

Response to the
Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development
Plan 2010

by

Newtonhill, Muchalls & Cammachmore
Community Council

Prepared by Michael Morgan

Newtonhill, Muchalls & Cammachmore Community Council

23 September 2010

This document represents the formal response to the proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2010 (LDP) by the Newtonhill, Muchalls & Cammachmore Community Council.

The Newtonhill, Muchalls & Cammachmore Community Council held a number of public consultation exercises to discuss the impact of the Main Issues Report which included a Planning for Real event held in May 2009. The Planning for Real event provided residents with the opportunity to question some of the developers regarding the proposals put forward for the LDP. Since the publication of the proposed LDP the Community Council has received a number of representations regarding its contents.

The Community Council supports the decisions made by the Kincardine & Mearns Area Committee especially with respect to Elsick being the preferred development area in the Portlethen to Stonehaven corridor. We agree with the proposed development areas and the proposed policies with the exception of the items listed below.

The Newtonhill, Muchalls & Cammachmore Community Council wish to make the following submissions:

1. Bids in the Main Issues Report

We support the decision of the Kincardine & Mearns Area Committee to select Elsick as the preferred development. We also support the decision of Aberdeenshire councillors to reject all the bids from the Main Issues Report that did not appear in the proposed LDP and we do not want any of these bids to be reintroduced or new ones to be added.

2. In the village of Newtonhill

From our consultation exercise it was clear that the consensus of opinion of the residents of Newtonhill that further development is not required in Newtonhill. The intention of the proposed development at Elsick was to avoid piecemeal expansion to existing communities. The development of a new town designed and built from a master plan was their preferred option.

H1, which would require a master plan, should be deleted and the allocation of 70 houses given to Elsick M1.

EH1 with its allocation of 35 houses, along with H1, would require a new road from Cairnhill Road to Park Place, diverting traffic through the village. EH1 should also be deleted and given to Elsick M1.

3. Land to the west of the Causey Mounth close to West Cammachmore

The Community Council are very pleased that the area between the A90 and the Causey Mounth has been designated a greenbelt. We would like to see that greenbelt extended approximately 0.5 miles (0.8 km) west of the Causey Mounth. A proposal to extend the greenbelt up to a defensible line delineated by natural boundaries had been put before the Area Committee, we ask for the proposal to be included in the plan.

The Kincardine & Mearns Community Plan 2010-2014, under Sustainable Environment, in paragraph D9(b) says:

The Causey Mounth will be protected and where possible sections of the route will be developed and enhanced through the Development Planning and Core Path Planning process.

The greenbelt will:

- protect the village of West Cammachmore from coalescence with the new town of Elswick
- provide a wildlife corridor
- protect the Causey Mounth from future development.

4. Retail development policies SGRetail 1 and SGRetail 2

We believe that the way that these two policies are worded it would not be possible for a small shop to be approved in one of the villages of Newtonhill, Muchalls or Cammachmore. SGRetail 1, policy 2 states that the proposed development must be in a defined town or have followed the sequential approach. SGRetail 2 appears to be very restrictive as to the type of retail activity that would be allowed although the reasoned justification for SGRetail 2 aims to promote the rural economy and to promote retail services throughout the region.

We are looking for policy that would allow a community store, a corner shop, or a small arts and crafts shop. The retail floor area should be limited to not more than 100 square metres. We would expect a shop of this nature to bring the benefits of employment and income into the community.

5. SG STRLType2: Greenbelt

As a policy, **development should not be allowed in designated greenbelt for any reason.** Greenbelt exists to be exactly as it sounds, a green space to protect communities from coalescence, to provide quiet, restful corridors where people can get away from the built environment. The greenbelt also provides essential areas where wildlife can live in safety alongside towns and villages.

Policy exists to allow planning officers to make delegated decisions and to make recommendations to elected councillors. If this policy needs to be challenged for local or national reasons, then the mechanism exists for elected councillors to apply their knowledge of local conditions to make a reasoned decision on a case-by-case basis.

6. SG Enabling development

The Community Council see a problem with SG Enabling development in that it provides a developer the opportunity to build anywhere, even outside of allocated housing development areas. We believe that it is essential that:

1. The associated development must be an area with an existing housing allocation sufficient to accommodate the new development.
2. The associated development should be geographically close to the building requiring restoration.