

111 Cluny and Sauchen

Response ID	Respondent
495	Diane Howie
616	Norman Lawie
757	Emily Owen
1205	Colin Thomson Architects on behalf of Michael S. Allen
1398	Jose Delgado
1500	Ewan Cameron
1539	Stewart Milne Homes
1580	SEPA
1610	Halliday Fraser Munro on behalf of Mr & Mrs Howie and Mr & Mrs Brownie
1809	Scottish Water

1. Issues

Settlement Objectives

A number of respondents were concerned with the lack of community facilities, with some particularly highlighting the need for a shop and/or community hall (495, 1398, 1610). Comments were raised that the village should be making a larger contribution to housing in the Westhill area to drive economic development there (495, 1610).

Infrastructure

Two respondents provided factual information regarding flood risk and water network capacity in relation to the existing allocations and the development bid sites (1580, 1809). The promoters of bid Ga006 highlighted the issues of the primary school nearing capacity and of traffic congestion on the A944, and felt that the development of their bid site would help to alleviate these issues (495, 1610).

Existing Allocations

SEPA have stated that they would object to the continued inclusion of the existing EH1 and H1 allocations within the LDP unless further information on flood risk is provided. In respect of site EH1 they have identified that the 2014 flood hazard map indicates that the site may be at greater risk of flooding than previously thought, and that the risk of flooding from the Cluny Burn should be assessed prior to the inclusion of this site within the plan. In respect of the H1 site they have stated that approximately 50% of the site is at risk of fluvial flooding based on the indicative flood maps, and that an objection would be raised unless the boundary of the site is amended or a flood risk assessment demonstrates the developable area and capacity of the site (1580).

Bid Ga006

A number of respondents, including the site promoters, highlighted the proposed improvements to community facilities and infrastructure that this development could provide (495, 757, 1398, 1610). It was also argued that the visual impact of development on site Ga006 could be minimised with green space networks or phased development, and that the loss of prime agricultural land can be justified in SPP for developments with satisfactory socio-economic benefits (1610). However, one respondent raised concerns with the proposal, arguing that the scale of the development was too large and that the community facilities proposed were largely unnecessary (1500). One respondent felt that the bid was of an inappropriate scale for the settlement and proposed an alternative development site (see below) (1205).

Bid Ga049

The developer for site Ga049 welcomed the officers' preference for this site but disagreed that the site should only be developed with the remaining 27 units of the initial 50 allocated, and instead felt that an additional 49 units should be developed (1539). However, two respondents felt that site Ga049 should not be an officer preference as it has no safe pedestrian footpath to the primary school and would push the primary school over-capacity (616, 1610). One respondent felt that the bid was of an inappropriate scale for the settlement and proposed an alternative development site (see below) (1205).

Bid Ga065

One respondent felt that the bid was of an inappropriate scale for the settlement and proposed an alternative development site (see below) (1205).

Bid Ga066

One respondent suggested that site Ga066 is a better location for the growth of the village, as it is closer to the primary school and includes a pedestrian footpath/cyclepath as part of the bid. They felt that this site would be best placed to accommodate the shortfall that has occurred in Sauchen because only 23 of the allocated 50 houses were approved on the existing H1 site as a result of flooding constraints (616). However, one respondent felt that the bid was of an inappropriate scale for the settlement and proposed an alternative site (see below) (1205).

SEPA has identified that the majority of this site may be at risk from flooding from the Cluny Burn. They have stated that they are unable to agree the principle of development on this site on flood risk grounds and would object to its inclusion in the plan unless this risk was assessed (1580).

Alternative Bid

One respondent proposed an alternative 1.48 hectare site opposite the Kirkwood Business Park (just off the A944 Aberdeen-Alford road) for the development of 8 houses with strategic landscaping. They felt this proposal would be in keeping with the informal nature of the adjacent housing as well as being adequately distant from the nearby commercial properties (1205).

2. Actions

Settlement Objectives and Existing Allocations

The comments in relation to community facilities and services within Cluny and Sauchen are noted. However, these comments have largely been made by promoters of the various bid sites. Whilst it is acknowledged that a number of the bid proposals may deliver community benefits, existing LDP policies allow for such provision to be made without the need to allocate large-scale new housing sites. In response to the comments about the role that Cluny and Sauchen should play in supporting economic development in Westhill, it is considered more appropriate and sustainable to address any such issues within Westhill itself. A more detailed analysis of issues in Westhill, including the need for development allocations, is provided in the Westhill issues and actions paper.

The observations from SEPA concerning the affect of flood risk on the existing housing allocations are acknowledged. It should be noted, however, that planning permission in principle has already been granted for the development of 8 dwellings on the EH1 site, and that a subsequent reserved matters application (APP/2013/3014) was approved in December 2013. SEPA did not object to these applications on flood risk grounds. The EH1 site is identified as being effective within

the 2013 Housing Land Audit and is considered to form a legitimate component of the housing land supply. It is therefore not considered appropriate to remove the EH1 allocation or to require further more detailed flood risk information at this stage. In respect of the H1 allocation, it is accepted that recent planning applications (APP/2012/3688 and APP/2012/4176) have established that a significant amount of the site is not developable owing to flooding constraints. Planning application APP/2012/4176 was approved for 23 dwellings on the developable part of the H1 site, leaving a shortfall of some 27 dwellings against the original allocation. It is therefore agreed that the existing H1 allocation should be amended to reflect this. This has a local impact on the land supply position in Cluny and Sauchen, which is discussed below in respect of the bid sites.

Bid Sites

Overall, there are currently sufficient site allocations within the Aberdeen Housing Market Area (AHMA) that are effective or capable of becoming effective to meet the SDP housing requirement. As such, there is not considered to be any overall requirement to add to the housing land allocations within the AHMA at this stage. However, as identified above, it is likely that around 27 fewer dwellings than originally envisaged will be delivered on the existing H1 allocation in Sauchen owing to flooding constraints. As the H1 site was allocated to support Cluny Primary School, and to help deliver a new footpath link between Sauchen and the Primary School, it may be of local benefit to consider allocating new sites within Cluny and Sauchen to make good the 27 dwelling shortfall.

Site Ga049 has been proposed for the development of the remaining 27 houses from the H1 allocation plus an additional 49 dwellings. As identified within the MIR, this site is considered to be logically located. It would also utilise the infrastructure delivered as part of the already consented development on the H1 site. Although it is partially affected by flooding, a flood risk assessment has already been undertaken and development could still progress on part of the site. Whilst there is not considered to be any justification for allocating the proposed 49 additional dwellings, given the overall supply of housing allocations to meet the SDP requirement within the AHMA, it is considered that a smaller allocation to accommodate 27 dwellings is likely to be appropriate. This would involve a limited southerly extension to the boundary of the existing H1 allocation, as identified in the Masterplan that has previously been approved for the H1 site.

Bid site Ga066 has been submitted as a possible alternative for accommodating the 27 dwellings that were unable to be built on the H1 allocation. Whilst it is noted that this site is well related to the primary school, SEPA have indicated that they would be likely to object to the inclusion of this site within the plan in the absence of further flood risk assessment. As no such assessment of flood risk has been provided in support of the bid, it is not considered appropriate to allocate this site for development.

The comments in support of bid Ga006 are noted. However, it is maintained that this development would be out of scale with the existing village and that there is no justification for allocating land at this scale given that there are sufficient existing allocations within the AHMA to meet the SDP requirement. Whilst it is accepted that this bid would include the provision of community facilities it is not considered that these benefits are sufficient, in themselves, to justify the scale of development proposed.

The alternative bid that has been proposed opposite the Kirkwood Business Park is acknowledged. However, as this site was not submitted at the call for sites stage, and therefore not included in the MIR, there has not been any opportunity for public comment on this proposal. Similarly, it has not been subject to Strategic

Environmental Assessment. Planning Circular 6/2013 makes it clear that if a particular issue or site arises that was not consulted on in the MIR, the planning authority may need to carry out further consultation on that particular issue before publishing its Proposed Plan, if it wants to include it in the plan. There is therefore limited scope for including this site in the Proposed Plan unless further consultation is first undertaken. In any event, there is not considered to be any overall need to allocate this site for development given that there are sufficient existing sites within the AHMA to meet the SDP requirement.

3. Committee Recommendations

1. The existing EH1 allocation should be retained within the LDP as it has planning permission for 8 houses.
2. The existing H1 allocation should be extended southwards in order to provide sufficient land to accommodate 50 dwellings in total. The extended allocation should incorporate the area identified as 'Area 2 (Additional Land)' in Figure 10 of the approved Sauchen Masterplan (September 2012).
3. As no further specific needs have been identified within the settlement, there is no reason to allocate additional development land in Cluny and Sauchen at this stage.

4. Committee Decisions

1. Garioch Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their meeting on 28 May 2014.
2. Infrastructure Services Committee noted the recommendation of the Area Committee and agreed that site H1 should be extended.

