



Proposed Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2015 Representation Form

Please use this form to make comments on the Proposed Aberdeen Local Development Plan, ensuring that your comments relate to a specific issue, site or policy in either the Proposed Plan, Proposed Supplementary Guidance, Proposed Action Programme or Strategic Environmental Assessment Environmental Report. Please include the relevant paragraph(s) and use a separate form for each issue you wish to raise.

The consultation period runs between Friday 20th March and Monday 1st June 2015. Please ensure all representations are with us by 5pm on Monday 1st June.

Name	Mr <input checked="" type="radio"/> Mrs <input type="radio"/> Miss <input type="radio"/> Ms <input type="radio"/> Dr H R Millar
Organisation	
On behalf of (if relevant)	
Address	Failte Mid Anguston Peterculter Aberdeen
Postcode	AB14 0PP
Telephone	██████████
E-mail	

Please tick if you would like to receive all future correspondence by e-mail

What document are you commenting on?	Proposed Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	Proposed Supplementary Guidance	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Proposed Action Programme	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Strategic Environmental Assessment Environmental Report	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Policy/Site/Issue	Site Name - OP108: Mid Anguston	Paragraph(s)	

What would you like to say about the issue?

Please see attached letter.

What change would you like to see made?

I would like this proposal to be permanently removed.

Please return the completed form by:

- post to the Local Development Plan Team, Aberdeen City Council, Business Hub 4, Ground Floor North, Marischal College, Broad Street, Aberdeen AB10 1AB; or
- email to ldp@aberdeencity.gov.uk

The representation form can be filled in, saved, e-mailed and/or printed. You must "save as" to ensure the completed form is saved with the changes you have made. If you need more space, please fill out another representation form or send a word document attachment via e-mail with your completed representation form. **Please ensure all representations are with us by 5pm on Monday 1st June.**

Thank you. For more information, please visit www.aberdeencity.gov.uk/aldp2016 or to contact the Local Development Plan Team call 01224 523470.

Data Protection Statement

The comments you make on the Proposed Plan will be used to inform the Local Development Plan process and the Examination into the Local Development Plan by the Scottish Ministers' Reporter. You must provide your name and address for your representation to be considered valid, and this information will be made publicly available. Other personal contact details such as telephone and e-mail will not be made public, although we will share these with the Reporter, who may use them to contact you about the comments you have made. For more information about how Aberdeen City Council maintains the security of your information, and your rights to access information we hold about you, please contact Andrew Brownrigg (Local Development Plan Team Leader) on 01224 523317.

Failte
Mid Anguston
Peterculter
Aberdeen
AB14 0PP

16 May 2015

Local Development Plan Team
Aberdeen City Council
Business Hub 4
Ground Floor North
Marischal College
Broad Street
Aberdeen
AB10 1AB

Dear Sir or Madam,

**Aberdeen Local Development Plan – Proposed Plan
Proposal for 8 houses at Mid Anguston – OP108**

I responded fully regarding this plan in my letter of 20 February 2014 in response to the Main Issues Report. I enclose a copy. I have read the assessment of all the responses to the proposal and note that the recommendation was “do not allocate the site for residential development for the proposed plan”

The majority of responses, including several (9) from those living adjacent to the site in Mid Anguston, were against the proposal. There were 5 responses in support of the development. 3 of those were from people who do not live near the site. Just one was from a neighbour who lives in Mid Anguston but is a close personal friend of Mr Clubb, who responded on behalf of the developer, Churchill Homes (unsurprisingly the 5th letter of support).

In his submission, dated 21st March 2014, Mr Clubb makes some very misleading statements. He repeatedly alleges that the local community opinion is supportive but there is only evidence of support from one local resident. He refers to public consultations but I am only aware of one event which took place several years ago. I had no knowledge of it at the time and I only know about it because Councillor Boulton told me she attended. He says the development is very much part of the existing settlement when in fact it would completely alter the nature of Mid Anguston, destroying its rural character. The access on the road coming off the North Deeside Road and on Quarryhill does not, as he has stated, allow the passage of 2 vehicles along the entire length. Everyone who lives here knows this from personal experience and near misses are commonly reported. My worst experience was when I was forced into a ditch to avoid a speeding oncoming vehicle, and we also have knowledge of collisions. I have lived here for 23 years and have no experience of problems with vermin from the disused chicken sheds as alleged by Mr Clubb. He suggests the site is a brownfield site, but it is very

clear that it is a greenfield site in green belt which is currently used for agricultural purposes, i.e. sheep and horse grazing, with the disused chicken sheds only occupying a quarter of the proposed housing scheme site.

The reasons against the development are well summarized in the responses report and can be listed as follows:

1. Assessed as undesirable in the Development Options Report and rejected previously by the Scottish Government Reporter.
2. Unsatisfactory local road to cope with the resultant increase in traffic, which is an even greater concern in view of the proposed steading and riding centre developments at Nether Anguston Farm.
3. Landscape impact, causing urbanization of green belt.
4. Inadequate or absent pedestrian, cycle and public transport connections making residents totally dependent on cars.
5. No evidence that this development would make any difference to the primary school provision in Peterculter as alleged by the developer, but it might have an adverse impact at Cults Secondary School which is at capacity.
6. The proposal would not meet the type of housing demand which is most needed.
7. No mains sewerage in the area and concern about water seepage from the disused quarry at the top of the hill.
8. Concern about impact on wildlife.
9. Enough green belt is already allocated for housing.
10. Not in line with green belt policy.

As noted above, following assessment of responses, the recommendation from planning officials was that this proposal should not be supported. However, at the Communities, Housing and Infrastructure Committee on 28th October 2014, the convener, Councillor Cooney, seconded by Councillor Milne moved for the proposal to be reinserted. This is very difficult to understand, considering the multiple local objections, and the repeated recommendations against the proposal from the professional planners of the local authority and the Government Reporter. No reason for the councillors recommendation is minuted. It is very unfair that members of the public are expected to provide justification if objecting to a proposal (and certainly there is overwhelming justification to object in this case) but councillors appear to be under no obligation to explain why they make decisions such as this. This is contrary to the spirit of open government and democratic accountability.

I have another concern regarding procedure. This proposal was discussed in the context of the Main Issues Report at a Community Council Meeting in March 2014 in Peterculter attended by Councillor Boulton and some local residents including myself. Overwhelming local opposition to the development was clear and the community council came to a clear view recommending against the development. It is my understanding that the next day Mr Clubb, as representative of the developer, approached Community Council Officers requesting a meeting. His request was declined and he was told that Community Councillors do not enter into discussions with developers,

but I am not clear whether this convention also applies to elected Aberdeen City Councillors. Subsequently, City Councillors, for unspecified reasons, have decided to reinsert the proposal in the draft plan. Does this mean that there has been further contact between a councillor or councillors and the developers representatives, and if so, is this normal practice and is this part of the public record?

In conclusion I continue to object to this proposal.

Yours sincerely


Dr H R Millar

Failte
Mid Anguston
Peterculter
Aberdeen
AB14 0PP

20 February 2014

Local development Plan Team
Aberdeen City Council
Business Hub 4
Ground Floor North
Marischal College
Broad Street
Aberdeen
AB10 1AB

Dear Sir or Madam,

Main Issues Report - Proposal for 8 houses at Mid Anguston

The way this proposal is dealt with in the recently published Main Issues report is very unsatisfactory. This is covered in, "2.1 Main Issue 1 – Greenfield Housing and Employment Allocations," from page 7 onwards.

In the second paragraph on page 7 there is a statement "New development should aim to reduce travel distances and make walking, cycling and public transport more attractive to people". The proposed development does not meet these criteria. These and other issues were clearly addressed in the Reporter's Report issued in December 2011, commenting on the draft Local Development Plan. The reporter's comments included the following,

1. "Access to the public transport network is over 2 kilometres away and accessibility to existing employment opportunities and local facilities is very poor."
2. "The stretch of road leading to the site is lengthy and has no provision for pedestrians"
3. "The nearest shops and other neighborhood facilities are some 3 kilometres away"
4. "The proposed development would therefore be inconsistent with Scottish Planning Policy"
5. "The council's current supplementary guidance on Transport and Accessibility states that public transport should be available within 400 metres of the origins and destinations of trips within the development. That is not the case here"
6. "...any development is likely to be heavily car dependent"
7. "It follows that there is no numerical justification for allocating this site in order to meet the allowances in the structure plan."
8. "...housing and the extension of that housing over the rest of the site would, in my view, be highly obtrusive in the agricultural landscape."

Not surprisingly the Mid Anguston development was withdrawn from the Local Development Plan in the light of these comments.

The only justifications given in the Main Issues Report for reintroducing this proposal now are to "increase housing choice" and to "support the primary school." 8 executive houses cannot increase housing choice for the majority of the population and the reference to the primary school is irrelevant. The numbers will be too small to make a difference, children in these households might be of secondary age, and, owners of these proposed expensive houses might well choose private schooling.

There are serious inadequacies in the local roads, which are not sufficiently considered. Quarryhill Road is only made up to no 1 Quarryhill Road. The access to the houses beyond that and the access to some of the proposed new houses are from a problematic, unmade up and unadopted road. Also, the road from the North Deeside Road into the Anguston area is inadequate. It is a twisty road with many blind corners. In many places there is not room for 2 vehicles to pass without going on the verge or possibly into a ditch. I have personal experience of being forced into a ditch by speeding oncoming traffic and my daughter has been hit in a head on collision on a blind corner. Traffic problems have worsened over the years with several steading housing conversions and commercial developments in the area (a cattery and helipad). With the advent of online shopping there are frequent delivery vans. Many go at excessive speed and are unaware of the limitations of the road. In addition the road has been full of potholes over recent years with the limited patching provided not keeping pace with the deterioration. This can only get worse if there are more housing developments.

Other potential problems are brushed aside in the application form from Churchill Homes (Aberdeen) dated 07.06.2013. Their form states that there is a "landscape fit" and "no intrusion". In fact the proposed development will have a major impact on the landscape and outlook. The view from our house and many of our neighbours is currently a rural view. If the development is allowed to go ahead this will become like a suburban housing outlook. Under the item N) "Footpath and Cycle Connections", they state that there is a "limited range of connections", where in fact there are none. They also state that there are water and sewerage connections where, in fact, there is no mains sewerage. Also there is an intermittent watercourse down the middle of the site. There is speculation that this tracks down from the large, water filled, disused quarry at the top of the hill. The water in the quarry is currently at its highest level in living memory.

I am extremely concerned about the way the main Issues report summarises the options for "Issue 1 Greenfield Housing and Employment Allocations" on page 11. Only 2 options are presented, **both** assuming that the sites identified in table 3 on page 9 (which includes the Mid Anguston proposal) should be released for housing. Why is the option of **not** releasing these greenfield sites being considered? It seems that the Mid Anguston development is being presented as a fait accompli. Bearing in mind the flimsy

justification for the development when set against the independent reporters comment in 2011 are there some other unstated reasons for including this development? If so, these reasons should be publicly discussed. If not the development proposal should be withdrawn.

Yours sincerely,

Dr H R Millar