

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:	MR
First Name:	PETER AMPERSON
Surname:	ANDERSOU
Date:	30/7/2020
Postal Address:	77.50.00
Postcode:	
Telephone Number:	
Email:	

Are you happy to receive future correspondence only b	y email? Yes ☑ No □
Are you responding on behalf of another person? Yes a	□ No 🗹
If yes who are you representing?	N. 100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100
Tick the box if you would like to subscribe to the Abo	rdonnehire I DD aktoor tou

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):

LDP 20	21 NN							
	ops and	opz						
Reason for change:								
	PLEASE	Sets	FOLLOWENS PASSES	for donatis				

I would like to object to the Proposed Local Development Plan for the changes in Potterton. The Proposed Local Development Plan would open us up to mass development and I do not wish for this to happen to the village of Potterton, allowing for over 50% increase in housing over 5 years, as well as potential for the village to triple in size if this onslaught of building were to continue. I object to OP1, OP2 and the destruction of the green belt around the village of Potterton.

#### **Reason for Change:**

Inappropriate use of Greenbelt This is not an appropriate location for this kind of development, and the Green Belt here at Potterton should be-- protected. The areas around Potterton mentioned in the Local Development Plan are currently Green Belt areas, yet are to be changed into areas suitable for housing and this is unacceptable. This is an unjustifiable loss of Green Belt. As established by the Land Audit, there is currently 7.2 years of available housing within the Aberdeen Land area. This housing is not needed here. The changes to the Local Development Plan do not accurately depict the wishes of the community, who were relatively unaware that this mass development is in the pipeline.

#### **Ancient Woodland and Protected Species**

There are historical interests, such as cairns and standing stones. There are protected species in the area and ancient woodland. These should be protected from development.

#### **Landscape Value**

Within the Landscape Character Assessment of Aberdeen (Nicol, let 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."

### **Lack of Community Engagement**

Due to the Covid19 pandemic, there has not been a public meeting with regards to the changes to be made to the village, but nevertheless, the community deserves more engagement than has been made accessible to them. Especially when this massive shift in the Local Development Plan for our area could be made to irrevocably change the future of this village.

## **Roads and Lack of Infrastructure**

There will be excessive traffic and noise, and an increased risk to all road users' long term. The roads are not suitable for an additional number of houses. The trunk roads which connect to the AWPR were not upgraded, and are not set to be upgraded as per the Proposed Local Development Plan. These are C class country roads, including single tracks, passing places, blind summits and narrow bends. It is entirely irresponsible to increase traffic on these roads, during building development and ongoing through a surge of new occupancy.

The transportation note within the Main Issues Report was completed by RPS Ltd on behalf of the developer of OP1 and OP2. Based on their findings, Potterton has an average of 1.7 cars per household. On that assumption, it would be an additional 396+ cars. However, within the transportation note, they consider no impact on the village from increased traffic, or increased construction traffic. Within this transportation note, it accounts for Potterton having a 'frequent bus service, however this needs to be corrected, as according to Local Bus Service Policy, Potterton has a timetabled service. (Frequent is less than 15 minutes intervals.)

Road safety is already a massive concern, without additional pressure on the roads surrounding Potterton. The transportation note lacks credibility as it does not accurately depict roads and transportation around the

current settlement. Whilst the benefits of the AWPR linking to all major business parks in Dyce, Westhill & Altens are highlighted, Potterton has no direct bus services to any of these destinations. Also, almost all of Potterton's amenities are centred around Balmedie, and again, there are no direct bus services to Balmedie. The scale of this development WILL result in traffic loading due to lack of public infrastructure in bus services, as all residents will have to drive to access services. The Main Issues Report (on why bid site FR123, the old Wester Hatton tip was undevelopable) recognized that additional traffic loading onto the AWPR at this junction was not to be taken lightly. The Main Issues Report on bid site FR123, also identified concerns of forecasted traffic growth and a potential bottleneck to the Black dog AWPR junction. The benefits of the AWPR will be diminished by development at Potterton.

"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." (Main Issues Report)

#### **Education**

Ongoing concerns from the local community council have continued to be noted in their meetings, and yet the proposed LDP does not raise education provision as an overwhelming constraint "All residential development may be required to contribute towards additional primary school capacity." (pLDP) -

It is not appropriate to accept developers' contributions as part of housing development and then address educational provision after the fact. Balmedie Primary is already predicted to be at 118% capacity within 5 years. This need addressed before any new development should be considered within the entirety of the Balmedie Primary catchment area. In a recent LDP email update from Aberdeenshire Council, it was noted that there was an opportunity for an Officer from the Policy Team to attend a Community Council meeting

# Social Exclusion due to lack of access to technology

The COVID-19 pandemic has made the information completely inaccessible to many members of the community who have no access to appropriate technology. This is not apathy towards planning and development, but a lack of access to information.

virtually, however this has not been made available to the residents in Potterton.

## Sewage/Lack of infrastructure

It is concerning to note that OP1 and OP2 lie within SEPA's 1 in 200-year Flood Risk Area. It is noted in the Strategic Environment Assessment report for Formartine that there would be localised impacts on watercourses during development, which is concerning when the sites border existing homes, Ancient Woodland and the protected species which live in the woodland. There is insufficient capacity at Balmedie Waste Water Treatment Works for all the development in Potterton, Belhelvie, Balmedie and Newburgh included in the Proposed Local Development Plan. Scottish Water are aware that there is a high-water table at Potterton, with ongoing issues with drainage and runoff, which the pumping station cannot cope with. Additional development would not be suitable in the sites noted in the Proposed Local Development Plan.

#### "The village was originally located along Manse Road"

This is factually incorrect within the Main Issues Report. The village was not originally located along Manse Road, and this can't be used to create the "settlement's sense of place" closer to desired sites of OP1 and OP2. It appears from this statement that the proposed Local Development Plan wants to favour that side of the village as a central point or hub, which in turn would allow for mass development. Planning documents claim that there's no "sense of place" and "lack of identity" in our village, but this diminishes the experience of living here whilst equally appearing to market the Green Belt for development. Potterton has always been a community and the resident's value it and take pride in it. Biodiversity Within the supporting document (Strategic Environmental Assessment of New Allocated Sites and Alternative Bids — Formartine.), there is a clear omission of information with regards to biodiversity. Other sites within the village refer to the negative impacts of Biodiversity as: "Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA and Sands of Forvie SAC are set to the north. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying sites and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species." The proximity to these areas of biodiversity is noted throughout the report for proposed sites around Potterton, but has been omitted for sites OP1 and OP2. Both OP1 and OP2 are within the same close proximity to "qualifying sites" and "qualifying species". The Local Authority cannot choose to use information for one proposed site but omit it for another, when the sites are all within the same close proximity. As an example, it could be argued that Milton of Potterton neighbouring OP1 is in fact closer to Sands of Forvie than FR121 at Gourdiepark. (Milton of Potterton, the border of OP1 site is 13.3miles from Forvie Sands, whilst Gourdiepark is 14.1 miles away from Forvie Sands.) This is an inaccuracy of reporting by omission. This should have been included when discussing biodiversity on OP1 and OP2.

#### Roads and Lack of Infrastructure

The increased road traffic passing my home ( ) would cause significant problems entering and exiting the relatively concealed drive at this property, traffic coming from the direction of Potterton is at times already a problem, the problem would become a serious safety issue.

There will be excessive traffic and noise, and an increased risk to all road users' long term. The roads are not suitable for an additional number of houses. The trunk roads which connect to the AWPR were not upgraded, and are not set to be upgraded as per the Proposed Local Development Plan. These are C class country roads, including single tracks, passing places, blind summits and narrow bends. It is entirely irresponsible to increase traffic on these roads, during building development and ongoing through a surge of new occupancy. The transportation note within the Main Issues Report was completed by on behalf of the developer of OP1 and OP2. Based on their findings, Potterton has an average of 1.7 cars per household. On that assumption, it would be an additional 396+ cars. However, within the transportation note, they consider no impact on the village from increased traffic, or increased construction traffic. Within this transportation note, it accounts for Potterton having a 'frequent' bus service, however this needs to be corrected, as according to Local Bus Service Policy, Potterton has a timetabled service. (Frequent is less than 15 minutes intervals.)

Road safety is already a massive concern, without additional pressure on the roads surrounding Potterton. The transportation note lacks credibility as it does not accurately depict roads and transportation around the current settlement. Whilst the benefits of the AWPR Finking to all major business parks in Dyce, Westhill & Altens are highlighted, Potterton has no direct bus services to any of these destinations. Also, almost all of Potterton's amenities are centred around Balmedie, and again, there are no direct bus services to Balmedie.

The scale of this development WILL result in traffic loading due to lack of public infrastructure in bus services, as all residents will have to drive to access services. The Main Issues Report (on why bid site FR123, the old Wester Hatton tip was undevelopable) recognized that additional traffic loading onto the AWPR at this junction was not to be taken lightly. The Main Issues Report on bid site FR123, also identified concerns of

forecasted traffic growth and a potential bottleneck to the Blackdog AWPR junction. The benefits of the AWPR will be diminished by development at Potterton. "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." (Main Issues Report)

#### **Education**

Ongoing concerns from the local community council have continued to be noted in their meetings, and yet the proposed LDP does not raise education provision as an overwhelming constraint. "All residential development may be required to contribute towards additional primary school capacity." (pLDP) - It is not appropriate to accept developers' contributions as part of housing development and then address educational provision after the fact. Balmedie Primary is already predicted to be at 118% capacity within 5

years. This need addressed before any new development should be considered within the entirety of the Balmedie Primary catchment area.