

From: [REDACTED]
To: [LDP](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: LDP2021 NN Representation - Potterton Development OP1/OP2
Date: 31 July 2020 14:31:52

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing in response to proposed development at sites OP1 and OP2 within Potterton (LDP2021 NN). As a resident of the village, [REDACTED], I wish to voice strong objection to such development based on a number of key factors which I do not believe have been adequately addressed.

Given the current economic climate, as well as the importance of environmental considerations, I am not convinced that a development of 233 new homes is either necessary, required, or a beneficial use of the land. Green belt, depending on who is defining it, was to reduce the creep of urban sprawl. Development of the green belt then only where the residences built upon it were for local workers or were there was a desperate need. There is little evidence been presented here which suggests that either of these criteria are met. Indeed, the Aberdeen Land Audit has shown that there is over 7 years of available housing and at this time there is no requirement for further development. There are also a number of large-scale developments already underway at Dubford and Grandholme which have not been completed or filled.

As an amenity, the green belt serves to add to the cultural and aesthetic benefits for the residents of the village. The proposed changes would significantly reduce the green spaces and have an impact of the mental and physical health of villagers. A large part of the appeal and character of the village of Potterton is its locations and surroundings. Whilst described as a predominantly mid-20th century development village, this does not accurately portray the characterful and distinctive nature of a large proportion of the area. Asides from the more 'modern' looking Denhead and Denview developments, this does not consider the individual cottages or the wooden clad cottages. Neither of which can be accurately summed up as 'mid-20th C.'. The details of the proposed plan do not look to safeguard the local visually distinctive nature of the community or show any signs of keeping with the lay out and spacing of the newer developments. The proposed plan, including two story terraces, is not in keeping with the local surroundings and appears to push as many possible houses as possible onto the plot.

The Landscape Character Assessment of Aberdeen (Nicol, I et al, 1996), Potterton is acknowledged as a Landscape Character area and also states that "*Large scale development would not fit in with the existing pattern*" and should "*allow existing areas of greenbelt to have some permanence.*"

I am dismayed by statements suggesting that Potterton has 'no sense of place' and 'a lack of identity'. From the interactions I have with other families and residents in the village I can attest that this is patently false. Many residents have long established roots within the area and this planned development would not add either identity or sense of place but rather the opposite and erode the benefits already in place here. Events such as the pop-up café's organised by the local residents to other charity events regularly take place and add to the community spirit which is strongly felt by many residents.

Asides from the benefits provided by the green spaces around Potterton, there is a real concern regarding the provision of infrastructure and suitability of the proposals for development. SEPA has noted that OP1 and OP2 lie within a flood risk area and water often pools in the rolling land around the site during periods of heavy rainfall. Scottish Water are aware of the high water table in Potterton and acknowledge ongoing problems with run off and suitable and adequate drainage. The local pumping station is reported as unable to cope with the volume of water which can be present and any additional development would create further strain on a stretched process.

Further to this, the Balmedie Waste Water Treatment Works, covering all of the proposed local development planning for Potterton, Balmedie, Belhelvie and Newburgh is shown to have insufficient capacity for any such development. This points to significant remedial works needing to be undertaken with no provision made clear. Any such works would also likely be extensive and further impact the biodiversity and landscape during and after operations.

Transport and road infrastructure also plays an important role in any development. Currently, the key entrances and exits into Potterton are via the turn onto the B999 and the unclassified road connecting Belhelvie to the Black Dog roundabout. During the extensive AWPR works, the roads surrounding Potterton were not upgraded and suffered heavily from an increase in both commuter traffic as well as from commercial and industrial vehicles. There is no plan in place to facilitate improvement of these within the plan and such an increase would be inevitable. A development of the proposed size would inevitably require a large number of heavy goods vehicles over a prolonged time. Further damaging the already deteriorating surfaces. As the roads are frequently used by agricultural vehicles such as tractors, depending on season, there are issues with passing traffic. There are no plans to show how this could be remedied.

The notes regarding transportation consider no impact to the village from increased traffic or increased construction traffic. Given that the Main Issues report, completed by [REDACTED] on behalf of the developer, lists an average of 1.7 cars per household, how can an additional 400 cars be considered of no impact? There is no mention of additional road safety measures or calming measures which would be necessary and this increased flow of traffic through the village would have a significant detrimental effect in terms of localised sound and environmental pollution.

I would also like to draw attention to the listing of the bus service within Potterton as 'frequent'. There is currently a timetabled service but this does not fit the description of frequent. Furthermore, the timetabled services do not connect Potterton to a number of the highlighted local business parks. There is already strain on the amenities with many listed for Potterton actually centred in Balmedie. It is worth noting that there is no direct service between Potterton and Balmedie and as such, it is disingenuous to suggest this will not have an

effect of traffic. Previous planning for the Wester Hatton tip, found undevelopable, recognised the issues of traffic loading quoting, *"Arguments that it will contribute to forecast traffic growth at this location are not to be taken lightly if the function of the AWPR as a transport corridor, and not a development corridor, is to be delivered."*

As a parent I have specific concerns regarding the provision of education within the area. At present, the current local catchment area primary, situated in Balmedie, is predicted to reach 118% capacity within the next 5 years. No provision has been made for this within the plans I have seen.

"All residential development may be required to contribute towards additional primary school capacity." (pLDP)

Having witnessed other developments around the country promise improved cultural and educational amenities which never materialise, I am not persuaded by the prospect of this being an afterthought as it appears so here. I was told directly by a developer regarding a proposal on the other side of Potterton at an open meeting in the village hall, that whilst contributions could be made, it would be down to the council to sort that out. As we here ever increasingly of the financial struggles of all local authorities, I would not be comfortable in this erosion of provision with any child's education.

The following was also brought to my attention thanks to the works of local residents who have worked hard to provide information which was otherwise lacking.

In the Submission of the Report of the Examination, dated 19th Dec 2016, planning reporters acknowledged that no modifications to the Green Belt were recommended in Potterton. Under Settlement Features, *"Paragraph 49 of Scottish Planning Policy identifies that a Green Belt should support the Spatial Strategy by directing development to the most appropriate locations, protecting and enhancing character, landscape setting and identity of a settlement and provide access to open space. It is appropriate to maintain the Green Belt around Potterton to support the vision for the settlement"*. Potterton was excluded from Strategic Growth Area at this time.

"No evidence has been provided to substantiate the concern that the long-term viability of existing services may be threatened unless growth is permitted. Even if this were the case, this would not be an adequate basis for permitting the large-scale growth being sought."

In this time, nothing has changed that should allow such growth to be permitted in this village or within the Belhelvie area, therefore bid sites for large scale development should not have been included within the Proposed Local Development Plan for Potterton.

This highlights the problem with moving forward with such proposals during a time of economic uncertainty as well as at a time when 'normal' processes and procedures have not been followed. Not everyone has will be as informed of the details here and many will also not be as savvy regarding the use of electronic communication. None of this should be taken as apathy towards to the plans. There is a strong negative feeling for this in the village which is visible in the number of Keep Potterton Green signs in windows and on display in gardens. I strongly refute the assertion that the developers have actively engaged with the residents here and would hope that these issues are carefully considered.

This is not a case of NIMBYism. If I could see a real need for further development and evidence that my concerns were addressed, I could concede the requirement for housing development here. For the reasons detailed above I would like to reiterate my objection to the proposed plan.

Kind regards,
Adam Brown

