10 AUG 2020

Please use this form to make comments on the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020. If you are making comments about more than one topic it would be very helpful if you could fill in **a separate response form for each issue you wish to raise.**

Please email or send the form to reach us by 31 July 2020 at the following address:

Post: Planning Policy Team, Infrastructures Services
Aberdeenshire Council, Woodhill House, Westburn Road, ABERDEEN, AB16 5GB

Email: ldp@aberdeenshire.gov.uk

Please refer to our **Privacy Notice** at the end of this form for details of your rights under the Data Protection Act.

YOUR DETAILS

Title:	Mrs
First Name:	Robert
Surname:	Pirie
Date:	28/07/2020
Postal Address:	[redacted]
Postcode:	
Telephone Number:	
Email:	

Are you happy to receive future correspondence only by email? Yes ☑ No ☐

Are you responding on behalf of another person? Yes ☐ No ☑

If yes who are you representing?

☐ Tick the box if you would like to subscribe to the Aberdeenshire LDP eNewsletter:

An acknowledgement will be sent to this address soon after the close of consultation.

YOUR COMMENTS

Please provide us with your comments below. We will summarise comments and in our analysis will consider every point that is made. Once we have done this we will write back to you with Aberdeenshire Council's views on the submissions made. We will publish your name as the author of the comment, but will not make your address public.

Modification that you wish to see (please make specific reference to the section of the Proposed Plan you wish to see modified if possible, for example Section 9, paragraph E1.1):

Ref LDP2021NN

I object to both OP1, OP2 and the destruction of the green belt around Potterton. This will destroy the character of the village and I object to the loss of green belt land which is protecting our amenity and our rural identify.

Please remove Potterton from the Strategic Growth Area and from promoting growth in the Energetica Corridor on Page 19 para 5.14.

Please remove the Community Hall, the Business Units and the word "Contemporary" to describe the settlement from the Potterton vision statement. Change the Flood Risk from Small Watercourse to Large Watercourse.

In the Potterton vision remove the word "contribute to" preserving the amenity and change back to "The planning objective for the settlement is to preserve the amenity of the village, which shall be achieved through the use of protected land designations and through the application of the greenbelt policy." Reinstate the Greenbelt Designation on both proposed sites.

The proposed sites do not meet the criteria for Effective land it is constrained land and should be removed from the local development plan.

Remove the Ancient Woodland as a provision for Open space and remove it as enhancing biodiversity.

Remove the core path they state is in keeping with the proximity. Remove the words "should provide connectivity" to the existing settlement

The Community Hall has not been consulted or engaged publicly about this development and it has passed through the Main Issues stage with no public scrutiny, allowing it to get into the Proposed development plan unchallenged. There has been no consultation on the desire for a new community hall and Potterton already has a community hall. Please have this removed from the vision statement and its false statement

I object to both OP1, OP2 and would like the plan modified to removed both sites. and the destruction of the green belt around Potterton. This will destroy the character of the

village and I object to the loss of green belt land which is protecting our amenity and our rural identify.

Reason for change:

I would like to strongly object to the proposal of the new housing development in our Beautiful Potterton on OP1 & OP2 (FR140, FR141A and FR141B)
The Belhelvie Council have failed all residents of this peaceful green and safe village, by not engaging with us. The removal of Greenbelt on both sites within Potterton has taken place with no public consultation, there has been no discussions or publications to inform the residents this was taking place. It has been done [redacted] and [redacted] to [redacted] developers. The developers and the council have [redacted] what type of community we're going to live in [redacted]
This is completely unacceptable as this is our home, our community, our rural space.
Why did the council not challenge the change in Greenbelt? The very thing that is being pushed on us in the LDP is [redacted] development, and Greenbelt is supposed to protect that from happening. This constitutes urban sprawl in the Greenbelt and will increase our village by 56%. This is not a small change nor a small development [redacted]. I'm not anti-development and we've had some very appropriate development in Potterton over recent years, but this proposal is not in keeping at all, not in scale or form, and will result in the loss of our village identity as an agricultural community. We find it very hard to understand how this has been allowed to happen. You will find it hard to find any comments from residents during the main issue stage [redacted]. The reputation of the community council has been lost and what's in its place is mistrust. The integrity in the process is also lost.

I request that you modify the plan to have the Greenbelt designation reinstated
It does not meet the policy for Greenbelt as set out by the Scottish Government Planning Policy. There is no established need to justify the release of Greenbelt as a national requirement. Housing land supply is showing 7 1/2 yrs of supply so Greenbelt should not be released. There is adequate housing supply. The Greenbelt is there to protect our amenity, our rural space, our landscape setting and how that reflects our character as a farming community. The very area we all use for accessing rural space to walk and enjoy the countryside is where they wish to mass develop. This will limit the very thing that Greenbelt is supposed to protect along with the loss of our identity. This is unjustified loss and nothing has been demonstrated to show otherwise.

I request that in the LDP under the vision of Potterton please remove the desire for a new community & the identified preference for small business units near to the existing land. There has been no public consultation on the need for a community hall so it should be

removed. We already have a community hall. The Forsyth Hall also does not exist and should be removed. This is falsifying information. There has been no demonstrated need for business units in Potterton and we already have sufficient business units suited to a rural community. To add more would be inappropriate to the setting of Potterton, as we are a farming community not a business destination.

Potterton does not meet the criteria for the Effective land supply

Both sites should be removed as they do not meet the criteria for Effective land that can be delivered within 5yrs. There are infrastructure constraints which are well documented stating that these would take large amounts of investment to overcome. The scale of infrastructure required would require a scale of development so large that the character of the village would be lost and it has been noted by the Formartine cllrs previously in 2013 that this would out weight any benefits. The physical elements of the road constraints which the proposed development would access cannot be overcome. There are points which are single file where houses sit at either side, so the road cannot be widened. There are blind corners in the road out to the AWPR which have signed warnings about on-coming traffic on the same side of the road. White lines were put onto the roads but this does not change the fact they're still very narrow at points and veichels and HGV's still straddle the other side. There is a huge risk to flood in the sites and its in the SEPA 1:200 flood risk. The sites are acting as a natural basin for the water and any displacement of land will cause flooding, and specifically down to Milton of Potterton homes. There as several soggy bog areas in the field due to the water run-off and high-water table in Potterton. The site is on a slope, with one part so steep that it's not something that can be overcome, the steepest part is next to the ancient woodland and any changes there puts biodiversity at risk and the woodland itself. It would also have huge implications for the residents who live adjacent to the site. These are not things that can be overcome without huge risk to existing residents. The land is contaminated, this is documented in the planners bid assessment reports. We are we using land that floods, has poor road access and is contaminated. There is still a methane flare from the landfill site, which these properties would be in the zoning area for. It is not safe to have construction that close.

I request that you remove Potterton from the Energetica Corridor

Potterton has no allocation for housing or employment land and is not in the Strategic Growth Area. We have infrastructure constraints and it is not supported to use that as reasoning for developing here. We are not a strategic area and by adding development you're adding 100's of additional cars a day to the roads and increasing emissions. This is not the vision for the Energetica corridor. Potterton is not a business destination, it's a farming community.

I request that the LDP to be "removed' Potterton from the Strategic Growth Area.

Page19 Paragraph 5.14 Stating that Potterton is in the Strategic Growth Area.

Potterton is not within the Strategic Growth Area

Our lack of public infrastructure like roads and public transport are not suitable to support the strategy of what a growth area is supposed to function as and what it represents, Development here will only increase emissions, and our roads cannot be improved to support additional traffic or public transport routes. Access is via a C class road and an

unclassified road. This is not strategic.

- I contest the council and developers being allowed to solely decide that our semi-rural village will increase by 50% over 5 years
- This is Inappropriate scale and form for Potterton of our very scarce Greenbelt land in Scotland. Please visit the village to see for yourself.
- The scale proposed would result in the immediate loss of our village identity and setting.
- We have several protected species directly adjacent to the sites who cross over it and in the adjoining ancient woodland. The sites are also used by many other animals which may not be protected by this is their habitat.
- This development is situated too far away from amenities. This was identified by several other developers during the final issues and actions papers. This will only cause more traffic and bottle necks in the village as we have calming restrictions in place.
- We have a timetabled bus service, which is 1 bus every two hrs through the village. This is typical of a rural village. This will only add additional cars to the roads. The roads are not suitable for new bus routes out to the AWPR. This is also a safety risk for existing residents and particularly those living along the road.

- There are no plans to upgrade our roads, no plans to upgrade the sewage or the drainage.

- Our roads flood due to the high-water table and run off. The drains are at capacity and can't cope as it stands.

- The burn continues to get contaminated and this is a environmental hazard if you're going to add further development in Potterton in the next 5 yrs.

- Paragraph 49 of Scottish planning - Green Belt should support the Spatial Strategy by directing development to the most appropriate locations. It is appropriate to maintain the Green belt around Potterton and direct the development to nearby sites in Blackdog as part of the Strategic Growth Area and/or the old landfill site which is brownfield. This would contribute towards the 40% target of developing brownfield sites in Aberdeenshire.

- Potterton has already been subject to years of development, which has had an Impact on health and air quality, as well as quality of enjoying the area. We've had the long-term effects of toxic waste due to the landfill on our outskirts. Then we had to deal with the construction of the AWPR with HGV's racing unsafely through our small narrow roads and past small cottages who live along there. ,The damage is still very evident, which still needs to be rectified. These trucks accessing our roads is a huge safety issue and I feel it's not been taken into account when proposing the same roads to be used for the construction traffic of these proposed developments, while resulting in hundreds of additional cars being added to them. I have had several near misses with trucks along this road are have encroached due to the narrowness and I've been forced up the verge.

- OP1 and OP2 lie within SEPA 1 in 200 a year Flood Risk Area. Scottish Water are aware of the fact we have a high-water table at Potterton, with ongoing issues with drainage and run off from the adjacent fields, our plumbing station can't cope with additional development.

- There is insufficient capacity at Balmedie Waste Water Treatment Works for all the developments in Potterton, Belhelvie, Balmedie and Newburgh included in the Proposed Local Development Plan. This has been noted in the Strategic Environment assessment report for Formartine; stating there would be localised impacts on the watercourses during development, which is concerning when the sites border existing homes, Ancient Woodland and the protected species which use the area as habitat.

- This development does not meet sustainable climate change as set out in the LPD page 4.3 as it will add 100s of car journeys a day, it will limit active travel for existing residents and new. There are no cycle lanes or paths in the area and the one core path we have does not have good connectivity and it's remote from the proposed sites. The site also floods and is acting as a natural basin protecting many homes who live in Milton of Potterton and Potterton House estates. The trees are Potterton house were planted to try and deal with the drainage issues of water flooding. There is huge risk to existing residents if these sites go forward.

- The Greenbelt protects not only our rural green space, it protects the habitat for many types of wildlife and protected species. would detriment our wildlife.
- The Ancient Woodland is home to rare forms of biodiversity and it's being put at risk of preservation.
- There is a long historical thread, which is at threat of having its sense of place lost. Potterton House and the surrounding estate houses form part of our history along with the Mill. Milton of Potterton has its own unique character and sense of community. The Greenbelt is protecting it's "sense of place" in the landscape setting it deserves. This should be an area of permanence. Speculative developers have shown little thought to its identity and the impact on the community there, and will swamp Woodside Cottage which was the old Keepers Cottage out of sight in the landscape swallowing up the Ancient Woodland from the landscape in one move. This is totally unacceptable and would be a huge loss. This constitutes sprawl which Greenbelt is supposed to serve the purpose to stop coalescence.
- Our access to rural space will be gone as the development will have swallowed up the area which we use to walk down. The roads will make it to unsafe to walk there anymore.
- The development constitutes ribbon development as it's not close to the settlement and is a strip lobbed onto the side down a road.
- The LDP states the village was originally located along Manse Road, this is incorrect. This can't be used to create its "sense of space" and closer to the desired sites. I
- Incorrectly stating where the village was originally located works in the favour of the developers to mass develop this side of Potterton. The sites are actually quite remote from the village, there actually detached.

- Planning documents claim that there's no "sense of place" and "lack of identity" in our village, stating that this side of Potterton has a hard edge. These statements try to diminish the experience of living here, whilst equally appearing to market the Greenbelt for development.
- Potterton has always been a community and the resident's value it and take pride in it.
- The Covid-19 pandemic has made the information completely inaccessible to many members of the community who have no access to appropriate technology.
- THE MAINTENANCE OF AN ADEQUATE SUPPLY SHOULD NOT INCLUDE THE DESTRUCTION OF GREEN BELT
- The Ancient Woodland cannot be used as provision of open space for the development as it's privately owned land, which is part of the Potterton House designed landscape. Neither should you be allowing development right up to its boundary and blocking this piece of history with an inappropriate housing development. There is scant provision for the protection of these woods and it's will put its preservation at huge risk.
- Due to Potterton being surrounded by prime agricultural land including the proposed development sites, we have to accommodate a large volume of farm traffic on our already challenging roads. The proposed sites which are currently put to good use as grazing land are directly adjacent to where heavy farm machinery exists fields, which produce crops for food production. it is unsafe to develop on mass scale next to these sites where we have continued seasonal farming traffic. This is a single file unclassified road.

- Belhelvie Community Council meeting from 8th June 2020 state The Council view it is inevitable that further housing developments would happen at Potterton as it has at all other Parish settlements. This statement was recorded prior to the submission process of public representation. This certainly undermines the public consultation process as set out by Aberdeenshire Council. It flies in the face of their polices on Greenbelt and that of The Scottish Government. In looking back at the Belhelvie Banter (a local pamphlet) for the last year and in March 2019 the BCC reports - Reviewing the development of Aberdeenshire's Council 5 year Development Plan for the area ([redacted]) There are no details of proposals and no recommendations for readers to go to the council website to send their comments and objections. The BCC made no other entries in the next three editions in June, September and December 2019. Their submission in the March 2020 Belhelvie Banter makes no reference to the LPD.

- The roads around Potterton are not suitable for additional traffic, as a result of development - construction traffic, cars or any additional volume of buses to route through the village or towards the AWPR. The roads including the various pinch points at Milton of Potterton are a constraint which cannot be overcome to accommodate a bus and vehicle passing at the same time.
- Barratts proposals for an upgrade create a rat run right through the village and that alone cannot remove the roads constraint. It's just another safety issue. The various pinch points on the Den Road and the road towards Milton of Potterton cannot be widened as there are existing homes along these routes.
- The Den road out to the AWPR is also not suitable for new bus routes or additional traffic, as it would have safety implications for the existing residents, and again, contains more narrow points, issues with visibility, and a hairpin bend at Milton of Potterton back towards the village

The role of the Belhelvie Community Council in the process needs to be questioned . They have made no attempt to engage the residents of Potterton for their views to the changes of the LDP and the proposed development . The residents of Potterton are frustrated and ANGRY by the way the BCC have ignored them

There still has been no public consultation on the LDP in Potterton, and It is unacceptable for the LDP to process to conclude without the views of Potterton residents being taken into consideration. I request that the resident's views are taken into account before the LDP is finalised.

We want to know what has changed to allow such a dramatic change to the housing allocations for Potterton? Further examination of the Local Development Plan (2017) reveal why these same sites were not brought forward.

In Formartine Settlements within the Main Issues Report 2013, it was stated that Potterton is not suitable for housing allocation because of the infrastructure constraints. And that a development large enough to deliver all the infrastructure required would change the character of the place so much that this would outweigh any benefits of development.

Why is it justified to increase the number of homes here by 56% if there are still the same infrastructure constraints?

PRIVACY NOTICE

Aberdeenshire COUNCIL

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN PUBLIC COMMENT

The Data Controller of the information being collected is Aberdeenshire Council.

The Data Protection Officer can be contacted at Town House, 34 Low Street, Banff, AB45 1AY.

Email: dataprotection@aberdeenshire.gov.uk