

Home » Tools and Resources » Internet Enquiries

## E-Mail Enquiry

Class:	LDP	<input type="button" value="Change Class"/>
To:	LDP@aberdeenshire.gov.uk	
CC:	[REDACTED]	
From:	[REDACTED]	1, 3
Date:	22/09/2014 09:50:41	
Subject:	[ACE/605996] LPD MIR Addendum Consultation	
Status:	New Enquiry	<input type="button" value="Change Status"/>
Owner:	No Owner Assigned	<input type="button" value="Change Owner"/>
<i>(Individual dealing with the Enquiry.)</i>		
Age:	0	
<i>(in work days)</i>		
Comments:		<input type="button" value="Edit Comment"/>

### Enquiry Text

I apologise for the fact that this submission on behalf of the Echt and Skene CC is a little late but hope that you will nonetheless include our responses in your consideration.

We wish to respond on two of the questions posed in the addendum as follows:

Question 1 Do you have any comments on the Revised Spatial Framework for Wind Energy Development or the proposal to require the development industry to assess the "Visual envelope" of settlements through the planning application process?:

ESCC Response: It is appropriate for the Aberdeenshire Spatial Framework to show all areas within 2km of settlements as "Areas of Significant Protection".

Scottish Planning Policy further qualifies such Areas of Significant Protection "based on landform and other features that would restrict views out from the settlement". The Zone of Theoretical Visibility for a large wind turbine is going to be much greater than that for a small one, and so it is not possible for planning policy to determine what will be seen in views from a settlement before an application is made for a specific size of turbine. It would therefore seem that there is no alternative to the preferred option which is to require the developer (as at present) to provide a ZTV with his application and to seek to argue how other features might restrict visibility further.

However, if a proposed development is within 2km of, and visible from, a settlement the policy needs to be clear what the consequences would be for judging the application e.g. does the fact that it is visible rule it out? If not then this would appear to represent no change from the current policy where every application is assessed subjectively for its impact on residential amenity anyway.

Land Supply and Distribution Question 3 Do you agree with the assessment of land supply in light of the updated information? If not, please explain why?

ESCC Response: We agree that no additional housing development land allocations need to be made in the 2016 LDP.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]  
 Chairman  
 Echt & Skene Community Council

### History

22/09/2014 10:11 Enquiry (Current Document)  
 22/09/2014 10:16 Automatic Reply

SUBMISSION No.	053
ISSUES RAISED	1, 3
SUPPORTING DOCS	