raised a lack of safe road crossings such as at Hill of Banchory West Road (71). There was concern as to the environmental impact as the settlement has limited local employment, public transport and growth which would increase the number of commuters to Aberdeen (196, 252, 309, 651). The public who do not own transportation are suffering due to unreliable bus services and the closure of shops and services (253). Additional roads built would stretch resources for repairs even further (329).

It was expressed that there is a need to improve footpath and cycle ways provision within the settlement (202, 849, 1040) and the core path networks should be upgraded before further development (361, 731). A non-vehicular transit strategy should be identified for the settlement in the Proposed LDP. This should include east to west pathways that are all-weather tarmac 3m wide paths based along the Deeside Way, the water pipeline path, North Hill of Banchory and through the north of the industrial estate before the construction of new housing developments (202). Existing paths should be upgraded to an approved standard for dual use paths such as the Deeside Way and the water pipeline route (202). There should be a provision of safe on-road and off-road cycle lanes from homes to facilities and cycle storage facilities at retail and sporting developments (505, 692). Existing paths should be recognised, maintained and protected from development (557). Encouraging low impact travel such as walking and cycling and more path networks should be at the centre of future development (557, 1030).

Transport - Hill of Banchory Proposed Distributor Road

A significant number of respondents objected to the proposed relief road linking to OP2, MR038 and MR039, with support of the retention of Protected Land P7 and P9. The proposals would impact on trees, woodland and green infrastructure which are valuable for wildlife habitat, recreation and wellbeing (24, 26, 27, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 51, 52, 55, 56, 71, 79, 92, 93, 96, 107, 118, 134, 181, 190, 206, 208, 225, 361, 389, 498, 538, 570, 611, 624, 659, 681, 685, 710, 732, 743, 744, 748, 749, 750, 764, 848, 850, 859, 917, 918, 964, 968, 1015, 1032, 1042, 1052, 1061). The woodland should be part of the Loch of Leys LNCS (79).

Respondents expressed concern that the route would impact on amenity, cause air/light/noise pollution, and a loss of privacy (24, 27, 29, 30, 31, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 52, 55, 79, 107, 118, 134, 181, 190, 206, 208, 375, 389, 416, 570, 611, 659, 743, 744, 748, 749, 764, 881, 917, 918, 1015, 1032, 1042, 1052, 1061).

There was concern that the route would cause increased traffic and safety issues including at the roundabout, for children in the woods and as it converges in a populated area close to children walking to school (27, 32, 35, 46, 47, 56, 416, 681, 710, 741, 848, 850, 1032). There is concern over the creation of congestion as it would not serve as a bypass and the route would not connect to new developments in the LDP including Phase 1 of OP2 (35, 225, 343, 538, 741, 850, 1015). One representation expressed that the route of the distributor road needed clarification in the Proposed LDP and that it is urgently required to ease congestion on the town centre and A93 (139).

The route would fail to meet the planning objective of protecting and enhancing the role and attractiveness of the town (710), would have a negative visual impact on the landscape setting, sense of place and character (43, 52, 343, 416, 570, 659). The proposal would cause a tree break out of keeping with the character of tree lines in the area (416, 570) and impact on drystone walls and existing tree borders (1032). One respondent was concerned about the ability to retain a site for education provision if this route was agreed (710).

The Hill of Banchory Masterplan has been agreed and should be adhered to as this agreed route has less impact (26, 30, 42, 45, 46, 47, 51, 56, 79, 134, 206, 361, 389, 538, 624, 681, 685, 710, 732, 743, 848, 1015). One respondent questioned the validity of the Development Plan and Masterplan if the agreed route is not implemented (206, 710). A number of respondents questioned the need for the relief road and considered there to be alternative routes available (41, 72, 1052). Several respondents objected to the route as it would be for financial reasons, rather than for the benefit of the settlement, as the agreed route is feasible and no justification has been provided for the re-routing (26, 27, 30, 32, 35, 42, 43, 93, 208, 685, 1042, 1061).

One representation considered that the re-routing of the road indicated a problem with the original route (29).

There were a number of respondents who highlighted that the purchase of the homes in the area was on the promise that the woodland would not be removed and commented that the proposed route would impact on the value of these homes (41, 52, 918).

Existing Site – OP2

One respondent expressed that the development would have a significant impact on the surrounding heathland and wetland habitat. They also noted that there would be an impact on the amenity of local residents (651). The west part of OP2 should not be developed if areas within the town become available that can be reused rather than removing woodland and building on greenfield land (968). This development would significantly increase traffic congestion and cause safety issues on Raemoir Road and the Hill of Banchory junction where there is no crossing facility (309, 750).

The principles of the 2015 Masterplan should be honoured and in particular that biodiversity and landscape character must be protected and enhanced as the town expands north. There should be an emphasis on good quality soft landscaping, the

core path network for access to the school, and recreation and other facilities should be provided. The path network should be upgraded before construction starts. Trees should not be clear felled but felled in stages as work is due to commence (290). The new access created through Protected land P7 should through time be closed and replanted to maintain the tree line (741). Development should facilitate safe paths to school (750).

SEPA has noted an inconsistency with the Settlement Statement general flood risk text and allocation text, as a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) will be required. Additional text should be included for enhancement of the straightened watercourses through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated (805).

Existing Site – OP3

This development would significantly increase traffic congestion and cause safety issues on Raemoir Road and the Hill of Banchory junction where there is no crossing facility (309, 750).

The principles of the 2015 Masterplan should be honoured. There should be quality soft landscaping, green buffer zones for biodiversity and a path network providing appropriate access and linkage (290). Development should facilitate safe paths to school (750).

SEPA has noted an inconsistency with the Settlement Statement general flood risk text and allocation text as an FRA may be required. Additional text should be included for enhancement of the straightened watercourses through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated (805).

Existing Site – OP4

This development would significantly increase traffic congestion and cause safety issues on Raemoir Road and the Hill of Banchory junction where there is no crossing facility and a lack of pavements (309, 624, 750, 290). One respondent noted there is community concern about the access and safety at all junctions leading on to Raemoir Road (290).

There is a need to ensure landscaping is provided (290). Development should facilitate safe paths to school (750).

SEPA has advised that an FRA will be required. The pluvial extent of flooding is probably highlighting an area of fluvial risk from the small burn. It affects a relatively large proportion of this small site. A buffer strip would be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as a positive feature of the development. Enhancement of the watercourse and removal of any redundant features should be investigated (805).

Bid MR014 (Existing Site BUS2)

A number of respondents have objected to this retail proposal (against the Officers' recommendation of "preferred"), primarily due to a concern about the negative impact that an edge of town retail development could have in terms of encouraging car usage and its impact on the health of the town centre by reducing high street footfall (105, 139, 309, 624, 733, 737, 744, 750, 808, 849, 916, 961, 1040). One respondent questioned whether the Town Centre Health Check that has identified Banchory as a 'robust healthy town centre', remains valid (808). Another questioned what evidence there is that traffic currently going to "Inverurie" would be diverted by this development (849).

Other respondents supported this development as a positive contribution to the Banchory area for providing a modest sized retail park with good connectivity to other local amenities, with potential for drawing people into Banchory (180, 361, 375, 827). Others take a cautious view in taking forward this development, considering it would only be acceptable if there is no impact on the town centre with careful consultation with town centre businesses (136, 505, 935). There was support for the Officers' comments regarding the need to ensure balance between the town centre and any new retail units (69, 290). The High Street is at present struggling and further competition could weaken its viability; there is a need to mitigate adverse effects on the town centre (290).

One respondent supported the site for Class 1 retail but opposes the restriction of comparison bulky goods and 6000m² rather than the proposed 6317m² as the Aberdeen City and Aberdeenshire Retail Study 2013 states there is a capacity for convenience and comparison goods, does not recommend a setting a floor space requirement, and that there is sufficient potential capacity to support this level of floorspace. Outwith the town centre there is capacity for comparison retail which would minimise trade diversion. The restriction to that level has not been tested and could affect the viability of the site. The restriction to comparison bulky goods only would not be viable as modern retail parks require a mix of tenants, must be able to diversify and provide a range appropriate to the location. The town centre is unable to address the identified deficiencies given its limited scale and lack of medium/large scale opportunities but can diversify to office uses. Appropriate uses could be tested through the planning application process and bulky goods is an old concept due to mergers of stores and the rise of mixed goods retailers for comparison and convenience, but not clothing goods (180).

Measures should be taken to enhance the green network to mitigate against the loss of semi-natural habitat (69). SNH has recommended that any further expansion (including relief roads) are carefully considered in light of the original 2010 Masterplan for the wider north Banchory area which was used in the bid submission and avoid eroding the established landscape framework, biodiverse open spaces and active travel to the site from residential areas (506).

SEPA has advised that an FRA may be required for this site, and that a buffer strip will be required to prevent development within the natural river corridor of the Burn of

Bennie. Enhancement and removal of any redundant features should be investigated (805).

Bid MR024

There was support for the proposed visitor centre including reasons such as being in a good location to support the High Street and boosting tourism, but there are reservations about parking capacity, traffic and concern about the long term commitment to finance and manage the proposed facility (69, 136, 290, 309, 361, 375, 624, 750, 935, 1040). This site was preferred over bid MR030 (624, 935). One representation expressed that the proposal would go hand in hand with improvements to the attractiveness of the town and the establishment of additional attractions (136, 139).

A number of respondents suggested the site could be put to a better use such as for a new health centre including undergrounding parking (737) or a new Academy where the existing Academy could then be re-used for additional housing rather than having to expand into woodland and fields (968). It was highlighted that there were alternative sites for the visitor centre (880) including how it would be better based near the library/museum to draw visitors to the High Street (737).

Others considered there is no need for a visitor centre (916, 961), particularly in the town centre as there are limited locally owned shops and car parking charges are a deterrent (916).

Bid MR029 and Bid MR030

For both MR029 and MR030, representations in support for development commented that many of the trees on site are poor quality and require to be removed and additional tree planting would mitigate any loss (227, 228). The representations highlight that the principle of tree loss has been accepted through development at Hill of Banchory and other sites such as bid MR061 (227, 228, 849). SNH have commented on previous planning applications to note that impacts on The River Dee Special Area of Conservation (SAC) could be avoided (227, 228). The site is a sustainable location and would not lead to increased car dependency given its close proximity to the town centre and public transport (227, 228, 849). Deebank has been included in the settlement boundary in a previous LDP (227, 228).

Representations commented that the site location would not erode the rural character given the site is infill within an existing ribbon development, well contained by the landscape and surrounded by development (227, 228, 849). The scale and density of MR029 would represent substantial extension to Deebank and would provide a range of sizes and locations of sites as all the proposed sites are located north of Banchory and would be an ideal location for down-sizing opportunities (227). MR030 would not cause noise and disturbance (228).

There has been notable objection to these two separate bids on the same site, in agreement with the Officers' recommendation of "not preferred". The developments in

this location would erode rural character, promote urban sprawl, impact on the SLA, cause loss of green space and mature trees, impact on nature conservation and recreation associated with the River Dee, impact on car dependency/pollution, it is not within walking distance of schools, would impact on existing infrastructure and services, and impact on the amenity of the existing residential area (69, 105, 136, 139, 290, 309, 361, 375, 492, 502, 505, 570, 621, 692, 694, 705, 731, 733, 737, 808, 880, 985, 1040). One representation was concerned that development would necessitate mains drainage connection across the River Dee that would open up the south of the river to large scale development (705).

Comments that specifically relate to the visitor centre (bid MR030) considered this site an unsustainable location for the proposed use, and that a visitor centre/heritage hub is better located in the town centre near the High Street and car park, with some specifically supporting bid MR024 (139, 309, 375, 492, 621, 624, 731, 750, 849, 880, 935).

SNH has advised that if bid MR029 or bid MR030 were allocated, any development should retain the broadleaved woodland on site. Particular attention to construction methods would be required in order to minimise the risk of pollution during any construction due to its close proximity to the River Dee SAC (506).

Bid MR031

One representation supported the site for 15 homes as the builder has the experience and capability to deliver a site of this nature as shown 650m away where they delivered a high quality low density development similar to the proposal. The density is not underdevelopment of land as it was carefully considered to ensure it could sit within the landscape and would cause negligible disruption to the wider setting. Low density housing would be in keeping and appropriate for the area where there are a number of clusters of small scale detached homes between Banchory and Strachan (581).

There is local demand and it would be within easy reach of services and facilities in Banchory. The site would offer a suitable and sustainable site in a rural setting easily accessible to local services in line with SPP that advocates for a choice and range of housing types and locations. The builder is keen to promote custom and self build plots with an indicative 50% bespoke self build homes that is a priority for the Scottish Government. The MIR assessment was unduly negative as the development would be set back from prominent locations serving Scolty Woodland car park and would be sensitively designed to mitigate impact on the SLA and the woodland. The site is similar to the preferred site in Drumoak as it is within the SLA and should similarly be required to be carefully designed (581).

The site would not comprise the wider woodland, providing compensatory planting to avoid net tree loss. The site is within "long established" ancient woodland that generally has lesser ecological value and development would be concentrated in these areas to minimise loss of trees within areas of ancient woodland (581).

Resistance to development in this area will have a detrimental impact on the town centre as the balance of the settlement moves eastward (849).

A number of respondents have objected to this proposal (in agreement with the Officers' recommendation of "not preferred"), with concerns raised on the erosion of rural character and the SLA, overdevelopment, impact on woodland including ancient woodland; impact on nature conservation and recreation associated with the Scolty Hill and River Dee; impact on amenity; the increase in traffic/road safety, not within walking distance of schools and car dependency (69, 105, 136, 139, 192, 290, 309, 361, 375, 492, 621, 624, 692, 694, 705, 710, 727, 731, 733, 737, 750, 808, 848, 880, 935, 1040). One representation was concerned development would open up the south of the Dee for development (309). There would be drainage issues for a private drainage system and Auchattie Road has no proper drainage either (727).

SNH have noted that the site includes ancient woodland of semi-natural origin (506). The Woodland Trust Scotland welcomes the MIR comments (876).

Bid MR033

One representation supported development of this site as it would provide connectivity to Inchmarlo and is an opportunity to benefit the landscape (361). Resistance to development in this area would have a detrimental impact on the town centre as the balance of the settlement moves eastward (849).

A number of respondents have agreed with the Officers' recommendation of "not preferred" on the basis of causing ribbon development, risk of the coalescence of Inchmarlo and Banchory, car dependency, impact on wildlife and nature conservation related to the River Dee and associated outdoor recreation, loss of green space, negative visual impact through urban sprawl, and cumulative impact on local infrastructure (69, 105, 136, 139, 201, 290, 309, 360, 375, 692, 731, 750, 737, 880, 935).

SNH has advised that if bid MR033 was allocated, construction methods would be required to minimise the risk of pollution during construction, due to close proximity to the River Dee SAC (506).

Bid MR038 and Bid MR039

A number of respondents agreed with Officers' recommendation of "preferred" for MR038 (494, 520) and "reserved" for MR039 (494, 520, 624). One respondent supported the sites as Banchory is a key settlement in the Local Growth and Diversification part of the AHMA, sustaining growth in poor market conditions. Ongoing housing growth with growing employment, commercial and leisure sectors provides a more self-sufficient settlement rather than a commuter town. The ongoing growth is essential to the continued success of the settlement. There is logic to continuing expansion north where there has been infrastructure delivered. The ongoing upgrade to water and drainage networks places Banchory in a stronger position to contribute to the housing requirement of the SDP. The sites would be a logical

expansion of OP2 whilst avoiding and potentially enhancing the Loch of Leys LNCS. MR038 provides development projected until 2029/2030 and MR039 would likely be started by the end of the 10-year Plan period. Both sites could be masterplanned and phased alongside the western part of OP2. Both sites could be adequately serviced from either of the possible distributor road routes being explored (520).

If the site is developed it should be restricted to lower density and protect and enhance the environment for residents around the Hill of Banchory (651). Core paths should link to facilities and amenities (290).

There has been notable objection to these two separate bids that fall partly on the same site, against the Officers' recommendation of "preferred" for MR038 and "reserved" for MR039. Respondents' objections include: impact on the Loch of Leys LNCS; wildlife, biodiversity and habitat; woodland; character and landscape setting of the settlement; amenity and should remain undeveloped for OP2 residents; recreational areas (69, 105, 118, 131, 136, 225, 290, 331, 361, 375, 451, 452, 494, 538, 570, 624, 651, 692, 737, 741, 750, 849, 850, 863, 866, 880, 895, 935, 975, 1058). Respondents have highlighted that 60% of the border for MR038 is contiguous with the Loch of Leys LNCS and they believe that a 50m buffer zone should be maintained (331, 451, 452, 570).

Concerns were raised in relation to overdevelopment of the area; pressure on infrastructure and services including schools and the health centre; road capacity issues through additional traffic/congestion/road safety/pollution; and proximity from the town centre and facilities/ services; (136, 192, 239, 290, 309, 331, 451, 452, 611, 624, 651, 692, 737, 744, 750, 880, 935). The access for MR039 needs to be clarified as no country road exists to the south and should be assessed as part of the bid (118, 131, 975). Development should be put on hold until the completion of the distributor road in accordance with the Hill of Banchory Masterplans as there is no alternative way to connect this development to the primary distributor roads (968). Access roads should take account of biodiversity and wildlife habitat, woodland impact and green buffer zones (290).

One respondent has questioned whether the development would provide a range of properties including one-bedroomed bungalows for elderly people (881).

Concern was raised about possible flood risk and the impact to a quaking bog (290, 331, 451, 452). SEPA have commented that flood risk assessments may be required for both MR038 and MR039. Buffer strips would be required (805).

SNH note site briefs are recommended for both sites to ensure retention and enhancement of existing biodiversity and to identify provision for active travel. MR038 should ensure the site is linked to the core path network (506).

The labelling of these sites in the MIR was unclear (651).

Bid MR040, MR041, MR056 and MR062

A number of respondents supported development in this area specifically at MR040 (521, 849, 975), MR041 (69, 361, 375, 494, 521, 849, 975), MR056 (139, 361, 375, 435, 849, 975, 1030), and MR062 (849). These respondents have highlighted reasons for support including: there are no protected areas; woodland can be maintained or that biodiversity value is less than other areas as it is plantation; the TPO would not be impacted; core paths would be retained; these form a natural extension to the settlement without isolation and boundaries are well defined; are more accessible being relatively near Banchory town centre compared to other development; have good access to recreation; the school roll forecast shows adequate capacity; access constraints can be overcome; and, a growth project is underway for WWTW capacity and there is ongoing upgrades to the water/drainage networks. One representation expressed that MR056 should be supported over MR039 as it relates better to existing housing, amenities, facilities and the town centre, avoiding one housebuilder having a monopoly on allocated sites (1030). These sites would not impact on a LNCS unlike other bids (118).

One representation sought the inclusion of MR040 and MR041. This is due to ongoing growth being essential for the continued success of the settlement, and it is evident that the level of infrastructure delivered as part of existing development provides a clear logic to continuing expansion. Banchory is a key settlement in the Local Growth and Diversification part of the AHMA, sustaining growth in poor market conditions, therefore, ongoing housing growth with growing employment, commercial and leisure sectors provides a more self-sufficient settlement rather than a commuter town. Development would contribute towards the delivery of the housing requirement as numerous allocated sites have failed to meet housing numbers forecast in the Housing Land Audit (521).

One representation expressed that MR056 was previously a preferred site for the LDP 2017, scale is appropriate to the site characteristics and surrounding area, delivery would not impact on the area as supported through an indicative site layout plan, transportation statement, access plans, tree survey and ecological assessment. The core path and woodland would be retained and enhanced with the exception of 6 trees in poor condition (435).

A significant number of respondents objected to many or all of the bid sites MR040, MR041, MR056 and MR062 in agreement with the Officers' recommendation of "not preferred". Respondents generally objected for reasons including: the loss of woodland/open space and impact on a TPO; and, impact on biodiversity and wildlife including if areas of woodland were to be excluded from site boundaries (38, 69, 74, 75, 77, 85, 101, 103, 105, 116, 117, 120, 124, 125, 136, 139, 158, 166, 168, 171, 192, 216, 220, 290, 309, 319, 324, 343, 361, 362, 439, 445, 493, 494, 500, 505, 624, 649, 670, 682, 684, 692, 710, 732, 734, 736, 737, 738, 750, 763, 764, 848, 880, 887, 899, 940, 948, 958, 974, 976, 981, 986, 987, 1001, 1031). Woodland should be detached from any site and not allocated for housing (1041).

Development would affect amenity, privacy, health including contradicting NHS Greenspace Policy, leisure and recreational value of the area (38, 69, 77, 85, 103, 116, 117, 120, 123, 124, 125, 133, 136, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 164, 171, 196, 216, 252, 253, 309, 324, 362, 439, 445, 493, 494, 500, 557, 692, 736, 737, 738, 750, 887, 940, 948, 974, 981, 986, 987, 1001, 1031).

Respondents expressed that development would fail to meet the planning objective of protecting and enhancing the role and attractiveness of the town as it would impact on the local beauty spot known as Sunset Seat, landscape including the SLA, character and skyline of the settlement, and cause urban sprawl (69, 85, 116, 136, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 164, 166, 196, 252, 362, 710, 736, 737, 738, 750, 764, 842, 974, 976, 1001, 1031). Respondents raised issues of overdevelopment, the sites are not needed and stated there were more reasonable alternative sites to develop in the Banchory area including brownfield sites (38, 69, 85, 116, 124, 125, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 192, 362, 649, 738, 827, 887, 940, 974, 976, 1001). A number of respondents considered that the sites go beyond defined stone wall boundaries in the area and do not form a natural extension to the settlement, particularly bid MR040 (69, 85, 139, 253, 361, 375, 764, 880, 1001).

Respondents were concerned with regards to increased traffic/congestion including as a result of the proximity of the sites from facilities, amenities and public transport; access and impact on road safety particularly due to narrow roads; increased air/noise/light pollution; road wear; and, parking demand (38, 69, 77, 85, 101, 103, 116, 117, 123, 124, 136, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 166, 171, 196, 216, 220, 252, 253, 319, 353, 362, 439, 445, 493, 542, 649, 682, 692, 732, 736, 737, 750, 764, 842, 848, 887, 899, 940, 958, 974, 976, 987, 1001, 1031). Representations highlighted that access to MR062 from Tocher Lane has planning approval for a dwelling and would no longer be available to use (842) and MR041 may benefit from dual access (139).

Respondents expressed a concern that development in this location would put pressure on existing infrastructure, services and facilities due to the lack of capacity at schools and the health centre, lack of retail in the settlement, its proximity and lack of public transport, impact on water reservoir and the electricity stations on site, water pressure, gas, power, and sewage (69, 77, 85, 103, 117, 120, 123, 124, 125, 136, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 166, 168, 192, 196, 252, 253, 290, 319, 493, 649, 732, 736, 746, 764, 848, 940, 974, 987, 1001).

Respondents were concerned that the sites and loss of woodland would increase flood risk, soil erosion and result in the loss of carbon stores (887, 899). There were concerns raised relating to surface water flood risk (116, 1001).

These sites should be looked at together with MR077 for coordination on access, open space and utilities (216).

SNH expressed that if MR040 and MR062 were allocated they should ensure adequate biodiverse open space, identify provision for active travel and link the site to the core

path network. SNH also recommended that if MR056 and MR062 were allocated they should ensure retention and enhancement of existing woodland. It is noted that MR041 is largely woodland including planted conifers and broadleaved semi-natural woodland (506).

Bid MR053 / Existing Reserved land R3

One respondent supported bid MR053 for housing as the Council has not moved to acquire the site, has no plans in the foreseeable future to do so, or have expressed no clear intentions. Their sole focus has been on refurbishing the existing school, there is no pressing incentive for a replacement, and it is unlikely that a need will be identified in the review of the learning estate. The key constraint of the woodland is a monoculture crop due for thinning and will be felled irrespective of zoning. The plantation has little amenity value and does not have any value as a recreational resource. Community needs can be adequately met on council land such as on the playing fields at Tillybrake or on the existing primary school site adjacent to the existing academy. The site is well placed in terms of sustainable connectivity and can meet the 6 criteria for a successful place. The success of the Energy Centre and Banchory Heating Network at the Hill of Banchory is dependent on development at this site. The site has existing and partially implemented permission from 2007 (824).

There was substantial agreement with the Officers' assessment of "not preferred" and to retain the site for a secondary school (27, 32, 48, 69, 71, 72, 75, 78, 86, 87, 105, 118, 131, 132, 133, 136, 139, 192, 225, 256, 275, 290, 294, 309, 311, 322, 327, 328, 335, 336, 338, 344, 348, 349, 354, 360, 361, 364, 375, 404, 416, 493, 494, 495, 499, 538, 624, 625, 626, 628, 633, 636, 637, 638, 642, 645, 646, 647, 650, 653, 654, 655, 659, 661, 662, 663, 664, 669, 671, 674, 675, 676, 678, 680, 686, 687, 688, 691, 695, 700, 710, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 721, 722, 724, 726, 727, 732, 733, 734, 737, 740, 741, 744, 745, 746, 747, 751, 753, 754, 756, 759, 761, 762, 763, 766, 774, 777, 784, 786, 801, 802, 807, 844, 847, 848, 850, 861, 863, 871, 872, 884, 897, 900, 903, 904, 916, 934, 935, 961, 964, 973, 974, 975, 979, 982, 983, 993, 994, 997, 1000, 1002, 1018, 1030).

This site was considered by respondents as the only site that would be suitable for a new school and it would be difficult to find an alternative which would result in delays to delivering one (27, 32, 106, 132, 256, 322, 327, 328, 335, 336, 344, 348, 349, 354, 356, 357, 358, 364, 499, 659, 687, 716, 726, 866, 982, 1018, 1030). One representation objected to housing here unless there were plans to rebuild the school on the existing academy site (734). The site is accessible and close to amenities and alternative sites for a school would generate additional traffic (78, 132, 192, 256, 275, 322, 327, 328, 335, 336, 344, 348, 349, 354, 356, 357, 358, 364, 499, 716, 726, 982, 983, 1018).

Banchory is in need of a new secondary school (27, 32, 59, 78, 86, 87, 106, 404, 418, 499, 659, 687, 727, 744, 764, 880, 974, 986) and its necessary to provide facilities for the large number of housing site being allocated and built (336, 338, 659, 727, 737, 745). The condition of the school is below an acceptable level of build quality, not fit for purpose and is nearing capacity (59, 78, 86, 87, 256, 275, 311, 322, 327, 328, 335, 336,

338, 344, 348, 349, 354, 356, 357, 358, 362, 364, 404, 493, 499, 727, 744, 745, 916, 948, 982, 983, 987, 1018). The Academy is identified as a priority in the Community Action Plan and the loss of the site would be to ignore the community (404, 982, 983). No further housing development should take place until it has been replaced (311).

Representations expressed a desire for an education hub that accommodates adult education and evening/weekend activities (275, 322, 327, 328, 335, 336, 344, 348, 349, 354, 356, 357, 358, 364, 499).

A number of respondents expressed that the woodland contributes to the landscape character and amenity (32, 131, 494, 738, 863, 866, 975) but if it were to be lost on this site it should be for community benefit (32, 69, 493, 850, 863, 866). Some respondents objected to housing and the reservation for a school as the woodland should be retained as its loss would impact on character, wildlife, biodiversity, amenity and recreational value (570, 549, 692, 738, 750). One respondent contested that the site is commercial woodland as Scots Pine is found there (624). SNH noted that the site is recorded as ancient woodland inventory long established plantation origin and planted conifer (506).

Respondents objected to the housing bid as the settlement is already overdeveloped (738) and the proposal would increase traffic on the roads (692). Housing development would impact on the core path network (27, 32) and is not well placed for pedestrian and cycle connectivity (624).

Bid MR061

There has been a level of support received for this bid for housing (69, 105, 118, 131, 136, 290, 309, 361, 375, 557, 737, 750, 848, 859, 895, 1038, 1040). Respondents both in support and objection expressed a number of concerns including: the number of homes proposed; access roads and increased traffic/noise; impact on paths and adequate provision for walking/cycling to and through the development; loss of woodland impacting on wildlife and recreation; development area is too large and should only be on the brownfield site; it is at odds with Main Issue 9 on rural brownfield development; impact on local character and contribute to coalescence of Banchory and Inchmarlo; impact nearby leisure facilities; the site would encourage more development above Corsee Road; capacity of existing infrastructure and services; the water main that passes through the site; and, proximity to public transport (69, 102, 122, 136, 139, 201, 309, 375, 439, 445, 489, 500, 692, 737, 734, 750, 848, 859, 895, 948, 1038, 1040).

The development proposal has been welcomed as it would reuse a now unlisted fire damaged site which attracts vandalism and is an eyesore (118, 290, 361, 710, 975), it improves the access road (105) and the location allows for accessibility through path networks for low impact travel on foot or cycling (557).

Respondents requested that access should be taken from Glassel Road (692); there should be buffer zones to protect the disused railway path and woodland (737); the proposed 50 homes should be for sheltered or special needs housing (880); focus

should be on smaller or affordable homes (737); and, that there should be more houses, rather than less, in order to ensure affordable housing is built (849). One respondent stressed the importance of retaining reference to the hospital in the design of the homes, ensuring very high quality and keeping tree removal to a minimum with top quality soft landscaping to fit into the semi-rural setting (290). There should be a core path network linking the development to the town for access to facilities. There should be greater access by public transport (290).

One respondent welcomed the proposed allocation of bid MR061, however objected to reducing the housing number from the bid proposal of 100 to 50 homes (569). The respondent considered the derelict site presents an opportunity for increased density compared to previous limitations governed by the footprint of the former hospital, and as such a Masterplan of 100 homes has been prepared. Some tree loss is acknowledged but it was argued that this is outweighed by the wider benefits of redeveloping a contaminated brownfield site, providing greater access to the wider woodland and path networks in the area. The respondent also considered the site is in close proximity to services and amenities and existing road access can be improved with a second access provided. Finally, education constraints can be mitigated, and waste water treatment provision would not constrain development (569).

Other issues raised included that there needs to be wider engagement with local interested parties to determine if there is support for development and that the developer has not progressed with previous planning permissions on this site nor currently at Land West of Raemoir Road, therefore this site should not be promoted (139).

SNH has recommended a site brief to ensure the site retains existing landscape structure and biodiversity value on site, and to ensure there is adequate meaningful and biodiverse open space incorporated in the development. Provision should also be made for active travel, with links to the core path network, and proposed planting as part of a landscape framework should be sensitive to local landscape character, and be proportionate in scale and extent relative to the scale of development (506).

Bid MR075 / Existing Site OP1

The MIR recommended to retain the park and ride and football pitch rather than substitute for an athletics field/facilities, and maintain the eco village at 30 homes rather than 35 homes.

One representation objected to the MIR assessment, however, proposed changes for OP1 including a revised site layout including a mixed use allocation for a 32 home demonstration eco village, tourism uses, community uses that includes a full sized all-weather sports pitch, and a park and ride (or other use compatible with tourism/community use) (825). One respondent expressed that a holistic study is needed to discover what is necessary and could be accommodated at Woodend for the community in relation to sporting facilities, existing facilities, eco housing and the park

and ride (1040). One representation objected to the bid amendments as it would be for profit over meeting community wishes (309).

One respondent objected to the retention of the park and ride facility as it creates uncertainty as there is no commitment by the Council to build or a timeline for the project. In recognition of existing parking issues in the town centre the respondent requests it is allocated for a "*park and ride site or other use compatible with tourism and community uses deemed acceptable on the site*" (825). Further respondents have queried the benefits to the settlement of a park and ride site and doubt whether it would be effective due to costs, speed of transport and choice of destinations (105, 309, 361, 975, 1040). The park and ride would not relieve congestion in the town centre, parking is available across many locations on the bus routes and there is no demand for one (361, 375, 849). Parking requirements in the town centre are unlikely to increase and this constraint would be further alleviated by the relocation of the football to this site and the medical centre move (118, 131, 375). Respondents do not consider that a park and ride should be in instead of local amenity uses (118, 131).

Nestrans support the recommendation to retain the park and ride facility as it remains a key element of the Regional Transport Strategy and the provision of facilities on the A93 would increase options for bus travel on this corridor (19). One respondent supports the retention of the park and ride (750).

The eco village concept has support from respondents (290, 624, 750, 825, 880) but at no more than 30 homes (290, 624, 750). The community would consider it essential that it should be of high quality as it is a key site at the eastern entry to the settlement. High quality homes, site design incorporating features to retain stone dykes and quality landscaping is required (290). Landscaping and the eco village should enhance the east entrance of the settlement (750).

One respondent disagreed that there had been no progression with the eco village as there have been ongoing consultations regarding the planning application. The respondent proposes an increase in the number to 32 homes, rather than 35 homes or maintaining it at 30 homes, as it allows for the ready calculation of the affordable housing element but maintains a low density, highly landscaped and sustainable development of high quality (825).

A number of respondents objected to housing on the site as further housing is not required and the area should be kept for community sports clubs (118, 131, 361, 375, 863, 866, 975). Respondents commented that the site should only be used for sports facilities as housing would change the landscape character of the area (118, 131).

There were a significant number of respondents objecting to the bid's omission of a football pitch due to the need for an 11-a-side pitch as a minimum and multi sports complex for the whole community (136, 375, 625, 626, 628, 633, 636, 637, 638, 642, 645, 646, 647, 650, 653, 654, 655, 661, 662, 663, 664, 669, 671, 674, 675, 676, 678, 680, 686, 688, 691, 695, 700, 715, 717, 718, 719, 721, 722, 724, 740, 746, 747, 751,

753, 754, 756, 759, 761, 762, 763, 774, 777, 784, 786, 801, 802, 807, 844, 847, 849, 861, 871, 872, 884, 897, 900, 903, 904, 934, 973, 979, 994, 1000, 1002). There was support for sporting facilities and an all-weather pitch in this location (136, 290, 750, 880) over other locations (750). One concern was raised with respect to the concentration of many sports facilities in this area as it would create parking issues and congestion (739).

One representation noted that a change from a football pitch to an all-weather pitch could be accommodated as shown with feasibility work undertaken and it could potentially be multi-use (825, 826). One respondent highlighted that a football pitch can be provided elsewhere in line with the Reporter at the LDP 2017 Examination so long as it is an equivalent site. However, the respondent agreed to the all-weather facility as it could allow for expansion of both rugby and football activities and the site could still allow for the incorporation of athletics facilities (825).

It was requested that further time is allowed for an agreement to be reached between parties involved in the discussion to relocate the athletics facilities for the betterment of the sporting facilities at Woodend (825). In support of the alternative athletics facilities that the Woodend site could provide, one respondent highlighted that there is currently no direct access to Alexander Park (bid MR076), with no parking and no changing facilities. There is a separate housing proposal (bid MR076 for 40 homes) that the respondent considers a determining factor in relation to bid MR075 (828). Further comments regarding the athletics field are summarised under bid MR076.

SNH noted that the site is adjacent to and slightly overlaps with ancient woodland and planted conifer (506).

SEPA has advised that an FRA may be required to assess flood risk from a small watercourse on the northern edge of the site and ephemeral stream flow paths within the site. Buffer strips will be required adjacent to the watercourses and should be integrated as a positive feature of the development. Enhancement of the straightened watercourses through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated (805).

Bid MR076

In support of bid MR076 for 40 homes, one respondent acknowledged that this bid depends on the success of the Woodend site in delivering the athletics track and associated facilities. With regards to the concern for loss of woodland identified in the MIR, the respondent considered the proposed new access for this development would not have a significant impact on trees, and that the trees would provide screening to be improved and managed. The respondent highlighted that significant areas of green/open space would remain in the west of the settlement (828). Another representation does not object to housing development in this location if the athletics track was moved to Woodend (1040). One representation suggested this could make an excellent all-weather pitch location provided the athletic park could be relocated to the ruby club (69).

Respondents have objected to this proposal, in line with the Officers' recommendation of "not preferred", primarily due to loss of a sporting facility that is currently protected as 'P1' and considered it should remain as protected land (69, 105, 136, 139, 201, 290, 297, 309, 359, 361, 375, 689, 714, 731, 737, 739, 744, 750, 880, 935, 943, 981, 990, 1037). Respondents have highlighted the importance of the site in this location on the west side of Banchory in a sheltered area that is specifically suited to athletics, with no guarantee at this point in time that an equivalent would be provided at the Woodend site that have recently been developed with support from Sport Scotland and Woodend would not provide sufficient shelter from the wind that is necessary until any tree planting had matured (359, 375, 714, 731, 737, 739, 750, 943, 990, 1037). One representation expressed that the athletics club would be worse off at Woodend due to the shared facilities with the rugby club that dominates most of the land and would result in restricted use of the facilities (297, 739). The Banchory Stonehaven Athletics Club is designated as a priority user under a 99 year lease arrangement on this site (297).

Respondents did not consider a housing development would be suitable in this location for reasons including: risking opening up the area to further development, causing urban sprawl and encroachment on to the woodlands; impact on local character; impact on the environment and the green network/green spaces; coalescence of Banchory and Inchmarlo; visual impact affecting nearby tourist accommodation; car dependency and increased traffic on the narrow Glassel Road; increased pressure on infrastructure (201, 297, 309, 689, 731, 739, 744, 935, 943, 981, 990). Respondents expressed that this is an important site as it acts as the western gateway to the settlement and development would impact on the setting of the settlement (139, 290). Any future development would need to be carefully managed to enhance rather than detract from the settlement's entrance (290). One respondent was concerned the proposed housing density is too high (201).

SNH has advised that if bid MR076 was allocated, the retention and enhancement of existing woodland would be required, together with provision of biodiverse open space and active travel, ensuring the core path to the site is retained/upgraded (506).

Bid MR077 / Existing Reserved Land R2

There was support for this site as part of strategic housing (69, 375, 750, 827, 958) as it would not impact on woodlands (361, 375, 494). One representation supported development as the biodiversity value is less than other areas due to being plantation and the site is relatively near Banchory town centre compared to other development (849). Another respondent agreed the development of this site would be possible but highlighted that it is somewhat on the edge of the settlement (290). One representation expressed a preference for development of this site over MR038/MR039 but highlighted a need for a road upgrade (361).

Respondents considered that development in this area would result in or lead to the loss of woodland/open space and associated biodiversity and wildlife value (75, 103, 116, 166, 196, 216, 252, 309, 651, 692, 737, 738, 880, 940, 974, 976, 981, 1001, 1031).

Respondents expressed that the bid would affect amenity, privacy, health including contradicting NHS Greenspace Policy, leisure and recreational value of the area (103, 116, 133, 216, 692, 736, 738, 940, 974, 981, 1001, 1031). One respondent was of the view that development in this area is a community concern (494).

Respondents were concerned that the proposal would impact the landscape including the SLA, character of the area, and cause urban sprawl (116, 166, 737, 738, 974, 976, 1031). Respondents raised issues of overdevelopment, the sites are not needed and stated there were more reasonable alternative sites to develop in the Banchory area including brownfield sites (940, 974, 976). A number of respondents considered that the sites would negatively impact on the defined settlement boundary (880, 1001) and going outwith the boundary would be premature (139).

Respondents were concerned with regards to increased traffic/congestion including as a result of the proximity of the sites from facilities, amenities and public transport; access and impact on road safety particularly due to narrow roads; increased air/noise pollution; road wear; and, parking demand (103, 166, 216, 692, 940, 974, 976, 1031).

Respondents expressed a concern that development in this location would put pressure on existing infrastructure, services and facilities due to the lack of capacity at schools and the health centre, lack of retail in the settlement, its proximity and lack of public transport (103, 166, 651, 940, 974, 1001).

This site should be looked at together with MR040, MR41, MR056 and MR062 for coordination on access, open space and utilities (216).

SNH raised that a site brief would be required to ensure adequate biodiverse open space, identify provision for active travel and link the site to the core path network (506).

One respondent accepted the removal of existing reserved land R2 for a cemetery (827) although another respondent disagreed with the removal (880).

Bid MR080 / Existing Reserved Land R4

The majority of respondents did not object to the Officers' recommendation to retain this site as reserved land for health care use, but had concerns about the loss of open space, with a significant number requesting a stipulation that the current football pitch and play park are replaced prior to construction, due to these facilities being in constant use (69, 71, 118, 131, 290, 361, 375, 551, 624, 625, 626, 628, 633, 636, 637, 638, 642, 645, 646, 647, 650, 653, 654, 655, 661, 662, 663, 664, 669, 671, 674, 675, 676, 678, 680, 686, 688, 691, 695, 700, 715, 718, 719, 721, 722, 724, 737, 740, 746, 747, 750, 751, 753, 754, 756, 759, 761, 762, 763, 774, 777, 784, 786, 801, 802, 807, 827, 844, 847, 861, 871, 872, 880, 884, 895, 897, 900, 903, 904, 916, 934, 961, 973, 975, 979, 994, 1000, 1002). One representation considered that an all-weather pitch at OP1 would reduce any impact of this development (750).

A number of respondents were concerned with the impact of the loss of the existing health centre would have on the town centre including on retail particularly pharmacies (72, 136, 916, 961), that it should be located centrally with a car park and nearby to pharmacies (744, 880). Respondents expressed that the existing health centre should be extended or redeveloped (72, 916, 961). If the proposal goes forward, on-site pharmacies should be refused in order to protect the High Street (916, 961).

There were concerns raised that the bid site would not be large enough for the use with the growing demand on the health centre, provide adequate parking (105, 309) and be accessible (136, 750).

There was objection to the bid site due to the loss of open space and recreational area (72, 744).

One respondent noted that in the LDP 2017 Examination the Reporter stated that improvements were required to the site (including drainage) to ensure that the site remained fit for purpose for the proposed use (827). SEPA has advised that bid MR080 has no requirement for an FRA, however noted that the scale of surface water flood risk may be difficult to manage (805).

SNH considered that an NHS development should seek to incorporate green infrastructure for health and wellbeing, and requested that the potential for active travel links are explored (506). Mairi here

Bid MR082

The majority of representations agreed with the Officers' recommendation of "not preferred". The concerns raised included: the sensitivity of the site due to its proximity to the Loch of Leys LNCS and potential for impact on wildlife; potential impact through artificial lighting; road access improvements required; not suitable for football; not in the best interest for the community; it would isolate facilities; and sought MR075 or an equivalent site that has the necessary infrastructure to provide a football pitch (69, 105, 136, 290, 309, 361, 375, 625, 626, 628, 633, 636, 637, 638, 642, 645, 646, 647, 650, 653, 654, 655, 661, 662, 663, 664, 669, 671, 674, 675, 676, 678, 680, 686, 688, 691, 695, 700, 715, 717, 718, 719, 721, 722, 724, 740, 744, 746, 747, 751, 753, 754, 756, 759, 761, 762, 763, 774, 777, 784, 786, 801, 802, 807, 844, 847, 849, 861, 871, 872, 884, 897, 900, 903, 904, 934, 973, 979, 994, 1000, 1002).

Respondents expressed that the relocation of football facilities from MR075/OP1 has not been in consultation with the football club (361, 375). The bid location does not enable economical use of an all-weather pitch and would be isolated from other sports clubs so it would not enable use of shared facilities (375). Respondents stated that OP1 remains best placed for an all-weather pitch (69, 750, 849).

One respondent has commented that existing football pitches should remain in the centre of the town and be upgraded as the proposed location would not support the town centre (744, 880).

One representation disagreed that the site is isolated given the distributor road as part of the Lochside development is currently being installed. This respondent highlights the abandonment of the bid and that OP1/MR075 could accommodate an all-weather pitch but notes there may still be a requirement for additional football pitches elsewhere in the settlement (826).

One respondent noted a flood risk on the site (290).

SNH recommended, if the site was allocated, the retention and enhancement of existing woodland, the need for active travel provision and a requirement for a suitable buffer along the Burn of Bennie (506).

APP/2008/4366 The Mews

One representation noted that the community playing field has not materialised yet and questions whether it can be ensured to be delivered (309).

3. Actions

Vision/ Objectives

Comments received in relation to the Vision and Planning Objectives are noted. Review of the Vision statement to be included within the Proposed LDP is ongoing and will account for comments received. It should be noted that the Planning Service cannot address matters of parking fees and traffic controls. Developer contributions are intended to address any impact on infrastructure created by the development proposed but cannot resolve existing deficiencies; contributions can only be sought where it meets the 5 policy tests contained in Planning Circular 3/2012: Planning Obligations and Good Neighbour Agreements. The issue regarding “The Mews” (APP/2008/4366), has been drawn to the attention of our Development Management colleagues.

Protected Land

It is agreed that the existing protected land should remain in the Proposed LDP. The open space audit is currently being updated and it is anticipated there may be an amalgamation, amendment and additions to protected sites within and surrounding the settlement.

The arts centre adjoining OP1 is not a use that requires a specific protection. Outdoor learning opportunities within natural spaces would not require an allocation as there is sufficient protected land that provide this recreational opportunity.

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 LDP.

Text should also be added to reflect the amendments sought on Flood Risk Assessment for existing sites OP1, OP2, OP3 and OP4.

Services and Infrastructure

Information received from Scottish Water confirms the Banchory WWTW growth project is underway but additional development would be required to initiate a growth project once development meets their five growth criteria.

Settlement Boundary

An amendment to the settlement boundary to incorporate the entirety of the properties of Mosscroft and Norwood Lodge would be appropriate.

With regards to the boundary amendment to include the site of the Cowshed restaurant within OP2, it was previously agreed by the Reporter for the LDP 2017 Examination that its inclusion into the settlement boundary may be more appropriate once sites OP2 and/or OP3 have been developed. The inclusion as part of the allocation boundary or settlement boundary would essentially have the same effect in providing opportunity for infill development. The previous position is maintained in that it may be appropriate once sites OP2 and OP3 are built out. Similarly, it is considered that the property of Woodfield may be appropriate for inclusion once the allocations are built out. At this point there would be more clarity as to the relationship of these properties with the settlement.

Spatial Strategy for Banchory

We acknowledge the substantial objection to additional development in Banchory and to individual bid sites. It is anticipated that all the housing allocations will be built out prior to the end of the Proposed LDP period based on the Housing Land Audit 2019. In light of the recommendations to not have Future Opportunity sites, as discussed under "Issue 8 Shaping Homes and Housing", bid sites MR039 and MR077 that were Officers' preference for being reserved are not recommended to be brought forward as allocations.

There are common themes across the majority of bid sites with the most prevalent issues raised on environmental impact, character, amenity, recreation, infrastructure, services, and design/range of types of housing. It is recognised that a large portion of the bid sites are likely to result in environmental impacts particularly for trees/woodland (including TPOs), biodiversity and wildlife. Many of these areas are also recognised as having recreational or character/landscape value. The various issues raised on traffic, road safety/access, path connectivity, amenity and design/type of housing proposed could only be satisfactorily assessed through the development management process.

The view that there should be spatial balance of development to maintain the town centre as the physical centre of the settlement is simplistic in that it is not reflective of the potential constraints to development. There are limited opportunities for development within close proximity to the town centre and facilities such as the schools and sports facilities.

The Planning Service does not consider landownership or crime levels as part of the assessment of bid sites or planning applications. In terms of a planning forum being required for Banchory, consultation is undertaken in accordance with the agreed Development Plan Scheme for the production of the LDP and it is believed that the community have sufficient engagement opportunities in this process.

With regard to the request made by SNH to ensure that adequate provision is made for biodiverse open space, policies are in place that require all development to enhance biodiversity and provide adequate public open space. Allocation summaries will be amended to reflect comments where appropriate.

It is also acknowledged that statements supporting the “not preferred” bid sites and that these constraints may be mitigated in some circumstances. However, it is considered that sufficient housing land has been recommended for allocation and that these preferred bids will provide the most appropriate balance of the issues discussed above.

In addition to two housing sites (MR038 and MR061), MR014 (retail), MR024 (visitor centre), and MR080 (health care use) are recommended for allocation/reserved land.

Hill of Banchory Proposed Distributor Road

It is acknowledged that there is significant objection to a proposed alternative distributor road as part of OP2 and contained within indicative site layouts for bids MR038 and MR039. It is considered that the preferred bid MR038 can be served by a suitable access arrangement such as that contained within the Hill of Banchory Masterplan. It is noted that a planning application for this alternative distributor road route has been submitted, however, as it is currently under consideration it is not recommended that any action should occur in the Proposed LDP in this regard. Any alternative access arrangement should be assessed and determined through the development management process.

Local Nature Conservation Sites have been reviewed and no change is proposed to the Loch Of Leys designation.

Existing Site – OP2

As development has commenced for this allocation it should remain within the LDP until it is built out. The opportunity for amendments to the allocation summary are limited so as to avoid conflict between the agreed Masterplan and in respect to the planning permissions approved on the site. Further planning applications will be assessed against the relevant policies that cover the issues raised through the comments.

Existing Site – OP3

As development has commenced for this allocation it should remain within the LDP until it is built out. The opportunity for amendments to the allocation summary are limited so as to avoid conflict between the agreed Masterplan and in respect to the planning

permissions approved on the site. Any further planning applications will be assessed against the relevant policies that cover the issues raised through the comments.

Existing Site – OP4

The allocation is noted as effective within the Housing Land Audit therefore it would not be appropriate to remove the allocation at this time. Notwithstanding the planning application currently under consideration by Development Management, the allocation summary can be updated to reflect the comments raised on flood risk. Matters such as roads, landscaping, and path connectivity would be assessed against the relevant policies as part of the planning application process.

Bid MR014 (Existing Site BUS2)

A number of comments have been received in relation to the condition of the town centre and there is concern that this proposal would further impact on its health. Comments regarding the retail study are acknowledged and note it highlighted a potential comparison goods opportunity beyond 2022 but the report also stressed that there are enormous uncertainties and variations with long term forecasting therefore it would be inappropriate to quantify potential new floorspace for the period after 2022. The recommended strategy is, and remains, to protect the town centre. A bulky goods comparison facility is appropriate as it is believed that there is no appropriate footplate for such a store in the town centre. The restriction on the floor space to above 6000m² is reflective of the bid submission and is appropriate given the town centre caters for smaller retail floorspaces.

Bid MR024

There is general support for the proposed visitor centre and heritage hub. Noted are the concerns regarding impact of the potential development and the support for maintaining the site for the health centre, or the consideration of using it for a new Academy. The bid is considered to be an appropriate and complementary use for the town centre if the opportunity arises for redevelopment of the site. It is unlikely the site would be of a sufficient scale to support a new Academy site. Recommended is the reservation of the site but that does not mean the visitor centre could not be proposed elsewhere. As part of any planning application, any proposal on the site would have to comply with the relevant policies and therefore issues such as parking and traffic issues would require to be assessed and mitigated if necessary.

Bid MR029 and Bid MR030

For reasons set out in the MIR, principally natural heritage constraints, and having given consideration to comments received from SNH, it is maintained that bids MR029 and MR030 should not be allocated in the Proposed LDP.

Bid MR031

For clarity and as discussed above, bid MR031 is not recommended to be allocated in the Proposed LDP, again due to natural heritage constraints. Acknowledged is the representation in support of the site and agreed is that the development plan should provide a mix of developments sites and that self-build is a valid option in many places.

However, it is not considered that this is the right development in the right location as per the reasons set out in the MIR.

Bid MR033

For reasons set out in the MIR, principally the risk of coalescence of Inchmarlo and Banchory, and having given consideration to comments received, it is maintained that bid MR033 should not be allocated in the Proposed LDP.

Bid MR038 and MR039

For reasons set out in the MIR, and having given consideration to comments received including from SNH and SEPA, it is maintained that bid MR038 should be allocated in the Proposed LDP. No overriding reasons for its exclusion have been provided.

Whilst adjoining the Loch of Leys LNCS, there are no buffer zones required around this type of site. Further to this, the site is largely semi-improved grassland (correcting the MIR description of agricultural land). Whilst there are areas of woodland of local value and possible risk through drainage into the LNCS, these factors can be carefully designed into any proposal and managed as part of the planning application process.

As the proposal is alongside the existing site OP2 which is under construction, it is unlikely to significantly alter the character of the immediate area. Development in this location would not result in the loss of recreational land given its current use is for grazing.

The allocation summary will include statements to reflect information received on matters to be taken into account during the assessment of any planning application.

For clarity and as discussed above, bid MR039 is not recommended to be allocated in the Proposed LDP.

Please see the discussion regarding the proposed southern relief road above.

Bid MR040, MR041, MR056 and MR062

It is acknowledged the comments in support particularly for MR041 and MR056. The Reporter's comments for the LDP 2017 Examination on the bid area MR056 noted it as offering some development potential, it relates well to the established residential area and offers relatively good accessibility to the town centre. However, it is considered that sufficient additional housing allocations have been identified for the Proposed LDP. For clarity and as discussed above, bids MR040, MR041, MR056 and MR062 are not recommended to be allocated in the Proposed LDP.

Bid MR053 / Existing Reserved Land R3

A substantial number of comments were received in support of the recommendation to maintain the reserved status rather than allocate for homes. The comments regarding the Council's intentions with the site and not progressing it are noted. However, the position that it is prudent for the Proposed LDP to safeguard a site for educational purposes arising from the deficiencies of the existing Academy site is maintained. As it

is recommended as a reserved site, rather than an allocation, there is a reduced need for certainty over its delivery. The matter of woodland loss would only be justifiable in the circumstances set out in SPP paragraph 218 to which housing rather than education is unlikely able to provide significant public benefit.

It is acknowledged that the school site has been reserved since the LDP 2012 in the place of a residential area within the Hill of Banchory Masterplan. At the time of the proposed reservation the land was offered by developers as a potential site for a new Academy with a request that additional replacement residential land was allocated at Banchory North (existing site OP2) or North West (existing site OP3). The Issues and Actions paper for the LDP 2012 agreed the housing numbers from this site could be included on the proposed Banchory North site that was subsequently allocated as part of the LDP 2012. It is not agreed that the site should revert back to housing land and given that replacement land was allocated directly north of the Energy Centre and Banchory Heating Network, we dispute the viability argument put forward. The respondent highlighted that the 'phase 12' housing on this site has partially implemented planning permission from 2007. The eastern part of 'phase 12' was built under a latter permission from 2011 and there is no evidence of the 2007 permission itself having been implemented. There is no requirement to update the boundaries given the planning history.

Bid MR061

A level of support for this bid site with benefits recognised from potential development is acknowledged. For reasons set out in the MIR, and having given consideration to comments received including from SNH, it is maintained that bid MR061 should be allocated in the Proposed LDP. It is agreed that the allocation summary should include requirements on high quality design and the need to reflect the site's history.

With regards to the density of development proposed, it is worth highlighting in this circumstance that site numbers are recommended as indicative under "Issue 8 Shaping Homes and Housing". A further reduced density to 40 homes, from our MIR recommendation of 50 homes, is reasonable and realistic to ensure the impact of the development does not outweigh the benefits of the redevelopment of the site. The reduction in density should assist with concerns regarding road access with the potential for two access points. In terms of ancient woodland on the site, it is proposed that the site area is divided into two opportunity sites and reduced to a developable area that excludes the woodland surrounding the brownfield sites. However, any potential higher density proposal and its impacts can be assessed as part of any planning application and considered against the relevant policies.

With an allocation of the site it would be included as part of the settlement with the requirement to integrate itself through improved connectivity. Subsequently, the rural brownfield policy would not apply in this case.

The allocation summary will include statements to reflect information received on matters to be taken into account during the assessment of any planning application.

Bid MR075 / Existing Site OP1

The park and ride element remains part of the Regional Transport Strategy and the retention is supported by Nestrans. Whilst there is a mixed response on the need and benefit of this facility, and the timescales for its delivery, it is recommended maintaining sustainable transport options within the settlement. The suggested amendment to the allocation summary in this regard is not agreed as it would allow for an 'either or' approach that could result in the loss of the park and ride option. This does not represent good planning.

In terms of the housing element, the reason is accepted for the increase to a 32 home allocation given. This would allow for an on-site contribution of one additional affordable home. There are objections to OP1 including housing however this forms part of the original mixed use allocation and currently a planning application is under consideration for this element. The existing allocation summary promotes high quality development including landscaping and retention of the stone dykes.

The resounding support for the retention of a football pitch on this site and amendment to an all-weather pitch is acknowledged. One respondent highlighted that the Reporter previously agreed the site can be provided elsewhere so long as it is an equivalent site. In keeping with this recommendation, the retention of the statement to that effect within the allocation summary is proposed.

In terms of the athletics field, it is not considered appropriate for additional time to be given for agreements to be reached on reallocating the facilities. It may be considered an appropriate use as part of the 'community' uses currently promoted in this location, however, this should not be at the loss of a football pitch or park and ride facility.

Bid MR076

For clarity and as discussed above, bid MR076 is not recommended to be allocated in the Proposed LDP. For reasons set out in the MIR, and having given consideration to comments received, it is maintained that bid MR076 should remain as protected land and not be allocated in the Proposed LDP for housing.

Bid MR077 / Existing Reserved Land R2

For clarity and as discussed above, bid MR077 is not recommended to be allocated in the Proposed LDP.

The existing Reserved Land R2 for a cemetery has been identified by the Council's Landscape Services Team as no longer suitable for this use. The removal of this site is recommended.

Bid MR080 / Existing Reserved Land R4

A large number of respondents are concerned at the loss of existing facilities at this site. As part of the LDP 2012 process, the loss of the football pitch was considered and it

was deemed appropriate for a replacement football pitch at the current OP1 allocation providing scope for an enhanced sports facility. Its location, whilst not in the town centre, is not on the edge of the settlement or inaccessible.

It is considered appropriate to retain the reserved site as the NHS have maintained their interest through the submission of the bid. The reservation does not mean the health centre could not be proposed elsewhere. As part of any planning application, any proposal on the site would have to comply with the relevant policies and therefore issues such as parking, traffic, active green infrastructure, active links and surface water drainage would require to be assessed and mitigated if necessary.

Bid MR082

Support for the Officers' recommendation is welcomed and the abandonment of the bid is noted. For reasons set out in the MIR and for clarity, having given consideration to comments received, it is maintained that bid MR082 should not be allocated in the Proposed LDP.

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. Review the Vision statement to account for comments received including the importance of the natural environment including woodland/ wildlife habitat/ Scolty Hill, support for retail/ business and footway / cycle path provision.
2. Update 'Services and Infrastructure' and 'Flood Risk' of the Settlement Statement to reflect the latest information received.
3. Incorporate the properties Mosscroft and Norwood Lodge into the settlement boundary.
4. Update areas of protected land.
5. Retain existing sites OP1, OP2, OP3, and OP4 amending text on flood risk should planning permissions be subject to change.
6. Replace reserved land R1 with protected land as the facilities have been built.
7. Remove reserved land R2 (cemetery) as the land is unsuitable for this use.
8. Retain reserved land R3 for potential educational facilities.
9. Retain reserved land R4 (bid MR080) for a potential health centre.

10. Add reserved land for a cemetery extension.
11. Add reserved land MR024 for potential use as a visitor centre and heritage hub.
12. Allocate bid MR014 for retail opportunities. The allocation summary should limit the retail opportunities to above 6000 m² floorspace and bulky comparison goods. It should also include a statement on a watercourse buffer strip, FRA, construction method statement and biodiversity and path network enhancement.
13. Allocate bid site MR038 for 100 homes. The allocation summary for the site should include a statement on woodland, core paths, FRA, watercourse buffer strip, construction method statement, ecological survey/mitigation plan, archaeological survey, scheduled monument, and biodiversity and path network enhancement.
14. Allocate bid site MR061 for 40 homes separated into two opportunity sites. The allocation summary for both sites should include a statement on woodland, open space, landscaping, paths, FRA, construction method statement, design, and biodiversity and path network enhancement.
15. Amend allocation summary for existing site OP1 to include a 32 home eco village and substitute the football pitch for an all-weather pitch. The allocation summary should include an additional statement on watercourse buffer/enhancement and consideration of the built heritage of Crathes Castle.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the recommendations 2 to 12, 14 and 15 at their special meeting on 17 September 2019.
2. The Committee agreed to amend recommendation 1 to “support retail/business with a particular emphasis on the town centre”.
3. The Committee did not agree recommendation 13 (allocation of bid site MR038).
4. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr Area Committee and agreed not to allocate bid MR038 in the Proposed LDP. The Committee requested that Officers reconsider the site capacity in respect of bid MR061, in the context of any potential impact on ancient woodland and report further to Full Council.
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 that the allocation in the Proposed Local Development Plan 2020 in respect of bid site MR061 at Glen O'Dee be increased from 40 units to 100 units. Members voted as follows – 25 for the motion that the allocation in the Proposed Local Development Plan 2020 in respect of bid site MR061 at Glen O'Dee be increased from 40 units to 100 units, and 38 for the amendment that the allocation in the Proposed Local Development Plan 2020 in respect of bid site MR061 at Glen O'Dee of 40 units be approved. Two Members declined to vote.

The amendment was carried, and the Council agreed that the allocation in the Proposed Local Development Plan 2020 in respect of bid site MR061 at Glen O'Dee of 40 units be approved.

Issue 156 Cairnie

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
397	Halliday Fraser Munro on behalf of Strathdee Properties Ltd
805	SEPA

2. Issues

General

The updates and proposed alterations to the text in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) were welcomed and considered to be a useful update (397).

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA highlighted the lack of capacity at the Waste Water Treatment Works, highlighting the need to contact Scottish Water (805).

Existing site – OP1

SEPA has outlined that the existing OP1 site is adjacent to activities regulated under SEPA licenses. As such Environmental Health would need to advise on the appropriateness of locating development adjacent to regulated activities and sewage works (805).

Bid MR013

One respondent has welcomed the comment that MR013 could act as a natural expansion to the settlement and it was stated that the progression on to this site following development of the neighbouring OP1 allocation is understood. It was also outlined that the layout would be determined by market demand (397).

3. Actions

General

The comment on the Draft Proposed LDP is acknowledged.

Services and Infrastructure

With regard to waste water treatment, information from Scottish Water confirms that there is no capacity available, and that their five growth criteria would have to be met for additional development. The existing text under “Strategic drainage and water supply” is considered to be sufficient and as such no change is required.

Existing site – OP1

Environmental Health have commented to the Planning Service on the appropriateness and suitability of this development site as part of the planning application approved on OP1.

For existing site OP1 Scottish Water requested to be contacted to ascertain whether a sewer diversion is required; the allocation summary will be updated.

Bid MR013

It is not recommended to allocate bid MR013, particularly with the slow build out of the existing OP1 allocation. Our revised position since the publication of the MIR is that housing sites will not be reserved as possible future opportunity sites (refer to the Issues and Actions paper on 'Shaping Homes and Housing').

4. Recommendations

1. Amend the allocation summary for existing site OP1 to include a statement on sewers.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the above recommendation at their special meeting on 17 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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 157 Clatt

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
805	SEPA

2. Issues

SEPA has stated that the 'Services and Infrastructure' section of the text should highlight that there is no public waste water infrastructure (805).

3. Actions

Information received from Scottish Water confirms there is no sewage capacity and additional development would be required to initiate a growth project once development meets their five growth criteria. The existing text under "Strategic drainage and water supply" is considered to be sufficient and as such no change is required.

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. Remove OP1 due to the lack of delivery, modify the Vision to reflect this removal and amend the settlement boundary accordingly.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the above recommendation at their special meeting on 17 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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 158 Craigwell (Dess)

1. List of Respondents

Number	Respondents
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
805	SEPA

2. Issues

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has stated that the Services and Infrastructure section of the text should highlight that there is no public waste water infrastructure (805).

Bid MR059

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) commented that the site is close to the River Dee and within the enclosing valley, and the large scale of the site would be likely to significantly impact upon the special landscape qualities of the Dee Valley Special Landscape Area within it sits (506).

If the site is allocated, a site brief would be required to ensure the Deeside Way/NCN195 was retained and links to this provided, and to ensure adequate biodiverse open space is incorporated (506).

3. Actions

Services and Infrastructure

The Services and Infrastructure section should be updated to highlight that there is no public waste water infrastructure. Given the lack of any allocations this is potentially not essential, but for completeness and guidance for any ad hoc development this should be considered.

Bid MR059

For reasons set out in the MIR, and having given consideration to comments received from SNH, it is maintained that bid MR059 should not be allocated in the Proposed LDP.

4. Recommendations

1. Update 'Services and Infrastructure' to highlight that there is no public waste water infrastructure.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the above recommendation at their special meeting on 17 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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 159 Crathes

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
997	Crathes, Drumoak & Durriss Community Council

2. Issues

Vision

One respondent has supported the overall strategy for the settlement, particularly for no additional development to be considered, providing time for consolidation and conserving the hall with associated parking for community use (997).

Bid MR078

One respondent supported the Officers' assessment highlighting that the location is in a cold, dark depression that would be unpleasant for a cemetery. There was a question of how much more cemetery space is required and where this is set aside in the Main Issues Report (997).

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) has highlighted that the site includes planted conifer and lies adjacent to mixed planted/semi-natural conifer and broadleaved woodland (506).

3. Actions

Vision

Support for the Settlement Strategy and Vision is noted.

Bid MR078

Support for the Officers' recommendation is acknowledged. The Council's Landscape Services identify when and where cemetery space may be required. As part of early stakeholder engagement Landscape Services has identified areas for additional cemetery space across Aberdeenshire and these are noted as Reserved sites in the Draft Proposed Development Plan. There is satisfaction that as the bid is by an external party the recommendation for this site will not impact on the provision of sufficient cemetery space within the Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP).

The potential impact on the woodland is noted as one of a number of constraints highlighted within the Main Issues Report, and opinion is maintained that this site should not be allocated in the Proposed LDP.

Existing Site – OP1

OP1 is recommended for removal as completion is anticipated before 2021.

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. Amend the Vision to include references to conserving the hall with associated parking.
2. Remove OP1 as the site is under construction and likely to be completed in 2019.
3. Amend the settlement boundary to include gardens of existing properties and ground associated with the hall, and update protected land.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 17 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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 160 Drumblade

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
467	John Wink Design on behalf of Mr James Innes
805	SEPA

2. Issues

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA advised that there is no waste water treatment available in the settlement but outlines that the preference would be for a single combined, adoptable treatment solution to be found. It was also stated that there is no Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) requirement from SEPA (805).

Bid MR045

One respondent supports the inclusion of MR045 as providing a natural addition to the settlement, supporting the local primary school, enhancing the character of the surrounding area and support local needs (467).

3. Actions

Services and Infrastructure

Information received from Scottish Water confirms there is no public sewer available. The Settlement Statement should be amended to reflect that a combined waste water treatment solution is preferred and that an FRA is not required.

Bid MR045

Support for the bid site is acknowledged. For reasons set out in the MIR, and having given consideration to comments received, it is maintained that bid MR045 should be allocated in the Proposed Local Development Plan.

4. Recommendations

1. Update 'Services and Infrastructure' and 'Flood Risk' of the Settlement Statement to reflect the latest information received and the desire for a combined waste water treatment solution.
2. Remove OP1 as the site is under construction and likely to be completed before 2021.
3. Allocate MR045 for 5 homes.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 17 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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 161 Drumdelgie

1. List of respondents

Number	Respondents
506	Scottish Natural Heritage

2. Issues

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) outlines that site MR037 is adjacent to ancient woodland (506).

3. Actions

The comment from SNH is noted. For reasons set out in the MIR, it is maintained that bid MR037/existing site OP1 should not be allocated in the Proposed LDP due to lack of delivery.

4. Recommendations

1. Remove OP1 (MR037) due to lack of delivery and remove the Settlement Statement.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the above recommendation at their special meeting on 17 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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 162 Finzean

1. List of Respondents

Number	Respondents
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
805	SEPA

2. Issues

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA advised that there is no waste water treatment available in the settlement but outlines that the preference would be for a single combined, adoptable treatment solution to be found (805).

Bid MR007

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) has advised that there are trees on part of site MR007 and a watercourse runs through it (506).

3. Actions

Services and Infrastructure

Information received from Scottish Water confirms there is no public sewer available. The Settlement Statement should be amended to reflect that a combined waste water treatment solution is preferred.

Bid MR007

For reasons set out in the MIR, and having given consideration to comments received including from SNH, it is maintained that bid MR007 should not be allocated in the Proposed Local Development Plan.

Bid MR008

For reasons set out in the MIR, it is maintained that bid MR008 should be allocated in the Proposed Local Development Plan.

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. Modify the Vision within the Settlement Statement to reflect the aspirations as expressed in early consultation by stakeholders.

2. Update 'Services and Infrastructure' of the Settlement Statement to reflect the latest information received and the desire for a combined waste water treatment solution.
3. Remove OP1 as the site is under construction and likely to be completed in 2019.
4. Allocate MR008 for 8 homes. The allocation summary for the site should include a statement on design, landscape (including screening), and a construction method statement.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 17 September 2019 including an additional recommendation to adjust the settlement boundary.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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 163 Forgue

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
805	SEPA

2. Issues

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA note that the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) highlighted that there is no waste water treatment servicing the settlement. It is preferred that all proposed properties within a development connect to a single waste water treatment plant (WWTP). The treatment plant must be installed to a standard that can be adopted by Scottish Water. SEPA would not be likely to approve any proposal for single individual waste water discharges (805).

Existing Site – OP2

While this site currently has planning permission SEPA note that if the applicant seeks to renew or extend this consent, or seeks a different consent for planning permission again, then a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) would be required. A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse and should be integrated as a positive feature of the development. Enhancement of the straightened watercourse through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated (805).

3. Actions

Services and Infrastructure

Information received from Scottish Water confirms there is no public sewer available. The Settlement Statement should be amended to reflect that a combined waste water treatment solution is preferred.

Existing Site – OP1

No comments were received for this existing site. The retention of this site in the Proposed LDP is recommended.

Existing Site – OP2

The comment from SEPA is noted and it is considered that an amendment to the allocation summary is appropriate.

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. Modify the Vision within the settlement statement to reflect the aspirations as expressed in early consultation by stakeholders including the Community Council. Add text to the Vision to include references to encourage small scale growth.
2. Update 'Services and Infrastructure' and 'Flood Risk' of the Settlement Statement to reflect the latest information received.
3. Retain existing site OP1.
4. Amend the allocation summary for existing site OP2 to include an FRA, enhancement of the watercourse and a watercourse buffer strip.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 17 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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 164 Gartly

1. List of Respondents

None.

2. Issues

No issues were raised in respect of Gartly.

3. Actions

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 included the amendment to the Vision, removal of 'Flood Risk' section and removal of existing site OP1.

4. Recommendations

1. Modify the Vision within the settlement statement to reflect the aspirations as expressed in early consultation by stakeholders. Add text to the Vision to include references to the lack of shop/meeting space and desire for improvements to recreation facilities.
2. Remove 'Flood Risk' section.
3. Remove existing site OP1 due to the lack of delivery and amend the settlement boundary accordingly.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 17 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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 165 Glass

1. List of Respondents

None.

2. Issues

No issues were raised in respect of Glass.

3. Actions

Bid MR016 / Existing Site OP1

For reasons set out in the MIR, it is maintained that bid MR016 should not be allocated in the Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) and the existing site OP1 removed.

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 included the amendment to the Vision, the addition of Reserved Land and the removal of existing site OP1.

4. Recommendations

1. Modify the Vision within the Settlement Statement to reflect the aspirations as expressed in early consultation by stakeholders. Add text to the Vision to include references to community desire for a new hall and associated parking facilities.
2. Add Reserved Land for a community park and car park associated with the hall (in accordance with APP/2016/2398) and amend the settlement boundary accordingly.
3. Remove existing site OP1 due to the lack of delivery and amend the settlement boundary accordingly.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 17 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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 166 Glenkindie

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
805	SEPA

2. Issues

SEPA noted that no reference is made regarding the existing waste water drainage facility in the draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) for Glenkindie. There is public waste water drainage, covering part of the settlement. Consultation with Scottish Water is necessary to confirm that future population growth is within the design criteria for the sewage treatment works and if not, the need for an upgrade may be required. This should be highlighted in the Plan (805).

3. Actions

With regard to waste water treatment, information from Scottish Water confirms that there is no capacity available, and that their five growth criteria would have to be met for additional development.

4. Recommendations

1. Update 'Services and Infrastructure' of the Settlement Statement to reflect the latest information received.
2. Retain existing site OP1.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 17 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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 167 Huntly

1. List of respondents

Number	Respondents
8	Mr John Rhind
74	Mr Alistair Punt
318	Ms June Cameron
466	John Wink Design on behalf of Mr James Innes
468	John Wink Design on behalf of Mr James Innes
470	John Wink Design on behalf of Mr James Innes
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
513	Halliday Fraser Munro on behalf of ANM Group Ltd
798	Ryden LLP on behalf of Scotia Homes Limited and Drumrossie Homes Limited
805	SEPA
816	John Wink Design on behalf of Mr Alistair Campbell
1009	Historic Environment Scotland

2. Issues

General

The settlement is incapable of delivering the strategic housing requirement (798).

Flood Risk

SEPA have requested that a flood risk assessment should still be highlighted as a requirement for OP1. They have also noted that flood risk assessments may be required for OP3 and OP6. OP3 and OP6 would require a buffer strip (805).

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has noted that the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) uses former text and they understand there is further capacity at the Huntly Waste Water Treatment Works (805).

Existing Sites – OP1, OP2, OP3

Support has been expressed for reserving OP1 (816), OP2 (513, 816) and OP3 (816). It has been highlighted that access constraints are close to a resolution and there is commitment to providing a mix of housing to meet needs (816).

One respondent highlights that OP2 is capable of being developed separately from OP1 and OP3, utilising the existing road network along its south and west boundaries.

There is confidence of a future increased market demand, possibly linked with the A96 dualling, which would reduce shared infrastructure costs for OP2 (513).

Wording has been provided for a development brief for OP2 to highlight its suitability for around 100 homes, existing access opportunities and respecting the setting of Battlehill (513).

Concern has been expressed in relation to OP1 and OP3 and the increased risk of flooding on these sites due to climate change (318).

Existing Sites - OP4, OP5 / Bid MR003

One respondent considers the housing allocation should be reallocated due to the sewer constraint (8).

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) raised that OP4/OP5 should ensure adequate biodiverse open space, provision for active travel and link to the core path (506).

Bid MR001

SNH agrees with the Officers' assessment (not preferred) on landscape impact for a reason to not support the site (506).

Support has been expressed for allocating the bid as the site can be screened, is not at risk of flooding and is now protected by upstream protection works. The housing allocation for OP4 and OP5 should be relocated to this site due to the existing allocations' sewer constraint (8).

SNH recommended a site brief to ensure adequate biodiverse open space, provision for active travel and a link to the core path (506).

Bid MR002

Support has been expressed for affordable housing in this location over employment use as this employment opportunity has not progressed and there is available employment land elsewhere within the settlement (8).

SNH recommended a site brief to ensure adequate biodiverse open space, provision for active travel and a link to the core path (506).

Bid MR011

Support has been expressed for housing on this site as the missives are concluded with a new house builder to deliver affordable housing (74).

SNH recommended a site brief to ensure adequate biodiverse open space, provision for active travel and a link to the core path (506).

Bid MR044

SNH agrees with the Officers' assessment (not preferred) on landscape impact for a reason to not support the site (506).

Support has been expressed for allocating the site as there is commitment to its delivery to enhance and support the employment opportunities for the settlement (466). One respondent highlighted that the site is a natural extension of Linnorie Business Park and a planning application can address visual impact through a strategic landscaping plan. It was commented that the farm shop use would provide local produce more than supermarkets and the use would benefit from its accessible location. It is considered that the site can be accessed from the A97 and achieve the necessary visibility splays (466).

SNH recommended a site brief to ensure adequate biodiverse open space and provision for active travel (506).

Bid MR046

SNH agrees with the Officers' assessment (not preferred) on landscape impact as a reason to not support the site (506). Support has been expressed for allocating the site on the basis that there should be land available to meet market demand and existing sites BUS3 and OP6 have not progressed. The site would provide employment opportunities to meet the settlement planning objectives and the A96 dualling will stimulate demand for both housing and employment opportunities (468).

It has been noted that the location of the site provides a stronger connection between the existing business parks on both sides of the A96 compared to BUS3 and OP6 and given the adjacent allocations, it is in character with the area (468).

SNH raised that the site should ensure adequate biodiverse open space and provision for active travel (506).

Bid MR047

SNH has highlighted that there should be provision for active travel (506).

Bid MR066

Historic Environment Scotland identified that the Category A listed Scott's Hospital is a constraint to this site due to the potential impact on views from the asset (1009).

Support has been expressed for allocating the site as it is within the settlement and relates well to the surrounding area. It has been highlighted a flood risk assessment would be carried out to assist with the number and layout of housing. In addition, the density could be adjusted to not compromise amenity. It has been highlighted that the site is screened from the A96 and a full landscaping plan would be provided with a planning application (470).

SNH recommended a site brief to ensure adequate biodiverse open space, provision for active travel and link to the core path (506). One representation highlights the site would provide linked open space and path connectivity (470).

3. Actions

General

We acknowledge the comment on the strategic housing requirement and we note the uncertainty on the deliverability of the existing sites. This has been taken account of below where alternative sites are recommended.

Flood Risk

The existing Settlement Statement for Huntly acknowledges the flood risk for the settlement and that associated with OP6. It would be appropriate to add text regarding the requirement for a buffer strip and the potential requirement for a flood risk assessment. Please see below regarding the recommendations for OP1 and OP3.

Services and Infrastructure

Information received from Scottish Water confirms that there is capacity at the Huntly Waste Water Treatment Works. Text should be amended under “Strategic drainage and water supply” to reflect the current position with regard to waste water drainage.

Existing Sites – OP1, OP2, OP3

Whilst the MIR identified the sites as future opportunity sites, in accordance with the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan (SDP) sufficient additional housing land allocations are identified in the Rural Housing Market Area. OP2 and OP3 are long term infrastructure constrained sites that will be allocated for 15+ years by the start of the Proposed LDP period. OP1, whilst a latter allocation, has not facilitated the delivery of the sites in the east of Huntly. There has been no change in circumstances or progress made on any of these sites that promotes confidence of their deliverability within the next Plan period.

The flood risk comments are acknowledged. However, no action is required in this regard.

Existing Sites - OP4, OP5 / Bid MR003

The MIR recommended the reservation and removal of OP4 and OP5 respectively. However, in accordance with the SDP sufficient additional housing land allocations are identified in the Rural Housing Market Area. OP4 and OP5 are long term infrastructure constrained sites that will be allocated for 15+ years by the start of the Proposed LDP period. There has been no change in circumstances or progress made on either of these sites that promotes confidence of their deliverability within the next Plan period.

The comments regarding biodiverse open space and connectivity are noted. However, no action is required in this regard.

Bid MR001

It is noted that SNH support the landscape reasons for the recommendation. The comments regarding biodiverse open space and connectivity are noted. However, no action is required in this regard.

It is acknowledged that the flood risk on the site may not impede the delivery of the site however a recent flood risk assessment would be necessary to determine this. Nonetheless, it is maintained that this is not a preferred site due to the concerns for landscape impact.

The constraints on OP4 and OP5 are noted however the reallocation of the housing to this location is not considered appropriate for the above reasons.

Bid MR002

Support for the site is acknowledged. For reasons set out in the MIR, and having given consideration to comments received, we maintain that bid MR002 should be allocated in the Proposed LDP. With regard to the request made by SNH to ensure that adequate provision is made for biodiverse open space, policies are in place that require all development to enhance biodiversity and provide adequate public open space. Policies are also in place to ensure the consideration of active travel and connectivity to path networks.

Bid MR011

The supporting comment is acknowledged. For reasons set out in the MIR, and having given consideration to comments received, we maintain that bid MR011 should be allocated in the Proposed LDP. With regard to the request made by SNH to ensure that adequate provision is made for biodiverse open space, policies are in place that require all development to enhance biodiversity and provide adequate public open space. Policies are also in place to ensure the consideration of active travel and connectivity to path networks.

Bid MR044

The support for the allocation of the site is acknowledged. However, SNH's support of the landscape reasons for the recommendation that has been made is noted. It is maintained that this site is not a suitable extension to Huntly. Sufficient unconstrained employment land is available through existing sites to meet the requirements of the SDP and there is not a particular need for significant additional employment land within Huntly.

The comments regarding biodiverse open space and connectivity are noted. However, no action is required in this regard.

Bid MR046

The support for the allocation of the site is acknowledged. The support from SNH of the landscape reasons for the recommendation is noted. It is maintained that this site is not a suitable extension to Huntly. Sufficient employment land is available through

existing sites to meet the requirements of the SDP. It is considered that there is not a particular need for significant additional employment land within Huntly and existing sites are available without constraint.

The comments regarding biodiverse open space and connectivity are noted. However, no action is required in this regard.

Bid MR047

For reasons set out in the MIR, and having given consideration to comments received, it is maintained that bid MR047 should be allocated in the Proposed LDP. With regard to the request made by SNH, policies are in place to ensure the consideration of active travel and connectivity of sites.

Bid MR066

The support for the allocation of the site is noted. Whilst they alleviate some concern regarding path connectivity, it remains unclear at this time whether an allocation would have an appropriate road access, be able to accommodate flood risk and not result in an impact on a Category A listed building. In light of this, it is not considered an appropriate site for development due to the significant concerns regarding its deliverability.

Comments regarding biodiverse open space and connectivity are noted. However, no action is required in this regard.

Bid MR067

No comments were received for this bid. For reasons set out in the MIR, it is maintained that bid MR067 should not be allocated in the Proposed LDP.

Windfall Site

It is considered appropriate to identify in the Proposed LDP windfall site APP/2017/0783 (a business park) to the east of existing site OP6 as an opportunity site and amend the settlement boundary to accommodate this including the adjoining built-up area.

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. Modify the Vision within the Settlement Statement to reflect the aspirations as expressed in early consultation by local stakeholders, including the Community Council. Add text to the Vision to include references to local character, conserving the town centre and increasing connectivity.

2. Update areas of protected land including the golf course as forming part of the green network
3. Update 'Services and Infrastructure' of the Settlement Statement to reflect the latest information received.
4. Remove existing sites OP1, OP2, OP3, OP4 and OP5 and amend the settlement boundary accordingly.
5. Add the following text to the allocation summary for OP6:
"A Flood Risk Assessment may be required. A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse on site and should be integrated as a positive feature of the development. Enhancement of the straightened watercourse and removal of any redundant features should be investigated."
6. Allocate bid site MR002 for 50 affordable homes, MR011 for 52 affordable homes and MR047 for employment land.
7. Add the proposed development area for planning application APP/2017/0783 as an opportunity site in the Proposed LDP for a business park including Class 2 (Financial, Professional and Other Services) and Class 4 (Business) Uses. The settlement boundary should be amended to include this and the surrounding built-up area.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 17 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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 168 Inchmarlo

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
49	Mr Ron McGraw
69	Ms Jane Innes
81	Messrs Dennis & Weston Archdale
82	Messrs Dennis & Weston Archdale
90	Mr & Mrs Malcolm & Christina Wilson
91	Mr Tom Smitton
104	Dr David Cooper
175	Mr William Laver on behalf of Mrs I J Shaw
201	Mr & Mrs Nick & Heather Hall
290	Banchory Community Council
309	Mr James Ian Wood
316	Mr & Mrs G & J Starbuck
320	Miss Jean Butchart
497	Mr Ken Gow
499	Mr Ian Chapman
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
613	Ms Patricia Graham
641	Mr Phil Allen
677	Ms Cora Hamilton
726	Valerie Chapman
731	Feughdee West Community Council
737	Mr Alan Sealy
750	Ms Shaheen Salaripour
805	SEPA
916	Ms Rachel Knox
942	Barton Willmore on behalf of Skene Enterprises (Aberdeen) Ltd
961	Scott Forbes
1026	Mrs Patience Barton
1028	Mr Christopher Dunn

2. Issues

Flood Risk

SEPA has advised that the text "Parts of Inchmarlo are in an area potentially vulnerable to flood risk as identified by the National Flood Risk Assessment. Flood Risk

Assessments (FRA) may be required" should be added to the Settlement Statement (805).

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has noted that the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) highlighted Inchmarlo Septic Tank as being for the retired community only. However, they are not clear if OP1 development is connected with the retirement community. If it is, it should be ensured that the population growth is within the current design criteria for the sewage treatment works, and if not, an upgrade may be required. Other development not associated with the retirement community would be expected to connect to the public network (805).

Existing Site – OP1

There is support for the continued allocation of OP1 to enable the sustainable delivery of housing programmed for the existing Inchmarlo Continuing Care Retirement Community site (942).

SEPA has advised that should the extant planning permission expire for OP1, an updated Flood Risk Assessment may be required (805).

Bid MR012

The site was considered to be within an area of high flood risk and without facilities (309).

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) has noted that the site is close to Burn of Canny/River Dee Special Area of Conservation. There may be a requirement for a construction method statement if this site were to be developed (506).

Bid MR050

In support of the bid (in agreement with the Officers' recommendation of "preferred"), the one representation has accepted the reduced capacity/reduced site area from 200 homes to 120 homes, and confirmed that an FRA and Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) would be provided through the planning application process, and landscape impact would be considered as part of any design or masterplan (942).

It was considered that the development would help ensure the long term future and viability of the Inchmarlo Retirement Community (201, 942), and preserve the unique Inchmarlo setting (201). There was also support for the proposal as long as the new homes are part of the retirement community and that there is improved public transport to reduce car use, retain independence and reduce social isolation (737). Although it was questioned whether the location is suitable for older people (750), and whether older people should be within a mixed community of young and old together (309).

Other respondents have viewed the bid less favourably due to the limited amenities and facilities to serve the number of homes proposed by MR050 (81, 82, 104, 613, 309, 916), and concern that basic facilities at the care village have remained the same

despite increasing numbers of homes, with limited medical facilities, accommodation and other provision e.g. inadequate dining room in Inchmarlo House (104, 309). It was considered that the attractiveness of the original concept of the retirement community is declining largely due to lack of community facilities (104). It was highlighted that there is a link between residential care beds at Inchmarlo House and the 'emergency medical response' provided to home owners on the Inchmarlo Estate, and therefore the number of new properties should be linked to provision of the residential beds (104). Added pressure on the wider community's services, in particular the GP surgery, and/or capacity of existing infrastructure was also a concern (731, 916, 961, 1026).

It has been stated that Councillors have previously voted that Inchmarlo Continuing Care community has reached its limits (613). There was concern about the lack of provision for 'buyback', shared ownership or renting alternatives (104), and it is considered that rentable sheltered housing should be included (731). It was highlighted that existing properties on the Inchmarlo Estate are left empty and unsold, and it is questioned why more homes need to be built when the current supply seems to exceed demand (104). It is felt there is a lack of open discussion between the developer/enterprise company and the Inchmarlo community (not helped by lack of meeting space), and that the enterprise company will 'do as it chooses' (104).

There is opposition to this development due to increased car usage/car dependency (613, 731, 916, 961, 1026, 1028). There are no safe walking or cycling routes to access local services some distance away (613), and there are road safety concerns regarding the current A93 entrance (81, 82 613, 731, 1028). Although East Lodge is considered a safer entrance than the A93 (1028).

There were concerns about the negative impact of the development due to scale and prominence of the scheme being in an elevated, visible position in the landscape (69, 497, 731) and with potential impact on drainage/flooding as it is a sloping site (731). Extensive landscaping and significant planting would be required, however sympathetic scale, density and design could help mitigate the impact (69). There was concern regarding urbanisation caused by expansion of the care village (497, 1026, 1028), together with ribbon development (497), light pollution and coalescence of Banchory and Inchmarlo (731, 916, 961). Furthermore, the proposal is outwith the natural boundary of Inchmarlo and its immediate grounds which are bordered by a dyke/stream (1026).

There were objections due to wildlife impact (731), loss of good agricultural land (1026), and disturbance from construction (1028).

SNH recommended a site brief to ensure there is retention and enhancement of existing woodland of value, together with meaningful biodiverse open space and recreational footpaths. Active travel links to Banchory should be considered (506).

SEPA has advised an FRA may be required due to small watercourses running through the site. Buffer strips will be required adjacent to the watercourses and should be

integrated as positive features of the development. Enhancement of any straightened watercourse and removal of any redundant features should be investigated (805).

Bid MR068

A number of respondents are opposed to this development, in line with the Officers' recommendation of "not preferred" (49, 69, 90, 91, 175, 201, 290, 309, 316, 320, 499, 613, 641, 726, 731, 737, 916, 961). Reasons cited include lack of proximity and/or connectivity to Banchory causing car dependency, increased traffic and/or concern about unsuitable/narrow road access (49, 69, 90, 175, 290, 309, 499, 613, 641, 726, 731, 737, 916, 961) with no safe access to Banchory by foot or cycle (613). There was a specific concern about the added traffic together with the adjacent approved development (windfall site, planning application ref APP/2015/2350) (49, 731), and one respondent considered the bid site should be assessed after the adjacent windfall site has been delivered (49). Development at the Hill of Banchory is preferred in terms of road traffic, public transport, access to the AWPR, and being better located in terms of other infrastructure and existing facilities (90).

There was concern regarding impact on the rural/semi-rural character of the area causing urbanisation, and/or overdevelopment due to the scale of the site (69, 90, 91, 641, 916), including concern about cumulative impact of development in the area (90, 91) and light pollution (916, 961). The site would cause continuous development to the north of the A93 (641) and coalescence of Banchory and Inchmarlo (290, 916, 961). It was also highlighted that the bid application did not show approved developments on adjacent sites, including tree felling that took place (916).

Respondents have objected to loss of green space, trees, and natural habitat for wildlife, in particular as the bid site has returned to its natural state of wetlands, rough grassland and trees (91, 175, 316, 677, 916). It was considered that this development would contradict one of the priorities highlighted in the MIR to "protect our special area" (91).

Loss of open space and the amenity/leisure/recreational/tourism use was raised as a concern, (49, 90, 91, 641, 731, 737), and it is considered that the bid would overturn the current LDP land use designation (49). The existing site should be retained and enhanced as a positive feature or returned to community use for recreation (750). Also, the old golf course is poorly drained, with potential flood/drainage implications for neighbouring properties (90, 175, 641, 677). A golf course going into liquidation should not result in large housing developments as this would set a precedent (309).

Impact on the amenity and security of the Inchmarlo Estate retirement community has been highlighted for a number of reasons including opened up pedestrian and vehicular access, having mixed housing adjacent that would cause noise disturbance including construction noise (104, 175, 201, 320, 641, 677, 175). Development of bid MR068 may render bid site MR050 unattractive to potential buyers (81, 82). There was also

concern about impact on the nearby holiday accommodation, and that MR068 development may render the 9 hole golf course unviable (201).

There was agreement with the MIR that schools, local services, facilities and/or infrastructure would not be able to support the scale of development proposed (69, 90, 91, 290, 309, 499, 613, 726, 731, 916, 961). The site is not justified, nor is it beneficial to anyone other than the developer (49).

SNH has highlighted this is a large scale site, with the potential for significant impacts on, and erosion of, the qualities of the Dee Valley Special Landscape Area (SLA) and the immediate northern setting to the Inchmarlo site which includes, and is adjacent to ancient woodland. If allocated, a site brief is recommended to ensure adequate biodiverse open space, links to core paths to the south and east, and active travel provision to link any development to Banchory.

Windfall site

Respondents have noted that the 'windfall' (i.e. unallocated) site Planning Application Ref. APP/2015/2350 that was cited in the MIR does not appear on the settlement plan nor as an allocation in the Draft Proposed LDP, but the site should be included (290, 805). SEPA felt that this should be included as an allocation, considering the timescale and scale of housing (805).

3. Actions

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 LDP.

Services and Infrastructure

Information received from Scottish Water confirms that a potential SR21 growth project is planned for Inchmarlo Septic Tank that serves OP1 Inchmarlo Continuing Care Community. It would be appropriate to update the Settlement Statement accordingly.

Existing Site – OP1

There is acknowledgement of the support for this existing allocation.

Text should be added to reflect the amendments sought on the FRA text for existing sites OP1.

Bid MR012

For reasons set out in the MIR, and having given consideration to comments received from SNH, it is maintained that bids MR012 should not be allocated in the Proposed LDP.

MR050

It is acknowledged that there is a level of support for this bid site with benefits recognised from potential development. For reasons set out in the MIR, and having given consideration to comments received including from SNH, it is maintained that bid MR050 should be allocated in the Proposed LDP. Support is given for care communities and as such it is considered appropriate to provide an additional allocation to maintain the growth of this community. The concerns raised in relation to the capacity of the facility and the lack of amenities and subsequent impact on infrastructure and Banchory services would need to be assessed as part of a planning application. The operation of the care community including issues in terms of how the existing housing stock is managed is not a consideration for the Proposed LDP.

In terms of environmental impact, the bid site has not been identified as prime agricultural land and a reduced boundary area (from that proposed in the bid submission) removes areas of woodland from the site. With regard to the request made by SNH to ensure that adequate provision is made for biodiverse open space, policies are in place that require all development to enhance biodiversity and provide adequate public open space.

The allocation summary will include statements to reflect information received on matters to be taken into account during the assessment of any planning application.

MR068

It is acknowledged that there is notable concern for development of this site. For reasons set out in the MIR, and having given consideration to comments received including from SNH, it is maintained that bid MR068 should not be allocated in the Proposed LDP.

Windfall site

To ensure consistency with the Housing Land Audit, and implemented planning permission, it is considered appropriate to identify in the Proposed LDP windfall site APP/2011/2402 (tourism, leisure, business and residential) where delivery is projected during the 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. Update 'Services and Infrastructure' and 'Flood Risk' of the Settlement Statement to reflect the latest information received.
2. Update areas of protected land including the existing golf course as forming part of the green network and to recognise its importance in providing a setting to the settlement.

3. Amend text on flood risk for existing site OP1 should planning permissions be subject to change.
4. Allocate bid MR050 for 120 homes. The allocation summary for the site should include a statement on landscaping, built heritage, retention/enhancement of existing woodland, paths, and FRA/watercourse buffer strip.
5. Add the proposed development area for planning application APP/2011/2402 to the Settlement Statement as an allocation. The allocation summary should include statements covering matters such as woodland, open space, biodiversity, landscaping, paths, buffer strips, archaeology and drainage impact assessments, should planning permissions be subject to change.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 17 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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 169 Keig

1. List of Respondents

None.

2. Issues

No issues were raised in respect of Keig.

3. Actions

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 included the removal of existing site OP1 and amendment to the allocation summary for existing site OP2.

4. Recommendations

1. Remove existing site OP1 due to the lack of delivery and amend the settlement boundary accordingly.
2. Retain existing site OP2 for 13 homes in accordance with planning permissions granted.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 17 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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 170 Kennethmont

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
471	John Wink Design on behalf of Mr David Grant
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
805	SEPA

2. Issues

Services and Infrastructure

In relation to strategic drainage and water supply, SEPA has noted that the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) uses the former text 'no capacity and a growth project will be initiated'. It is suggested that the developer should contact Scottish Water early in the planning process to initiate a growth project for an upgrade to the public Waste Water Treatment Works (805).

Existing sites - OP1 (bid MR064) and OP3

It has been highlighted that during the current Plan period (Local Development Plan 2017), pre-application discussion with the Planning Authority was carried out along with their consultees and a full planning permission for 32 homes was submitted in April 2019 (471). The respondent proposes that business plots can be sold along with each housing plot, or be made available to local business within the existing community. It is considered this may bring new opportunities to the village and the potential to allow people to live and work in the community. In addition, development would reduce the need for a long distance commute (471).

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) has requested adequate provision is made for biodiverse open space, links to core paths to the north of the site and active travel provision to, for example, the school (506).

Bid MR063

If site MR063 is allocated, SNH has recommended a site brief to ensure adequate biodiverse open space, links to core paths to the north of the site and active travel provision to, for example, the school (506).

Bid MR065

If site MR065 is allocated, SNH has requested adequate provision is made for biodiverse open space, links to core paths to the north of the site and active travel provision to, for example, the school (506).

3. Actions

Services and Infrastructure

With regard to waste water treatment, Scottish Water confirms there is limited capacity at Kennethmont Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW) and a growth project has been initiated. Text should be added under 'Strategic drainage and water supply' to reflect the current position.

Existing sites - OP1 (bid MR064) and OP3

It is noted that a planning application has been submitted for 32 homes with associated infrastructure (planning application reference APP/2019/071). Given that this application is currently pending a decision, it is considered appropriate to make no change to existing site OP1 at this time, retaining its existing boundaries and allocation status for 30 homes, and make no change to the adjacent existing OP3 allocation for employment uses.

With regard to the request made by SNH to ensure that adequate provision is made for biodiverse open space, policies are in place that require all development to enhance biodiversity and provide adequate public open space. However, the allocation summary text should be amended to include a requirement to link to core paths and make active travel provision.

Bid MR063

The request made by SNH for a site brief is noted, however, in line with the Officers' assessment in the Main Issues Report, the site is not supported. It is considered that the proposal for 70 homes would not be deliverable within the Plan period, constituting overdevelopment of the settlement at this time. No action is required.

Bid MR065

The request made by SNH for open space and active travel provision is noted, however in line with the Officers' assessment in the Main Issues Report, the site is not supported. As a second phase to existing OP1, it is considered that the proposed 40 homes would constitute overdevelopment of the settlement at this time. No action is required.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

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. Amend the Vision statement to update policy reference to: “Policy P4 Hazardous and Potentially Polluting Developments and Contaminated Land”.
2. Under ‘Natural and Historic Environment’ amend reference to the Kennethmont Local Nature Conservation Site to correctly state this lies on the western edge of the settlement (not eastern edge).
3. Update text within ‘Strategic drainage and water supply’ to state there is limited capacity at Kennethmont WWTW, and a growth project has been initiated.
4. Retain existing site OP1 (bid MR064) as an allocation for 30 homes, with no changes to site boundaries, and amend allocation summary text to include the requirement for links to core paths to the north of the site and active travel provision, including links with the school.
5. Remove existing site OP2 on account of the site being under construction and due for completion 2019.
6. Retain existing site OP3 for Employment uses.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the recommendations 1 to 3, 5 and 6 at their special meeting on 17 September 2019.
2. The committee agreed to amend recommendation 4 to 32 homes.
3. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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 171 Kincardine O'Neil

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
67	Mr Colin Leslie
197	Mr & Mrs John & Catherine Nichols
200	Ms Lyndsay MacEwen
254	Ms Jacqueline Keith
255	Mr Maxwell Keith
293	Mr Andrew Graham MacEwen
366	Mr John McCurry
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
544	Mr & Mrs Jean And Norman Abbot
584	Strutt & Parker on behalf of Kincardine Estate
622	Kincardine O'Neil Community Association
623	Kincardine O'Neil Community Association Committee
696	Mr & Mrs Stephen & Jennifer Birkett
699	Ms Patricia Mulhall
701	Mr John Wise
772	Mid Deeside Community Council (MDCC)
778	Mr Robert Farquharson
779	Mr Robert Farquharson
780	Mr Robert Farquharson
781	Mr Robert Farquharson
793	Mrs Moira Holmes
805	SEPA
852	Ms Susan Farquharson
858	Ms Lynne McCurry
870	Ms Rosemary Coleshaw
879	Ms Lesley Stone
892	Mr Timothy Stone
949	Strutt & Parker on behalf of Kincardine Estate

2. Issues

General

One respondent considered it intimidating, confusing and discouraging to comment on development bids in Kincardine O'Neil and its Conservation Area status. The public

are being asked to comment on a judgement made by someone who probably has poor knowledge of the area (781).

Flood Risk

In relation to existing site OP1, SEPA has advised there is no requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (805).

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has noted that the wording used in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) under 'Strategic drainage and water supply' uses the former text "limited capacity and a growth project will be initiated." SEPA's understanding is that a growth project has been initiated for the settlement. The progress of the growth project and delivery date should be verified to ensure there is adequate capacity at the public Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW) for the developments (805).

Bid MR017, MR018, MR019

The comments below comprise a combined summary of responses to MR017, MR018 and MR019 ("the development") since these bids are for the same proposal of 84 homes on the same site, but with three different delivery timescales proposed. Bids MR017 and MR018 were sites "not preferred" in the Main Issues Report, and bid MR019 was recommended as a reserved site "not preferred for immediate development".

In support of development of MR019, one respondent considered this is a logical location for a future phased development which would allow the community to retain valued local services. This respondent considered that members of the community seeking to prevent the development are residents immediately adjacent to the site and that no declarations of interest were made as part of Kincardine O'Neil Community Association Committee's response to the MIR (949).

Respondents considered that the views of the community should be taken account of, that the applicant/developer has shown disregard for these views, the site had been rejected in the past, and that a recent consultation exercise run by the Community states that the majority of respondents rejected the site (67, 293, 778, 779, 780). Respondents noted the proposal would not support the Kincardine O'Neil Community Vision to develop local services, to be sustainable and focussing on its history, culture, leisure and tourism (293, 366). It is considered that greater consultation is needed, with a more progressive vision drawn up by villagers in consultation with the Council (858). Another respondent considers the community should start to build its own vision along the lines of the 'Local Place Plan' concept proposed through the new Planning Bill (293).

There was considerable opposition to the development taking place within any of the proposed timescales, primarily because the respondents considered the proposal would cause large scale growth and over-development in relation to the size of the village, with associated impacts including landscape and visual impact (due to a prominent location),

impact on the Dee Valley Special Landscape Area (SLA), archaeological site, erosion of the historic character of the Conservation Area and/or concerns regarding access, traffic, road safety, increase in carbon footprint, and general lack of services, facilities and infrastructure to support this development (67, 197, 200, 254, 255, 293, 366, 544, 622, 623, 696, 699, 701, 772, 778, 779, 780, 793, 852, 858, 870, 879, 892).

Respondents questioned the level of need for housing considering the settlement's location outwith a 'Strategic Growth Area' (366, 858, 892) and the sustainability of further growth in addition to recent significant growth (67, 293, 622, 852, 858, 892). It is noted that as the MR019 proposal is for 10+ years, this would be beyond the Plan period (200). It was considered that the development would turn the west end of the village into a housing estate that would dominate the village (701, 892), creating a 'dormitory' (67) and 'satellite' of Aberdeen (870). It is felt that the village should be left alone (67) and that it needs time to consolidate following recent major development in order to identify issues to be taken into account for future housing development (892).

There are more suitable sites available and smaller/infill developments, as previously happened, are favoured for having less of an impact on the village/conservation area (622, 778, 779, 780, 793, 858, 892). It was argued there is an attempt by the developer to build an excessive number of homes in one part of the village (referring to OP1 and OP2) and once built, to use this to justify building more adjoining them (858). If development is to take place it should be architecturally sympathetic and sited discretely to minimise visual impact (701).

The proposal contradicts the planning objectives stated in the MIR to protect and enhance attractiveness, and in relation to tourist appeal, in particular being in Royal Deeside (67, 852, 858). Respondents disagreed with the Officers' assessment including: that it would not provide natural infill (699, 892), impacts would not be limited (67, 879, 892), that this site "abuts the settlement" is overstated and is opposite the "built up area" (852, 892). Respondents considered the proposal as ribbon, linear development (254, 255, 852, 858) and extending beyond the village boundary and encroaching into the countryside (699, 892). Comparison has been made with the Officers' assessment for bid MR021 which states that due to the A93 sitting raised, with limited visibility below causing minimal visual impact, the MR019 site is on upward sloping fields north of A93 with no way of limiting visual impact on approach (892).

Impact on the Deeside Way has been highlighted as a concern (254, 255, 293) as the path would pass through a built-up area (254), and views across the river and mountains would be lost from the west end (255).

It was considered that the proposed housing development would be contrary to Council policies, particularly in relation to the historic environment, housing growth, and/or the environment (200, 544, 622, 772, 778, 779, 780, 793). It was considered of no benefit to the community to have a conservation area with planning permission restrictions, yet have no restrictions applying to new buildings (255). Other respondents consider the site should not be developed as it is intrinsic to the integrity of the village as an

'Outstanding Conservation Village' and 'Rural Field System' (858), and is on good quality/prime agricultural land which should remain for this use (254, 293, 858). There are no real mitigation options for the serious long-term effects of all the development bids in relation to impact on a conservation area, and yet policy is there to protect the character and appearance of an area (778, 779, 780). Only organic growth and infill should be allowed, designed to fit with and maintain the historic character of the village (852).

Impact on wildlife/protected species was highlighted (254, 255), and that substantial mitigation would be required, but there is little evidence this can be achieved (200).

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) has highlighted the scale of development presented by the development imposes significant impacts on the historic townscape character and wider landscape setting within the Dee Valley SLA, and that the site includes an area of semi-natural broadleaved woodland. The Deeside Way (NCN195) which is also a core path, runs along the north eastern boundary of the bid site. If allocated, the special qualities of the Dee Valley SLA should be taken account of in any site brief/masterplan in particular in the treatment of development which constitutes a new settlement edge, and should respond to the historic townscape. In addition, a site brief would be required to ensure woodland protection/enhancement, adequate biodiverse open space, links to the core path/Deeside Way to the north east of the site and active travel provision to the village centre and the school, together with a high quality meaningful hard and soft landscape proposal (506).

SEPA has identified a possible requirement for a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) to demonstrate there will be no increased flood risk downhill of the site. This requirement should be confirmed with the Flood Risk Unit (805).

Bid MR021

There is support for the proposed development in agreement with the MIR recommendation (an "Officers' preference") as it is considered this would enhance the village by providing more amenities and attractions (622, 772), and would build on the village's historic and cultural heritage, providing tourism and leisure businesses appropriate to the historic Deeside location (366, 858). However, connectivity to the village centre would need to be addressed and provision made for pedestrian and cycle access (622, 879, 892). It has been requested that there is a developer requirement for pedestrian/cyclist access that is not along the A93 or across playing fields, but through Boat Wood (892).

There is support in principle for bid MR021, but with reservations about this leading to substantial further development, notably on the north side of the A93 (544, 892). Respondents also have expressed reservations concerning the character and setting of the village, but with support given to the development as long the site blends in and visual impact is mitigated (544, 879, 696, 892). Visibility of the site from A93 and Deeside Way is a concern (254). To address visual impact, it is suggested that the site

should remain below the level of the road (879), and screening provided from the A93 as per existing development from the south side (892).

Development of the site is not viewed favourably by some on account of there being no pavements and no case for 'connectivity', being too far from the village (200, 254, 779), and it is disagreed that the site would be infill development (778, 779, 780). It is also considered the site would cause linear growth/ribbon development (254, 255, 778, 779, 780, 852), and that it would disrupt the green boundary to the settlement (the playing fields) (852).

It was highlighted that there are other sites within the village that are more accessible and less car dependent that do not require new pavement construction (852). It is considered the former filling station site or the Smiddy is a more suitable/alternative location for the proposed development (200, 892). Whilst MR021 could enhance the village, there is no need to locate it at the end of the settlement, whereas MR057 site could be an ideal location for a farm shop/café, and there are also vacant retail units in the village (699).

It has been assumed that the commercial viability of the project has been confirmed, as businesses have come and gone in the village over the years (696). There is concern about the impact of new business competition on existing local shop/café/services in this small settlement, including loss of visitors exploring the village (67, 254, 255), and it is considered this bid is an attempt to extend the village westwards in order to get MR019 accepted (778, 779, 780). There was concern regarding the siting of advertising boards (254, 255).

SNH has identified the need for active travel links to the site (506).

SEPA has advised that there would be no requirement for an FRA for this site, but has highlighted there should be a developer requirement for a hydromorphological assessment to determine the likelihood of the River Dee adjusting its course at this location (805).

Bid MR023

One respondent has expressed disappointment that the site is "not preferred", despite Officers acknowledging the benefits of the proposed development, and that a small enterprise park would bring jobs and boost the local economy. The respondent states that small businesses have to leave the village in order to grow, due to a lack of larger flexible business units in the village. The proposal is for hardstanding and service connections to allow flexible, modular units to be connected when required (584).

Other respondents have expressed concern about loss of wildlife habitat, (200, 254, 255, 544, 622, 696, 772), including loss of woodland (255, 366, 544, 879), with no suitable land offered for replacement tree planting (879, 892). In support of the development, it has been stated that compensatory tree planting is proposed on an adjacent site to the east, and the bid site would be fringed with trees (584). Whilst one

respondent considered that the land proposed for alternative tree planting is already wild, natural habitat (892).

One respondent noted that a path around the perimeter would be safeguarded and pedestrian access ensured from the village. The respondent also considered the site is not in a high car dependant location as there is good connectivity to the village, and that the site has limited visual impact being located out with the Conservation Area (584).

However, a substantial number of respondents consider the site is an inappropriate location for the proposed use due to having an unsuitable/unsafe road, in particular for commercial traffic being narrow/single track with no pavements, and/or due to the site being remote from the village (67, 200, 254, 255, 293, 366, 544, 622, 696, 772, 778, 779, 780, 793, 852, 892). Pollution was also a concern (696).

The proposal is considered out of keeping with the character of the settlement (197, 544) and is contrary to the conservation objectives of the village (696). The site would be visible from the Deeside Way and would be an eyesore and there was concern about the loss of a path through the site used by children (254, 255).

The site should not be included as there is sufficient opportunity for development both in other allocations and brownfield opportunities (879), and there is agreement that there is no case for additional small business land at this point (892). Others take a stronger view that the development is not required, with no local demand (67, 197), and would be “bonkers” (778, 779, 780).

If allocated, SNH has stated a site brief would be required to ensure woodland protection/enhancement, adequate biodiverse open space, links to the core path/Deeside Way to the south of the site and active travel provision to the village centre and the school (506).

Bid MR057 / Existing Site OP3

There has been support for this site as a suitable development of small scale that is well located, a good fit, with limited impact overall (366, 544, 622, 623, 696, 858, 879, 892). In particular, it was highlighted that this is exactly the type of development that has previously served the village well, helping to maintain its outstanding landscape and cultural identity (892). It was also considered that bid MR057 would have less impact on cultural heritage than bid MR019 (623). However, the houses should be in keeping with the existing settlement with regards to conservation, maintaining rural appeal, and taking into account views (696). Access, flooding and traffic management issues would need to be addressed at the detailed planning stage (622, 772).

The development should be limited to 8 homes as planned (366, 858), unlike other recent development where numbers were increased to maximise profit over what is beneficial for the community (858).

Others have not supported bid MR057 on the basis that the site is not required as there has been other recent development in the village (699), and the site would impact on the character and appearance of the village and be contrary to policies on historic environment (778, 779, 780).

SNH has noted that the site is adjacent to the River Dee Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and identifies the requirement for a construction method statement (506).

SEPA has advised that an FRA **will** be required to determine the developable area. SEPA also advise that the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and the Draft Proposed LDP are inconsistent with regard to developer requirements. Additional text should be added to state that the buffer strip will need to allow sufficient space for restoration of the Neil Burn, and enhancement of the straightened watercourse and removal of any redundant features will be required to be investigated (805).

3. Actions

General

The respondent's comments regarding the consultation process are acknowledged. However, consultation is undertaken in accordance with the agreed Development Plan Scheme for the production of the LDP.

Flood Risk

Text should be amended to reflect the comments from SEPA for existing site OP1.

Services and Infrastructure

Information received from Scottish Water confirms the WWTW has limited capacity available and additional development would be required to initiate a growth project once development meets their five growth criteria.

Existing Sites

OP1/OP2 is recommended to be amended to remove the housing element that is anticipated to be completed before 2021.

Bid MR017, MR018, MR019

The significant level of objection to the development of this site is acknowledged including the issues raised from SNH and SEPA. In light of the recommendations to not have Future Opportunity sites, as discussed under "Issue 8 Shaping Homes and Housing", this site is not recommended to be brought forward as an allocation. In accordance with the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan (SDP) sufficient additional housing land allocations are identified in the Rural Housing Market Area. It is considered that Kincardine O'Neil would benefit from a period of time to consolidate and react to recent and ongoing growth. The existing OP3 site would maintain an appropriately small opportunity for housing development during the Plan period.

Bid MR021

A level of support for this bid site with benefits recognised from potential development is acknowledged. For reasons set out in the MIR, and having given consideration to comments received including from SNH and SEPA, it is maintained that bid MR021 should be allocated in the Proposed LDP. It is agreed that the allocation summary should include requirements for landscaping and path connectivity where possible. As part of any planning application, any proposal on the site would have to comply with the relevant policies and therefore issues such as active travel links (and where they can be appropriately provided), design and River impacts would require to be assessed and mitigated if necessary. The advertisement aspect may also fall under the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (Scotland) Regulations 1984 and require additional consent.

Bid proposers are required to confirm that the site is deliverable as part of their bid submissions. It is considered that this small scale opportunity is appropriate and complimentary to the adjoining BUS site uses within this part of the settlement.

The allocation summary will include statements to reflect information received on matters to be taken into account during the assessment of any planning application.

Bid MR023

For reasons set out in the MIR, and having given consideration to comments received including from SNH, it is maintained that bid MR023 should not be allocated in the Proposed LDP. An area for compensatory planting was identified by one of the respondents, however, this is within Bartlemuir Wood to the east of the bid site. This is an area of land already identified as woodland and as such the planting would not be considered as compensatory or offset development of the bid site. Nevertheless, concern remains to the suitability of access and general connectivity to the settlement.

Bid MR057 / Existing Site OP3

The comments received both in support and against this bid/existing site OP3 are acknowledged. As it is an existing site, albeit currently constrained, the bid submission has provided some confidence the site will move forward. There is satisfaction that the site continues to be appropriately sited and at the right scale. As per the recommendations under "Issue 8 Shaping Homes and Housing", site capacities are not recommended to have a "maximum". However, in accordance with SEPA's comments, the site should include a buffer strip that would reduce the developable area of the site.

The allocation summary will be amended to include statements to reflect information received including the provision of high-quality development and that on flood risk/buffer strips.

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 stakeholders.
2. Update 'Services and Infrastructure' and 'Flood Risk' of the Settlement Statement to reflect the latest information received.
3. Amend the allocation for existing site OP1 to remove the area built out and update the allocation summary to reflect its current position and SEPA comments.
4. Remove OP2 as it is anticipated to be built out by 2021.
5. Amend the allocation summary for existing sites OP3 to include statements on design and flood risk/buffer strips.
6. Allocate bid site MR021 for retail/café/services. The allocation summary for the site should include a statement on landscaping and design, path connectivity and hydromorphological assessment.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 17 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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 172 Kirkton of Tough

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
805	SEPA

2. Issues

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has requested it is highlighted in the Services and Infrastructure section of the Settlement Statement that there is no public waste water infrastructure (805).

Bid MR055

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) has noted there are mature trees/semi-natural woodland adjacent to the site (506).

3. Actions

Services and Infrastructure

It is considered that SEPA's comments are appropriate to add to the Settlement Statement, with text added to reflect that there is no public waste water infrastructure.

Bid MR055

It is noted there are trees and woodland adjacent to the site, however in line with the Officers' assessment in the Main Issues Report, the bid is not supported. It is considered that the village may be supported through small scale growth using rural development policies.

4. Recommendations

1. Update 'Services and Infrastructure' to note that there is no public waste water infrastructure.
2. Update protected land with a minor amendment to accommodate existing properties.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 17 September 2019.

2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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 173 Logie Coldstone

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
368	Cromar Community Council
652	Logie Coldstone Trust
786	Mr David Ellis
805	SEPA
959	Ms Gillean Morrison

2. Issues

General

One representation would like to encourage landowners to put in bids for a large number of smaller developments, rather than larger sites that have proved difficult to deliver in this area. Smaller sites would be a more feasible scale and would facilitate integration into the existing community (368).

Vision / Planning Objectives

The Vision statement for Logie Coldstone was considered as negative and should be re-written in a proactive manner. It should be highlighted that Logie Coldstone is a thriving community and it should be stated that “Logie Coldstone has a primary school and community hall which are central for promoting growth” (959). Furthermore, there is a community desire for the existing hall and its adjacent site to be conserved for community use. The community aspires to the creation of footpaths that links Logie Coldstone to Migvie Church, Tarland and Dinnet (652).

One representation presented a full vision as follows:

“Logie Coldstone is a village situated on the edge of the Cairngorms National Park, with Morven, and a large area of native Scots pine woodland, providing an attractive scenic backdrop. Logie Coldstone is an active community with a primary school and community hall. These facilities are central to the community and by promoting growth in this settlement, development will support these assets and contribute to the long term viability of the community. There is a community desire for the hall and the site adjacent to be conserved for community use. An allocation to create new homes, including affordable homes, will sustain population and support the school and community facilities” (652). This rewrite of the Vision was supported by another respondent (368).

Respondents were in favour of land being allocated for housing within Logie Coldstone (368, 652, 786) as it provides an opportunity for new homes including affordable homes (652). Development would help to sustain population and community facilities and support the school (368, 652). Priority should be given to sustain Logie Coldstone

School and community hall, promote/enhance the amenity of the settlement and promote tourism and economic development (652).

Flood Risk

SEPA suggested to add the text "Logie Coldstone lies within 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.

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA highlighted that only a small portion of the settlement is connected to the public sewer network. Therefore, it should be highlighted in the 'Services and Infrastructure section' of the Settlement Statement that there may be capacity issues for developments wishing to connect unless the works are upgraded. It should be ensured that the population growth is within the design criteria for the sewage treatment works, otherwise the need for a growth project will need to be highlighted (805).

Existing Site - OP1

Three respondents object to the removal of existing site OP1 site from the Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) (368, 652, 959). The site has the potential for delivering affordable homes and there is support for delivering this site (652). The site could also provide a play park and a centre for the village (959).

New Layout for existing site OP1

A new layout plan has been submitted for the existing site OP1, which shows a reduced size/scale of the site accommodating a total of 10 homes (5 market homes and 5 affordable homes). The remaining area would be used as a community space and would be treated as an extension to the hall (652). This would allow improved parking facilities, public amenity area and playing field and tourism use for the hall and public use (652).

One respondent supports this proposed revised scheme/new bid as it shall satisfy the demand for housing in Logie Coldstone, with a realistic housing allocation that would also provide a focus for the settlement (368).

Additional Bid

One additional bid has been submitted at the site to the rear of Sunnybrae Cottages for 5-6 affordable homes. An indicative site plan was submitted which shows a partial layout of the site (652).

One respondent stated that the proposed new bid shall satisfy the demand for housing in Logie Coldstone (368). Furthermore, the proposed site at Sunnybrae offers a good opportunity for the provision of more housing, including affordable homes. This bid is in line with proposed policy on organic growth, mentioned in the MIR (Main Issue 8) (368).

3. Actions

General

The comment received for more smaller bid sites in this area is acknowledged. Landowners/developers are encouraged, prior to the 'Call for Sites', to submit a range of options to consider.

Vision / Planning Objectives

It has been noted that the Vision statement for Logie Coldstone needs to be more positive by focusing on it being a thriving community and supporting the school and hall. The amended Vision provided is supported with the addition of the community aspiration for footpath connectivity.

It has been noted that there is a desire to allocate land for housing development within the settlement.

Flood Risk

The request made by SEPA for additional text on flood risk is acceptable and to be added to the Settlement Statement is considered appropriate. This should be included in the Proposed LDP.

Services and Infrastructure

Information received from Scottish Water confirms the limited sewage capacity and additional development would be required to initiate a growth project once development meets their five growth criteria. The existing statement on sewage and water capacity remains appropriate. No action is required in this regard.

Existing Site - OP1

The objections for removal of existing site OP1 have been noted. It has been noted that the site could accommodate a play park within the existing site area.

New Layout for existing site OP1

The new layout and amended boundary of existing site OP1 accommodating 10 homes is acceptable. The allocation summary will include community uses including car parking, a potential hall extension and an amenity area. It is noted that the extension to the community hall would meet the needs of the community. The retention of an amended existing site OP1 allocation is recommended in the Proposed LDP.

Additional Bid

It is acknowledged that new development would provide opportunity to deliver affordable homes. However, it is considered that an allocation is unnecessary as it is within the settlement boundary and that OP1 should continue to be the focus for development, providing a sufficient level of housing for the settlement. Due to its location, it could be treated as an 'infill' development opportunity under the policy P3: Infill Development Within Settlements and Householder Developments (including home and work proposals). It is advised applicants should hold discussions with

Development Management regarding the number of homes that could be accommodated within the site.

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. Modify the Vision within the Settlement Statement with:
“Logie Coldstone is a village situated on the edge of the Cairngorms National Park, with Morven, and a large area of native Scots pine woodland, providing an attractive scenic backdrop. Logie Coldstone is an active/thriving community with a primary school and community hall. These facilities are central to the community and by promoting growth in this settlement, development will support these assets and contribute to the long term viability of the community. There is a community desire for the hall and the site adjacent to be conserved for community use. An allocation to create new homes, including affordable homes, will sustain population and support the school and community facilities. The community aspires to the creation of footpaths that links Logie Coldstone to Migvie, Tarland and Dinnet.”
2. Update ‘Flood Risk’ of the Settlement Statement to reflect the latest information received.
3. Incorporate the property Miorbhail into the settlement boundary.
4. Amend allocation summary and boundary for existing site OP1 to a reduced capacity of 10 homes with community uses including car parking, potential hall extension, and amenity area.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 17 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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 174 Lumphanan

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
805	SEPA

2. Issues

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has noted that the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) uses the text, “capacity available”. It should be ensured that the population growth is within the current design criteria for the sewage treatment works. However, if not, an upgrade may be required (805).

Existing Site - OP1

SEPA stated that a Flood Risk Assessment may be required at a planning application stage. A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse on the western boundary and should be integrated as a positive feature of the development. Enhancement of the straightened watercourse and removal of any redundant features will be required to be investigated (805).

3. Actions

Services and Infrastructure

Information received from Scottish Water confirms there is sewage capacity available but should demand exceed capacity, additional development would be required to initiate a growth project once development meets their five growth criteria. The existing statement on sewage and water capacity remains appropriate. No action is required in this regard.

Existing Site - OP1

The request made by SEPA for additional text on ‘flood risk assessment’ to be added to the Settlement Statement is considered appropriate and should be included in the Proposed Local Development Plan.

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. Modify the Vision within the Settlement Statement to reflect the aspirations as expressed in early consultation by stakeholders including the Community Council. Add text to the Vision to include references to local facilities, and encourage improvement/vibrancy to spaces and facilities.
2. Update areas of protected land including the golf course as forming part of the green network and to recognise its importance in providing a setting to the settlement.
3. Add the following text to the existing site OP1 allocation summary:
“A Flood Risk Assessment may be required. A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse on the western boundary and should be integrated as a positive feature of the development. Enhancement of the straightened watercourse and removal of any redundant features will be required to be investigated.”

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 17 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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 175 Lumsden

1. List of Respondents

None.

2. Issues

No issues were raised in respect of Lumsden.

3. Actions

Services and Infrastructure

Information received from Scottish Water confirms that there is no waste water capacity available and that their five growth criteria would have to be met for additional development. Despite there being no allocations recommended, this information should be included in the Settlement Statement under 'Services and Infrastructure'.

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 included the removal of existing sites OP1 and OP2 including references to these allocations within the Settlement Statement, and amendment of the 'Natural and Historic Environment' section.

4. Recommendations

1. Amend 'Natural and Historic Environment' section to correct the Local Nature Conservation Site name to 'Lumsden Moss'.
2. Update 'Services and Infrastructure' to note that there is no public waste water infrastructure.
3. Remove existing sites OP1 and OP2 due to the lack of delivery and amend the settlement boundary accordingly.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 17 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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 176 Monymusk

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
11	Mr & Mrs Richard & Susan Pike
16	Mr Michael Tweedie
99	Mr Phil Cropper
100	Ms Janina Kutscha
114	Ms Marjon van der Pol
115	Mr Matthew Brettle
129	Cluny, Midmar, and Monymusk Community Council
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
805	SEPA
909	Strutt & Parker on behalf of Monkmusk Land Company
1080	Sir/Madam A Simmers

2. Issues

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has also stated that it should be ensured that the population growth is within the current design criteria for the sewage treatment works. However, if not, an upgrade may be required (805).

Bid MR074

There has been objection to the development of bid MR074 for a number of reasons including: insufficient waste water treatment capacity and concern about water supply, surface run-off, flood risk and deterioration of water quality of the River Don; impact on natural habitat and wildlife (aquatic species in particular and impact on fishing); lack of public transport, lack of safe walking/cycling routes, increased car reliance and resultant traffic impact; lack of amenities and strain on existing services/facilities; concern about education capacity; and loss of prime agricultural land (11, 16, 99, 100, 114, 115, 129, 1080).

The concerns regarding traffic impact relate to the historic nature of the village having a single route through, and safety concerns at road junctions created by phase 1 and 2 of the existing OP1 site, and the junction at B993, with potentially 90 cars resulting from the proposed development (99, 100, 114, 115, 129, 1080).

There were also concerns regarding impact on the conservation area, and respondents consider more housing development would have a visual impact on the historic environment (99, 100, 114, 115, 129, 1080).

Specific concerns were raised about the proposed development restricting any future opportunity to develop a sports facilities next to the school, (99, 100, 114, 115, 129, 1080), and impact on the existing football playing field (16).

It is considered that the community does not need more housing, nor that new houses would support local business (99, 100, 114, 115, 129, 1080).

One respondent has supported the Officers' recommendation in the Main Issues Report to 'reserve' the site until confirmed by a mid term Plan review (909). The respondent agrees the development provides a 'rounding off' of the settlement, which they state is envisaged in the approved Masterplan. The flooding issue is acknowledged, but the respondent highlights this only affects a small part of the site and that this would be investigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The respondent acknowledges that mitigation may be required to address constraints and issues including the junction at the B993, waste water issues, water supply, and education capacity, but considers that solutions can be found. It is however disputed that the land is prime agricultural land (909).

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) has noted that the site abuts a minor road which forms part of the western edge of the Monymusk House Gardens and Designed Landscape. SNH consider this association presents an opportunity to reflect the character and species of the designed landscape policies in the proposed landscape framework that should form part of the proposed development of this site (506).

SNH has recommended a site brief to ensure adequate woodland protection, connectivity, biodiverse open space, and active travel provision to the village centre, and to identify links the core path network (506).

SEPA has stated that an FRA may be required for bid MR074, and that a buffer strip will be required adjacent to the Gullie Burn on the northern boundary and should be integrated as a positive feature of the development. Enhancement of the straightened watercourse and removal of any redundant features will be required to be investigated (805).

3. Actions

Services and Infrastructure

With regard to waste water treatment, information from Scottish Water confirms that there is no capacity available, and that their five growth criteria would have to be met for additional development. Despite there being no allocations recommended, this information should be included in the Settlement Statement under 'Services and Infrastructure'.

Bid MR074

The objections to this development are noted. It is acknowledge that there are a range of constraints and issues to be addressed should this site be brought forward for

development, and it is not recommended to allocate this site in the Proposed Local Development Plan (Proposed LDP). Following the recent significant growth that Monymusk has seen, it is maintained that the village requires time to consolidate.

Further to publication of the Main Issues Report, the revised position is that sites will not be reserved as possible future opportunity sites subject to mid-term review in the Proposed LDP (refer to Issue 8 Shaping Homes and Housing). As such, it is not recommended to allocate the site subject to bid MR074.

It is noted however that there is support for the development, and that the respondent considers solutions can be found to the range of issues and constraints identified. In relation to the disagreement raised regarding prime agricultural land, for clarity, it is pointed out that whilst not all of bid MR074 is prime quality, a large portion of the site is classified prime agricultural land (quality grade 3.1).

The request by SNH to consider landscape character is noted, and their recommended site brief requirements, however as the site is not being supported no action is required.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

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. Update the Vision statement to account for the current status of housing development commitment.
2. Insert the following text under Services and Infrastructure: "Strategic drainage and water supply: No waste water treatment capacity is available. Scottish Water would be required to initiate a Growth Project once development meets their five growth criteria".
3. Remove OP1 as the site is under construction and due for completion 2019.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 17 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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 177 Muir of Fowlis

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
805	SEPA

2. Issues

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA commented that there is no reference made to the availability of the waste water treatment in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) for Muir of Fowlis. It was stressed that reference should be made regarding waste water drainage within the Proposed Local Development Plan. It should be highlighted that there may be capacity issues for this development unless the works are upgraded. Therefore, the requirement for a growth project should be highlighted in the Proposed LDP (805).

Existing Site - OP1

SEPA noted that the site currently has planning permission. If the applicant seeks for further planning permission, then a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) may be required (805).

3. Actions

Services and Infrastructure

With regard to waste water treatment, information from Scottish Water confirms that there is no capacity available, and that their five growth criteria would have to be met for additional development. 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.

Existing Site – OP1

The comment from SEPA is noted and it is considered that the existing allocation summary appropriately addresses an FRA.

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. Modify the Vision within the Settlement Statement to reflect the aspirations as expressed in early consultation by stakeholders. Add text to the Vision to include references to footway provision.
2. Add the following text within 'Infrastructure and Services':
"Strategic drainage and water supply: The existing Waste Water Treatment Works has no or very little capacity. A growth project will be initiated once development meets Scottish Water's criteria. Local water mains reinforcement may be required to facilitate new development."
3. Retain existing site OP1.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 17 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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 178 Rhynie

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
805	SEPA

2. Issues

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA stated the former text for waste water treatment 'limited capacity and growth project will be initiated', in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP). The developer should contact Scottish Water early in the planning process to initiate a growth project for an upgrade to the public Waste Water Treatment Plant (805).

3. Actions

Services and Infrastructure

Information received from Scottish Water confirms there is limited sewage capacity available and additional development would be required to initiate a growth project once development meets their five growth criteria. The existing statement on sewage and water capacity remains appropriate. No action is required in this regard.

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. Modify the Vision within the Settlement Statement to remove the 'speculative development' statement.
2. Remove OP1 due to the lack of delivery and amend the settlement boundary accordingly.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 17 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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 179 Ruthven

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
805	SEPA

2. Issues

Service and Infrastructure

SEPA stated that there is no reference made to the existing waste water drainage in Ruthven in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP). It should be highlighted that there is limited capacity at Ruthven Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP), and Scottish Water should be contacted at the early stage of the planning process to initiate a growth project for an upgrade to the public WWTP. In this respect, the Planning Service should contact Scottish Water to receive their confirmation on the suggested wording, prior to adding it in the next Plan (805).

3. Actions

Services and Infrastructure

Information received from Scottish Water confirms there is sufficient capacity for the allocation. Should demand exceed capacity, additional development would be required to initiate a growth project once development meets their five growth criteria. 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.

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. Modify the Vision within the Settlement Statement to reflect the aspirations as expressed in early consultation by stakeholders including the Community Council. Add text to the Vision to include references to the need for a focal point in the settlement.
2. Update 'Services and Infrastructure' of the Settlement Statement to reflect the latest information received.

3. Amend the settlement and allocation boundary to include the full extent of the planning permission granted on existing site OP1.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 17 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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 180 Strachan

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
805	SEPA

2. Issues

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA highlighted that the former text was used for waste water treatment in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan, which states that “limited capacity at Banchory WWTW and growth project will be initiated”. The Banchory growth project has been initiated and this statement needs to be updated in the proposed Plan (805). The progress of the growth project and the delivery date should be verified to ensure that there is adequate capacity within the public waste water treatment works for developments (805).

Existing Site - OP1

SEPA stated that this site currently has planning permission. If the applicant seeks for further planning permission, then an updated Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) may be required (805). A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse on the western boundary and should be integrated as a positive feature of the development. Enhancement of the straightened watercourse and removal of any redundant features will be required to be investigated (805).

3. Actions

Services and Infrastructure

Information received from Scottish Water confirms there is sufficient capacity for the allocation and Banchory WWTW growth project is underway. Should demand exceed capacity, additional development would be required to initiate a growth project once development meets their five growth criteria. 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.

Existing Site - OP1

The request made by SEPA for additional text on ‘flood risk assessment’ to be added to the Settlement Statement is considered appropriate and should be included in the Proposed Local Development Plan.

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. Update 'Services and Infrastructure' of the Settlement Statement to reflect the latest information received.
2. Incorporate the property Adentowie House and the cemetery extension into the settlement boundary.
3. Add the following text in the existing site OP1 allocation summary:
"A Flood Risk Assessment may be required in the event of a further planning application being submitted. A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse on the western boundary and should be integrated as a positive feature of the development. Enhancement of the straightened watercourse and removal of any redundant features will be required to be investigated."

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 17 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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 181 Tarland

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
156	Dr David Harper
318	Ms June Cameron
355	Tarland Development Group
368	Cromar Community Council
393	The MacRobert Trust
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
786	Mr David Ellis
805	SEPA
1009	Historic Environment Scotland

2. Issues

General

Landowners should be encouraged to put in bids for a large number of smaller developments, rather than larger sites that have proved difficult to deliver in this area. Smaller sites would be a more feasible scale and would facilitate integration into the existing community (368).

Vision

It was considered that the Settlement Statement does not go far enough to reflect the importance of the village's setting which is a crucial consideration in planning for the future. Additional text was suggested for inclusion as follows, "Tarland is situated at the gateway to the Cairngorms National Park in the heart of the Howe of Cromar, which is internationally famous for its unspoilt beauty. Its importance as an environmental asset is acknowledged in its designation as a Special Landscape Area. Thus, the landscape's sensitivity to development must be an essential consideration in meeting planning objectives" (368).

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has noted that the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) uses the text, "limited capacity and growth project will be initiated". It should be ensured that the population growth is within the current design criteria for the sewage treatment works. However, if not, an upgrade may be required (805).

Existing Site – BUS/ Bid MR070

Support is expressed for the Officers' recommendation ("preferred") for bid MR070 (368, 393). The definition of live/work was however questioned with support expressed only should the definition be to allow the owner of a business to live next door to a workshop/

store (368). Confidence is required to ensure that live/ work proposals should not raise noise concerns at such time as a planning application(s) come forward (393).

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) suggest that a development brief would be required to ensure adequate meaningful and biodiverse open space, links to the core path network and active travel provision to the village centre and school (506).

Existing Site – OP1/ Bid MR071

A respondent has disagreed with the Officers' recommendation for bid MR071 ("not preferred"), requesting that the site be retained in the Proposed LDP (393). Another respondent has requested that part of the site is allocated to allow development at a smaller scale, avoiding the area at risk from flooding (368). The respondent raises concern that there may be a lack of development opportunities in the settlement should no other sites come forward (368). Concern was raised with regard to increasing risk from flooding on this site (318), whereas the potential risk is contested by another respondent (393).

SNH has indicated that should the site be allocated a development brief would be required to ensure adequate meaningful and biodiverse open space, links to the core path network and active travel provision to the village centre and school. A construction method statement would also be required as the bid lies immediately adjacent to the Rive Dee SAC (506).

Existing Site OP2/ MR072

Respondents have expressed support for the Officers' recommendation for bid MR072 ("preferred") that seeks to retain the existing OP2 allocation (368, 393).

SNH has raised concern regarding site viability and has sought clarity on the level of protection/enhancement to be given to existing woodland. SNH has requested that the core part is retained and links provided to it through development (506).

SEPA has indicated that a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) may be required. A buffer strip would also be required adjacent to the watercourse running through the site and should be integrated as a positive feature of development. Enhancement of the watercourse and removal of redundant features would require to be investigated. SEPA has noted that as an extension to the Continuing Care Community which has private waste water drainage, should be ensured that the population growth expected is within the current design criteria for the private sewage treatment works. If not, an upgrade may be required (805).

Existing Site OP3/ MR073

Respondents have expressed support for the Officers' recommendation for bid MR073 ("preferred") that seeks to retain the existing OP3 allocation (355, 368, 393).

SNH has recommended a site brief be required to ensure adequate biodiverse open space and active travel provision to the village centre (506).

SEPA has confirmed that an FRA may be required. They have also requested that additional text is added to the allocation summary to require enhancement of the watercourse and removal of any redundant features following investigation.

Bid MR058

Respondents have expressed support for the Officers' recommendation ("not preferred") for bid MR058 (156, 368, 786).

SNH has indicated that should the site be allocated any Masterplan should be informed by the special qualities of the Special Landscape Area surrounding Tarland, a development brief would be required to ensure adequate meaningful and biodiverse open space, links to the core path network and active travel provision to the village centre and school. A construction method statement would also be required as the bid lies immediately adjacent to the Rive Dee SAC (506).

Historic Environment Scotland (HES) has highlighted the potential for impact on the extensive views from and to Tomnaverie Stone Circle, which is a Scheduled Monument. HES also raise the potential for cumulative impacts when considered with bid MR071 (existing OP1) (1009).

Support for Additional Sites to be Identified

A respondent has expressed support for land for business uses in the settlement, but does not stipulate any particular location for such development (786). Another respondent agreed with this suggestion, but proposed that a sand quarry to the east of Alastrean House may be a suitable site for employment uses. Development at this location may address noise concerns that have arisen with employment proposals elsewhere in the settlement (393).

Support was also expressed for identification of a second housing site in Tarland, although no specific site was identified for such (355).

3. Actions

General

The comment received, seeking more smaller bid sites in this area, is acknowledged. Landowners/developers are encouraged, prior to the 'Call for Sites', to submit a range of options to consider.

Vision

On the whole it is felt that the additional text proposed to be added to the Vision statement is acceptable, even though the emphasis that the Special Landscape Area for the area is set by the needs of Tarland. As the Settlement Statements in the Proposed LDP will not include planning objectives in the same way as presented in the Main Issues Report, it is suggested that replacing the proposed text "meeting planning objectives" with "determining planning applications, where relevant".

Services and Infrastructure

Information received from Scottish Water confirms that no capacity is available and the 5 growth criteria would be required for additional development. Text should be updated to reflect the current position with regard to waste water.

Existing Site – BUS/ Bid MR070

Support for Officers' recommendation for bid MR070 is welcomed. It is believed that it would be helpful to include a definition of 'live/work' within the Glossary section of the Proposed LDP. Aspects such as noise is a matter that would be considered as part of any planning application that comes forward on the site.

Comments raised by SNH should be reflected in the allocation summary for the site.

Existing Site – OP1/ Bid MR071

Whilst comments in support of retaining OP1 are acknowledged, significant concerns are continued regarding the deliverability of the site due in most part to flood risk. Even if the site area was amended to exclude the areas at risk from flooding the existing public road bordering the site regularly floods to a substantial depth and flow preventing safe access to and from the site. Development of this site could also significantly jeopardise future mitigation works to remove flooding risk. Until such time as this matter can be resolved the site should be removed from the LDP and thus not included in the Proposed LDP. The settlement boundary should be amended accordingly.

Existing Site OP2/ MR072

Support for bid MR072/ retention of site OP2 is welcomed. The site is allocated for a very specific use catering to a particular market associated with the Continuing Care Community at Alastrean House. It is considered appropriate to retain the site in the LDP and consider means to deliver this allocation. Comments raised by SNH and SEPA should be reflected in the allocation summary for the site.

Existing Site OP3/ MR073

Support for Officers' recommendation for bid MR073/retention of site OP3 is welcomed. As the site is subject to an extant planning permission it is appropriate to retain the site in the LDP until such time as development is completed.

Bid MR058

Support for Officers' recommendation not to allocate bid MR058 is welcomed. The site should not be included in the Proposed LDP. However, should the site be allocated in the LDP then matters raised by SNH and HES would need to be addressed and any site requirements included as part of any allocation summary for the site.

Support for Additional Sites to be Identified

Only one bid was received that was not already associated with an allocated site. It is believed that the focus during the Plan period should be to deliver existing opportunity sites.

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 the Vision statement, “Tarland is situated at the gateway to the Cairngorms National Park in the heart of the Howe of Cromar, which is internationally famous for its unspoilt beauty. Its importance as an environmental asset is acknowledged in its designation as a Special Landscape Area. Thus, the landscape’s sensitivity to development must be an essential consideration in determining planning applications, where relevant”.
2. Update ‘Services and Infrastructure’ of the Settlement Statement to reflect the latest information received.
3. Designate the golf course as Protected Land as forming part of the green network and to recognise its importance in providing a setting to the settlement.
4. Replace the BUS designation with an opportunity site allocation for a mix of uses including 10 live/work units and employment land. The allocation summary should state that a development brief would be required to ensure adequate meaningful and biodiverse open space, links to the core path network and active travel provision to the village centre and school.
5. Add text to the allocation summary of OP2 to ensure clarity is provided on the level of protection/enhancement to be given to existing woodland. The core path should be retained and links provided to it through development. A Flood Risk Assessment may be required. A buffer strip would also be required adjacent to the watercourse running through the site and should be integrated as a positive feature of development. Enhancement of the watercourse and removal of redundant features would require to be investigated. It should be ensured that the population growth expected is within the current design criteria for the private sewage treatment works. If not, an upgrade may be required.
6. Remove existing site OP1 and amend the settlement boundary accordingly.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 17 September 2019.

2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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 182 Torphins

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
74	Mr Alistair Punt
83	Ms Marianne Littlejohn
98	Mr Gary Carroll
165	Mr Mark Ogden
334	Mr Geoffrey Allis
339	Ryden LLP
433	Mr David Ewen
490	Ms Suzanne Rouse
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
615	Mr Glenn Iason
616	Mr Glenn Iason
620	Torphins Community Council on behalf of Torphins Community Council
760	Wardell Armstrong LLP on behalf of AJC Homes
788	Mr Colin Rouse
805	SEPA
845	Ms Alison Orren
853	Mr Richard Orren
991	Mr Hamish Strang
995	Mr David Laing
1003	Savills on behalf of Learney Estate

2. Issues

Spatial Strategy for Torphins

A number of representations considered that there is no need to allocate any new housing sites in Torphins, that there is sufficient land to meet needs, there is insufficient demand and no new housing allocation should be identified until those with existing planning permissions have been built out (74, 83, 98, 165, 433, 490, 615, 620, 788, 991, 995). Development should meet community need rather than the commercial interests of developers (788). Development on all the sites contradicts the LDP 2017 Examination (165) and should be adhered to (845, 853), noting visual land and there are sufficient sites (165).

Redeveloping brownfield sites should be the priority (433) and development should be limited to small-scale infill to preserve the nature of the settlement (74, 334, 845). Affordable housing, including flats (433), retirement housing (433, 620) and opportunities for first time buyers (620) should be promoted rather than large executive housing (433, 991).

Development should not be promoted on the high ground to the west of the settlement. Any new development should be located on ground above the new Battock Terrace Development (74). Ribbon development should be avoided (74). Development should not negatively impact on the Dee Valley Special Landscape Area or wildlife (74, 433) and that additional development would impact on the landscape (165), and character and historical layout of the village (788, 995). Sites to the west are at risk from flooding (74).

There is insufficient capacity in the primary and secondary schools (74, 165, 433, 620, 788) and services (98). There are concerns about road safety (165) in the Beltie Road area (74) and general traffic flow and increased traffic in the settlement (165, 334, 788).

Protected Land

A respondent has suggested that inclusion of site P8 in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) to protect the school grounds is not necessary as the school is not under threat, nor in need of protection (615).

Flood risk

SEPA has highlighted a typographical error in the 'Flood Risk' section of the Settlement Statement (805).

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has noted that there is no reference to waste water drainage for Torphins. It should be confirmed with Scottish Water that the proposed population growth is within the current design criteria for the sewage treatment works and if not, an upgrade may be required to be highlighted in the Proposed (LDP) (805).

Existing Site – OP1/ Bid MR060

Respondents have expressed support for the Officers' recommendation for bid MR060 ("preferred") that seeks to retain the existing OP1 allocation (165, 433, 620, 788, 845, 853, 991). Respondents noted that the site has low visual impact, offering smaller homes (620) and presents an opportunity to visually improve the site/western approach to the settlement (788). The development alone provides sufficient homes to meet the quota for the village (788, 845, 991), and improving on road safety with its advantage of being in close proximity to the water treatment facility (788). The bid site would have no adverse environmental impact (620).

Concerns were raised on increased commuting traffic, education capacity, lack of demand for additional homes and the need for smaller homes (615, 620).

SEPA has suggested that should the extant permission expire an updated Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) may be required. The Beltie Burn that borders the southern boundary is at 'Bad' status due to its poor physical condition. Any development would be required to investigate the restoration and enhancement of the burn. It was also noted that the south west corner of the site will be adjacent to the sewage works and

that Environmental Health should be consulted on an appropriate buffer to mitigate possible odour issues (805).

SEPA also noted that the site lies adjacent to activities which are regulated by SEPA under a Waste Management License, Pollution Prevention and Control (PPC) Permit or Controlled Activities (CAR) License. There may be co-location issues and Environmental Health need to advise on the compatibility of these sites with existing adjacent regulated activities (805).

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) has noted that there is a small overlap with a strip of semi-natural broadleaved woodland that should be retained and enhanced. SNH also indicate that a Construction Method Statement may be required given the site lies adjacent to the River Dee Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (506).

Bid MR004

One respondent has expressed support for the Officers' recommendation ("not preferred") for bid MR004, as it is likely to incur significant adverse landscape and visual impacts that would be difficult to mitigate (620).

SNH has noted that bid MR004 covers sloping ground that forms part of the immediate and wider setting of Torphins to the east. Development is likely to incur significant adverse landscape and visual impacts which would be difficult to mitigate (506).

Bid MR005

One respondent has requested that the site be allocated in the Proposed LDP for 50 homes as visual impact on the setting can be mitigated, be regarded as infill, provide open space and support the local school (339).

A number of respondents, including SNH have expressed support for the Officers' recommendation ("not preferred") for bid MR005 (83, 98, 433, 506, 620, 853). Concerns were raised on visual impacts (83, 98, 620), scale (853), environmental impacts (83, 98), little demand for this scale of housing (620), flood risk (620), need to upgrade utilities (98), education capacity (853), health service capacity (620) and landscape impact (853).

SNH noted that the LDP 2017 Examination highlighted the landscape and visual sensitivity of this site. Nonetheless, SNH indicated that should the bid be allocated then a site brief would be required to ensure adequate biodiverse open space and active travel provision to the village centre and school. A construction method statement would also be required as the site lies immediately adjacent to the River Dee SAC (506).

Bid MR034

One respondent has expressed support for the Officers' recommendation ("preferred") for bid MR034, citing there is no significant constraints, no capacity issues, it has suitable access and the scale of the development is appropriate (760).

Other respondents have objected to the site being allocated in the Proposed LDP (83, 98, 334, 455, 615, 620, 845, 853, 991). Concerns were raised on: visual impacts including on the landscape setting, Dee Valley Special Landscape Area (SLA) and character of the settlement (83, 98, 334, 620, 433, 845, 853, 991); environmental impacts (83, 98, 620); need to upgrade utilities (98); no natural western boundary to limit development (433, 845, 853); increased traffic and commuting (433, 615, 991); scale (853); flood risk (620); could prevent the cemetery extending (620); education capacity (615, 620, 845, 853); and lack of demand for additional homes (615); and, impact on the River Dee Special Area of Conservation (845).

SNH has indicated that a site brief would be required to ensure adequate biodiverse open space, link to core path network and active travel provision to the village centre and school. A construction method statement would also be required as the site lies immediately adjacent to the River Dee SAC (506).

SEPA has indicated that an FRA may be required (805).

Bid MR035

One respondent has expressed support for the Officers' recommendation ("preferred") for bid MR035, citing there is no significant constraints, no capacity issues, it has suitable access, and the scale of the development is appropriate (760).

However other respondents have objected to the site being allocated in the Proposed LDP (98, 334, 433, 615, 845, 853, 991). Concerns were raised on: visual impacts including on the landscape setting, Dee Valley SLA and character of the settlement (98, 334, 433, 845, 853, 991); environmental impacts (98); need to upgrade utilities (98); scale (853); no natural western boundary to limit development (433, 845, 853); increased traffic and commuting (433, 615, 620); education capacity (615, 845, 853); lack of demand for additional homes (615); and, affect the River Dee Special Area of Conservation (845).

SNH has indicated that a site brief would be required to ensure adequate biodiverse open space, link to core path network and active travel provision to the village centre and school. A construction method statement would also be required as the site lies immediately adjacent to the River Dee SAC (506).

SEPA has indicated that an FRA may be required (805).

Bid MR036

One respondent has requested that the site be identified as a long term "strategic" option, citing there is no significant constraints, it is well located to the village, has suitable access, there are no capacity issues and the scale of the development is appropriate (760).

A number of respondents have expressed support for the Officers' recommendation ("not preferred") for bid MR036 (83, 98, 334, 433, 615, 620, 845, 853, 991). Concerns were raised on: visual impacts including on the landscape setting, Dee Valley SLA and character of the settlement (83, 98, 334, 433, 620, 845, 853, 991); environmental impacts (83, 98); need to upgrade utilities (98); scale (620, 853); no natural western boundary to limit development (433, 620, 845, 853); increased traffic (433); health service capacity (620); education capacity (845, 853); and, affect the River Dee Special Area of Conservation (845).

SNH has indicated that should the bid be allocated then a site brief would be required to ensure woodland protection/enhancement, adequate biodiverse open space and active travel provision to the village centre and school. A construction method statement would also be required as the site lies immediately adjacent to the River Dee SAC (506).

Bid MR069

Three respondents have expressed support for the Officers' recommendation ("preferred") for bid MR069 (845, 853, 1003). One of these respondents has requested that the site be allocated in the Proposed LDP for 12 homes, rather than the 6 homes promoted by Officers in the MIR for flexibility and allow choice (1003). Respondents do not consider it to have constraints including: any environmental impacts and education where a slower build rate could be accommodated within the school (620, 1003); roads/connectivity; under a single ownership; and can be serviced (1003).

The site would have a positive visual impact (620) including having well-established natural boundaries and forming a logical extension to the existing housing pattern (1003). It would provide opportunity for self-build (promoted by the Scottish Government) or a small-medium scale development for a local builder; it would meet local demand in the area including for semi-rural plots; and meet the '6 qualities of a successful place' through design, connectivity, open space; and meet the needs of the community.

Other respondents have disagreed with the Officers' recommendation, indicating that the site should not be allocated in the Proposed LDP (615, 616, 620). Concerns were raised on: increased commuting traffic, safe access, servicing, delivery of affordable housing, education capacity and lack of demand for additional homes (615, 616). One respondent queried the bid submission in that there is no evidence of recent construction nearby (616).

SEPA has confirmed that no FRA would be required for the site (805).

New Site

It was suggested that the Old School House should be included as an opportunity site in the Proposed LDP as it is in urgent need for development and that the complete site should be marketed with encouragement for housing associations to become involved (620).

3. Actions

Protected Land

In accordance with the recommendations made under “Issue 12 Protecting Resources”, it is considered that all school sites within settlements should be designated as protected land.

Flood Risk

It is appropriate to amend this section in line with SEPA’s comments.

Services and infrastructure

Information received from Scottish Water confirms the WWTW has limited capacity available and additional development would be required to initiate a growth project once development meets their five growth criteria.

Existing Site – OP1/ Bid MR060

The comments received supporting this bid site/existing site OP1 and the concerns raised are acknowledged. As the delivery of the site is programmed during the Proposed LDP period, the retention of the allocation is recommended.

In terms of SEPA’s comments, Environmental Health have commented to the Planning Service on the appropriateness and suitability of this development site as part of the planning applications. The allocation boundary should be extended to incorporate the area to the south with planning permission for employment land under APP/2017/1834.

The allocation summary will be amended to include statements to reflect information received.

Bid MR004

For reasons set out in the MIR, principally due to woodland and character constraints, and having given consideration to comments received including from SNH, it is maintained that bid MR004 should not be allocated in the Proposed LDP.

Bid MR005

For reasons set out in the MIR, principally on visual impact, and having given consideration to comments received, it is maintained that bid MR005 should not be allocated in the Proposed LDP.

Bid MR034 and MR035

The comments received both in support and against this bid site are acknowledged. It is maintained that this site would be a natural location for future growth of the settlement, outwith the Dee Vally SLA. Careful landscaping, layout and design such that development is setback from the road with a potential ‘green wedge’ of landscaping, may offset some of the concerns in relation to the impact on the setting of the settlement and reduce the visual impact of existing ribbon development to the north

of Beltie Road. The site has the potential to create a civic space that will make a more formalised centre point for the benefit of the settlement as a whole.

In consideration of comments regarding the lack of need, it is agreed that existing site OP1 (MR060) may provide a sufficient level of housing for the settlement and should remain the focus for development but the allocation of the MR034 and MR035 sites provide a range of sites and important choice within the settlement. It is recommended that this bid site is taken forward as an allocation at this point in time, but with significant restrictions on the need for strategic open space provision to assist both biodiversity and sense of place.

Bid MR036

For reasons set out in the MIR, including flood risk, archaeology and the setting of the town, and having given consideration to comments received including from SNH, it is maintained that bid MR036 should not be allocated in the Proposed LDP.

Bid MR069

The comments received both in support and against this bid site are acknowledged. There is satisfaction that the site continues to be appropriately sited and provides a small scale opportunity for development in a well-contained hamlet without constraint. As per the recommendations under “Issue 8 Shaping Homes and Housing”, site capacities are not recommended to have a “maximum” therefore there is flexibility in its density. As part of any planning application, any proposal on the site would have to comply with the relevant policies and therefore potential issues such as access and developer contributions including the delivery of affordable housing would require to be assessed and mitigated if necessary.

Whilst the site is a potential site for development, considering the comments received, it is not in an appropriate location whereby development should continue to be focused within or adjoining Torphins itself. Furthermore, with consideration of comments regarding the lack of need, it is agreed that existing site OP1 (MR060) will provide a sufficient level of housing for the settlement. It is recommended this bid site is not taken forward as an allocation.

New Site

The comment to allocate the Old School House property as a development opportunity is noted. It is not however considered necessary as the site area (0.19ha) and planning permission for 4 homes would not be a scale appropriate to allocate. The site can be developed under ‘infill’ policies in the Proposed LDP and this will apply if an extended site area became available for development in the future.

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. Modify the Vision within the Settlement Statement to reflect the aspirations as expressed in early consultation by stakeholders. Add text to the Vision to include references to accessibility, and encourage improvement/vibrancy to spaces and buildings.
2. Update 'Services and Infrastructure' and 'Flood Risk' of the Settlement Statement to reflect the latest information received.
3. Update areas of protected land including the golf course as forming part of the green network and to recognise its importance in providing a setting to the settlement.
4. Amend the allocation boundary to incorporate APP/2017/1834 and amend the summary for existing site OP1 (MR060) to include text on flood risk, burn restoration/enhancements, woodland and a construction method statement, should planning proposals be subject to change.
5. Allocate bid sites MR034 and MR035 with a capacity of 50 homes. The allocation summary should include statements on significant open space provision to preserve the setting of the hall/river/approach from the west, FRA, paths, construction method statement and active travel.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the recommendations 1 to 4 at their special meeting on 17 September 2019.
2. The committee did not agree recommendation 5 (allocation of bid sites MR034 and MR035).
3. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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 183 Towie

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
805	SEPA

2. Issues

Flood Risk

SEPA suggested to add the following text to the Settlement Statement:
"Towie lies within area potentially vulnerable to flood risk as identified by the National Flood Risk Assessment. Flood Risk Assessments may be required." (805)

Services and Infrastructure

The former text for drainage infrastructure has been added in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan, which stated 'no waste water treatment available'. SEPA stated that if a new development cannot be connected to public waste water infrastructure, then it is unlikely to contribute to long-term sustainability, and therefore would pose concerns for SEPA in the absence of First Time Sewerage provision. It is preferred that all new proposed properties within a development connect to a single waste water treatment plant (WWTP). The treatment plant must be installed to a standard that can be adopted by the Scottish Water. SEPA is unlikely to approve any proposal for single individual waste water discharges (805).

Bid MR051/ Existing Site OP1

A Flood Risk Assessment may be required. A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the Back Burn of Towie on the eastern side of the site and should be integrated as a positive feature of the development (805).

3. Actions

Flood Risk / Services and Infrastructure

Information received from Scottish Water confirms there is no waste water asset. 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.

Bid MR051/ Existing Site OP1

The request made by SEPA for additional text, shall be added accordingly. For reasons set out in the MIR, and having given consideration to comments received, we maintain that bid MR051 should be retained as an allocation in the Proposed LDP at its current capacity of 5 homes.

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. Modify the Vision within the Settlement Statement to remove the statement on the allocation and rural development policies.
2. Update 'Services and Infrastructure' and 'Flood Risk' of the Settlement Statement to reflect the latest information received.
3. Incorporate the properties on Belnaboth Place into the settlement boundary.
4. Add the following text in the existing site OP1 (MR051) allocation summary:
"Flood Risk Assessment may be required. A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the Back Burn of Towie on the eastern side of the site and should be integrated as a positive feature of the development."

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 17 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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 184 Whitehouse

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
805	SEPA

2. Issues

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA requested to highlight in the 'services and infrastructure section' of the Settlement Statement that there is no public waste water infrastructure in Whitehouse (805).

3. Actions

Services and Infrastructure

Information received from Scottish Water confirms there is no waste water asset. 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.

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. Modify the Vision within the Settlement Statement to remove "outwith the main Aberdeen business centre".
2. Update 'Services and Infrastructure' to note that there is no public waste water infrastructure.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 17 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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 185 Marr Landward

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
95	Mr Jonathan Rose
126	Burness Paul LLP on behalf of Mr & Mrs Charles Miller
408	Halliday Fraser Munro on behalf of W&W Mackie
420	Birse and Ballogie Community Council (B2C2)
458	Mr & Mrs J & K Reader
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
805	SEPA
814	John Wink Design on behalf of Mr Peter Forsyth
830	Strutt and Parker on behalf of North Banchory Coy
997	Crathes, Drumoak & Durris Community Council
1039	Mr Adrian Jefferies

2. Issues

Bid MR052, Bridge of Alford

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) has recommended enhancement of the watercourse on the site to ensure it forms an attractive feature of the development (506).

SEPA has raised concern, highlighting that the presence of a watercourse over bid MR052 makes it difficult to see how the proposed development could be achieved. A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) would need to be submitted prior to the adoption of the Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) to avoid SEPA objecting to the bid proposal. SEPA has suggested that the allocation should be amended to only include developable land to the north-western part of the site and the allocation summary should state that an FRA may be required. SEPA has indicated that a suitable buffer strip would be required, with no culverting for land gain. SEPA are however concerned about the ability to provide a buffer strip and ensure good riparian management if the watercourse borders gardens (805).

SEPA has also noted that there is no reference to waste water drainage in the Draft Proposed LDP for Bridge of Alford. SEPA has requested that text is included in the Services and Infrastructure section of the Settlement Statement to state that there is no public waste water infrastructure in Bridge of Alford. Development where no public waste water infrastructure is available is unlikely to contribute to long-term sustainability and therefore would pose concerns for SEPA in the absence of First Time Sewerage provision. SEPA's preference would be for all proposed properties within this development to be connected to a single adoptable WWTP. SEPA would be reluctant to approve any proposal for single individual waste water discharges (805).

Bid MR079, Hirn, Banchory

Two respondents have expressed support for the Officers' recommendation ("not preferred") for bid MR079 on the basis of the scale of development proposed (95) and concerns regarding road capacity (997). Another respondent has disagreed with the Officers' recommendation for bid MR079, requesting that the site should be allocated in the Proposed LDP. The respondent contests the Officers' assessment in the Main Issues Report stating that the proposal is proportional to its surroundings and should not be considered as unsustainable development due to the availability and accessibility to local services (830).

Bid MR048, Largue, Huntly

A respondent has disagreed with the Officers' recommendation ("not preferred") for bid MR048, requesting that the site should be allocated in the Proposed LDP on the basis of its siting on the entrance to Largue and the lack of alternative development bids in the settlement. Development would provide an opportunity to enhance landscape character around the settlement and would integrate with the existing community. Open space would provide play areas and linking footpaths (814).

Should bid MR048 be allocated SNH has recommended enhancement of the watercourse on the site to ensure it forms an attractive feature of the development (506).

Bids MR025, MR026 and MR027, Marywell, Ballogie

Respondents have expressed support for the Officers' recommendation ("not preferred") for bids MR025, MR026 and MR027 (420, 458) on the basis that development would damage the Special Landscape Area and there is no need for more homes at Ballogie. There is no case that the housing would support the school roll (420). The proposals could not be considered as sustainable development and would result in additional car use on roads that are dangerous (420, 458). A second respondent raised issues regarding landscape impact, impact on the setting and character of Ballogie, loss of actively farmed land to accommodate development, lack of broadband capacity as well as there being an inadequate water supply (458).

SNH has noted that bid MR025 lies in close proximity to the River Dee SAC and therefore may require a construction method statement. Should bid MR025 be allocated SNH has recommended that woodland should be incorporated as a feature of development (506).

SNH has also noted that bid MR026 is adjacent to ancient woodland and ancient woodland is in close proximity to bid MR027 (506).

Bids MR006 and MR032, Montgarrie, Alford

A respondent has expressed support for the Officers' recommendation ("not preferred") for bid MR006 on the basis of potential for overlooking and promotion of piecemeal development (1039).

A respondent has disagreed with the Officers' recommendation for bid MR032, requesting that the site should be allocated in the Proposed LDP for 30 homes as well as small-scale commercial (including retail) and community or leisure uses. It was suggested that there is demand for such a development in Montgarrie. It was also noted that the site was identified as fh1 in the Draft Aberdeenshire Local Plan 2006. The site is without constraint and delivery would support Tullynessle Primary School which is forecast to be significantly under capacity. The site represents an infill opportunity. There would be minimal landscape impact. The site is within reasonable walking distance of Alford (1.9km) and is linked via a core path. There is a bus service connecting the two settlements (408).

The respondent has also requested that Montgarrie should be defined as a settlement in the Proposed Local Development Plan. There are smaller, more remote places such as Cairnie that are classified as being a settlement even though Montgarrie has more homes (408).

Should bid MR032 be allocated SNH has recommended that a site brief be required to ensure adequate woodland protection, biodiverse open space and active travel provision, including links to Alford and the core path network to the south of the site (506).

Other Issues – Tillyfourie

A respondent has requested that Tillyfourie is recognised formally as a settlement in the Proposed LDP and that organic growth should be permissible. Land to the east on Millers Land should be included within the settlement boundary. It was highlighted that Tillyfourie is well served by public transport (126).

3. Actions

Bid MR052, Bridge of Alford

Given comments by key stakeholders, particularly those from SEPA there is now some doubt as to the deliverability of the site. The bid as proposed could not be allocated in the Proposed LDP until an FRA is undertaken. As there is no information that confirms that an FRA has been undertaken, and the findings of such considered, it would be inappropriate to include the site in the Proposed LDP.

On the basis that bid MR052 is no longer being proposed to be allocated, the Settlement Statement for Bridge of Alford prepared and included in the Draft Proposed LDP would not need to be included in the Proposed LDP.

In such circumstances as the bid was allocated the allocation summary of the site would require to account for comments from SNH and SEPA and include a requirement that ensures enhancement of the watercourse, a buffer strip would be required, with no culverting for land gain, an FRA would be required as well as resolution of how waste water could be treated.

Bid MR079, Hirn, Banchory

Support for Officers' recommendation for bid MR079 is noted.

Whilst comment made in support of the bid is also acknowledged, it is maintained that the site is disproportionate to its surrounding and ultimately development would be car reliant. Intensification of housing in this area would lead to suburbanisation of the countryside. In addition, it is considered that there are currently sufficient existing development allocations within the Aberdeen Housing Market Area that are effective or capable of becoming effective to meet the Strategic Development Plan requirements. On this basis, there is not a strategic need to allocate further development opportunities in addition to those identified within settlements at this time.

Bid MR048, Largue, Huntly

Whilst comment made in support of bid MR048 are acknowledged, it is maintained that the site would not act as a natural extension of the settlement. A lack of alternative development bids in this location should not necessarily be seen as a reason to support the bid proposal. It is not recommended that the site be allocated in the Proposed LDP.

Bids MR025, MR026 and MR027, Marywell, Ballogie

Support for Officers' recommendation for bids MR025, MR026 and MR027 is noted. The sites were not identified as preferred options for reasons set out in the MIR and it is not recommended that the sites be allocated in the Proposed LDP.

Bids MR006 and MR032, Montgarrie, Alford

Support for Officers' recommendation for bid MR006 is noted.

Whilst comments made in support of bid MR032 are acknowledged, it is maintained that the bid as proposed could constitute overdevelopment and be excessive when compared to the size of the existing settlement. Even if a proposal at a significantly reduced scale came forward it would be considered that such a proposal would still result in car reliance.

Montgarrie does meet the criteria of being classed as a "settlement" in that it serves a residential function with at least 15 homes and has sufficient urban characteristics and facilities. As there are no protected, reserved, or opportunity sites identified there is no need to include Montgarrie within the "Settlement Statement" Appendix of the Proposed LDP.

Other Issues – Tillyfourie

It is not believed that Tillyfourie meets the criteria of being classed as a "settlement" in terms of the LDP. Whilst it serves a residential function with at least 15 homes, it lacks sufficient urban characteristics and facilities to be defined as a settlement. As such there is no justification to identify Tillyfourie within the "Settlement Statement" Appendix of the Proposed LDP.

4. Recommendations

1. No Landward bid proposals are recommended to be included in the Proposed LDP. As such no actions are required.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Marr Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 17 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Marr 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.