From:
To:
LDP

Subject: LDP Representation: Jennifer Nicol

Date: 24 July 2020 14:03:12

Good afternoon.

I have already submitted a representation to the Proposed Local Development Plan. However on further examination of the supplementary documents, I would like to make a further comment.

Contact details are:



My comment is below:

Within Housing Land Allocation, it shows Potterton incorrectly allocated under the Strategic Growth Area. Potterton is in the Local Growth Area. It has been allocated in the Housing Land Allocation incorrectly and should be removed.

See page 5 - Housing Land Allocations

 $\frac{http://publications.aberdeenshire.gov.uk/dataset/f14a62da-30d1-488d-9338-}{7b09e82360cf/resource/e82ca8dd-76bf-48fa-89e7-311bb94bfaf5/download/appendix-6-housing-land-allocations.pdf}$

LDP - See page 90 "Potterton is outwith the Aberdeen to Peterhead Strategic Growth Area" http://publications.aberdeenshire.gov.uk/dataset/f14a62da-30d1-488d-9338-7b09e82360cf/resource/98efd358-d474-4846-b723-ed2ce176aed4/download/appendix-7c-settlement-statements---formartine.pdf

This was also previously discussed by the DPEA when reporting on the previous Local Development Plan.

I would also like to highlight that the allocations at Potterton are not suitable, as shown by Aberdeenshire Council's previous LDP supporting document:

"If further allocations are appropriate in future, Potterton is not suitable for allocations as the settlement is currently constrained by a lack of educational, roads and water infrastructure." (Aberdeenshire Council's Local Development Plan, 2013, Formartine Settlement Appendix, Potterton pages 52-57

https://www.aberdeenshire.gov.uk/media/10940/formartineindexandsettlementstatementssmall.pdf)

Potterton still has the same constraints relating to education, roads and water infrastructure. The construction of the AWPR was to improve connectivity as a transport corridor, not a development corridor. The AWPR is the only change to infrastructure here. The C1 class roads immediately surrounding the village and OP1/OP2 remain unchanged.

I have been unable to find a planning document to justify why OP1, OP2 and the removal of the Green Belt at Potterton has been considered to be "suitable" in the Proposed Local Development Plan.

Kind regards, Jenny Nicol Sent from my iPhone