From:	
To:	LDP
Subject:	Consultation Response for K&M
Date:	23 July 2020 12:37:21

## Dear Sir/Madam

My comments refer to the LDP for Fettercairn, with reference to the Main Issues Report (MIR)

The LDP work is very thorough, however it was developed before the COVID-19 Pandemic. The economic impact of this is likely to be significant, which will clearly affect all economic sectors, which will have knock on affects for housing demand and supply. This also comes at a time when the Oil and Gas sector is facing long term economic decline and where we face the additional challenges of accelerating climate change. In the light of these factors, it would be useful for the LDP to include an analysis on how local priorities may change, and if the volumes being proposed are still realistic.

I support most of the items listed on the Settlement Features on Page 663 of the K&M LDP Plan. I am not against development in Fettercairn, but it must be proportionate and in keeping with the character of the village. Clear communication and greater efforts to engage local residents for specific planning proposals – getting people involved from the outset and not just allowing people to respond to well-developed plans - will help buy in for plans that bring about change which everyone feels OK with.

Regarding the inclusion in the LDP of development of OP1 which has been allocated 60 houses.

P663 – "Fettercairn Distillery provides local employment" suggests that it is a significant employer in the village. The Plant employs under 10 staff and some of this is seasonal and therefore fluctuating. Therefore, to use this as a reason to justify need for the development is not convincing. Most working people commute to work by car in surrounding towns such as Montrose, Brechin and Aberdeen.

P664 Local transport Infrastructure states public transport provision "may be required". There is very limited public transport in and out of the Village – and is in term-time only and therefore, if the Plan wishes to cater for younger and older residents, as it states in the MIR, this would be a necessity. Without an increase in public transport provision, the size of this project would, in my view challenge the principle stated in the MIR that the development has met the requirements to be 'well connected' (P1.5)

P664 Strategic drainage and water supply – it would be vital for appropriate sewerage facilities to be scoped out before any development went ahead, which has been problematic in the village in the past regarding new development.

P665 there is concern among residents of Dowrie Place and Garrol Place about a significant increase in traffic down a road that is also used for parked vehicles – and challenges the 'safe and pleasant' objective on P48 of the MIR.

There is a separate Planning Application decision for 9 affordable houses by that was turned down by the Council but overridden by the Scottish Government. Cumulatively these two separate proposals would significantly increase housing density in this part of the village and inevitably increase traffic in a relatively small road, as parking for the **Council But Openation** houses will be limited.

There is also a plan that has been passed to build a number (45?) houses a mile up the road at Fasque, all of which will increase traffic and congestion through the

village. A pavement is constructed from the site to the Primary School, however given the length of the walk and its relative isolation, it is very likely parents will drop their children off at School by car. The Sxhool is on Distillery Road which is already used by residents to park their cars, which can be problematic when heavy vehicles coming to and from the Distillery and agricultural vehicles are also going up and down regularly. Adding an extra 40 households' cars from OP1 to the usual school traffic from the catchment area, plus the extra cars from the Langstane development will need careful consideration.

The allocation for OP1 is as I understand it 60 – we need to be sure this does not go against the limits set out in the MIR around limits to clusters and groups of housing.

Thanks very much

Amy Anderson

