

Echt & Skene Community Council

Minute of LDP Consultation Process Meeting held 1st July 2020 via Skype

Attendees: Fiona Bick, Paula Houston, 6 Echt residents, Ailsa Anderson (Aberdeenshire Council), Mairi Stewart (Aberdeenshire Council)

LDP Consultation

As agreed under AOCB at the ESCC meeting of 18th June, the Planning Team were invited to give a presentation on the Draft Local Development Plan consultation.

Ailsa Anderson circulated a slide pack prior to the meeting and talked through the slides giving the context, setting out the overall scheme for preparing the LDP and explaining how parties could take part in the consultation exercise.

The following questions and answers followed:

Q: Can anyone submit a response to the consultation or do they have to have participated earlier in the plan preparation process?

A: Anyone can submit comments on the draft plan.

Q: Some of the settlement statements have mistakes in them as there seems to have been some copy and paste errors. Can we comment on these?

A: The planning service would welcome corrections being suggested.

Q: Will the new LDP have Supplementary Guidance?

A: There will be no Supplementary Guidance as it has led to confusion in the past. There will be a large number of appendices to the plan though.

Q: Has the Planning Team considered increasing the formal neighbour notification of the proposed developments to beyond 20m of each site, or was the 20m rigidly set by planning regulations and/or limited by budgetary considerations (with regard to the mailshot expense).

A: They had considered whether it was necessary to increase the notification scope beyond 20m, but decided there was no need in light of the extensive online consultation material available to all this year.

Q: Can children submit representations?

A: Yes, there is no age limit on representations. The Planning Team would like to involve more young people in the development planning and have developed education materials for primary and secondary pupils.

Q: Some of the claims made by developers in their bid submissions for sites appear to be incorrect. Are these relevant?

A: Respondents are encouraged to point out any misleading statements made within bid proposals.

Q: Will the 2021 LDP be in place for 10 years or 5 years?

A: The LDP will be revised in 5 years' time although the vision should be valid for ten years.

Q: Policy R2.4 refers to the redevelopment of brownfield sites being permitted in accessible rural areas. The definitions of brownfield sites excludes "*land being used for storage purposes e.g. silage clamps or other specialised agricultural structure*" Is it intended that these can be brownfield if they're not in active use?

A: No. A silage clamp or similar, is never considered a brownfield site whether it is, or was, being used as such.

Q: In R2.7 is there intended to be any limit on the size of development to be allowed in principle on larger brownfield sites? Or would the development have to be small-scale (i.e. occupy <0.5ha) and the rest of the area be reinstated? What is the intention for larger sites where part but not all of it may be brownfield/redundant?

A: There was a difference of interpretation between Ailsa and Mairi as to whether it was intended to have a 0.5ha limit or not. Partial brownfield sites are not addressed.

Q: Is R2.8 intended to apply only to proposals involving housing?

A: Essentially, yes, although there is scope for mixed uses to be permitted.

Q: R2.19 refers only to the remote rural areas. Is it intended that employment proposals in the accessible rural areas also have to demonstrate there are no other suitable sites and that the development can be accessed safely, and by pedestrians, cyclists and via public transport?

A: It was clarified that these tests should apply to employment proposals in all rural areas.

The Council Officers were asked if they would explain how the proposed policy R2 would be applied to the some local examples of sites so we could understand whether these would be supported in principle under the proposed LDP. They said they would ask colleagues in the Development Planning team to revert to explain how they would approach a determination.

(Post meeting note: They reverted to say they were not willing to provide a response as It could be construed as being prejudicial to the outcome of any future applications that might be made in respect to the examples.)

Future Meeting Dates:

30th July Lyne of Skene

10th September Echt

29th October AGM at Garlogie