

ABERDEENSHIRE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

FINALISED RESPONSE TO PROPOSED PLAN CONSULTATION MARR – ABERDEEN HOUSING MARKET AREA

Issue 088	Settlement - Inchmarlo	
Development plan reference:	Section 6 Proposals Maps Marr (p24) Schedule 1 Tables 7 (p29) Schedule 2 Tables 1-7 (p34) Schedule 3 Table 2-3 (p36 & 41)) Volume 3I Supplementary Guidance, Settlement Statements (p42)	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
1657, 1658 2581	Halliday Fraser Murno on behalf of Frank Burnett Mrs Jean Henretty	
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	Housing Land allocations in and around Inchmarlo for upto 60 houses.	
Planning Authority's summary of the representation(s):		
Site H1 Inchmarlo		
<p>1657, 1658 The allocation at Inchmarlo of 60 houses is age restricted and should not be counted against overall housing figures.</p> <p>2581: Representation states that the estate provides high priced executive housing which is not required. The plan should consider mixed use and affordable housing on more sustainable sites accessible to facilities.</p>		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
2581: No further housing should be developed on site H1 Inchmarlo.		
Summary of responses (including reasons) by Planning Authority:		
Overview		
<p>Inchmarlo lies to the west of Banchory within the Aberdeen Housing Market Area and in the "local growth and diversification area" identified within the Structure Plan. The allocations proposed aim to support the established Inchmarlo Continuing Care Community. Inchmarlo Continuing Care Community supports independent living with minimum intervention until additional support is required. Further information on the sites is contained in the Issues and Actions paper (Volume 7 page 61 Inchmarlo and Bridge of Canny East) which was informed by the Main Issues Report consultation, and was produced to inform the allocations in the Proposed Plan.</p>		
Site H1		
<p>Whilst the houses at Inchmarlo are targeted at a specific market they contribute to general housing figures and the impacts in terms of services will be equivalent to any other houses. The housing requirements within figure 8 page 17 of the Structure Plan do not exclude housing for occupants over 55 and set out the requirement for the whole population.</p> <p>The housing proposed is to support the Inchmarlo Continuing Care Community which is an established retirement village with care home. There is currently a range of homes from one bedroom apartments to four bedroom houses which are available to those over 55 or younger people if their health condition warrants. Therefore a mix of housing is available. The development will be required to provide at least 25 houses which are classed as "affordable". As an established facility it is appropriate to support its continued viability and enable Inchmarlo to build on the services provided. Mixed use proposals have been made within</p>		

other towns within the Local Growth and Diversification Area.

Conclusion

The allocation made is appropriate and sufficient for the purposes of delivering the strategy and aims of the Local Development Plan and the Structure Plan.

Any further plan changes commended by the Planning Authority:

No changes are commended.

Reporter's conclusions:

<INSERT TEXT>

Reporter's recommendations:

<INSERT TEXT>

Issue 89	Settlement - Banchory	
Development plan reference:	Section 6 Proposals Maps Marr (p24) Schedule 1 Tables 7 (p29) Schedule 2 Tables 7 (p33) Schedule 3 Table 2-3 (p36 & p41) Volume 3I Supplementary Guidance, Settlement Statements Marr (p8)	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
14 149 361, 362 366, 600 384 389 443, 1366 445, 1365 446, 1364 447, 1362 448, 1361 449, 1360 450, 1359 451, 1357 452, 1356 453, 1355 454, 1354 455, 1352 456, 1350 457, 1349 458, 1348 459, 1346 461, 1345 462, 1343 463, 1342 464, 1341 466, 1338 579, 1138 920, 921 966 967, 1999 968, 2022 969, 2021 970, 2020 971, 2019 973, 2017 974, 2016 979, 2012 980, 2011 981, 2010 982, 2009 983, 2008 984, 2007 985, 2006 986, 2005 987, 2004 988, 2003 989 990, 2001 991, 1996 992, 1997	Mr D Burgess Mr Graham Peter Mr Forbes Burn Banchory Boys Football Club June Edge Ms Sheila Mclean A Entwistle J Entwistle Jim Donnelly C Donnelly Sheena Youngson C Thomas Rae Jo Coutts Irene Ruddiner S W Ruddiner B Deepak James Cowe S Napier S Duffy D Mason J Kirk G Morrison K McDonald C Ross J Ross Barbara A Pinsent C Duffy Scottish Natural Heritage Knight Frank LLP on behalf of Bett Homes Ltd Derek Burgess Lynn Dickinson Julie Dey Jenny Hall Grant Park Janice Innes Jim Williamson J G Meiklejohn R Evans Hugh de Laurier R Bain G Livingstone J Ironside D Ironside C Dickinson V J Bruce M McGregor J C McGregor J Edge K Hassall Richard Hassall Elle Hassall	

993, 1995	Eleanor Hassall
995, 1998	Alison Burgess
996, 2023	Martin Girvan
997, 2000	Louise Mitchell
1029, 2024	J Fleming
1030, 2025	T Gray
1031	Jill Pratt
1032, 2045	Eddie Gray
1033, 2044	Sheila Christie
1034, 2043	Dianne Christie
1035, 2042	Frances Getliff
1036, 2041	Susan Hennessy
1037, 2040	Sally Hammond
1039, 2039	Yvonne Campbell
1041, 2038	Mr & Mrs Peter Cordiner
1043	Linda Furnival
1045, 2035	Lynn Irvine
1048, 2034	W Irvine
1049, 2033	Brian McPherson
1050, 2032	Stella McPherson
1051, 2031	Niall Davidson
1053, 2030	Claire Vannet
1055, 2029	David Thomson
1056, 2028	Julie Rogers
1059, 2027	Andrew Smith
1060, 2026	Marco Peacock
1063, 2036	Christine Peacock
1119	Andrew Richards
1120	Katherine Richards
1129	Craig & Sarah Duffy
1435, 1445, 1461	Bancon Developments
1573	Tulloch Homes Ltd
1655, 1656, 1657, 1658	Halliday Fraser Munro on behalf of Frank Burnett Ltd
1861, 1862	Ryden LLP on behalf of Sandlaw Farming Company Ltd
1880	Banchory Community Council
1886	Ryden LLP on behalf of Mr M. McKay
1926, 1927	Ryden LLP on behalf of Westhill Developments Ltd
1979	Scottish Environment Protection Agency
2013	Linda McIntyre
2014	Ken McIntyre
2037	Angela Furnival
2211	Rotary Club of Banchory-Ternan
2222	Mrs Sharon Kirk
2533	Mrs Sarah Duffy
2578, 2579, 2580, 2581	Mrs Jean Henretty
2706, 2707, 2708, 2709	Matthew W Merchant Chartered Architect
2728	Ms Clare Gordon
2754	Mr Derek Burgess
2853	Reiach and Hall Architects on behalf of Landowners of Proposed Sites
2934	Mark Tasker
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	Housing and Employment Land allocations in and around Banchory, sites H1, H2, M1 & M2.
Planning Authority's summary of the representation(s):	

General

Reallocation of units on site R4

1435, 1461: The developer states that sites M2 and H2 should have a greater allocation as the reservation of R4 for education and the relocation of effective units from that site has resulted in a reduction of 40 houses in the effective land supply.

Housing numbers

1657, 1658: The Marr Area Committee removed 50 houses from Banchory's allocation and these were not replaced.

1435, 1445, 1461: The developers state that taking the loss of the 40 effective sites into account, the first phase of development in Banchory only delivers 5 "new" houses which will hamper delivery of new housing and affordable housing in the town. An affordable housing contribution for the rezoned R4 housing has already been provided and the demonstration eco-village on site M1 is unlikely to provide affordable housing. To ensure the delivery of affordable housing commensurate with the identified demand additional housing land requires to be allocated within Banchory (1445).

1435, 1461: The developer contends that allocations are insufficient to maintain current build rates. An allocation of 600 units between 2011 and 2023 is required to meet current build rates. An aim of the Structure Plan is to increase completions and therefore in excess of 600 units is required.

1435, 1461: The developer states that Banchory offers considerable infrastructure capacity and allocations do not make efficient use of this which does not accord with the Structure Plan or the spatial strategy for local growth and diversification areas.

1657, 1658: Respondents state the allocation at Inchmarlo of 60 houses is age restricted and should not be counted against overall housing figures.

1657, 1658: Respondents consider there is inherent flexibility within the Structure Plan and Local Development Plan to allow allocation of specific sites without affecting strategy. Housing demand in Banchory will not be met with an allocation of 45 houses and existing allocations will at most provide catch up between 2007 and 2010 in terms of meeting demand. Therefore further allocations should be made.

Focus of development to north and east

921, 1861, 1862, 1886, 2706, 2707, 2708, 2709: Representations object to the focus of development to the north and east of Banchory on sites M1, M2 and H2. A more balanced approach, choice of location and type of housing is promoted. The approach taken in Banchory does not meet Scottish Planning Policy which requires plans to allocate a range of effective sites, advocates a sustainable approach to integrating housing with public transport and anticipates the majority of housing land will be met within or adjacent to settlements. Sites M1, M2, and H2 are considered to be too remote from the town centre and it is suggested continued growth in this area will detract from town centre vitality and viability. It is considered that the setting of the town will be adversely affected by continued development to the north and that there is limited landscape capacity due to topography. Growth to the north and east of Banchory will contribute to Hill of Banchory Primary school and make no contribution to Banchory Primary school which has a falling role.

149, 921: Concern is also expressed that the allocations made in Banchory favour one developer.

Site M1 Banchory

2222, 2580: Further clarity is sought as to what a demonstration eco-village is and it is suggested tighter limitations are required on the type of development.

2580: Respondent states that separate allocations should be made for the uses proposed within the site, and that the land for community facilities is reserved. The number of units proposed is reduced and the boundary to the north-east should remain along the link road to

prevent further housing and employment. There is no need for a park and ride scheme.

Site M2 Banchory

Flood risk

149, 2934: Objects to site M2 as it is a natural floodplain and is prone to flooding. A watercourse runs through the site which is a tributary to the River Dee SAC.

Recreation

149, 921, 1120: Representations object to M2 as it is an important recreational asset for Banchory.

Landscape and environment

920, 1120, 2934: Representations object on the grounds development would have an adverse impact on the landscape setting and would breach the skyline. The site has no trees to screen it and it is proposed to remove the landscape buffer to the north of BUS 1 (2934).

921, 1120, 1119, 1861: Several representations state the site has high wildlife, environmental and biodiversity value including designated sites and should be protected. In particular the western section of M2 was identified by a representation as being ecologically sensitive and having high wildlife, landscape and historic value (1120). Representation states development would be likely to have an adverse impact on the Loch of Leys Nature Conservation Area (1861).

579, 921, 1138: Scottish Natural Heritage state part of M2 is a Long Established Woodland of plantation origin and no justification has been given for the allocation that shows how this complies with Scottish government policy or the safeguarding policies. Concern is expressed in respect of the loss of open mature Scots pine and semi-natural broadleaf woodland (921).

579,1138 Scottish Natural Heritage state that whilst there are no records of red squirrel on the site the woods are likely to be part of a network used by red squirrel and the Scottish government policy sets out a strong presumption against developing woodland supporting UKLBAP priority species.

149: There is a water main through the site and concern is expressed about the removal of woodland prior to development

Accessibility

2581, 2934: The location on the edge of Banchory is considered to be contrary to the Structure Plan due to the accessibility to the town centre and the likelihood of M2 providing a sustainable mixed community .

Density and mix of housing

2934: The density of development proposed on the eastern part of M2 is very high and not comparable to Hill of Banchory.

921: Objects to the focus of development on site M2 as it does not provide a mix of housing opportunities and the site would not integrate well with Banchory.

Deliverability

921: Objects to M2 as the site is unlikely to be deliverable as it is one location and one developer.

Site H1 Banchory

1573: Representation supports the allocation and confirms its deliverability.

Site H2 Banchory

1119 Development of site H2 is considered to have a lower environmental impact than site M2.

2580 The settlement boundary should not be extended to the north.

Banchory Alternative Sites

920, 921: Land at Upper Abreadie should be allocated as a small infill site. It would not exacerbate the east/west spread of development and is an alternative to large scale releases. Development would integrate more easily with the town and provide a choice of locations. The site is not constrained by physical or natural features, no adverse impact on the landscape would occur, the site would provide affordable housing, and formal open space. The site is close to the town centre reducing dependence on private cars.

1655, 1656, 1657, 1658: West Banchory (M63 and M64) should be allocated as a sustainable mixed use site to ensure the Structure Plan Strategy is delivered and to maintain a 5 year land supply. Proposal is consistent with strategic policy aims including economic development, improved local facilities and affordable housing. Site is less sensitive in environmental terms, closer to recreational facilities and closer to the town centre than other identified sites in Banchory and should be considered as an extension to Banchory. Supporting information for the planning application proves the proposal will have a positive impact on Banchory. The Housing Land Audit also provides a case for early release of West Banchory.

1861, 1862: Land at Braehead farm should be allocated in preference to M2. Site has capacity to accommodate 300 houses and a visitor attraction with green recreational areas. Site provides an opportunity to create a gateway into Banchory and other benefits such as road realignment would accrue. The site is located close to the town centre. The peaks of Scolty Hill, Craig of Affrusk and Hill of Maryfield are the significant factor in forming the setting of Banchory rather than the proposed site. Allocation would address issue of sprawl to east.

1886: Land at Auchattie should be allocated as it is significantly closer to the town centre than M1 and M2. Development at Auchattie would provide a choice of location, choice of residential offer and boost service provision in the town centre. The development would support Banchory primary. Development would be well contained in the landscape with minimal visual impact. There are no technical difficulties in providing infrastructure and benefits such as reduction in speed limit, a footpath, provision of open space and infrastructure upgrades could be achieved. The area should be identified to absorb a proportion of phase 1 housing as part of Banchory or as a settlement in its own right.

1926, 1927: Land at Deebank south of the River Dee should be allocated for small scale residential development. Banchory is considered to be an appropriate location for development and a further allocation should be made. The site at Deebank is adjacent to the B974, core paths, and the settlement boundary. The site is 600m from the town centre. The site is bounded by existing development so would have minimal impact on amenity and landscape. The site has no constraints and has no flooding issues.

2706, 2707, 2708, 2709: Land at Corsee Wood should be allocated. The site is easily accessible from the town centre, is owned by the Forestry Commission and development would be integrated into the woodland. A mixed use development consisting of housing, workspace, care facilities, woodland and walkway enhancement is proposed as a community driven project through the National Forest Land Scheme.

2580, 2581, 1880 Representations were received expressing support for the Corsee Wood proposal as it would provide 100% affordable housing, is outwith the protected P7 area and development could be expanded further north in the future and would provide opportunities for employment in the west of the town.

2853: Site at **West Banchory Sunset Seat** should be identified for housing. At previous Local Plan Inquiry it was considered the site might at sometime accommodate development that would not compromise the viewpoint, its surroundings or established planting.

2579: As site BUS2 is developed by one supermarket a new business centre is required to sustain employment growth.

Site R1 Banchory

14, 361, 366,384, 389, 1129, 2533,2728 443, 445 to 459, 461 to 464, 466, 966 to 971, 973,

974, 979 to 993, 995 to 997, 1029 to 1037, 1039, 1041, 1043, 1045, 1048 to 1051, 1053, 1055, 1056, 1059, 1060, 1063, 1338, 1341 to 1343, 1345, 1346, 1348 to 1350, 1352, 1354 to 1357, 1359 to 1362, 1364 to 1366, 1995 to 2001, 2003 to 2014, 2016, 2017, 2019 to 2045, 2754: Respondents object to the reservation of R1 on the grounds that it is a popular and valuable local amenity that is widely used.

14, 443, 445 to 459, 461 to 464, 466, 966 to 971, 973, 974, 979 to 993, 995 to 997, 1029 to 1037, 1039, 1041, 1043, 1045, 1048 to 1051, 1053, 1055, 1056, 1059, 1060, 1063, 1338, 1341 to 1343, 1345, 1346, 1348 to 1350, 1352, 1354 to 1357, 1359 to 1362, 1364 to 1366, 1995 to 2001, 2003 to 2014, 2016, 2017, 2019 to 2045, 2754: Respondents object to reservation of R1 on the grounds that there are no parks nearby.

14, 384, 389, 1129, 443, 445 to 459, 461 to 464, 466, 966 to 971, 973, 974, 979 to 993, 995 to 997, 1029 to 1037, 1039, 1041, 1043, 1045, 1048 to 1051, 1053, 1055, 1056, 1059, 1060, 1063, 1338, 1341 to 1343, 1345, 1346, 1348 to 1350, 1352, 1354 to 1357, 1359 to 1362, 1364 to 1366, 1995 to 2001, 2003 to 2014, 2016, 2017, 2019 to 2045, 2754: Objection is made to R1 on the grounds that there are traffic management issues with the area being very busy at present making it difficult for traffic and pedestrians to cross the North Deeside Road and the addition of a medical centre or other community facility would make this worse.

14, 443, 445 to 459, 461 to 464, 466, 966 to 971, 973, 974, 979 to 993, 995 to 997, 1029 to 1037, 1039, 1041, 1043, 1045, 1048 to 1051, 1053, 1055, 1056, 1059, 1060, 1063, 1338, 1341 to 1343, 1345, 1346, 1348 to 1350, 1352, 1354 to 1357, 1359 to 1362, 1364 to 1366, 1995 to 2001, 2003 to 2014, 2016, 2017, 2019 to 2045, 2754: Objection is made to R1 on the grounds that the area surrounding the site has the greatest concentration of industrial and properties and the loss of the green space will make matters worse.

14, 1129, 1880, 2222, 2211, 2728, 443, 445 to 459, 461 to 464, 466, 966 to 971, 973, 974, 979 to 993, 995 to 997, 1029 to 1037, 1039, 1041, 1043, 1045, 1048 to 1051, 1053, 1055, 1056, 1059, 1060, 1063, 1338, 1341 to 1343, 1345, 1346, 1348 to 1350, 1352, 1354 to 1357, 1359 to 1362, 1364 to 1366, 1995 to 2001, 2003 to 2014, 2016, 2017, 2019 to 2045, 2754: It is considered that moving the medical practice out of the town centre and to R1 will harm the High Street.

443, 445 to 459, 461 to 464, 466, 966 to 971, 973, 974, 979 to 993, 995 to 997, 1029 to 1037, 1039, 1041, 1043, 1045, 1048 to 1051, 1053, 1055, 1056, 1059, 1060, 1063, 1338, 1341 to 1343, 1345, 1346, 1348 to 1350, 1352, 1354 to 1357, 1359 to 1362, 1364 to 1366, 1995 to 2001, 2003 to 2014, 2016, 2017, 2019 to 2045, 2754: Respondents highlight that the Banchory Community Plan states "There is a very strong desire to retain an improved Health Centre in the centre of the town and not to affect many people's travel abilities by moving it from the centre."

389: Object on the grounds physical activity should be encouraged and such a facility should not be lost.

1435, 1461 14, 362, 1129, 1880, 2222, 2211, 2728: Respondents prefer the town centre location of the medical centre due to its centrality and access to public transport.

14: One respondent was advised that a primary school could be located on the site which was considered unacceptable due to noise levels.

362: The site is protected within the extant plan and the protection should continue.

366, 600, 2211: Representations state additional football pitches are required not just replacements. Creation of sports facilities has not kept pace with development.

600: Banchory Boys Football Club (BBFC) regularly uses the Silverbank facility and object to its loss. The representation highlights that at least 13 football sides use Silverbank. The representation also highlights the deficiencies in other available pitches which can make them unusable for part of the year.

1435, 1461: It was noted that the site R1 was not considered in the Main Issues Report and as such has not been the subject of proper community consultation.

1435, 1461: The Silverbank facility is an important community facility and should be protected in its existing form. Alternatives for reservation for a medical centre include R4 or other opportunities in town.

384: It is suggested the medical centre should be located in the centre of the village or on the outskirts.

2211: A land swap should be considered between the medical centre and the putting green and tennis courts.

1979: Scottish Environment Protection Agency raises no significant flooding concerns for the site.

Site R2 Banchory

1880: Concern is raised that the facilities proposed on this site have not been developed.

2578, 2579: Representations state that as the primary school is built the remainder of the site should be reserved for potential education and community facilities allowing community facilities to be consolidated onto fewer sites.

1979: Scottish Environment Protection Agency raises no significant flooding concerns for the site.

Site R3 Banchory

1979: Scottish Environment Protection Agency raises no significant flooding concerns for the site, but given the presence of a nearby well, a drainage assessment may be required to assess any groundwater impacts.

Site R4 Banchory

579, 1138: Scottish Natural Heritage state R4 is a Long Established Woodland of plantation origin and no justification has been given for the allocation which shows how this complies with Scottish government policy or the safeguarding policies. They note that whilst there are no records of red squirrel on the site the woods are likely to be part of a network used by red squirrel and the Scottish government policy set out a strong presumption against developing woodland supporting UKLBAP priority species.

1880: Representation supports reservation of the site for education.

2222: Representation states further clarification should be given as to what facilities are proposed on the site.

2579: Representation objects to the reservation as education facilities should remain on one or two campuses and the council should consolidate community facilities onto fewer sites to ensure their accessibility and sustainability.

Modifications sought by those submitting representations:

Site M1 Banchory

2580: Divide site M1 to indicate separation between housing and community land.

Site M2 Banchory

1435, 1461: Increase allocation on M2 to 345 houses, 1094m² retail and 2188m² office accommodation on M2 and 2 ha of employment land. Increase H2 to 107. Extend M2 to include potential area A for 96 houses and potential area B for 126 houses.

579, 1138: Either remove M2 and R4 or provide justification for the allocation that relates to the criteria in Scottish Government Policy on the control of woodland removal; and more details requirements for the Masterplan for these areas should be set out that require some of this woodland to be retained as part of a functional habitat and give detailed requirements for

compensatory planting within the SG for Banchory.

1119, 2581: Delete M2.

1120: Delete east section of M2.

Site H2 Banchory

2580: Do not extend settlement envelope to the north.

Banchory Alternative Sites

920, 921: Allocate land at Upper Arbeadie for up to 50 houses.

1655, 1656, 1657, 1658: Allocate West Banchory for a mixed use development including hotel, tourism, leisure, business and up to 125 houses in phase 1.

1861, 1862: Allocate site at Braehead, Auchattie for 230 houses.

1886: Identify Auchattie as a settlement within Supplementary Guidance and prepare settlement statement.

1886: Draw settlement boundary around Auchattie and identify land for phase 1 housing as part of Banchory or as settlement in its own right.

1926, 1927: Allocate land at Deebank (M87) for up to 14 houses.

2706, 2707, 2708, 2709: Allocate land at Corsee Wood for a mixed use development including housing, workspace, care facilities and woodland and walkway enhancement.

2853: Allocate site A at Sunset Seat, Banchory West for housing.

Site R1 Banchory

1435, 1461: Omit site R1 from the plan.

361: Delete site R1 and replace with "Site P10 is protected to conserve the playing fields and recreational open space." Amend plan.

362, 443, 445 to 459, 461 to 464, 466, 966 to 971, 973, 974, 979 to 993, 995 to 997, 1029 to 1037, 1039, 1041, 1043, 1045, 1048 to 1051, 1053, 1055, 1056, 1059, 1060, 1063, 1129, 1338, 1341 to 1343, 1345, 1346, 1348 to 1350, 1352, 1354 to 1357, 1359 to 1362, 1364 to 1366, 1995 to 2002, 2003 to 2014, 2016, 2017, 2019 to 2045, 2754, 2533, 2728: Delete R1 and change to protected greenspace.

366: Change location of R1.

384: Build a new medical centre in the centre of the village or the outskirts (not on R1).

Site R2 Banchory

2578, 2579: Reserve R2 for potential education and community facilities such as a future secondary school with community centre.

Summary of responses (including reasons) by Planning Authority:

Overview

Banchory is within the Aberdeen Housing Market Area Local Growth Area. The allocations in Banchory take into account the Structure Plan, and local needs and capacities. The level of development reflects the needs of the community, the levels of development Banchory can sustain, and takes account of recent levels of development and planning consents.

Re-allocation of units on site R4

The developer contends that the reservation of site R4 has resulted in a loss of 40 houses from the effective land supply. Site R4 is formed from site fh2 for 110 houses and part of site fh1 for 90 houses within Aberdeenshire Local Plan. Site fh1 was granted planning consent for 44 houses and the area reserved for R4 would result in a loss of 25 houses. The reservation

also results in a loss of 110 houses from site fh2 and therefore a total of 135 houses are carried over to site M2 to account for the reservation. Therefore, a like for like replacement has been made. Any loss from the effective land supply which may result from the underdevelopment of site fh1 would be made up for elsewhere in the Aberdeen Housing Market Area (see Issue 25).

Housing numbers

Due to the weight of public opinion the Council decided that the 300 houses proposed in the Main Issues Report was an excessive allocation for Banchory and existing development needed time to bed in. The housing allocation at Banchory was therefore reduced to 250, with the majority of this in phase 2. The housing removed at this time was replaced in other areas of the Aberdeen Housing Market Area Local Growth Area. The Council's view was that current high build rates in Banchory should not be maintained due to the impacts on the character of the town. Sufficient land has been allocated within the Local Growth and Diversification Area to meet the Structure Plan's aim to increase completions. Provision is made within Policy 5 Housing land supply to draw down extra land from phase 2 allocations (2017 to 2023). Therefore, there would be an opportunity for draw down if there are issues of maintaining a five year effective supply. Issues relating to the general sufficiency and maintenance of housing land supply are dealt with in Issue 12 Housing land supply and issues relating to the specific allocation of sites and their effect on the housing land allocations are dealt with in Issue 25 New housing land allocations.

The affordable housing contribution for the rezoned R4 housing has already been provided in the Hill of Banchory development. As site M2 is a new allocation the requirement for 40% affordable housing would apply. Any affordable housing already provided in respect of the rezoned housing would be deducted from the 40% requirement. There is no requirement for additional housing allocations to be made.

Whilst the houses at Inchmarlo (see Issue 88) are targeted at a specific market they contribute to general housing figures and the impacts in terms of services will be equivalent to any other houses (with the exception of education). The housing requirements within figure 8 on page 17 of the Structure Plan do not exclude housing for occupants over 55, and set out the requirement for the whole population.

Focus of development to north and east

The focus of development to the north and east will utilise existing infrastructure and link to more mature development. An allocation in this area also provides confidence for developers to invest in community facilities at Hill of Banchory, for which land has been reserved at R2. This will help to address the imbalance perceived by respondents. Opportunities to develop close to the town centre at the scale required is limited and constrained by recreational uses and potential impacts on the setting of Banchory. The distance to the town centre is an issue and the masterplan will be important to ensure development is well connected to the existing settlement and employment areas. Developers have confirmed the deliverability of the sites and they are therefore effective. A range of sites are promoted across the Aberdeen Housing Market Area providing a choice in location and housing type.

Sites were assessed on their relative merits and not on the basis of the anticipated developer. The sites were fully debated through the Main Issues Report.

Site M1

The proposal on site M1 includes a demonstration eco-village which will showcase low and zero carbon housing and test latest technology. A tighter limitation on development is not appropriate as this may restrict innovation and flexibility should be given to Development Management to assess the appropriateness of proposals.

It is not appropriate to separately reserve land for community facilities as the site is to be brought forward through a masterplan. Locating a park and ride facility at M1 would allow the car park to be used for the recreational and tourist activities proposed as well as the transport interchange minimising costs and maximising use. The site is also visible and easily accessible to main routes, which is likely to be key to its success.

Site M2

Flood risk

Scottish Environment Protection Agency have not objected to the site, but have noted the site has a number of watercourses running through it which may be a flood risk. It is accepted that one of the qualities of the Loch of Leys Nature Conservation Area is its marshland habitats and that drainage from the site will require to ensure current flows to this area are maintained. It has been stated within the Settlement Statement that proposals on site M2 should protect the Loch of Leys Local Nature Conservation Area. Text has also been added to the supplementary guidance in respect of a flood risk assessment for the site.

Recreation

A large area of the original bid for this area has been protected or remains unallocated. Through engagement on the masterplan recreational use of these areas can be enhanced.

Landscape and natural heritage

Site P9 is protected to conserve the Loch of Leys Nature Conservation area, and the masterplan for site M2 will require to take this protection into consideration. The Ecological Appraisal undertaken by the developer of M2 supports this and has identified the need to protect the Loch of Leys Nature Conservation Area. The Landscape Capacity Study for Banchory carried out for the developer of M2 identified the north of Banchory as suitable for development. The existing buffer to the north of BUS1 is protected in the Supplementary Guidance Settlement Statements for Marr, page 8, as site P7 which is protected to conserve the landscape buffer.

Part of the site is long established woodland of plantation origin. However, it has little biodiversity value and Scottish Planning Policy (paragraph 146) does not have a strong presumption against its removal. Development of the site allows for the protection and enhancement of the Loch of Leys Local Nature Conservation Area. The area of long established woodland within site M2 is relatively small in the context of the large areas of woodland around Banchory that are recorded within the Ancient Woodland Inventory. Open space requirements could include wildlife corridors to allow red squirrels to move between woodland areas.

Accessibility

All bid sites of sufficient size to accommodate the level of development appropriate for Banchory were distant from the town centre, and some had unacceptable impacts on landscape and setting. Site M2 builds on existing development to the south and provides developers with the confidence to invest in facilities at Hill of Banchory.

Density and mix of housing

The density proposed on site M2 reflects the expectation in SG Housing 1: Housing Land Allocations 2007-2016 on page 63, that residential development will be provided at approximately 30 houses per hectare. This should also encourage a greater mix of house types and sizes. In addition the proposals will require to comply with Policy 6 Affordable Housing. Integration of the new development with older parts of Banchory is an issue for the masterplan stage.

Deliverability

Deliverability of the site has been confirmed by the developer. Whilst the water main crosses the site this is not a constraint to development.

Site H1

The support for development of site H1 is welcomed.

Site H2

The levels of development on site H2 are restricted due to the suitability and ability to provide two access points. The site does not go beyond the established woodland edge which forms a suitable settlement boundary.

Alternative Sites

As the allocations discussed above are appropriate and sufficient there is no requirement to

consider alternative sites.

Upper Arbeadie

The land at Upper Arbeadie, site M51, was fully debated at the Main Issues Report stage, but following widespread community engagement the Council's conclusion was to exclude the site, as development in addition to site M2 would lead to over-development.

West Banchory

The land at West Banchory, sites M63 and M64, were fully debated at the Main Issues Report stage as part of Inchmarlo. The proposal is for a Resort and Golf Club with residential development. The housing is included as enabling development to help deliver the leisure and recreational uses. Following widespread community engagement the Council's conclusion was to exclude the sites, as no business case was put forward in relation to the levels of residential development being sought.

South of Banchory: Braehead Farm, Auchattie and Deebank

Allocations to the south of Banchory at Braehead Farm, Deebank and Auchattie, (sites M86, M87 and M94) were fully debated at the Main Issues Report stage and following widespread community engagement the Council's conclusion was to exclude the sites due to the significant adverse impacts on the landscape and setting of Banchory.

Corsee Wood and Sunset Seat

Land at Corsee Wood and Sunset Seat were not proposed at any previous stage, so there has been no site assessment or public debate on the sites. There is therefore no reason to alter the allocations in the proposed plan which are already appropriate and sufficient. Development would have significant impacts on the landscape and a large portion of the area is designated as an Area of Landscape Significance. Part of Corsee Wood is also long established woodland of plantation origin.

Site BUS2

It is not necessary to make a replacement allocation for the area of BUS2 just because it has planning consent for a new supermarket. Other business sites are already available at BUS1 and a new allocation is made within M1.

Site R1

R1 is reserved for community uses including a potential health centre. There are at present no specific development proposals and the reservation of the site would not mean a new health centre could not be proposed elsewhere. The existing health centre adjacent to the Bellfield carpark has no capacity for expansion and it is appropriate for the local plan to reserve land for this essential community facility. Site R1 is central relative to surrounding population and is not located on the edge of the town. The site is adjacent to the main route through Banchory allowing the site to be accessible by public transport. Replacement playing field provision could be made within site M1 and SG LSD5: Public Open Space requires development to make provision for open space in line with the size of development which may include provision of pitches. Development of the site would require to comply with other relevant local development plan policies and therefore issues such as traffic impacts would require to be assessed and mitigated if necessary.

Due to the public concern over the potential loss of the playfields a minor modification has been made to the supplementary guidance settlement statement for Banchory. The Supplementary Guidance has been amended to include a requirement for replacement facilities, including a full size football pitch, should the existing playing fields be utilised for the development of healthcare facilities on site R1.

Site R2

Reservation of site R2 solely for education is not appropriate as proposals already exist for a leisure centre upon the site. Development of community facilities at this location will redress the imbalance perceived by respondents. Allocations on site M2 will provide confidence for developers to invest in community facilities at Hill of Banchory.

Site R3

The presence of the well is noted and appropriate wording in relation to a drainage impact assessment has been added to the supplementary guidance.

Site R4

Site R4 is reserved for potential education facilities. As a reserved site there are at present no specific development proposals and the reservation of the site would not mean a new school could not be proposed elsewhere or consolidated on the existing site.

The site is long established woodland of plantation origin but it has low biodiversity value. As a consequence Scottish Planning Policy does not have a strong presumption against its removal. Development of the site allows for the reservation of the site for education uses and therefore has clear public benefits. The area of long established woodland within site R4 is relatively small in the context of the large areas of woodland around Banchory that are identified within the Ancient Woodland Inventory. Open space requirements could include wildlife corridors to allow red squirrels to move between woodland areas.

Conclusion

None of the modifications sought are supported. The development strategy and land allocations in Banchory are appropriate and sufficient to meet the needs of the settlement strategy.

Any further plan changes commended by the Planning Authority:

No changes to the plan are commended.

The Settlement Statement has been changed to include a requirement for replacement facilities, including a full size football pitch, should the existing playing fields be utilised for the development of healthcare facilities on site R1. The supplementary guidance has also been amended to show the requirement for a flood risk assessment for site M2 and a drainage impact assessment for site R3.

Reporter's conclusions:

<INSERT TEXT>

Reporter's recommendations:

<INSERT TEXT>

Issue 90	Other Sites Marr AHMA	
Development plan reference:	Section 6 Proposals Maps Marr (p24) Schedule 1 Tables 7 (p29) Schedule 2 Tables 7 (p34) Schedule 3 Table 2-3 (p36 &p41) Volume 3I Supplementary Guidance, Settlement Statements Marr	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
933	Crathes, Drumoak & Durris Community Council	
944	Ann Martin	
1012	Heather Sabnis	
1127	James Stewart Henderson	
1405, 1547	Halliday Fraser Munro on behalf of Mrs. S Ironside & Mr. C Laurie	
1651, 1653	Halliday Fraser Munro on behalf of Mr and Mrs A P George	
1848	Ryden LLP on behalf of Dunecht Estates	
1935	Ryden LLP on behalf of Glenview Developments Ltd	
2058	Strutt & Parker LLP on behalf of Monymusk Estate	
2099	Mark Bramwell on behalf of Kirkton Development	
2753	Archial Planning on behalf of A&W Duncan	
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	Land allocations in other settlements in the Aberdeen Housing Market Area part of Marr.	
Planning Authority's summary of the representation(s):		
Crathes Site EH1		
933: Site EH1 is inappropriate for 45 houses. The principles within the approved Crathes Development Brief demonstrate the unsuitability of the site for 45 houses and a recent application was withdrawn as it failed to meet the requirements of that brief.		
933: There are no opportunities to build within the landform and the southern area (Fh1 in extant plan) should be removed with the more northerly area (A in extant plan) reduced to 15 houses.		
1127: The respondent questions the need for 45 luxury homes and suggests the number of units should be reduced.		
2099: Object to site EH1 as it would destroy the unique landscape character and local identity. The level of housing proposed is ludicrous and does not comply with development guidelines.		
933, 1012 : The field where the sewage treatment plan is proposed does not form part of EH1 and is subject to flooding. The location of the sewage treatment plan includes two ancient river terraces which contain many archaeological artefacts.		
1127: Respondent notes drainage will be a considerable and expensive issue.		
933: The Crathes Development Brief has been publicly consulted upon and should be given masterplan status and treated as Supplementary Guidance.		
1848: Support allocation of EH1 as it is on a public transport corridor, can take advantage of quick commuting times and is in an area of high housing demand. Development will support local services including village hall, primary school, and Milton of Crathes.		
Monymusk		
2058: Support continuation of the allocations from the extant plan as sites EH1 and EH2 in		

Monymusk. However, the Aberdeenshire Local Plan allocations made by the Reporter were indicative to be informed by a masterplan yet the proposed plan figures are fixed.

2058: Object to lack of future housing allocations in Monymusk. Land to north of St Andrews should be allocated as "housing area after 2016" for 44 houses in line with the approved Monymusk Masterplan. Phase 3 of the Monymusk Masterplan should be included as Reserve housing land post 2016, to meet shortfalls in housing numbers due to over-reliance on windfall. Phase 3 is the obvious direction for growth and should be identified.

Alternative Sites

1405, 1547: Monymusk Station The representations state it is important to allocate land in the Local Growth Area to ensure the survival of local services. Insufficient comfort that Monymusk Station could be developed under revised development in the countryside policy. Allocation of Monymusk Station would address the absence of new allocations at Monymusk, would increase contributions to required infrastructure and would redevelop a brownfield site. There is no evidence of protected species on site and the site has low ecological value. Allocation of Monymusk Station would be consistent with the decision to allocate development at Drumdelgie.

1651, 1653: Woodend of Glassel The representations state it is important to allocate land in the Local Growth Area to ensure the survival of local services, as there is insufficient comfort that the site could be developed under the revised development in the countryside policy. Effective sites, such as this unconstrained brownfield site, require to be allocated to ensure Structure Plan allowances are met. Competing tourist accommodation has placed the existing holiday chalet business on the site under threat and an allocation will allow the business to survive as it is proposed to retain two chalet lodges. The site benefits from being close to a bus and school route and development would increase contributions to required infrastructure. The enabling approach taken at Drumdelgie should also be applied to Woodend of Glassel.

944: Bridge of Canny East Object to failure to identify site at Bridge of Canny East (M59 in Main Issues Report) for 3-5 houses. The ground has little agricultural value and development would complement new houses opposite.

1935: Bridge of Canny East Bridge of Canny East should be allocated as a Rural Service Centre and an allocation made on M58 for up to 3 houses. The site is outwith the 1 in 200 year flood risk area.

2753: Mains of Invery Site at Mains of Invery should be allocated for residential development as the countryside policy would not allow this to be developed in full, the site is well screened, is less than a mile from Banchory town centre, will not have any adverse impact on landscape, will have no adverse impact on neighbouring properties, and will improve the site through removal of dilapidated buildings.

Modifications sought by those submitting representations:

Crathes Site EH1

933: Amend Crathes settlement statement to "Site EH1 is carried forward from the previous local plan for up to 45 houses. The existing Crathes Development Brief is required to be upgraded to Masterplan status and treated as Supplementary Guidance in the context of Policy 8".

1127: Reduce number of units on site EH1 Crathes.

2099: Remove site EH1 Crathes from the plan.

Monymusk

2058: Amend initial phase for site EH1 to read "south of St Andrews" and that land to north of

St Andrews will be delivered in the period after 2016 as in the Monymusk Masterplan.

2058: Reannotate EH2 as a housing site as per the Monymusk Masterplan.

2058: Identify land to north of St Andrews in the period after 2016 for 44 houses as shown in the Monymusk Masterplan.

2058: Identify phase 3 of the Monymusk Masterplan as Reserve Housing land post 2016.

Alternative Sites

1405, 1547: Allocate site at Monymusk Station for 8 houses in the first phase of the plan.

1651, 1653: Allocate site at Woodend of Glassel for up to 7 houses in the first phase of the plan.

944: Allocate site at Bridge of Canny East (M59 in Main Issues Report) for 3-5 houses.

1935: Identify Bridge of Canny East as a settlement and allocate site M58 for up to 3 houses.

2753: Allocate site at Mains of Invery for 9 houses.

Summary of responses (including reasons) by Planning Authority:

Overview

This response is in respect of sites in the Aberdeen Housing Market Area that fall within the "local growth and diversification area." The strategy within this area is for growth in communities to meet local needs. Allocations are made where there is a specific need identified, including providing opportunities to increase numbers going to primary schools where the roll is dropping. Both Crathes and Monymusk primary schools have falling rolls and consequently have had allocations "rolled forward" from the previous plan as suggested by paragraph 78 of Circular 1/2009. Sites are carried over in both Crathes and Monymusk to meet local needs, which are of a scale that reflects the existing settlement. The allocations made in Monymusk and Crathes are appropriate and sufficient for the purposes of delivering the strategy and aims of the Local Development Plan and the Structure Plan.

Crathes Site EH1

Site EH1 is an existing site carried over from the Aberdeenshire Local Plan and it was subject to examination in that plan (see paper apart Report of Aberdeenshire Local Plan Inquiry Issue 219 Crathes). Crathes is on a public transport corridor making this a sustainable location. The allocation will also support the school.

The "Planning Brief for Housing Development Crathes" (September 2006) demonstrates how development of 45 houses can be accommodated on the site. The site has a low density, at approximately 8 houses per hectare to take account of the established low density, the informal layout of existing development and visual impacts. The low density will also help conserve the site's topographic features. Whilst one application has been withdrawn (APP/2007/0091) this does not mean subsequent applications would not meet the Development Brief. The allocation is made for 45 units, but does not stipulate what size or type of housing should be constructed. The development will require to comply with plan policies including Policy 6 Affordable Housing.

The comments regarding the sewage treatment plant refer to the withdrawn planning application APP/2007/0091, where the sewage treatment plant was proposed outwith the allocation boundaries. If future applications show the treatment plant outwith the site this will be a matter for Development Management to consider. The landowner's agent has advised that waste water treatment can be provided for the site.

Due to public concern over development of this site a minor modification is proposed requiring a separate piece of Supplementary Guidance to be developed specifying layout and design proposals required for site EH1 in Crathes.

Monymusk

It is recognised that there is potential in the Aberdeenshire Local Plan for sites to be developed at a higher number of units than stipulated and this has been a concern raised by several communities. To address this issue the new Local Development Plan only supports increases in the number of units above that stipulated in the plan in exceptional cases, such as where there is an overriding public benefit. (see Supplementary Guidance, SG Housing 1: Housing land allocations 2007 – 2016 page 63)

Whilst site EH1 is carried forward from the Aberdeenshire Local Plan it is intended that the initial allocation for 43 houses will be developed in the most southerly section of the site with subsequent phases identified in the masterplan to the north. The whole site area has been shown to ensure a masterplan is developed for the entire area despite only the initial phase being allocated in the plan. If the entire Monymusk Masterplan were allocated this would result in 30% growth of the village which is excessive given the existing size of the settlement. It is premature to allocate Phase 3 of the Monymusk Masterplan, as this would be outwith the 10 year timeframe of the Local Development Plan.

Alternative Sites

The allocations made within the Aberdeen Housing Market Area are already appropriate and sufficient and there is no requirement to consider alternative sites.

Monymusk Station

The site at Monymusk Station was raised in response to the main issues report consultation but has not been the subject of public consultation. The site lies within the countryside of the Aberdeen Housing Market Area, and it is considered more sustainable to make allocations within existing settlements such as Monymusk. The site allocated at Drumdelgie provides the opportunity for the removal and redevelopment of a dilapidated and redundant building which has become an eyesore. The site at Monymusk Station differs from Drumdelgie as it does not contain building and redevelopment of the site would not result in the removal of any eyesore. The site at Monymusk Station would be unlikely to meet the requirements of Policy 3 Development in the Countryside.

Woodend of Glassel

The site at Woodend of Glassel (site M78 in the main issues report) was given full consideration following the publication of the Main Issues Report. Following widespread community engagement the Council's conclusion was to exclude it as it would create a dispersed settlement pattern. The site differs from the situation at Drumdelgie where the existing buildings are dilapidated and redundant, as there is a tourist accommodation business operating at Woodend of Glassel. The proposal would be inconsistent with SG bus 4: Tourist Facilities and Accommodation which presumes against the conversion of existing tourist accommodation to other uses. (See Issues and Actions Volume 7 page 117 Woodend of Glassel).

Bridge of Canny East

Both sites M58 and M59 at Bridge of Canny East were also fully debated at the Main Issues Report stage and following widespread community engagement the Council's conclusion was to exclude both sites. No sites were allocated at Bridge of Canny East due to the lack of services, and it is more sustainable to focus development in nearby Banchory. Development of site M59 would also have significant adverse visual impacts and the proximity of site M58 to an area of flood risk was a concern. The sites proposed would be unlikely to meet the requirements of Policy 3 Development in the Countryside (see Issues and Actions Volume 7 page 61 Inchmarlo and Bridge of Canny East).

Mains of Invery

Mains of Invery, site M76 in the main issues report, was fully debated at the Main Issues Report stage and following widespread community engagement the Council's conclusion was to exclude it as it lies within the countryside, with no services and is not part of a settlement. It is more sustainable to focus development in nearby Banchory. The site would be unlikely to meet the requirements of Policy 3 Development in the Countryside (see Issues and Actions

Volume 7 page 12 Banchory).

Conclusion

None of the modifications sought are supported. The development strategy and land allocations in the Aberdeen Housing Market Area are already appropriate and sufficient to meet the needs of the settlement strategy.

Any further plan changes commended by the Planning Authority:

It is suggested that a minor modification is made to the plan to add a footnote to Policy 8 Layout, siting and design of new development stating the requirement for a separate piece of Supplementary Guidance to provide a statutory basis for putting the development brief for site EH1 Crathes into practice.

No other changes are commended to the plan.

Reporter's conclusions:

<INSERT TEXT>

Reporter's recommendations:

<INSERT TEXT>