

Piers Blaxter

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 August 2014 09:28
To: Piers Blaxter
Subject: LDPdecisions.

Mr. Blaxter.

We met in Peterhead's Palace Hotel during Public Meeting re: Main Issues/LDP consultation.

I understand Political Regulation and Control mechanisms 'trickles down from the top'. This shapes and informs subsequent Planning constructs, such as Local Development Plans. LDP's are shaped by National Planning Guidelines currently in play.

Amending these Guidelines at a time when Aberdeenshire Council's LDP has reached a relative advanced stage must be questioned.

It is a waste of limited resources, and effectively 'moves the goalposts' on all the work previously carried out..

During a recent meeting, I was advised that the Scottish Government have recently brought out additional Planning legislation which impacts on Aberdeenshire Council's LDP, and appears to be in conflict with earlier Public Consultation outcomes.

The recent designation of large swathes of Aberdeenshire as being 'suitable for wind turbine deployment' with limited Planning constraint is of particular concern.

While I support the principal of wind turbines, there are very few rural areas of Aberdeenshire where wind turbines are not to be seen.

It is my opinion that they should be deployed in a windfarm configuration, rather than randomly deployed throughout the wider rural environment.

I would raise another point with you.

Wind turbine deployment (and other technologies) can be a contentious issue at a local level. As such, it should be for the 'impacted community' to decide whether or not a specific site (or technology) is acceptable.

This decision should be time specific to the planning application and taken at a local level, rather than previously decided at an earlier date by individuals or governmental authorities who are not burdened by such decisions.

Rather than make 'broad brush' policies which regulate an 'easy path' for potentially contentious technologies, National Planning Authorities should recognise Local Communities must be protected from the imposition of contentious technologies having Institutional support.

Your thoughts on the above?
Hope to hear from you soon.

Regards

[REDACTED]

SUBMISSION No.	005
IF	TD
SE	IL S