

PP1235

PROPOSED ABERDEENSHIRE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2020 RESPONSE FORM

As part of the production of the Local Development Plan, a 'Main Issues Report' was published in January 2019. The responses from these consultations have helped to inform the content of the Proposed Local Development Plan ("the Proposed Plan").

The Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan will direct decision-making on land-use planning issues and planning applications in Aberdeenshire for the 10-year period from 2021 to 2031. The Proposed Plan was agreed by Aberdeenshire Council in March 2020 as the settled view of the Council. However, the Proposed Plan will be subjected to an independent examination and is now open for public comment.

This is your opportunity to tell us if anything should be changed in the Proposed Plan, and why.

When writing a response to the Proposed Plan it is important to specifically state the modification(s) that you would wish to see to the Plan.


This is the only remaining opportunity to comment on the Proposed Plan. The reasons for any requested changes will be analysed and reported to Scottish Ministers. They will then appoint a person known as a Reporter to conduct a public examination of the Proposed Plan, focusing particularly on any unresolved issues and the changes sought.

Ministers expect representations (or responses) to be concise (no more than 2000 words) and accompanied by limited supporting documents. It is important to ensure that all of the information that you wish to be considered is submitted during this consultation period as there is no further opportunity to provide information, unless specifically asked.

Please email comments to ldp@aberdeenshire.gov.uk or send this form to reach us by 31 July 2020*.

We recommend that you keep a copy of your representation for your own records.

**UPDATE 16 June 2020: Consultation period was extended from 17 July 2020 for a further two-week period.*



ACCESSIBILITY

If you need information from this document in an alternative language or in a Large Print, Easy Read, Braille or BSL, please telephone 01467 536230.

Jeigu pageidaujate šio dokumento kita kalba arba atspausdinto stambiu šriftu, supaprastinta kalba, parašyta Brailio raštu arba britų gestų kalba, prašome skambinti 01467 536230.

Dacă aveți nevoie de informații din acest document într-o altă limbă sau într-un format cu scrisul mare, ușor de citit, tipar pentru nevăzători sau în limbajul semnelor, vă rugăm să telefonați la 01467 536230.


Jeśli potrzebowali będą Państwo informacji z niniejszego dokumentu w innym języku, pisanych dużą czcionką, w wersji łatwej do czytania, w alfabecie Braille'a lub w brytyjskim języku migowym, proszę o telefoniczny kontakt na numer 01467 536230.

Ja jums nepieciešama šai dokumentā sniegtā informācija kādā citā valodā vai lielā drukā, viegli lasāmā tekstā, Braila rakstā vai BSL (britu zīmju valodā), lūdzu, zvaniet uz 01467 536230.

Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan
Woodhill House, Westburn Road, Aberdeen, AB16 5GB

Tel: 01467 536230
Email: ldp@aberdeenshire.gov.uk
Web: www.aberdeenshire.gov.uk/ldp
Follow us on Twitter @ShireLDP

If you wish to contact one of the area planning offices, please call 01467 534333 and ask for the relevant planning office or email planning@aberdeenshire.gov.uk.



Please use this form to make comments on the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020. If you are making comments about more than one topic it would be very helpful if you could fill in a **separate response form for each issue you wish to raise**.

Please email or send the form to reach us by 31 July 2020 at the following address:

Post: Planning Policy Team, Infrastructures Services
Aberdeenshire Council, Woodhill House, Westburn Road, ABERDEEN, AB16 5GB

Email: ldp@aberdeenshire.gov.uk

Please refer to our **Privacy Notice** at the end of this form for details of your rights under the Data Protection Act.

YOUR DETAILS

Title:	
First Name:	Tara
Surname:	Cowley
Date:	31 July 2020
Postal Address:	c/o Strutt & Parker, [REDACTED]
Postcode:	[REDACTED]
Telephone Number:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]

Are you happy to receive future correspondence only by email? Yes No

Are you responding on behalf of another person? Yes No

If yes who are you representing?

Mr Ian Ross, [REDACTED]

Tick the box if you would like to subscribe to the Aberdeenshire LDP eNewsletter:

An acknowledgement will be sent to this address soon after the close of consultation.

YOUR COMMENTS

Please provide us with your comments below. We will summarise comments and in our analysis will consider every point that is made. Once we have done this we will write back to you with Aberdeenshire Council's views on the submissions made. We will publish your name as the author of the comment, but will not make your address public.

Modification that you wish to see (please make specific reference to the section of the Proposed Plan you wish to see modified if possible, for example Section 9, paragraph E1.1):

1. The Proposed LDP should be modified to allocate additional land for residential development to compensate for the anticipated shortfall in housing land to be created by the Plan, as suggested by Homes for Scotland.
2. Appendix 7c of the Proposed Local Development Plan, as it relates to the settlement of Foveran, should be modified to include additional land for residential development to the west and south of the village; this would include land proposed as part of the wider bid Site FR109 which we believe has the potential to compensate for the shortfall in housing land supply predicted to happen during the plan period as per Homes for Scotland's response to the consultation on the Proposed Plan.
3. The LDP should be updated as required to take account of any increase in housing numbers that would arise as a result of the above proposed modifications.

Reason for change:

Background

Strutt & Parker is instructed by Mr Ian Ross of [REDACTED] to prepare and submit representations in response to the current consultation on the Aberdeenshire Proposed Plan.

Mr Ross and his family own and farm land to the west and south of Foveran; the agricultural unit has been severed by the delivery of the AWPR in this location, and the productive quality of the land has been negatively impacted in places by the construction of the road.

We consider that there is an opportunity to meet the projected housing needs of the village in the medium and long term, including during this local plan period, through delivery of new homes on land to the south and west of Foveran. The village is perfectly placed to facilitate travel to Aberdeen with the Proposed LDP confirming that an active cycle way is being planned between Foveran and Aberdeen.

Submissions were made to both the Call for Sites and the Main Issues Report on behalf of Mr Ross proposing development on land to the south and south west of Foveran; these are referenced FR109 and 1020 respectively and are attached here as *Appendix 1* and *Appendix 2*.

This response should be considered in conjunction with supporting documentation appended herewith and all other representations to this consultation on behalf of Mr Ross, and with regard to the submissions by *Lippe Architects & Planners* on behalf of [REDACTED] for bid sites FR065, FR066 and FR067.

Foveran Settlement Profile

Foveran is identified in the Proposed LDP as being located within the Energetica Corridor and the Aberdeen to Peterhead Strategic Growth Area and as such provides the opportunity to deliver strategic housing and employment allowances.

The Proposed LDP recognises that the strategic location of Foveran has resulted in development pressure to deliver homes and business land in the settlement. This is reflected in the recent housing developments by [REDACTED] at Blairythan Terrace and by [REDACTED] at Westfield Road, both of which are complete and fully occupied and confirms marketability of the settlement.

The Proposed LDP confirms the importance of providing improved community facilities to enhance the settlement's role as a service centre. It also acknowledges that existing capacity at Foveran Primary may be constraint to development due to topographical difficulties associated with extending the footprint of the school, albeit the SEA analysis of sites confirms that the School roll is low and new housing would sustain the primary school (see *Appendix 3*). The Plan suggests that more new homes, beyond the numbers proposed for allocation, should not be delivered until a replacement school has been built.

Development in Foveran proposed by Aberdeenshire Council

The Proposed LDP identifies a number of sites in Foveran that are recommended to be allocated for residential development – refs **OP1, OP2, OP3, OP4** and **OP5**. In total, if capacities indicated by the Proposed LDP are achievable when requirements for infrastructure and open space are taken into account, these sites would contribute 245 new homes to the village within the plan period. This is a reduction of 49 units from the 294 identified in the MIR as appropriate for delivery in the village.

However, we consider that Foveran exhibits significant scope to deliver larger housing numbers during the plan period and beyond, in order to take advantage of its strategic position immediately adjacent to the AWPR (noting that the delivery of that road has severed land at Foveran and Rashierieve Foveran) which offers increased access and connectivity to Aberdeen and the north in a way that many other towns and villages across the Formartine settlements do not.

In this regard, we highlight our response to the Proposed LDP with regard to matters of housing land supply. We note the response from Homes for Scotland, as representative body for the housebuilding industry, suggests that at the date of adoption of the plan, if the proposed allocations are carried forward as currently published, that there will be a shortfall of 432 units in the housing land supply for the Aberdeenshire Housing Market area and that accordingly Aberdeenshire Council should modify the Proposed LDP to allocated more deliverable housing land.

We consider that this anticipated failure to meet the housing land supply is likely to be exacerbated further as there are significant doubts over the effectiveness of some of the allocations that have been proposed, in addition to unresolved constraints highlighted in previous Housing Land Audits that appear to still apply to a number of sites assessed by Aberdeenshire Council as being effectiveness; added to this is the illogical and inconsistent approach to the calculation of indicative site densities across the Plan area, which we consider have been inflated to such an extent in several cases (often far in excess of bids) that the numbers could never be practically or physically achieved.

Across the Formartine settlements and in particular with regard to Ellon, we note that concerns have been raised as to the traffic impacts of a bridge over the Ythan and general road capacity for future development in the town. We highlight that the Issues and Actions Papers for the Formartine settlements (*Appendix 4*) confirms that the implementation of the large residential allocation at Cromleybank (980 units), which we note has been carried forward from the 2012 LDP but has yet to deliver any new homes, has been delayed as a result of transport links. Whilst the Proposed LDP seeks to address this issue through the promotion of active travel as opposed to private cars we fail to see how this alone would remove the issue and the apparent constraint in the network capacity. We consider that this casts doubt on the effectiveness of the Cromleybank site and the associate projections for annual housing completions as included in the 2019 Housing Land Audit.

With the above in mind, we consider that an access constraint created by limited capacity in the local network in Ellon must also have implications for the accessibility of those settlements north of Ellon and we question how many of the proposed sites would be capable of delivery within the Plan period in the absence of a clearly identified solution for the transport issues in Ellon.

We consider that the above points to the likelihood of a future significant increase in the shortfall in housing land supply suggested to arise at the date of adoption of the Plan.

Suggested modification to proposed development in Foveran

In order to address the anticipated shortfall and likelihood of further failure in housing numbers as set out above, we suggest that Aberdeenshire Council must allocate additional land for housing development; this could be achieved on sites that demonstrate ability to deliver new housing within the plan period and those that have potential to carry on beyond that time.

We propose that an appropriate solution would be to **allocate land for residential development to the west and south of Foveran in the control of Mr Ross as per FR109.**

In our other responses to the Proposed Plan we confirm that Mr Ross holds the key to unlocking any capacity issues in the education and transport networks in Foveran that would enable the village to accommodate additional future development in a planned and phased manner, both within the plan period and beyond. Land in the control of Mr Ross can assist in the delivery of the southern link road identified by the Council as essential to alleviate capacity issues on Blairythan Terrace (*see Appendix 5*). A new primary school could also be delivered on Mr Ross' land to the west of the village in order to facilitate both the existing school roll and projected increases which would see the existing Foveran Primary exceed its capacity by 2023.

Delivery of each of the key pieces of infrastructure set out above would individually enable further housing to be delivered in Foveran; cumulatively they offer the potential to achieve an increase in housing numbers, both within and beyond the Plan period, that would enable Foveran to maximise its strategic position within both the SGA and Energetica corridors, and to fulfil its potential to become a high quality lifestyle, leisure and global business location.

Accordingly, land at FR109 in Foveran has the potential to plug the gap in the anticipated shortfall in housing numbers across the area as identified by Homes for Scotland with the potential for further delivery failures to arise as a result of the application by Aberdeenshire of unachievable indicative site capacities and other physical constraints across the site areas that will delay and in some cases prevent the delivery of planned housing development.

The area of land requested to be included as a potential location for future housing development is identified in the *Vision for Foveran & Rashierieve Foveran* Indicative Framework submitted to the MIR in 2019 in support of FR109 (included at *Appendix 6*); the area of land comprising Phase 1 of the Vision is the subject of a separate submission that confirms that housing delivery on that land would facilitate the delivery of the Council's required link road from Blairythan Terrace to the B977.

We suggest that development across FR109 would create a synergistic relationship with the potential for employment land development at Rashierieve Foveran, both as proposed in the plan and as suggested for modification in our other responses on behalf of Mr. Ross. The availability of employment land for short and long term development in such close proximity to Foveran would reduce the requirement to travel and would contribute towards objectives in relation to sustainability and climate change.

In total, the land in the control of Mr Ross could deliver in the region of 300 to 330 new houses within the plan period (based on the standard density set out in the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan) in addition to a new primary school and link road to alleviate education and traffic issues in the village. Further details of the phases and indicative periods of development are included in the *Vision for Foveran & Rashierieve Foveran* Indicative Framework.

Strategic Environmental Assessment

Contrary to the assessment of FR109 included in the SEA for the LDP we would highlight the following:-

- The proposed development site is located in an area where there are no known exceedance of air quality targets and no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) have

been declared; no quantifiable impact on air quality impact has been predicted to result from development here and appropriate measures could be put in place to mitigate any impact arising in the short, medium and long terms;

- We are not aware of any surface water hotspots across the site –SEPA’s 1 in 200 year flood risk map (attached at *Appendix 7*) confirms that the site is not at risk of flooding from any source and there is no justification for a Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out;
- All developments in the settlement are likely to result in increased travel requirements and emissions – this is not an issue particular to FR109;
- Whilst the delivery of new *homes on the site would result in the loss of Prime Agricultural Land at this location*, *Appendix 8* confirms that part of the land is not prime (instead being classed 3.2). Notwithstanding, *Appendix 8* also confirms that other land in the settlement which Aberdeenshire Council has proposed for development is 3.1 and therefore Prime Agricultural Land, and so a precedent has been set by the Council in this regard;
- All development results in landscape change – it is considered that a well-designed residential development with sensitive boundary treatments and landscaping delivers a better visual solution at this location than the proposed stand-alone link road;
- We are aware that a project is in place to upgrade the waste water capacity in the village - it is our understanding this is project is already committed with construction dates to be released;
- The proposed development would be facilitated by the delivery of a new primary school in Foveran on land within the wider boundaries of FR109, the anticipated impact on the village and material assets is positive as a result;
- A mix of house types and sizes can be delivered on the site;
- Coalescence will not occur with Rashierieve Foveran as a result of development here due to the ability to include strategic landscaping on land within the boundaries of FR109 both at Foveran and at Rashierieve Foveran.

Summary

We support the principle of new residential development in Foveran and we align with Aberdeenshire Council’s vision to deliver strategic housing and employment allowances and contribute to transform the area into a high quality lifestyle, leisure and global business location.

However, we suggest that to achieve the desired vision, the land to the south and west of Foveran should be allocated for residential development, for delivery both within the plan period and beyond. This land has the potential to meet the anticipated shortfall in housing numbers identified by Homes for Scotland, in addition to the further delivery failures anticipated to result through unachievable site capacities identified in the Proposed LDP and other constraints impacting the effectiveness and deliverability of housing sites proposed for allocation across the plan area.

We therefore respectfully request the modifications to the Plan as set out at the front of this submission.

PRIVACY NOTICE

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN PUBLIC COMMENT

The Data Controller of the information being collected is Aberdeenshire Council.

The Data Protection Officer can be contacted at Town House, 34 Low Street, Banff, AB45 1AY.

Email: dataprotection@aberdeenshire.gov.uk

Your information is being collected to use for the following purposes:

- To provide public comment on the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan. The data on the form will be used to inform Scottish Ministers and individual(s) appointed to examine the Proposed Local Development Plan 2020. It will inform the content of the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2021.

Your information is:

Being collected by Aberdeenshire Council	X
--	---

The Legal Basis for collecting the information is:

Personal Data	
Legal Obligations	X

Where the Legal Basis for processing is either Performance of a Contract or Legal Obligation, please note the following consequences of failure to provide the information:

It is a Statutory Obligation under Section 18 of the Town and Country (Scotland) Act 1997, as amended, for Aberdeenshire Council to prepare and publish a Proposed Local Development plan on which representations must be made to the planning authority within a prescribed period of time. Failure to provide details requested in the 'Your Details' section of this form will result in Aberdeenshire Council being unable to accept your representation.

Your information will be shared with the following recipients or categories of recipient:

Members of the public are being given this final opportunity to comment on the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan. The reasons for any changes that the Council receives will be analysed and reported to Scottish Ministers. They will then appoint a person to conduct a public examination of the Proposed Plan, focusing particularly on the unresolved issues raised and the changes sought.

Your name and respondent identification number (provided to you by Aberdeenshire Council on receipt of your

submission) will be published alongside a copy of your completed response on the Proposed Local Development Plan website (contact details and information that is deemed commercially sensitive will not be made available to the public).

In accordance with Regulation 22 of the Town and Country (Development Planning) (Scotland) Regulations 2008 where the appointed person determines that further representations should be made or further information should be provided by any person in connection with the examination of the Proposed Plan the appointed person may by notice request that person to make such further representations or to provide such further information.

Your information will be transferred to or stored in the following countries and the following safeguards are in place:

Not applicable.

The retention period for the data is:


Aberdeenshire Council will only keep your personal data for as long as is needed. Aberdeenshire Council will retain your response and personal data for a retention period of 5 years from the date upon which it was collected. After 5 years Aberdeenshire Council will review whether it is necessary to continue to retain your information for a longer period. A redacted copy of your submission will be retained for 5 years beyond the life of the Local Development Plan 2021, possibly until 2037.

The following automated decision-making, including profiling, will be undertaken:

Not applicable.

Please note that you have the following rights:

- to withdraw consent at any time, where the Legal Basis specified above is Consent;
- to lodge a complaint with the Information Commissioner's Office (after raising the issue with the Data Protection Officer first);
- to request access to your personal data;
- to data portability, where the legal basis specified above is:
 - (i) Consent; or
 - (ii) Performance of a Contract;
- to request rectification or erasure of your personal data, as so far as the legislation permits.



4. Site Details

Name of the site (Please use the LDP name if the site is already allocated)	Overhill Farm
Site address	████████████████████
OS grid reference (if available)	
Site area/size	72.13 ha (total) less 11.64 ha (CPO) = 60.49 ha
Current land use	Agricultural land
Brownfield/greenfield	Greenfield
Please include an Ordnance Survey map (1:1250 or 1:2500 base for larger sites, e.g. over 2ha) showing the location and extent of the site, points of access, means of drainage etc.	

5. Ownership/Market Interest

Ownership (Please list the owners in question 3 above)	Sole owner
Is the site under option to a developer?	No
	If yes, please give details
Is the site being marketed?	No
	If yes, please give details

6. Legal Issues

Are there any legal provisions in the title deeds that may prevent or restrict development? (e.g. way leave for utility providers, restriction on use of land, right of way etc.)	No
	If yes, please give details
Are there any other legal factors that might prevent or restrict development? (e.g. ransom strips/issues with accessing the site etc.)	No
	If yes, please give details

7. Planning History

Have you had any formal/informal pre-application discussions with the Planning Service and what was the response?	No
	If yes, please give details
Previous planning applications	Please provide application reference number(s), description(s) of the development, and whether planning permission was approved or refused:
Previous 'Call for sites' history. See Main Issues Report 2013 at www.aberdeenshire.gov.uk/ldp	Please provide Previous 'Call for sites'/'Bid' reference number: FMO17
Local Development Plan status www.aberdeenshire.gov.uk/ldp	Is the site currently allocated for any specific use in the existing LDP? No
	If yes, do you wish to change the site description and or allocation?

8. Proposed Use

Proposed use		Housing/employment/mixed use/other (please specify):
Housing	Approx. no of units	580
	Proposed mix of house types	Number of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detached: 290 • Semi-detached: 290 • Flats: • Terrace: • Other (e.g. Bungalows):
	Tenure (Delete as appropriate)	Private
	Affordable housing proportion	25 %
Employment	Business and offices	Indicative floor space: m ²
	General industrial	Indicative floor space: m ²
	Storage and distribution	Indicative floor space: m ²
	Do you have a specific occupier for the site?	Yes/No
Other	Proposed use (please specify) and floor space	m ²
	Do you have a specific occupier for the site?	Yes/No
Is the area of each proposed use noted in the OS site plan?		Not applicable

9. Delivery Timescales

We expect to adopt the new LDP in 2021. How many years after this date would you expect development to begin? (please tick)	0-5 years	x
	6-10 years	
	10+ years	
When would you expect the development to be finished? (please tick)	0-5 years	
	6-10 years	
	+ 10years	
Have discussions taken place with financiers? Will funding be in place to cover all the costs of development within these timescales	No	
	If yes, please give details (e.g. bank facility, grant funding, secured loan etc.)	
Are there any other risk or threats (other than finance) to you delivering your proposed development	No	
	If yes, please give details and indicate how you might overcome them:	

10. Natural Heritage

<p>Is the site located in or within 500m of a nature conservation site, or affect a protected species?</p> <p>Please tick any that apply and provide details.</p> <p>You can find details of these designations at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • https://www.environment.gov.scot/ • EU priority habitats at http://gateway.snh.gov.uk/sitelink/index.jsp • UK or Local priority habitats at http://www.biodiversityscotland.gov.uk/advice-and-resources/habitat-definitions/priority/ • Local Nature Conservation Sites in the LDP's Supplementary Guidance No. 5 at www.aberdeenshire.gov.uk/ldp 	RAMSAR Site	
	Special Area of Conservation	
	Special Protection Area	
	Priority habitat (Annex I)	
	European Protected Species	
	Other protected species	
	Site of Special Scientific Interest	
	National Nature Reserve	
	Ancient Woodland	
	Trees, hedgerows and woodland (including trees with a Tree Preservation Order)	
	Priority habitat (UK or Local Biodiversity Action Plan)	
	Local Nature Conservation Site	
	Local Nature Reserve	
If yes, please give details of how you plan to mitigate the impact of the proposed development:		
Biodiversity enhancement		
<p>Please state what benefits for biodiversity this proposal will bring (as per paragraph 194 in Scottish Planning Policy), http://www.gov.scot/Resource/0045/00453827.pdf) by ticking all that apply. Please provide details.</p> <p>See Planning Advice 5/2015 on Opportunities for biodiversity enhancement at: www.aberdeenshire.gov.uk/media/19598/2015_05-opportunities-for-biodiversity-enhancement-in-new-development.pdf</p> <p>Advice is also available from Scottish Natural Heritage at: https://www.snh.scot/professional-advice/planning-and-development/natural-heritage-advice-planners-and-developers and http://www.nesbiodiversity.org.uk/.</p>	Restoration of habitats	
	Habitat creation in public open space	X
	Avoids fragmentation or isolation of habitats	
	Provides bird/bat/insect boxes/Swift bricks (internal or external)	
	Native tree planting	X
	Drystone wall	X
	Living roofs	
	Ponds and soakaways	X
	Habitat walls/fences	X
	Wildflowers in verges	X
	Use of nectar rich plant species	X
	Buffer strips along watercourses	X
	Show home demonstration area	X
	Other (please state):	
Please provide details:		

11. Historic environment

Historic environment enhancement		
Please state if there will be benefits for the historic environment.	No If yes, please give details:	
<p>Does the site contain/is within/can affect any of the following historic environment assets? Please tick any that apply and provide details.</p> <p>You can find details of these designations at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • http://historicscotland.maps.arcgis.com/apps/Viewer/index.html?appid=18d2608ac1284066ba3927312710d16d • http://portal.historicenvironment.scot/ • https://online.aberdeenshire.gov.uk/smrpub/master/default.aspx?Authority=Aberdeenshire 	Scheduled Monument or their setting	No
	Locally important archaeological site held on the Sites and Monuments Record	Yes
	Listed Building and/or their setting	No
	Conservation Area (e.g. will it result in the demolition of any buildings)	No
	Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes	No
	Inventory Historic Battlefields	No
	If yes, please give details of how you plan to mitigate the impact of the proposed development: Full archaeological survey will be commissioned.	

12. Landscape Impact

Is the site within a Special Landscape Area (SLA)? (You can find details in Supplementary Guidance 9 at www.aberdeenshire.gov.uk/ldp)	No If yes , please state which SLA your site is located within and provide details of how you plan to mitigate the impact of the proposed development:
<p>SLAs include the consideration of landscape character elements/features. The characteristics of landscapes are defined in the Landscape Character Assessments produced by Scottish Natural Heritage (see below) or have been identified as Special Landscape Areas of local importance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SNH: Landscape Character Assessments https://www.snh.scot/professional-advice/landscape-change/landscape-character-assessment • SNH (1996) Cairngorms landscape assessment http://www.snh.org.uk/pdfs/publications/review/075.pdf • SNH (1997) National programme of landscape character assessment: Banff and Buchan http://www.snh.org.uk/pdfs/publications/review/037.pdf • SNH (1998) South and Central Aberdeenshire landscape character 	<p>If your site is not within an SLA, please use this space to describe the effects of the site's scale, location or design on key natural landscape elements/features, historic features or the composition or quality of the landscape character:</p> <p>The development can be landscaped, which will give a defendable southern edge to the village. This landscaping will be done in a way that increases biodiversity.</p>

assessment http://www.snh.org.uk/pdfs/publications/review/102.pdf	
---	--

13. Flood Risk

Is any part of the site identified as being at risk of river or surface water flooding within SEPA flood maps, and/or has any part of the site previously flooded? (You can view the SEPA flood maps at http://map.sepa.org.uk/floodmap/map.htm)	No If yes, please specify and explain how you intend to mitigate this risk:
Could development on the site result in additional flood risk elsewhere?	No If yes, please specify and explain how you intend to mitigate or avoid this risk:
Could development of the site help alleviate any existing flooding problems in the area?	No If yes, please provide details:

14. Infrastructure

a. Water / Drainage

Is there water/waste water capacity for the proposed development (based on Scottish Water asset capacity search tool http://www.scottishwater.co.uk/business/Connections/Connecting-your-property/Asset-Capacity-Search)?	Water	Yes
	Waste water	Yes
Has contact been made with Scottish Water?	No If yes, please give details of outcome:	
Will your SUDS scheme include rain gardens? http://www.centuralscotlandgreennetwork.org/campaigns/greener-gardens	Yes Please specify: TBC	

b. Education – housing proposals only

Education capacity/constraints https://www.aberdeenshire.gov.uk/schools/parents-carers/school-info/school-roll-forecasts/	Please provide details of any known education constraints. Is additional capacity needed to serve the development?	
Has contact been made with the Local Authority's Education Department?	No If yes, please give details of outcome:	

c. Transport

If direct access is required onto a Trunk Road (A90 and A96), or the proposal will impact on traffic on a Trunk Road, has contact been made with Transport Scotland?	No If yes, please give details of outcome:	
Has contact been made with the Local Authority's Transportation Service? They can be contacted at transportation.consultation@aberdeenshire.gov.uk	No If yes, please give details of outcome:	

Public transport	Please provide details of how the site is or could be served by public transport: Village has bus services to Ellon and Dyce.
Active travel (i.e. internal connectivity and links externally)	Please provide details of how the site can or could be accessed by walking and cycling: Village has walkways which would be linked in. Cycle paths to be proposed through development.
d. Gas/Electricity/Heat/Broadband	
Has contact been made with the relevant utilities providers?	Gas: No If yes, please give details of outcome(s):
	Electricity: No If yes, please give details of outcome(s):
	Heat: No If yes, please give details of outcome(s):
	Broadband: No If yes, please give details of outcome(s):
Have any feasibility studies been undertaken to understand and inform capacity issues?	No Please specify:
Is there capacity within the existing network(s) and a viable connection to the network(s)?	Yes Please specify: According to landowner
Will renewable energy be installed and used on the site? For example, heat pump (air, ground or water), biomass, hydro, solar (photovoltaic (electricity) or thermal), or a wind turbine (freestanding/integrated into the building)	Don't know If yes, please specify the type of renewable energy technology(s), if it is to provide electricity and/or heating (i.e. space heating and/or hot water), and the scale of provision (To supplement off-site connection all the way to 100% energy provision (off-grid)):
e. Public open space	
Will the site provide the opportunity to enhance the green network? (These are the linked areas of open space in settlements, which can be enhanced through amalgamating existing green networks or providing onsite green infrastructure) You can find the boundary of existing green networks in the settlement profiles in the LDP	Yes Please specify: TBC
Will the site meet the open space standards, as set out in Appendix 2 in the Aberdeenshire Parks and Open Spaces Strategy?	Yes Please specify: TBC

https://www.aberdeenshire.gov.uk/media/6077/approvedpandospacesstrategy.pdf	
Will the site deliver any of the shortfalls identified in the Open Space Audit for specific settlements? https://www.aberdeenshire.gov.uk/communities-and-events/parks-and-open-spaces/open-space-strategy-audit/	Not applicable Please specify:
f. Resource use	
Will the site re-use existing structure(s) or recycle or recover existing on-site materials/resources?	Yes If yes, please specify: TBC
Will the site have a direct impact on the water environment and result in the need for watercourse crossings, large scale abstraction and/or culverting of a watercourse?	No If yes, please provide details:

15. Other potential constraints

Please identify whether the site is affected by any of the following potential constraints:

Aberdeen Green Belt https://www.aberdeenshire.gov.uk/media/20555/appendix-3-boundaries-of-the-greenbelt.pdf	No
Carbon-rich soils and peatland http://www.snh.gov.uk/planning-and-development/advice-for-planners-and-developers/soils-and-development/cpp/	No
Coastal Zone https://www.aberdeenshire.gov.uk/media/20176/4-the-coastal-zone.pdf	No
Contaminated land	No
Ground instability	No
Hazardous site/HSE exclusion zone (You can find the boundary of these zones in Planning Advice 1/2017 Pipeline and Hazardous Development Consultation Zones at https://www.aberdeenshire.gov.uk/planning/plans-and-policies/planning-advice/ and advice at http://www.hse.gov.uk/landuseplanning/developers.htm)	No
Minerals – safeguarded or area of search https://www.aberdeenshire.gov.uk/ldpmedia/6_Area_of_search_and_safeguard_for_minerals.pdf	No
Overhead lines or underground cables	No
Physical access into the site due to topography or geography	No
Prime agricultural land (grades 1, 2 and 3.1) on all or part of the site. http://map.environment.gov.scot/Soil_maps/?layer=6	No
‘Protected’ open space in the LDP (i.e. P sites) www.aberdeenshire.gov.uk/ldp and choose from Appendix 8a to 8f	No
Rights of way/core paths/recreation uses	No
Topography (e.g. steep slopes)	No
Other	No
If you have identified any of the potential constraints above, please use this space to identify how you will mitigate this in order to achieve a viable development:	

--

16. Proximity to facilities

How close is the site to a range of facilities? *Delete as appropriate	Local shops	> 1 km
	Community facilities (e.g. school, public hall)	> 1 km
	Sports facilities (e.g. playing fields)	> 1 km
	Employment areas	> 1 km
	Residential areas	400m
	Bus stop or bus route	400m
	Train station	> 1 km
	Other, e.g. dentist, pub (please specify)	400m 400m-1 km > 1 km

17. Community engagement

Has the local community been given the opportunity to influence/partake in the design and specification of the development proposal?	Not yet
	If yes, please specify the way it was carried out and how it influenced your proposals:
	If not yet, please detail how you will do so in the future: Hold event to inform community in a local building

18. Residual value and deliverability

Please confirm that you have considered the 'residual value' of your site and you are confident that the site is viable when infrastructure and all other costs, such as constraints and mitigation are taken into account.	I have considered the likely 'residual value' of the site, as described above, and fully expect the site to be viable: Please tick: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--

If you have any further information to help demonstrate the deliverability of your proposal, please provide details.

19. Other information


Please provide any other information that you would like us to consider in support of your proposed development (please include details of any up-to-date supporting studies that have been undertaken and attach copies e.g. Transport Appraisal, Flood Risk Assessment, Drainage Impact Assessment, Peat/Soil Survey, Habitat/Biodiversity Assessment etc.)

Although we have put this site forward for residential use, equally parts of it could be used for mixed use.



Please tick to confirm your agreement to the following statement:



By completing this form I agree that Aberdeenshire Council can use the information provided in this form for the purposes of identifying possible land for allocation in the next Local Development Plan. I also agree that the information provided, other than contact details and information that is deemed commercially sensitive (questions 1 to 3), can be made available to the public.



Reproduced by permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of HMSO.
© Crown copyright and database right 2011. All rights reserved. Ordnance Survey Licence number 100020540



Key:

	LAND TO BE ACQUIRED
	SERVITUDE RIGHT TO BE ACQUIRED

MAP NO. RYC/G110/10

THE M9/A90/M90 TRUNK ROAD (BALMEDIE TO TIPPERTY)
COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER 2012
CPO SHEET 5 OF 7



Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2021: Main Issues Report 2019 **Main Issues Report Response Form**

Important Information: Please Read

The Main Issues Report (MIR) is a key stage in preparing the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2021 (LDP 2021). The MIR sets out options for how the LDP 2021 could be improved both in terms of the policies that Aberdeenshire Council will use to determine planning applications as well as identifying land allocations for development. The MIR has been published along with a Monitoring Report and Interim Environmental Report of the Strategic Environmental Assessment. These, along with other supporting documents are available at: <https://www.aberdeenshire.gov.uk/planning/plans-and-policies/ldp-2021/main-issues-report/>.

Comments are sought on the MIR and Interim Environmental Report, or indeed any other matter that you feel that we need to consider, by 5pm on Monday, 8 April 2019. Responses can be emailed to us at ldp@aberdeenshire.gov.uk or received via post, Planning Policy Team, Infrastructure Services, Aberdeenshire Council, Woodhill House, Westburn Road, Aberdeen, AB16 5GB.

Please note that in order for comments to be considered as valid you must include your contact details.

We will use these details to confirm receipt of your comments and to seek clarification or request further information as required. Should you have any concerns regarding the holding of such information please contact ldp@aberdeenshire.gov.uk. Anonymous comments will not be considered as part of the consultation process. Petitions will only be noted in the name of the person submitting the document.

All comments received will be carefully assessed and will be used to inform the preparation of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan. There will be a further opportunity to comment on the Proposed Plan when it is published in December 2019.

Name	Strutt & Parker
Organisation (optional)	
On behalf of (if relevant)	Mr Ian Ross, [REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Postcode	[REDACTED]
Telephone (optional)	[REDACTED]
E-mail (optional)	[REDACTED]



Doing things digitally is our preference. Tick the box if you are not happy to receive correspondence via email:

Tick the box if you would like to subscribe to the Aberdeenshire LDP eNewsletter:

Fair processing notice

Please tick to confirm your agreement to the following statements: ✓

By submitting a response to the consultation, I agree that Aberdeenshire Council can use the information provided in this form, including my personal data, as part of the review of the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan. This will include consultation on the Main Issues Report (including any subsequent Proposed Plan).

I also agree that following the end of the consultation, i.e. after 8 April 2019, my name and respondent identification number (provided to you by Aberdeenshire Council on receipt of your submission) can be published alongside a copy of my completed response on the Main Issues Report website (contact details and information that is deemed commercially sensitive will not be made available to the public).

The data controller for this information is Aberdeenshire Council. The data on the form will be used to inform a public debate of the issues and choices presented in the Main Issues Report of the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2021. It will inform the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan.

Aberdeenshire Council will only keep your personal data for as long as is needed. Aberdeenshire Council will retain your response and personal data for a retention period of 5 years from the date upon which it was collected. After 5 years Aberdeenshire Council will review whether it is necessary to continue to retain your information for a longer period. A redacted copy of your submission will be retained for 5 years beyond the life of the Local Development Plan 2021, possibly until 2037

Your Data, Your Rights

You have got legal rights about the way Aberdeenshire Council handles and uses your data, which include the right to ask for a copy of it, and to ask us to stop doing something with your data.

If you are unhappy with the way that Aberdeenshire Council or the Joint Data Controllers have processed your personal data then you do have the right to complain to the Information Commissioner's Officer, but you should raise the issue with the Data Protection Officers first. The Data Protection Officers can be contacted by writing to:

- [REDACTED], Data Protection Officer, Aberdeenshire Council, Business Services, Town House, 34 Low Street, Banff, AB45 1AY

If you have difficulty understanding this document and require a translation, or you need help reading this document (for example if you need it in a different format or in another language), please phone us on 01467 536230.

Which document(s) are you committing on?	Main Issues Report	✓
	Draft Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan	✓
	Strategic Environmental Assessment Interim Environmental Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Your comments

Main Issue 2: The Settlement Strategy

The sole focus of the identified Main Issue relating to the LDP Settlement Strategy is whether to remove the sections of the spatial strategy that refer to six different administrative areas in Aberdeenshire and instead to give a wider context to the settlement strategy as it applies over the whole area. We note the alternative set out in the MIR to keep the statements for each administrative area to assist communities Area Committees in using the Plan.

However as previously highlighted in our general comments on the MIR, we perceive a more fundamental issue that has the potential to significantly undermine the settlement strategy adopted by the Council, which is focussed on two key issues:-

- an overall lack of clarity with regard to the housing land requirement across the Aberdeenshire area and the means by which the Council proposes to satisfy this and maintain an effective 5-year land supply at all times; and
- a lack of clear intent with regard to the overall quantum of employment land to be delivered by the LDP in order to ensure compliance with the requirement established by the Strategic Development Plan (SDP).

We note the Council's acknowledgement in the suite of consultation documents that the majority of the identified Strategic Growth Areas (SGAs) are failing to perform as expected and that delivery is either occurring more slowly than projected or not at all. In particular, we note that the Aberdeen to Huntly Strategic Growth Area is recognised as being constrained by uncertainty surrounding the dualling of the A96 and the potential route options. We note that until such a time as a preferred route is identified, many of the sites in Inverurie and Huntly that are identified for development remain constrained and incapable of delivery; this threatens the Council's ability to maintain an effective 5-year housing supply in this SGA and creates uncertainty for the programming of delivery of employment land which is heavily dependent on the availability of critical infrastructure.

This is not a singular issue however with the anticipated rates of housing delivery in the Aberdeen to Laurencekirk SGA also falling badly behind projections. Infrastructure and capacity issues are frustrating delivery on sites that may otherwise be considered to be effective with the result that proposed housing numbers are being rationalised across some sites, which has led the Council to introduce a new allocation of some 300 dwellings proposed to be identified to the north of Porthlethen in order to bridge the housing delivery shortfall within this SGA.

We acknowledge the Council's assertion that the Aberdeen to Peterhead SGA will become the main focus to accommodate additional housing land allocations and is also the focus for employment land associated with the Energetica Corridor, partly due to the recent infrastructural upgrade achieved with the completion of the Aberdeen Western Peripheral Route (AWPR). However we do not consider it appropriate that a delivery failure exacerbated by prolonged infrastructure constraints in the other two SGAs can be fully compensated for through a singular focus on the strategic corridor between Aberdeen and Peterhead; a consistent approach to site allocation and delivery is required across all settlements and it is incumbent upon the Council to apply the same rigour to the assessment of the effectiveness and deliverability of identified 'preferred' and 'reserve' sites within the Aberdeen to Peterhead corridor as in the other SGAs.

In that regard we consider that, should the Council maintain its approach of proposing sites for development in the Aberdeen to Peterhead SGA that cannot be demonstrated to be capable of such development, it is inevitable that failures in the housing and employment land supply will emerge in this corridor in due course.

Accordingly, it is very possible that the Council's 'eggs in one basket' approach and inconsistent assessment of site effectiveness and ability to deliver will result in an overall failure to achieve the required effective 5-year housing land supply at all times across the Aberdeenshire area and will likely face a substantial number of departure applications for residential development on unallocated sites, which runs contrary to the principles of the plan-led system in place in Scotland.

We highlight the requirement within the Proposed SDP that a 75%/ 25% split of housing land will be achieved within the SGAs versus other locations in Aberdeenshire. We consider that the Council's acknowledgement of the significant constraints facing housing delivery in two of the three SGAs requires the Council to take steps to ensure that the SDP Housing Land Requirement can be satisfied in an appropriate manner across all of the settlements in the SGAs.

We therefore suggest that the Council must reconsider the effectiveness and capability of delivery of a number of sites that are identified as 'preferred options' or that have been carried forward from previous LDPs despite an inability for these sites to achieve anticipated housing numbers. It is our view that the Council has applied an inconsistent approach to the consideration of housing sites that have recognised and long standing constraints; in a number of settlements, sites that are identified as 'constrained' in the most recent 2018 Aberdeen City and Shire Housing Land Audit and for which no planning application has been submitted are carried forward as Preferred Options in the MIR. In some cases, these constrained sites are not only proposed to be carried forward but have also seen substantial increases to the indicative capacity, sometimes achieved through the incorporation of a larger area of land that would also appear to suffer the same constraint. Examples of these issues across the Formartine Settlements can be found in the preferred options being promoted by the Council in Balmedie; Cuminestown; Newburgh; Pitmedden; Turriff, and Udry Station.

We consider that the Council has the opportunity to be more consistent in how it proposes to allocate sites for future development, including by way of identifying 'reserve sites' that are not preferred for immediate development but which could come forward at a future time, for example to fill a shortfall created by the failure of delivery of other sites proposed for allocation, either within the same settlement or across those settlements located within SGAs. As per our response to general matters raised by the MIR, we consider that identifying allocations for 'strategic reserve' sites for longer term housing is a useful exercise for both communities and housebuilders in that it provides certainty on the potential locations for future residential development.

We highlight below examples where we consider the Council has an excellent opportunity to promote additional housing and employment development in the short, medium and long term on sites that exhibit substantial capacity to be considered effective; to overcome perceived locational constraints; are accessible, marketable and capable of delivery; and have the potential to make a significant contribution to housing land supply and employment development both during and after the Plan period.

To assist an understanding of the sites the subject of this submission, a Vision document has been prepared to demonstrate how the sites might be delivered, sets out appropriate phases of development, and includes a Preliminary Development Framework diagram to illustrate the overall concept.

Land at Overhill Farm, to the south and west of Foveran

Foveran is located within the Aberdeen Housing Market Area of the Formartine Area of Aberdeenshire Council and is positioned in the Aberdeen to Peterhead Strategic Growth Area (SGA). Foveran is located along the A90 corridor and benefits from immediate access to the AWPR which has been constructed adjacent to the settlement and brings Aberdeen and Westhill within a short drive to the south of the settlement, with Peterhead some 20 miles to the north. Other settlements such as Ellon, Newburgh, and Balmedie are a short distance away. As a result, the settlement is expected to provide opportunity to deliver strategic housing and employment allowances and to contribute towards transforming the wider area into a high quality lifestyle, leisure and global business location as part of the Energetica Corridor.

The settlement is classified, using the Scottish Government six-fold urban rural classification, as "Accessible Rural" and benefits from two principal local facilities (being the Village Hall and the Primary School) in addition to a play area adjacent to the village hall and a café/restaurant on the northern boundary of the settlement.

The LDP Priorities for the settlement are contained in *MIR Appendix: Formartine* highlighting how the Council has considered bids in the Formartine settlements including Officer's assessment of each site and their subsequent identification of preferred options, 'reserved' sites and those that constitute a future development opportunity.

The planning objectives for Foveran are set out below:-

- to meet housing need in the wider SGA as defined by the Aberdeen City and Shire SDP;
- to support community facilities and services;
- to support economic development in the Energetica Corridor; and
- enhance the settlement's role as a service centre by providing improved community facilities.

The Council notes that, due to its strategic location, there is pressure to deliver new homes and business land within the village but that constraints in educational provision may hinder the ability to achieve this ambition. The settlement has developed along the corridor of the former A90 but has now extended along an E-W axis with recent housing development south of Westfield Farm and at Blairythan Terrace offering greater housing choice in the village.

The MIR notes that delivery of the AWPR in this location has released capacity which can be used to promote significant development in the area.

The MIR identifies a number of sites in Foveran that are considered to be suitable for development and are identified as Officer's preference. Those sites are set out below:-

- **OP1:** South of Westfield Farm – 100 homes, 2ha employment land, 3ha strategic reserve
(partially under construction)
- **OP2:** West of McBey Way – 75 home
- **OP3:** South of Turin Way – 36 homes
- **OP4:** Land at Blairythan Terrace – 20 homes
- **OP5:** Land at Blairythan Terrace - 49 homes
- **OP6:** Land North of Westfield – 14 homes

The result of these proposed allocations would be to add 280 new homes to the existing village during the period of the LDP and would extend the current village layout in a westerly and southerly direction. We consider that the proposed allocation of these sites solidifies the Council's aspirations for growth in Foveran and confirms the focus on new housing development, with associated employment uses, in this accessible location during and beyond the LDP period.

We note however that the Council has assessed a small number of other sites proposed for development as part of the 2018 Call for Sites stage; these included land to South West of Foveran (Ref: FR109) and land north of Blairythan (FR142 and FR143). The Council has not considered that these sites are suitable for development with the Council's reasons for not preferring these sites set out below:-

FR109: *Density of development is too low; site is constrained in terms of educational provision; site goes through the Balmedie to Tipperty road scheme; site is partially within waste water hotspots; majority of the site is prime agricultural land; proposal constitutes a significant extension to the village for which no mitigation measures have been identified.*

FR142: *The scale of the proposed development would create an unnatural extension to the north which would erode all the character of the original form of the settlement; the site is not considered suitable for development.*

FR143: *The scale of the proposed development would create an unnatural extension to the north which would erode all the character of the original form of the settlement; the site is not considered suitable for development.*

We concur that the proposal to allocate land to the north of the village on sites FR142 and FR143 would have a significantly detrimental impact on the existing character, both of the settlement and its surroundings, given that the landscape is largely flat with open views. However, we consider that there is potential for future development at

Overhill Farm on the southern and western side of Foveran which would extend the settlement in a planned manner into an area contained by the AWPR which we consider acts as an appropriate boundary for future growth aspirations.

The Council's reasons as stated in the MIR for not favouring the site subject of this submission (FR109: Land to the south and west of Foveran) are addressed below.

Density of development

The area of land included in bid ref: FR109 extended to some 69 hectares and included land to the west of Rashierieve Foveran. The overall quantum of residential development proposed at that time was 580 homes, which equated to an average density of c. 8 homes per hectare. We acknowledge that such a density would not be in keeping with the 30 dwellings per hectare advocated for SGA settlements by the proposed Strategic Development Plan with which the LDP is required to be compliant.

The area of land originally proposed for development has been reduced to take into account the delivery of the AWPR which traverses the site promoted in FR109 and has the effect of severing that land at Overhill Farm that lies adjacent to the west of Rashierieve Foveran. Accordingly, this submission suggests a reduced area of approximately 41 hectares on the southern and western edge of Foveran that we consider would deliver a logical and planned extension to the settlement over time, and which would deliver an appropriate level of residential development with community facilities to meet associated demand from new housebuilding in the village.

Applying the standard density of 30 houses per hectare as advocated by the SDP for settlements within SGAs, the land at Overhill Farm has capacity to deliver in the region of 1,000 to 1,200 new homes to meet future demand over the medium to long term.

To illustrate how the development could be delivered over time, the Vision document produced by LBA Studio sets out how development could be delivered in a series of phases, their indicative capacities and their connectivity to the existing settlement and proposed future developments. This Vision document is appended to this submission and confirms that 4 main phases could be delivered across a 20-year period, with details of each below:-

Phase	Timescale of delivery	Site Area	Indicative Number of dwellings
1	Years 1-5	4 ha	120
2	Years 5-10	7 ha	210
3A	Years 10-15	10 ha	300
3B	Years 15-20	17 ha	510
TOTAL	20 years	38 ha	1,140

A 3ha area on the western edge of the currently proposed village boundary, adjacent to proposed Site OP5, is suggested by this submission to be safeguarded for community infrastructure with the potential for delivery of new community facilities at this location as part of a wider residential development at Overhill Farm.

As a result of the reduction in total area proposed for development and an increase in proposed densities of 30 dwellings per hectare to comply with those advocated in the proposed Strategic Development Plan, underdevelopment and low density on the site are no longer considered to be issues that would hinder future development at this location.

Education constraint

We acknowledge the Council's concerns with regard to the capacity of the existing primary school in the village and we share concerns about the ability of the school to cater to the anticipated increase in population that would arise as a result of the Council's preferred options for development. Whilst we note that the adopted LDP indicated that Foveran Primary School was operating at 40% capacity at time of its publication in 2017 and that the school roll was expected to rise to 53% in 2022, we acknowledge that the sites proposed to be allocated for residential development are likely to see the school roll reach a tipping point during the LDP period or soon thereafter dependent on build out and occupation rates.

We note that the MIR does not require the provision of additional education facilities but highlights the potential that a new school will be required in the future as the current school is not easily extendable and suffers from topographical restrictions.

We suggest that it is entirely possible to mitigate for anticipated constraints in education provision in Foveran; in that regard, it is suggested that the proposed development at Overhill Farm could include for the safeguarding of an area of 3ha which has potential to facilitate new community facilities and infrastructure, including education provision. The proposed location for this safeguarded area is on the western edge of the currently proposed settlement boundary – this location is considered to maximise connectivity between the allocated sites OP1 and OP2, on the northern edge of the village, and the existing and proposed development in the village core, in addition to being accessible from all areas of the proposed residential development at Overhill Farm.

The Vision document appended to this submission confirms that the community/education facilities could be delivered as early as Phase 2 of the overall development at Overhill Farm.

We therefore consider that education constraints should no longer be assessed as an issue that would hinder future development at this location.

Balmedie to Tippetty Road Scheme

The Balmedie to Tippetty Road Scheme was a 58km section of the AWPR project that proposed a significant upgrade of the existing A90 trunk road between Balmedie and Tippetty to deliver a dual two-lane standard with provision of two new grade separated junctions. The proposal was intended to complete a gap in the existing dual carriageway that was an acknowledged bottleneck in the strategic road network.

The road scheme cuts through the heart of the land to the south and west of Foveran and has the effect of severing the area of land included in the submission to the Call for Sites as Ref: FR109.

The construction of the AWPR is now complete; the project has had the effect of creating a containment to the southern extent of Foveran and offers a defensible physical feature which has the effect of preventing expansion of the settlement to the south of the road, thereby offering a defined area within which Foveran has capacity to grow into the future.

The presence of the AWPR at this location also reinforces Foveran's strategic position on the transport network which we anticipate will have the effect of increasing the attraction of the village and its popularity for new housebuilding within a short commuting distance of Aberdeen City.

As a result of the completion of the AWPR this is no longer considered to be an issue that would hinder future development at this location.

Waste water hotspots

We note that the Council refers in its assessment of the proposed development at Overhill Farm that "*part of the site is within waste water hotspots*". We are not aware of any issues in relation to waste water in the region and we highlight that the Council's assessment of the bid site at Blairythan Terrace (FR067), located immediately adjacent to the east of the land at Overhill Farm, confirms that there are adequate site services available.

We are aware that a project is in place that would seek to upgrade the waste water capacity in the village; it is our understanding this project is already committed with construction dates to be released. We are therefore unclear as to the weight the Council is attributing to this issue in its consideration of the site and we consider that this is an area for which appropriate mitigation can be provided, at the appropriate time, in line with the scale of the proposed development.

Prime Agricultural Land

The Council cites loss of Prime Agricultural Land as a reason for not taking forward the land at Overhill Farm as a preferred option. We acknowledge that the land is classified on the Hutton Institute (formerly Macaulay Institute) Land

Capability for Agriculture (LCA) maps as being partially 3.1, with an area of 3.2 on the central and western sections of the site. For the purposes of planning, Classes 1, 2 and 3.1 of the LCA classification are considered to constitute Prime Agricultural Land (PAL).

We acknowledge the role of productive agricultural land in the planning process and the policies in place to protect against the loss of prime agricultural land. We note that both SPP and adopted and emerging LDPs in Aberdeenshire would permit development on agricultural land where it is required to meet an established housing need.

Having reviewed the sites in Foveran that officers indicate are preferred for development, as listed above, we also note that they contain a significant portion of land identified on the Hutton Institute (formerly Macaulay Institute) Land Capability for Agriculture mapping as grade 3.1, which is Prime Agricultural Land (PAL) for the purposes of planning.

We also note a number of other sites in settlements across the Formartine area that contain PAL but which have been assessed as Officer's preference for future development. In this regard we highlight sites in Newburgh, Pitmedden, and Turriff that Officers confirm will result in loss of PAL but which can be justified on the basis that the sites would deliver a number of local aspirations which would override the loss of PAL, or where the loss of PAL would be considered to be insignificant in context of availability of PAL in the wider landscape surrounding the settlement.

We consider that a similar scenario exists in Foveran and that the relatively small area of PAL that would be lost should development come forward on the land at Overhill Farm could be justifiable to support the community, provide additional community benefit and provide housing choice for those seeking to live in an accessible rural location within easy commuting distance of Aberdeen. We highlight that the reduction of the total area of the site proposed for development would have the effect of reducing the area of PAL on which development is proposed.

Notwithstanding, we draw attention to the outcome of a recent planning case wherein Scottish Ministers considered an appeal against refusal of Planning Permission in Principle for a site at Lasswade Road in Edinburgh (ref: PPA-230-2152). The Reporter found against the Council's decision and sought fit to approve the release of some 14ha of Grade 3.1 agricultural land for purposes of residential development. In reaching his conclusion the Reporter considered that the need to meet the shortfall in the five-year effective housing land supply outweighed the loss of the 14 ha, deemed by the Reporter to be a "*relatively small area*", of prime agricultural land not currently in use.

Additionally, we highlight that the landownership at Overhill Farm extends to the west of the farm and therefore beyond that proposed for development within this submission. The development of land between Overhill Farm and Foveran village would not undermine the ongoing viability of an established farming business as alternative areas of agricultural land will continue to be farmed within the current ownership.

Relationship of site to the settlement

The proposed site is located on the western and southern edges of the settlement, adjacent to existing residential uses and in a natural 'bowl' created by the rising contours to the south and west. The Council's preferred sites at OP3, OP4 and OP5 would create a natural linkage from the existing settlement into the proposed site with the proposed site offering connections outwards from the villages via green corridors to be incorporated within site design.

We highlight the first phase of the site is within 350m from the Community hall at the heart of the village with the community facilities/community infrastructure proposed to be provided as part of the development located adjacent to the Phase 1 site and likely to be delivered in tandem with Phase 2.

We therefore consider that the site has a good relationship with the village core and is well connected with, and would be a complementary use to, the residential development proposed to be delivered on a number of sites at the heart of the village and on its northern edge.

Residential development elsewhere in the SGA

Having considered other sites within the Aberdeen to Peterhead SGA preferred by Officers as 'reserved' sites for residential purposes, we consider that the land at Foveran exhibits significantly more potential to deliver new homes in the future with fewer impacts that might be anticipated elsewhere.

We note that Officers have preferred sites in Balmedie, Pitmeddan and Udney Station as future reserves for residential development however we note the Council's acknowledgement that these sites are variously constrained by access, education provision, environmental factors and lack of demonstration of need, and we consider that any development in these locations would have significant landscape impacts that could not be mitigated.

We consider that the land at Overhill Farm is not constrained and has greater capacity to facilitate future residential development in a planned and phased manner that would deliver quality design and minimise landscape impact. The land has the potential to deliver high quality new homes including a mixture of family homes, homes for changing needs and affordable housing, in an attractive, sustainable and deliverable location.

Additional development in this settlement would assist in meeting the Council's strategic housing land requirement and would bring significant benefit to the settlement by way of additional community and education facilities. We therefore suggest that the Council should reconsider its preference for those sites in the above referenced settlements identified as 'reserved' sites in order to afford further consideration to the more appropriate potential for medium to long term development on land at Overhill Farm, Foveran.

Land at Overhill Farm, to the west of Rashierieve Foveran

Rashierieve Foveran is a small mixed use development located immediately south of Foveran; it is also within the Aberdeen Housing Market Area of the Formartine Area and positioned in the Aberdeen to Peterhead Strategic Growth Area (SGA).

As with Foveran, Rashierieve Foveran is located along the A90 corridor and benefits from immediate access to the AWPR which has been constructed adjacent to the settlement on its northern and western boundaries and brings Aberdeen and Westhill within a short drive to the south of the settlement, with Peterhead some 20 miles to the north. Other settlements such as Ellon, Newburgh, and Balmedie are a short distance away.

As a result, the settlement is expected to provide opportunity to deliver strategic employment allowances and to contribute towards transforming the wider area into a high quality lifestyle, leisure and global business location as part of the Energetica Corridor.

The LDP Priorities for the settlement are contained in *MIR Appendix: Formartine* highlighting how the Council has considered bids in the Formartine settlements including Officer's assessment of each site and their subsequent identification of preferred options, 'reserved' sites and those that constitute a future development opportunity.

The planning objectives for Foveran are set out below:-

- To provide local employment opportunities; and
- To support economic development in the Energetica corridor.

As recognised by the Council in relation to Foveran, the completion of the AWPR in this location has released capacity which can be used to promote significant development in the area. The Council recognises the potential for this area to deliver strategic employment land and to this extent directs employment land to Rashierieve Foveran from larger settlements such as Newburgh, where it is noted that the Council has not considered any land to be allocated for employment uses as it recognises that there remains capacity at the nearby allocations at Rashierieve Foveran that is able to meet local demand for employment land.

We note that the Council's consideration of bids received during the Call for Sites stage states that only one bid was received for development in Rashierieve – bid ref: FR129 relates to land to the west of Bon Accord Granite, which is identified in the current LDP partially as site OP1 for employment uses (which we note is also included in the Employment Land Audit 2017) with the northern part of this site identified as SR1, a strategic reserve for future employment land.

In its response to **FR129** the Council states that "*the proposed site is currently allocated for employment uses. The site is best suited to light industrial/office/service industry and mixed use proposals due to the housing to the south east*

along the A90. Most of the site is prime agricultural land. The mix of uses proposed by the applicant would fit with the existing context of the area, remove the requirement for significant landscaping and provide opportunities for live work proposals. This would fit well within the Energetica Corridor”.

We support Officer’s preference to carry this site forward into the emerging LDP for a mix of uses within Classes 4 and 5. We concur that the site is an accessible and acceptable location for employment land and we support the Council’s identification of land for short term delivery in addition to reserving additional land for future development.

We highlight however that the Council has failed to take cognisance of bid site FR109 for land at Overhill Farm, the original boundaries of which extended as far south as Rashierieve Foveran. The construction of the AWPR in this area has had the effect of severing the land at Overhill Farm such that a parcel of the land is now most closely associated with Rashierieve Foveran, being cut off from the remaining land at Foveran by the AWPR route.

We note the Council’s acceptance that the current employment land allocation accepts the loss of some prime agricultural land in this area but its concern that any further development in this area would result in the further loss of prime agricultural land. We note the LCA classification of part of this site as Grade 3.1 however we highlight that the construction of the AWPR has impacted upon the quality and capacity of this land for agricultural purposes with the result that it cannot be considered to be viable and productive agricultural land but rather accommodates informal grazing.

Accordingly, we consider that there is potential for the future development of some 9ha of additional employment uses on land to the west of Rashierieve Foveran associated with Overhill Farm which would extend the settlement in a planned manner into an area contained by the AWPR (which we consider acts as an appropriate boundary for future growth aspirations) and would serve to meet the Council’s aspirations for strategic employment development in this immediate area as part of the Energetica Corridor. We therefore request that the Council extend the boundaries of sites OP1 and SR1 in the current LDP, which are proposed to be carried forward as Officer’s Preference into the new Aberdeenshire LDP, to take in the land to the west extending to the boundary with the AWPR.

The Vision document appended to this submission confirms the extent of the area at Rashierieve Foveran proposed for additional employment development and assesses the context and capacity of the existing settlement to support this. It sets out how additional future development on land to the west of the settlement could be delivered in a phased manner to support the two currently allocated sites that are considered to be Officers Preference for development. It also identifies the relationship between future employment development at Rashierieve Foveran and proposed residential development on land to the west and south of Foveran as proposed earlier in this response; we consider that the Council’s aspirations for population growth in Foveran will require the allocation of additional employment land in the immediate vicinity in order to deliver sustainable development offering local employment choices for future residents.

We therefore consider that the allocation of an additional 4 ha of land to accommodate employment development to the west of site OP1 would deliver an appropriate response to the Council’s requirement for employment land within the Energetica Corridor, and would enable a concentration of uses in a singular location that benefits from immediate access to the strategic transport network. We suggest that it would be appropriate for the Council to identify this location as a focus for mixed employment uses, incorporating business, offices, light industrial, R&D, general industrial, logistics and storage and distribution which we consider could be delivered with minimum impact on the amenity of the existing settlement.

Having assessed other sites proposed by the Council for employment purposes we consider that the land at Rashierieve Foveran exhibits significantly more potential for additional employment land in a logical location immediately adjacent to the AWPR which offers connectivity with the strategic network. We note that Officers have preferred a site incorporating some 12ha on the western edge of West Pitmillan, to the north of Foveran, as a ‘reserved’ site for future employment uses (ref: FR117) however we consider that development at that location would have a significantly negative landscape impact being that the site is located in open countryside and is visually prominent from its surroundings.

We also note that the land to the west of West Pitmillan is prime agricultural land and suffers from access constraints. Delivery of this site would also be dependent upon future employment development on land surrounding the Enerfield Business Park (ref: FR118).

We highlight that the Interim Environmental Report of the Strategic Environmental Assessment confirms that an assessment of the West Pitmillan reserved site indicated that the proposed development would have negative impacts on air quality; climatic factors; soil; and cultural heritage. The negative impacts on air, climatic factors and soil could not be improved by mitigation.

We suggest that a more appropriate response would be for the Council to extend the area currently identified for a strategic reserve (ref: SR1) to the west of Rashierieve Foveran. This land comprises approximately 5ha which is contained by the AWPR to the north and west and by the existing settlement to the east. The quality and capability of the land for agricultural purposes has been diminished by the construction of the AWPR which has also severed the land from its wider agricultural unit. There is existing access to the site via the former A985 which has now been downgraded as a result of the AWPR construction. A westerly extension of the land to the west of the SR1 site, in addition to a similar extension of the land to the west of the OP1 site as suggested above and in the attached Vision document, would enable a coherent approach to delivery of employment land in this area and would support a concentration of uses to enable Rashierieve Foveran to become a strategic location for employment within the Energetica Corridor.

Conclusions

As per our comments in the introductory section of this response, we suggest that the Council should reconsider its current approach to achieving new housing delivery across the Strategic Growth Areas, the strategy for which appears to prioritise new housing delivery in the Aberdeen to Peterhead corridor without appropriately addressing historic failures in this and the other two SGAs between Aberdeen to Huntly and Aberdeen to Laurencekirk.

We consider that it is incumbent upon the Council to adopt a consistent approach to the assessment of proposed development sites and to identify and deallocate those sites with a history of failing to deliver new housing in favour of other proposed development sites that are available and capable of housing delivery and contributing to the requirement to maintain an effective 5-year housing land supply. The Council must also put in place appropriate plans that will provide certainty on the location of future strategic development across the Aberdeenshire area beyond the period of the LDP.

Therefore, we are of the view that the proposed development of land at Overhill Farm in Foveran and Rashierieve Foveran would be an appropriate response to the Council's requirement for residential and employment development. We consider that development at Overhill Farm would have no negative impact on the settlements of Foveran and Rashierieve Foveran; would assist in meeting the aims of the Local Housing Strategy; would have a positive impact on the vital facilities in the settlements in terms of delivering a new Primary School in Foveran, with the capacity to ensure safe routes to school, and to providing additional employment land and facilitating an appropriate strategic reserve at Rashierieve Foveran as is required within the Energetica Corridor.

The proposed developments the subject of this submission would not represent either overdevelopment or underdevelopment; the land is partially prime quality agricultural land for the purposes of planning however the construction of the AWPR has impacted upon the productive capabilities of the land. It is suggested that potential for loss of prime agricultural land can be justified both in the context of the availability of other areas of prime agricultural land in the surrounding landscape and the Council's aspirations to focus strategic housing and employment development in this area.

The Vision document appended to this submission provides more detail on the potential developments at Foveran and Rashierieve Foveran, including the principles of the proposed developments; site context and analysis; an overview of appropriate phasing of both the housing and employment elements, and an indication of how the proposed developments would complement each other and the wider area.

We believe that there are significant benefits to the area to be derived from this proposal which should receive your support. We consider that it is wholly appropriate, in the context of the identification of a significant number of 'reserve' or 'future opportunity' sites across the Aberdeenshire area, for the Council to acknowledge the potential for the land at Overhill Farm, Foveran and Rashierieve Foveran to deliver strategic housing and employment development in the future by way of safeguarding the land for development in the Proposed Local Development Plan due for publication later this year or in early 2020.

Strategic Environmental Assessment of New Allocated Sites and Alternative Bids – Formartine

Contents

BALMEDIE.....	3
BARTHOL CHAPEL.....	17
BELHELVIE	19
BEREFOLD.....	23
BLACKDOG	24
COLLIESTON	27
CULTERCULLEN	27
CUMINESTOWN	28
DAVIOT.....	30
ELLON.....	38
FOVERAN.....	53
FYVIE	63
GARMOND	66
KIRKTON OF AUCHTERLESS.....	68
METHLICK.....	73
NEWBURGH	80
OLDMELDRUM	88
PITMEDDEN AND MILLDALE	107
POTTERTON.....	119
RASHIERIEVE FOVERAN.....	135

ROTHIENORMAN..... 136

ST KATHERINES 141

TARVES 144

TIPPERTY 148

TURRIFF 155

UDNY GREEN 170

UDNY STATION 171

WEST PITMILLAN..... 176

WOODHEAD 178

YTHANBANK 186

LANDWARD SITES – DRUM OF WARTLE 191

LANDWARD SITES – FORGUE 193

LANDWARD SITES – HATTONCROOK 197

LANDWARD SITES – WHITECAIRNS..... 199

BALMEDIE

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP1 (FR077) Land at Balmedie South		Proposal: 80 homes, 11ha employment land, mixed commercial land, retail and hotel	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Balmedie Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW) does not have capacity, but a potential growth project is underway investigation. SEPA requires connection to the public sewer for all new developments in Balmedie to protect Balmedie Bathing Beach. Local sewer reinforcement and Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may also be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. o Invercarnie / Mannofield/Turriff Water Treatment Works (WTW) has capacity for this area, but local mains reinforcement maybe required. o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. 	0
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No flood risks. o Car use/CO₂ emissions could be mitigated through being in close proximity to amenities of Balmedie, with employment opportunities not too far away, and public transport options available (bus links). 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A proposal of this scale will cause a significant loss of valuable agricultural land (i.e. through increases in concentrations of contaminants, soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter). o Impacts are likely to be localised and medium/long term. However, the site is a logical extension to the settlement in terms of proximity from services and meeting housing employment and retail need and would offer potential benefits in terms of increased biodiversity. 	0
Biodiversity	+/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Sands of Forvie SAC and Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA are set to the northeast. The development could have an effect indirectly through drainage and geese grazing areas. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. No significant loss of land for geese foraging or roosting is anticipated. o The development will enhance biodiversity through enhancement and extension of existing woodland to the south and provide links to green space network within the settlement. 	+
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Site temporarily changed due to AWPR compound. 	0

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects. 	
Material Assets	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure – education capacity/contributions will have been factored into the developer’s viability considerations. o Affordable housing to be provided. 	+
Population	+	The development would provide a good mix of house type and size.	+
Human Health	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. o Links and improved access to open space. o Potential employment opportunities – live/work balance. 	+
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: OP2 (FR124) Land south of Chapelwell		Proposal: 220 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Balmedie WWTW currently does not have capacity, but a potential growth project is under investigation. SEPA requires connection to the public sewer for all new developments in Balmedie to protect Balmedie Bathing Beach. Local sewer reinforcement and DIA may also be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. o Invercarnie / Mannofield/Turrieff WTW has capacity for this area, but local mains reinforcement maybe required. o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. 	0
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No identified impacts. 	0
Soil	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	-

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A small area of prime agricultural land within the site which will result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. 	
Biodiversity	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA and Sands of Forvie are set to the northeast. The site is at a relatively close proximity to the qualifying sites and would have an effect indirectly through drainage. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. ○ However, planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. Recreational access to the site is actively managed by the RSPB. SNH advise that there should be no additional pressures from visitors where facilities and visitor management plans are in place. No significant issues from increased public access is foreseen. No significant loss of land for geese foraging or roosting is anticipated. ○ The development will enhance biodiversity through enhancement and extension of existing woodland area to the south and provide links to green space network within the settlement. 	+
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Significant development would further alter the character of the area; however, it already has an allocation. However, the site is relatively flat and would appear to be a logical extension to the existing settlement. The impact could be mitigated by strategic landscaping/reinstatement of the woodland belt to the south. ○ Given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects. 	0
Material Assets	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure – education capacity/contributions will have been factored into the developer's viability considerations. ○ Affordable housing to be provided, in excess of policy requirements. 	+
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A good mix of house types is proposed. ○ The development would allow integration of people through mixed tenure of housing. In any case, this would be mitigated through compliance with the Local Development Plan policies. 	+
Human Health	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ Links and improved access to open space. 	+
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: FR079 Site 1, East of A90, South Orrock, Balmedie		Proposal: Employment (Business & Offices, General Industrial, Storage & Distribution)	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A proposal of this scale is likely to lead to a decrease in air quality due to the nature of the use for business and employment uses which are dislocated from a settlement and currently require vehicular transport. 	-
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Balmedie WWTW currently does not have capacity, but a potential growth project is under investigation. SEPA requires connection to the public sewer for all new developments in Balmedie to protect Balmedie Bathing Beach. Local sewer reinforcement and DIA may also be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Invercarnie / Mannofield/Turriff WTW has capacity for this area, but local mains reinforcement maybe required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses may occur during the development phase of this site if the northern part of the site were developed. 	0
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions although given the size of the site this is not likely to be significant. ○ This could be mitigated through the development of FR116 which is a very large residential development that could provide nearby homes for employees. The site is on a busy bus route so that could reduce commuter traffic. 	0
Soil	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of some prime agricultural land and will result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. 	--
Biodiversity	0/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA and Sands of Forvie SAC are set to the north. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying sites and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species. The development would have an effect indirectly through recreation pressures, land take for development, and impact on geese grazing areas. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. Recreational access to the site is actively managed by the RSPB. ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or water course would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. 	+
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced but this has already occurred directly adjacent to the site with the construction of the new A90. The effects on landscape character would not be significant. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects. 	0

Material Assets	0	o The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure.	0
Population	0	o The site is currently dislocated from the settlement but within reasonable distance providing additional employment opportunities relatively close to Balmedie.	0
Human Health	0	o Unlikely to have a significant impact on human health.	0
Cultural Heritage	0	o Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR080 Site 2, East of A90, South Orrock, Balmedie		Proposal: Employment Land	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	-	o The only potential impact would be localised due to the site being isolated away from any settlement yet consisting of an employment development which may include heavy industrial processes, etc. o Impact likely to be veiled due to new road being built on adjacent land.	-
Water	0	o Balmedie WWTW currently does not have capacity, but a potential growth project is under investigation. SEPA requires connection to the public sewer for all new developments in Balmedie to protect Balmedie Bathing Beach. Local sewer reinforcement and DIA may also be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. o Invercannie / Mannofield/Turrieff WTW has capacity for this area, but local mains reinforcement maybe required. o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	0
Climatic Factors	-	o The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. This could be mitigated through the development of FR116 which is a very large residential development that could provide nearby homes for employees. The site is on a busy bus route so that could reduce commuter traffic.	0
Soil	-	o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	-

Biodiversity	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ The development will potentially result in the loss of existing trees, woodland and hedges. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or water course would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. 	+
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects. 	0
Material Assets	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure. 	0
Population	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site is currently dislocated from the settlement but within reasonable distance providing additional employment opportunities relatively close to Balmedie. 	0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to have a significant impact on human health. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR089 Land at Keir Farm, Balmedie		Proposal: 500 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A proposal of this scale is likely to lead to a decrease in air quality, which can be mitigated as the settlement is on a bus route. 	-/0
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Balmedie WWTW currently does not have capacity, but a potential growth project is under investigation. SEPA requires connection to the public sewer for all new developments in Balmedie to protect Balmedie Bathing Beach. Local sewer reinforcement and DIA may also be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Invercarnie / Mannofield/Turrieff WTW has capacity for this area, but local mains reinforcement maybe required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (ground, coastal, transitional or loch) is good. 	0

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to the public sewage infrastructure. 	
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. This would be reduced if the proposal provided opportunities to live/work or land adjacent was allocated for employment uses. ○ This site is close to a busy bus route and this could mitigate the need for commuter car use. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in remediation of contaminated soil. 	0
Biodiversity	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sands of Forvie SAC and Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA are set to the northeast. The development would have an effect indirectly through recreation pressures, land take for development, drainage and impact on geese grazing areas. ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ The development is not likely to conserve, protect and enhance the diversity of species and habitats, and the natural heritage of the area. ○ The development will potentially result in the loss of existing trees, woodland and hedges. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or water course would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. 	+
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries, as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects. 	0
Material Assets	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure. ○ The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. These include social infrastructure and community facilities where a need has been identified, and these can be secured through developer obligations. 	0
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A mix of house types is proposed and this will result in housing choice for all groups of the population. 	+
Human Health	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths, but provides opportunities for open space. ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	+
Cultural Heritage	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Potential for an adverse impact on schedule monument Hare Cairn. Restricting development to the east (next to the road) may help mitigate impact. 	-/0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR103 Land at Blairton Farm, Balmedie		Proposal: 6 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Balmedie WWTW currently does not have capacity, but a potential growth project is under investigation. SEPA requires connection to the public sewer for all new developments in Balmedie to protect Balmedie Bathing Beach. Local sewer reinforcement and DIA may also be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Invercarnie / Mannofield/Turrieff WTW has capacity for this area, but local mains reinforcement maybe required. 	0
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There would be minimal CO₂ emissions from general heating and travel. 	0
Soil	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development could result in remediation of contaminated soil. 	+
Biodiversity	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA and Sands of Forvie SAC are set to the north. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying sites and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species. The development would have an effect indirectly through recreation pressures, land take for development, drainage and impact on geese grazing areas. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. Recreational access to the site is actively managed by the RSPB. ○ The development is likely to adversely affect populations of protected species, including European Protected Species, their habitats and resting places or roosts as bats may be using the site. ○ The development may result in the loss of existing trees, woodland and hedges. ○ The development will enhance biodiversity through redevelopment of brownfield land. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or water course would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. 	0
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects. The impact will depend on the level of existing landscaping being retained. 	0
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are infrastructure constraints associated with the site relating to education provision at Balmedie Primary School, which could have a temporary effect. However, the scale of development would not lead to a significant level of contribution towards the school. ○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure. ○ The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. These include infrastructure and community facilities, and where needs are identified mitigation could be sought through developer obligations. 	0

Population	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A limited mix of house types is proposed resulting in a reduced housing choice for all groups of the population, although semi-detached housing is welcomed. This can be mitigated through Local Development Plan policies that ensure that developments are made up of mixed sustainable communities with a minimum of 25% affordable housing. 	+
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	0
Cultural Heritage	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment and could improve it. o Invariably, the allocation will adversely affect the built features, their context, pattern of past historic use, and the setting in which they sit, in landscapes and within the soil (archaeology), and also in our towns, villages and streets. o New developments that deviate from existing designs, layouts and materials could adversely affect the setting of historic settlements in the long-term. 	+
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR116 Land at Blairton, Balmedie		Proposal: 1650 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have long-term negative effects on air quality due to transport emissions resulting from this scale of development. o However, it is in an accessible location close to a busy bus route that could help to reduce commuter traffic. 	-
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. o Balmedie WWTW does not have capacity, but a potential growth project is under investigation. Additional WWTW would be required but this is a generic issue and a growth project would be expected for a development of this scale. SEPA requires connection to the public sewer for all new developments in Balmedie to protect Balmedie Bathing Beach. Local sewer reinforcement and DIA may also be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. o Invercarnie / Mannofield/Turriff WTW has capacity for this area, but local mains reinforcement maybe required. 	0
Climatic Factors	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. This would be reduced if the proposal provided opportunities to live/work or land adjacent was allocated for employment uses and has sufficient public transport (Balmedie is on a major bus route). 	-
Soil	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land and will result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. 	--

Biodiversity	+/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA and Sands of Forvie SAC are set to the north. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying sites and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species. The development would have an effect indirectly through recreation pressures, land take for development, and impact on geese grazing areas. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the designations. ○ This is certain to have a significant detrimental impact on the local environment and natural beauty. The increase in public access would have a devastating impact (litter, noise, dog walking and fouling, domestic cats) on the fragile local flora (Marram grass, Northern Marsh Orchid, Wild Pansy) and wildlife (deer, buzzards, marine birds and mammals, etc.). Areas of natural beauty and established woodland should be protected wherever possible. A wide buffer strip will be required. ○ The development of commercial arable agricultural land to residential and community uses including green corridors, riparian areas and park land will lead to an opportunity to significantly improve the biodiversity of site. ○ The development would help preserve the existing Local Nature Conservation Area adjacent to the site and will enhance biodiversity through provision of a significant amount of semi-natural space. ○ The development would enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed. 	?
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in a specific part of the area will be changed and be displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. However, given the development would be in keeping with the pattern of settlement along the coast and would protect the most sensitive landscape features, this impact is not likely to be significant in the long-term and the effects are only likely to have a low impact in the long-term. 	0
Material Assets	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site has very limited constraints in terms of vehicular access as a grade separated junction off the new A90 would provide excellent access to the site from and to Aberdeen without the need to access via Balmedie. ○ Proposal of this scale could have a positive effect through provision of affordable housing, water/waste water infrastructure and transportation infrastructure. ○ The developer has not proposed a new secondary school and as such the scoring reflects that this has not been addressed in the submission. If a secondary site could be made available, then this proposal would receive a ++ score. 	+
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A mix of house types is proposed resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population. ○ If employment land and mixed use. The development would allow integration of people; where they meet and work. Employment opportunity in the village. 	+
Human Health	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It would result in a significant increase in open space, green networks and connectivity leading to a benefit to human health. ○ If a community campus could be provided, this would avoid the need for travel and enhance non-motorised options for access to secondary school provision in the area 	+
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR022 Land at Millden, Balmedie		Proposal: 500 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A proposal of this scale will lead to a significant decrease in air quality (i.e. through increases in concentrations of air pollutants) due to increased traffic flow in Balmedie. The development of employment land is likely to worsen air quality if that development will be for heavy and chemical processing. ○ The site is near to services and a busy bus route so this could reduce private vehicle emissions. 	-
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The WWTW is not available for this area. The proposal is likely to have a significant negative effect. Impacts are likely to be localised and medium/long-term. This impact would be mitigated if the development could connect to the public sewer. ○ Balmedie WWTW currently does not have capacity, but a potential growth project is under investigation. SEPA requires connection to the public sewer for all new developments in Balmedie to protect Balmedie Bathing Beach. Local sewer reinforcement and DIA may also be required. ○ Invercarnie / Mannofield/Turriff WTW has capacity for this area, but local mains reinforcement maybe required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies is poor. The effects could be significant in the longer-term. A buffer strip could potentially mitigate this impact. 	-
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, there is a good bus service so the emission increase would be less than a similar development in a more remote location. ○ The site is within an area identified as low flood risk. Impacts are likely to be localised and medium/long-term. 	-
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. These are considered neutral in impact. 	0
Biodiversity	+/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sands of Forvie SAC and Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA are set to the northeast. The development would have an effect indirectly through drainage, visitor pressure, impact of geese grazing grounds. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the designations. ○ However, the scale of the development would allow for good quality open space and could enhance biodiversity. 	+/-
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects. 	0

Material Assets	+/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal could have a long-term impact on the sewage network and schools without appropriate investment. This is considered to be a short-term impact. The proposal includes a primary school and where a need is identified for any other community facilities/infrastructure these could be mitigated through developer obligations. 	+
Population	-/?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No indication of the mix of house types proposed could result in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. In accordance with the LDP policy, a sustainable mix of house type and tenure would be required with a minimum of 25% affordable housing. 	+
Human Health	0/+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Population not at risk from hazardous developments. o Will create opportunities for open space. Linkages are limited due to A90(TP to the east). 	0/+
Cultural Heritage	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There is potential for an adverse impact on scheduled monument The Temple Stones, stone circle NE of Potterton House. An assessment on its setting will be required as part of an EIA. 	--/?
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR128 Land at Southfolds Farm, Balmedie		Proposal: 20 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Individual developments of this scale are unlikely to have any effect on air quality. 	0
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A proposal is likely to have a significant negative effect as it will exceed public sewage treatment capacity. Impacts are likely to be localised and medium/long-term. This could be mitigated by the delivery of FR089 which would deliver a Scottish water growth project. o Balmedie WWTW currently does not have capacity, but a potential growth project is under investigation. SEPA requires connection to the public sewer for all new developments in Balmedie to protect Balmedie Bathing Beach. Local sewer reinforcement and DIA may also be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. o Invercannie / Mannofield/Turriff WTW has capacity for this area, but local mains reinforcement maybe required. 	0
Climatic Factors	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The Site is within an area identified as low flood risk. Impacts are likely to be localised and medium/long-term. o A proposal on this scale is unlikely to have any effect on CO₂ emissions. 	0
Soil	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. o A proposal of this scale will cause a significant loss of valuable agricultural land (i.e. through increases in concentrations of a certain contaminant(s) in soil, soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter). Impacts are likely to be localised and medium/long-term. 	-

Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal would have a neutral effect as it is of a scale or in a location which is unlikely to negatively affect a nature conservation site or wider biodiversity. 	0
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The scale and location of the proposal will have a negative impact on the landscape character, and the effect is likely to be long-term. o The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. o However, given that over the long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects. 	0
Material Assets	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access and education provision at Balmedie Primary School, which will have a long-term effect. These constraints could potentially be mitigated via developer obligations. 	-
Population	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The significance of effects are uncertain if the house type is unknown. This will be mitigated through the LDP policy for sustainable mixed houses with a minimum of 25% affordable housing. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Development of the site is unlikely to have any significant effects on existing pathways or access to open space. o The population is not at risk from hazardous developments. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR148, Hill of Keir		Proposal: 21 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Individual developments are unlikely to have any effects on air quality 	0
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Balmedie WWTW has no capacity in the area WWT is likely to be through septic tanks. SEPA requires connection to the public sewer for all new developments in Balmedie to protect Balmedie Bathing Beach, but due to the location of the proposal, it is unlikely that this could be mitigated through connection to a mains sewer. Given the site's distance from the settlement, it is unlikely to have a significant effect on water quality. o Invercarnie / Mannofield/Turrieff WTW has capacity for this area, but local mains reinforcement maybe required. It does not propose private water abstraction. 	0
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The site has no land at flood risk. o Proposals of this scale are unlikely to have any effect on CO₂ emissions. 	0

Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases 	0
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal would be unlikely to negatively affect a nature conservation site or wider biodiversity 	0
Landscape	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ However, given that over a long term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects. ○ The landscape setting of the area may be impacted upon from the south. ○ This could potentially be mitigated through strategic planting / screening 	-
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access and education provision at Balmedie Primary. 	-
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. ○ This can be mitigated through Local Development Plan policies that ensure that developments are made up of mixed sustainable communities with a minimum of 25% affordable housing. 	+/-
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Development of the site is unlikely to have any significant effects on existing pathways or access to open space ○ The population is not at risk from hazardous developments 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development is unlikely to have any effects on the historic environment 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

BARTHOL CHAPEL

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP1 (FR059) Land at Barthol Chapel, Inverurie		Proposal: 5 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the most part, individual developments of this scale are likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects on air quality, largely limited to the construction period. 	0
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ WWTW capacity is unknown for this area, but a private sewer is proposed, otherwise it will have to connect to a public sewer. If the site is allocated, this will be specified in the Settlement Statement. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody; the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to the public sewage infrastructure. ○ With the information on the quality of water around the site, the effects could be insignificant in the longer term. ○ A watercourse runs through the site, so a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, this mitigation would be stated in the development requirements of the opportunity site. 	-/?
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, a site of this scale is unlikely to have any effect on CO₂ emissions. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ The development is not likely to maintain or enhance existing green networks. ○ However, some biodiversity enhancements are proposed. 	0/+
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. 	0

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects. 	
Material Assets	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Development could support Barthol Chapel Primary School which is forecast to be significantly under capacity by 2022. ○ The proposal could lead to additional pressure on secondary school education and local roads infrastructure. Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ Development seeks to retain land currently designated as protected land for open space, to be the 'village green' with a safe route to school. 	+/-
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Development offers housing choice in areas which is largely limited in terms of availability of housing. 	+
Human Health	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Open space provision and enhancements proposed increases accessibility to green space. ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	+
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No impact on cultural heritage. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative Sites

None.

BELHELVIE

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP2 (FR131) Land at Cairntack (East)		Proposal: 41 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Balmedie WWTW currently does not have capacity, but a potential growth project is under investigation. DIA may be required. An upgrade to an adoptable standard would be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Invercannie / Mannofield/Turriff WTW has capacity for this area, but development will connect directly off trunk main and 24-hour storage will be required. Mains reinforcement may be required following a WIA for the District Metered Area. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. 	-/0
Climatic Factors	0/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There would be minimal CO₂ emissions from general heating and travel. ○ Some surface water flood risk on site. SuDS or other measures would mitigate surface water drainage issues. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ The development would have no contribution in enhancing existing green networks and improving connectivity/function or creating new links. ○ Mitigation measures, such as native tree planting would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. If the site is allocated, these mitigation measures would be stated as part of the development requirements of the site. 	0
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In light of the scale and location of the proposal, it would have minimal impact on the landscape character and the effect is likely to be short-term. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects. 	0

Material Assets	-	o There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely education provision at Balmedie Primary School, and lack of WWTW capacity. Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects.	-/0
Population	0	o No mix of house types is proposed, resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types.	+/0
Human Health	0	o It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	0	o Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment as there is no special built heritage features set close to the site.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: OP3 (FR024) Land to the East of Cairn View		Proposal: 49 homes (increased from 25 homes)	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	o For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	--	o Balmedie WWTW currently does not have capacity, but a potential growth project is under investigation. DIA may be required. An upgrade to an adoptable standard would be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. o The WWTW could be resolved through communications with Scottish Water and if required a growth project, or by private drainage as proposed. o Invercarnie / Mannofield/Turriff WTW has capacity for this area, but development will connect directly off trunk main and 24-hour storage will be required. Mains reinforcement may be required following a WIA for the District Metered Area.	-
Climatic Factors	0	o The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. o The development is not within an identified flood risk area.	0
Soil	0	o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	0	o Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity. o A range of biodiversity enhancements are proposed. o Sands of Forvie SAC and Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA are set to the northeast. The development would have an effect indirectly through drainage, visitor pressure, impact of geese grazing grounds.	0

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o However, planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. Recreational access to the site is actively managed by the RSPB. SNH advise that there should be no additional pressures from visitors where facilities and visitor management plans are in place. No significant issues from increased public access is foreseen. No significant loss of land for geese foraging or roosting is anticipated. 	
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal is of a scale and in a location which is unlikely to have any effect on landscape quality, subject to appropriate screening and design of the properties. If allocated, mitigation measures will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site or designated as protected land. 	0
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. These include community facilities and infrastructure. Where there is an identified need, these impacts can be mitigated through developer obligations. o There is insufficient education and WWTW provision, however, consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. 	0
Population	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Some mix of house types proposed results in some housing choice for all groups of the population. The Local Development Plan policies that ensure that developments are made up of mixed sustainable communities with a minimum of 25% affordable housing. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development is unlikely to have any effect on existing pathways or access to existing open space. o The site is not within a hazardous site. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development will not have a long-term or permanent negative impact on any cultural heritage site due to its location. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: FR025 Cairntack (West), Belhelvie		Proposal: 50 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Balmedie WWTW currently does not have capacity, but a potential growth project is under investigation. DIA may be required. An upgrade to an adoptable standard would be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. o The WWTW could be resolved through communications with Scottish Water and if required a growth project, or by private drainage as proposed. 	-/?

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Invercarnie / Mannofield/Turriff WTW has capacity for this area, but development will connect directly off trunk main and 24-hour storage will be required. Mains reinforcement may be required following a WIA for the District Metered Area. 	
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. ○ The development is not within an identified flood risk area. 	-/0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	+/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site is adjacent to an area of semi-natural ancient woodland included in the long-established plantation origin, which could be affected. Effects could be mitigated by a buffer strip and new native woodland and improved connectivity. ○ A range of biodiversity enhancements are proposed. ○ Sands of Forvie SAC and Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA are set to the northeast. The site would have an effect indirectly through drainage, visitor pressure, impact of geese grazing grounds. 	+
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal is of a scale and in a location, which is unlikely to have any effect on landscape quality, subject to appropriate screening and design of the properties. If allocated, mitigation measures will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site or designated as protected land. 	0
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. These include community facilities and infrastructure. Where there is an identified need these impacts can be mitigated through developer obligations. ○ There is insufficient education and WWTW provision. However, consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. 	0
Population	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some mix of house types proposed results in some housing choice for all groups of the population. The Local Development Plan policies that ensure that developments are made up of mixed sustainable communities with a minimum of 25% affordable housing. 	+
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development is unlikely to have any effect on existing pathways or access to existing open space. ○ The site is not within a hazardous site. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development will not have a long-term or permanent negative impact on any cultural heritage site due to its location. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

BEREFOLD

Preferred Sites

None.

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: FR013 Land at the Former Overton Piggery, Berefold		Proposal: 6 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	o Individual developments of this scale are unlikely to have any effect on air quality.	0
Water	--	o WWTW is not available for this area. Private treatment (septic tanks) will be required to mitigate effects.	0
Climatic Factors	-	o The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. This cannot be mitigated due to the location. o The development is not in an area identified at flood risk.	0
Soil	0	o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	+	o The development will enhance biodiversity through redevelopment of brownfield land.	+
Landscape	-	o The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. This could be mitigated through strategic planting and screening.	-
Material Assets	0	o The quality of new assets created through the development of this site would be minimal, due to the size of the development.	0
Population	-	o The proposal is all for detached houses with affordable housing contribution being proposed as a commuted sum.	-
Human Health	0	o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	0	o Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

BLACKDOG

Preferred Sites

None.

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: FR057 Land to West of A90, Blackdog		Proposal: Commercial mixed use: Roadside Services, including petrol station, hotel, restaurant and drive-thru	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments	Effect – post mitigation
		<p>Effects should be assessed in terms of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Local trade may increase traffic flow, but development is meant to cater for passing trade. ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	- /?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Limited capacity at Strabathie WWTW and a potential growth project is under investigation. DIA required. The demand for water and wastewater capacity for the nondomestic element of this development will depend on the business use. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ There is currently sufficient capacity at Invercannie / Mannofield/Turriff WTW. Local mains reinforcement may be required depending on the outcome of a WIA. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody; the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to the public sewage infrastructure. ○ With the information on the quality of water around the site, the effects could be significant in the longer-term. 	-/?
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development is close to the AWPR and would be servicing passing vehicles, so it would not be considered to be generating additional CO₂ emissions. ○ Part of the development is in an area identified at flood risk and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. 	-
Soil	0/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0

Biodiversity	?/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development of a greenfield site could affect gorse bush/unfarmed land to the south of the site, and could have long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. o NESBReC have recorded water vole on Blackdog Burn. It is unknown if the development is likely to adversely affect populations of protected species, including European Protected Species, their habitats and resting places or roosts. o Along the Blackdog Burn, the development could maintain or enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed. o The development could fragment green networks, and cause habitat fragmentation/connectivity. o The development will result in the loss of existing gorse. o Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or water course would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. 	-
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced as there is limited development west of the A90. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. o Due to the scale and location of the proposal, the landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, and naturalness will change. o However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	-/?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access and water and waste water infrastructure. These could be overcome by consulting with roads and Scottish Water. 	0
Population	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development would allow integration of people to socialise. Employment opportunity in the area. 	0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR113 Site OP1, Town Centre, Blackdog		Proposal: Identify as a principal town centre, the approved OP1 town centre development for 11,500sqm, retail floorspace, 850-seat cinema and 2,000sqm food and beverage (class 3) uses	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal will increase traffic flow, especially from the cinema users, but it will serve the new Blackdog community, and the indicative masterplan shows land for a park and ride. o For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	-

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are good public transport links to Blackdog that could mitigate against private vehicle emissions. 	
Water	- /?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited capacity at Strabathie WWTW and a potential growth project is under investigation. DIA required. The demand for water and wastewater capacity for the nondomestic element of this development will depend on the business use. However, this is a significant development and these issues will be mitigated as part of the planning of the infrastructure required to support the development. This is a reversible short-term impact. There is currently sufficient capacity at Invercannie / Mannofield/Turriff WTW. Local mains reinforcement may be required depending on the outcome of a WIA. Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody; the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to the public sewage infrastructure. With the information on the quality of water around the site, the effects could be significant in the longer-term. 	- /?
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development could have a long-term negative impact due to attracting people to the area and increased emissions. However, a park and ride facility can be catered for within the site, and so its effects should not be significant. 	0
Soil	0/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	+/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. The development could affect the conservation objectives and natural features of a locally important designated site (Blackdog to Bridge of Don LNCS, which includes important coastal habitats and is popular with sea ducks in the winter and breeding birds) if not sensitively constructed and has inadequate SuDS. There are opportunities to enhance biodiversity. Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to a water course would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. 	+/-
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant scale development that would further alter the character of the area. However, the site is farmland and is a planned extension to Blackdog. The impact could be mitigated by strategic landscaping. 	0
Material Assets	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing the water and waste water issue can be resolved, the proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on other local infrastructure. It is also part of a larger proposal that will result in the upgrade of existing water and drainage infrastructure and provide open space opportunities. 	+
Population	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development would allow integration of people; where they meet and work. Employment opportunity in the village. 	0
Human Health	0/+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would not result in the loss of core paths. It will provide small-scale opportunities for new areas of open space, as shown in the indicative masterplan of the approved PPP. 	0/+
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

COLLIESTON

Preferred Sites

None.

Alternative Sites

None.

CULTERCULLEN

Preferred Sites

None.

Alternative Sites

None.

CUMINESTOWN

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP1 (FR038 and FR039) Land to the North/West of Teuchar Road		Proposal: 60 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Developments of this scale are unlikely to have any effect on air quality. 	0
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cuminestown WWTW does not have the capacity to accommodate 60 homes. An upgrade to an adoptable standard would be required. Foul and surface water pipes cross the middle of OP1, from east to west. Scottish Water should be consulted to ascertain whether a diversion is required. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Turriff WTW has capacity. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development is on a greenfield site near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies is bad. Impacts, if they occur will be long-term. ○ A watercourse runs through the site and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement to reflect this requirement as an opportunity to enhance the riparian habitat. A flood risk assessment may also be required. 	-/0
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A proposal on this scale is unlikely to have any effect on CO₂ emissions through increased car travel. ○ The development is within an area identified as medium/high flood risk. Impacts are likely to be localised and medium/long-term. ○ Development seeks to avoid the flood risk zone – this area could form part of the open space provision. A FRA may also be required. If allocated, these mitigations would be stated in the development requirements of the opportunity site. 	-/0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. These will be short-term and should be considered a neutral impact. 	0
Biodiversity	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal would have a positive effect as it proposes to conserve, protect and/or enhance significant habitat and maintain or enhance existing habitat connectivity (i.e. green networks) and create new connections. 	+
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal is of a scale or in a location which is unlikely to have any effect on landscape quality. 	0

Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal will have long-term negative effects on the sewage network unless resolved by investment. Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. o Development will help sustain local services and facilities. 	0/+
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A mix of house types results in housing choice for all groups of the population. 	+
Human Health	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Development of the site is unlikely to have any significant effect on existing pathways or access to open space. o Population not at risk from hazardous developments. o Development of the site will lead to long-term improved access to existing open space (i.e. new pathways). 	+
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development is unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative Sites

None.

DAVIOT

Preferred Sites

None.

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: FR018 West of Wellpark, Daviot		Proposal: 30 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For a development of this scale, air quality is likely to have a short to medium-term temporary insignificant effect. 	0
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Daviot WWTW has limited capacity and could not service the full scale of the proposed development. An upgrade to an adoptable standard would be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Invercarnie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity, but development will connect directly off trunk main and 24-hour storage will be required. Mains reinforcement may also be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. 	0
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to key services) and increased emissions. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss. 	-
Soil	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ Prime agricultural land is found within the proposed site and will result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. This is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss. 	-
Biodiversity	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ However, biodiversity enhancements are proposed. 	-/+
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. 	-

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ Development risks impacting on adjacent designed landscape (Daviot Estate) and potential negative landscape impacts on the approach to the village from the west. Due to the scale of development relative to the settlement, it is unlikely that strategic planting will mitigate impact. 	
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. ○ There is a WWTW capacity issue, also an education issue as Meldrum Academy is forecast to be over capacity. Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ There are few facilities in the village and no services. 	0
Population	+/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The mix of house types proposed resulting in housing choice for all groups of the population. 	+/0
Human Health	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ Good access to walking/cycling routes and promoting active travel to facilities such as the primary school and hall. 	+
Cultural Heritage	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Siting and scale of the development would impact on setting and sense of place provided by Daviot Estate. Due to the scale of the development relative to the settlement, it is unlikely that strategic planting will mitigate impact. 	-
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR081 Land at Whiteley Farm, Daviot		Proposal: 12 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	0	In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality, particularly in towns where air quality is approaching the EU objective.	0
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Daviot WWTW has limited capacity and could not service the full scale of the proposed development. An upgrade to an adoptable standard would be required. Private drainage could be an option. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Invercannie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity, but development will connect directly off trunk main and 24-hour storage will be required. Mains reinforcement may also be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. 	0

Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. There are no measures available to mitigate against this. However, a proposal of this scale is unlikely to have any effect on CO₂ emissions. 	0
Soil	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. o The site lies on prime agricultural land which is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. It will result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss. This would have a long-term impact. 	-
Biodiversity	0/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The ancient woodland associated with the estate is to be retained. As a mitigation against any negative impact, a buffer strip next to an existing area of ancient woodland would provide biodiversity enhancement. If the site is allocated, the need to integrate the woodland as a positive feature of the development together with a buffer strip will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site. 	+
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. o The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations. o However, over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely education provision at Meldrum Academy, which will have a temporary affect. o There is also a WWTW capacity issue. Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. o The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. o The site is not connected to any settlement, and there are few facilities in the nearby village of Daviot and no services. 	0/-
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No mix of house types is proposed, resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. Although proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types, as the proposal is for self-build homes, it is unlikely there will be a mix of house types. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths, and potentially new path links could be provided but the site is not well connected. o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	0
Cultural Heritage	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Site risks negative impact on the setting of the former designed landscape around the Daviot Estate. o As a mitigation against any negative impact, a buffer strip next to existing woodland should be planted. If the site is allocated, the need to integrate the woodland as a positive feature of the development together with a buffer strip will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR100 Land Adjacent to Norven, Daviot		Proposal: 3 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ Daviot WWTW has limited capacity and could not service the full scale of the proposed development. An upgrade to an adoptable standard would be required. Private drainage has been proposed. Due to the scale of the development, this alternative method is acceptable. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Invercannie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity, but development will connect directly off trunk main and 24-hour storage will be required. Mains reinforcement may also be required. 	0
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, a proposal of this scale is unlikely to have any effect on CO₂ emissions. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction. 	0
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ Biodiversity enhancement is proposed however, this will only make a small-scale impact. 	0/+
Landscape	0/?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects. ○ This is a small-scale development which benefits from existing screening to the east. Further landscaping would limit impact further. 	0
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely education provision at Meldrum Academy, which will have a temporary affect. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure provider will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. 	-

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. ○ The site is not connected to any settlement, and there are few facilities in the nearby village of Daviot and no services. 	
Population	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types, but the scale of development would have a negative impact. 	-
Human Health	0/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. ○ The site is distant from the settlement with limited opportunity for foot/cycle path connectivity. ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	0/-
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR101 Land West of Daviot, Daviot		Proposal: 37 homes (self-build plots)	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For a development of this scale, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Daviot WTW has limited capacity and could not service the full scale of the proposed development. An upgrade to an adoptable standard would be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Invercannie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity, but development will connect directly off trunk main and 24-hour storage will be required. Mains reinforcement may also be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. 	0
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to key services) and increased emissions. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss. 	0/-
Soil	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ Prime agricultural land is found within the proposed site and will result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. This is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss. 	-

Biodiversity	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. o However, biodiversity enhancements are proposed. 	0/+
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. o The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. o However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. o There is a WWTW capacity issue, also an education issue as Meldrum Academy is forecast to be over capacity. Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. o There are few facilities in the village and no services. 	-
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The mix of house types proposed would result in limited housing choice for the population. However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types. 	-/+
Human Health	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. o Good access to walking/cycling routes, and facilities such as the primary school and hall. 	+
Cultural Heritage	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR102 Land North of Woodland Gardens		Proposal: 12 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	0	For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Daviot WWTW has limited capacity and could not service the full scale of the proposed development. An upgrade to an adoptable standard would be required. Private drainage could be an option. This is a reversible short-term impact. 	0

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Invercarnie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity, but development will connect directly off trunk main and 24-hour storage will be required. Mains reinforcement may also be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, site water budgets, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. 	
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. There are no measures available to mitigate against this. However, a proposal of this scale is unlikely to have any effect on CO₂ emissions. 	0
Soil	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The site lies on prime agricultural land which is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. It will result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss. This would have a long-term impact. 	-
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ The development is not likely to conserve, protect and enhance the diversity of species and habitats, and the natural heritage of the area. ○ The development has potential to enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed. ○ As a mitigation against any negative impact, a buffer strip next to an existing area of ancient woodland would provide biodiversity enhancement. If the site is allocated, the need to integrate the woodland as a positive feature of the development together with a buffer strip will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site. 	+
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely education provision at Meldrum Academy, which will have a temporary effect. ○ There is also a WWTW capacity issue. Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. ○ The site is not connected to any settlement, and there are few facilities in the village and no services. 	0/-
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. Although proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types, as the proposal is for self-build homes, it is unlikely there will be a mix of house types. 	+/0

Human Health	+/?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths, and potentially new path links could be provided but the site is not well connected. ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	+/?
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to have any significant effects on the historic environment as the site is remote (albeit close) from the House of Glack and its policies. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

ELLON

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP1 (FR090) Cromleybank		Proposal: 980 homes, a new Primary School and associated facilities, and 2ha of Employment Land	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have a long-term negative effect on the air quality, particularly in towns where air quality is approaching the EU objective. The development will increase traffic flow in Ellon. ○ A mixed-use development may mitigate transport related air pollution. Also, the site is near a busy bus route, which could reduce commuter traffic. 	-/0
Water	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ellon WWTW once upgraded and / Invercannie / Mannofield/Turriff WTW will have capacity for this area. Sewage network investigations may be required as the demands of non-domestic developments will depend on the business use. WIA may be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (ground, coastal, transitional or loch) is good/high. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody; the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to the public sewage infrastructure. ○ The site is bisected by, and adjacent to, watercourses. Buffer strips would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement to ensure the watercourses are integrated as positive features of the development. A flood risk assessment, water impact assessment and drainage impact assessment will also be required. 	+
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, the site is near/next to a busy bus route [railway station], which could reduce commuter traffic. ○ The development is in an area identified at risk from fluvial and surface water flooding and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. Part of the site found to be at risk from flooding could form part of the open space provision. If allocated, this mitigation would be stated in the development requirements for the site. A FRA will also be required. 	-/0
Soil	-/+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	-/+

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land and will result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss. ○ However, development will involve remediation of brownfield land. 	
Biodiversity	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA is set to the southeast. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying sites and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species. The development would have an effect indirectly through recreation pressures, land take for development, drainage and impact on geese grazing areas. ○ However, planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. Recreational access to the site is actively managed by the RSPB. SNH advise that there should be no additional pressures from visitors where facilities and visitor management plans are in place. No significant issues from increased public access is foreseen. No significant loss of land for geese foraging or roosting is anticipated. ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or water course would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. This provides opportunity to enhance green networks. 	+
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	++	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. ○ A proposal of this scale is expected to have a significant positive effect through provision of affordable housing, new community facilities (school), employment land and new public transport. ○ Development is also expected to provide new planting (enhancing green networks) and foot/cycle paths. ○ Transportation/access arrangements are not in place. Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required. 	++
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The mix of house types proposed will result in housing choice for all groups of the population. ○ The development would allow integration of people; where they meet and work. Employment opportunity in the settlement. 	+
Human Health	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	+
Cultural Heritage	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Invariably, the allocation will adversely affect the built features, their context, pattern of past historic use, and the setting in which they sit, in landscapes and within the soil (archaeology), and also in our towns, villages and streets. ○ Potential for adverse impact on both the site and setting of Category A Listed Old Bridge of Ellon. The development should be set back from the bridge (buffer strip) and possible use of strategic landscaping along River Ythan would mitigate effects. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect		

0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect
--

Site Ref: OP3 (FR011) Hillhead Drive		Proposal: 10 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects due to the scale of the development. 	0
Water	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ellon WWTW once upgraded and / Invercarnie / Mannofield/Turriff WTW will have capacity for this area. ○ Some impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies is good. ○ The site is adjacent to a watercourse. A buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects and provide open space. If allocated, this mitigation would be stated in the development requirements of the opportunity site. 	0
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A proposal on this scale is unlikely to have any effect on CO₂ emissions. The site is located adjacent to an existing settlement with good connectivity. ○ The development is in an area identified at risk from surface water flooding and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. Impacts are likely to be localised. This could be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and suitable SuDS. If allocated, this would be stated in the development requirements for the site. 	0
Soil	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of agricultural land. Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. It will result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss. 	--
Biodiversity	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development is not likely to conserve, protect and enhance the diversity of species and habitats, and the natural heritage of the area. ○ The development will enhance biodiversity due to the buffer strip around watercourse. 	+
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure. 	0

Population	-	o There is a limited mix of homes proposed which are focused for the families. However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types.	0/+
Human Health	0	o The development would not have any adverse impact on human health as there shall be no loss in core path or green network.	0
Cultural Heritage	0	o There is no historic feature near the site.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: CC1 (FR032) Waterton		Proposal: 10,000sqm retail and leisure uses	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	o The development includes retail units and leisure facilities which would result in minimal or no effect on air quality.	0
Water	-	o Ellon WWTW once upgraded and / Invercarnie / Mannofield/Turriff WTW will have capacity for this area. Sewage network investigations may be required as the demands of non-domestic developments will depend on the business use. o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. o The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (ground, coastal, transitional or loch) is high.	-/?
Climatic Factors	-	o The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the likelihood of increased travel and increased emissions. o There is surface water and fluvial flooding risk associated with this site. This could be mitigated through appropriate SuDS treatment, and buffer strips. Also, a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) may be required. If allocated, these mitigations would be stated in the development requirements for the site.	0
Soil	0	o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	0/+	o The development is not likely to maintain or enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed. o The development would not degrade the existing biodiversity in the area. o Biodiversity enhancements are proposed.	0/+
Landscape	-	o The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change.	-/0

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The impact could be mitigated by strategic landscaping, and if allocated, this will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site or designated as protected land. o However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	
Material Assets	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Development presents infrastructural pressures associated with transport; water-delivery infrastructure; education; sewerage infrastructure; natural environment and waste management infrastructure (waste collection, transfer stations and composting facilities). o Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures for traffic/roads issues, WWTW, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. o However, development provides retail and leisure uses for the local community, together with open space provision and potential links to the core path network. 	+
Population	0	o The development would allow integration of people; where they live and work. Employment opportunity in the town.	0
Human Health	+	o This would increase provision of open space with potential for links to the core path network.	+
Cultural Heritage	-	o The development may have long-term and permanent negative effects on the siting of a Grade B listed building. The development may weaken the sense of place, and the identity of existing settlements. This can be mitigated with appropriate screening.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: FR092 Site at Cassiegills, Ellon		Proposal: 150 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have a long-term negative effect, particularly in towns where air quality is approaching the EU objective, including Ellon. o The site is on a bus route which could reduce commuter traffic. 	-/?
Water	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Ellon WWTW once upgraded and / Invercannie / Mannofield/Turriff WTW will have capacity for this area. o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. 	0

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody; the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to the public sewage infrastructure. o The site is adjacent to watercourses and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. There is also small-scale flood risk associated with the existing watercourses. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would state the need for buffer strips and also a Flood Risk Assessment to mitigate these effects. 	
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There would be minimal CO₂ emissions from general heating and travel. o The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel to services) causing increased emissions. o The development is in an area identified at low risk from confluvial and surface water flooding and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. However, part of the site found to be at risk from flooding could form part of the open space provision. A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) may also be required. If allocated, these mitigations would be stated in the development requirements for the site. 	-/0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases 	0
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA is set to the southeast. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying sites and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species. The development would have an effect indirectly through recreation pressures, land take for development, drainage and impact on geese grazing areas. o The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. o Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. 	0/+
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o May generate significant landscape and visual impacts. The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. o The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. o However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	-/0
Material Assets	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure. 	0
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The mix of house types proposed will result in housing choice for all groups of the population. 	+
Human Health	0/+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	0/+
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR031 South of A920		Proposal: Mixed use development including 150 homes, retail and riverside park	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have long-term negative effects on air quality, particularly in towns where air quality is approaching the EU objective, including Ellon. ○ Development is mixed use and the site is next to a bus route, which are factors that could reduce commuter traffic. 	-/?
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ellon WWTW once upgraded and / Invercannie / Mannofield/Turriff WTW have capacity for this area. Sewage network investigations may be required as the demands of non-domestic developments will depend on the business use. WIA may be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (ground, coastal, transitional or loch) is high. 	-/0
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, the site is next to a bus route which could reduce commuter traffic. ○ There is small-scale, surface water flooding associated with this site. This could be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and buffer strips, and if allocated, these mitigations would be stated in the development requirements for the site. 	-/?
Soil	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ There would be loss of prime agricultural land and will result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss. 	--
Biodiversity	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA is set to the southeast. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying sites and could have an impact on the qualifying species. Impacts through drainage, visitor pressure, impact of geese grazing grounds may also occur. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the designations. ○ The proposal could affect woodland and scrub adjacent to the river Ythan. A buffer strip would be required. ○ The development is not likely to maintain or enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed. ○ The development would not degrade the existing biodiversity in the area. ○ Biodiversity improvements are proposed. 	+

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mitigation measures such as compensatory planting would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. If the site is allocated, the need for compensatory planting and/or a buffer strip will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site. 	
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ Significant scale development would further alter the character of the area. However, the site is relatively flat and the impact could be mitigated by strategic landscaping, and if allocated, this will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site or designated as protected land. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	-/0
Material Assets	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Development presents infrastructural pressures associated with transport (roads and bridges); water-delivery infrastructure; education; sewerage infrastructure; natural environment and waste management infrastructure (waste collection, transfer stations and composting facilities). ○ Mixed use development provides a positive impact, but large-scale development in this location presents an overdevelopment. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures for traffic, WWTW and school provision, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. 	-/+
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A mix of house types is proposed resulting in a reasonable housing choice for most groups of the population. 	+
Human Health	0/+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. ○ There is potential to improve core path links. 	0/+
Cultural Heritage	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ New developments that deviate from existing designs, layouts and materials could adversely affect the setting of historic settlements in the long-term. ○ The development may have long-term and permanent negative effects on the siting of a Grade B listed building. The development may weaken the sense of place, and the identity of existing settlements. This can be mitigated with appropriate screening. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR063 Site 1, Adjacent to Golf View, Ellon		Proposal: 122 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have long-term negative effects on air quality, particularly in Ellon where air quality is approaching the EU objective. 	-

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a local bus service close by, but this is unlikely to reduce commuter traffic. 	
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ellon WWTW once upgraded and / Invercarnie / Mannofield/Turriff WTW have capacity for this area. Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. As a small watercourse runs through this site which floods (surface water) its effects on the water environment could be negative. A watercourse runs through the site and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required. If allocated, these mitigations would be stated as part of the development requirements of the opportunity site. 	-/?
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the location of the site and there is only one bus service passing the site, the development could have a medium-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. The development is in an area identified at risk from surface water flooding and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. The proposed SuDS pond would help to mitigate flooding downstream as a result of the housing development. 	-/0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	0/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA is set to the southeast. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying sites and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species. The site is on farmland but is adjacent to Ellon Golf course and mature trees, where red squirrels have been recorded. As such, it is likely to have medium-term adverse impacts on biodiversity through disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. However, animals may adjust to the presence of humans in the medium/long-term. The development includes an area of the green network, which will form part of the open space. It is adjacent to the Formartine and Buchan Way. In light of this, the proposal is unlikely to significantly enhance existing green networks or improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed. Mitigation measures, such as compensatory planting or a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. If the site is allocated, the need for compensatory planting and/or a buffer strip will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site. 	0
Landscape	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development is a large extension into the landscape and would have a negative impact on the setting of Ellon and the landscape character, as much of the edge of Ellon in this area is screened by mature trees. Given the sensitivity of the site, the effect is likely to be long-term. The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness will change. The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. It may be possible to mitigate through strategic planting. If allocated, a visual and landscape impact assessment will be required and stated in the development requirements for the site. 	-/?
Material Assets	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public sewage drainage is required, which will have a temporary effect subject to resolving these conditional matters. 	-/?

		o The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on other local infrastructure in the short-term – Ellon Academy is forecast to be at 93% by 2022.	
Population	-	o House types are to be confirmed. The indicative plan shows individual plots (no flats), thereby it could provide only a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types.	+
Human Health	0/+	o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health for people. o The development would have no positive or negative impact on human health.	0/+
Cultural Heritage	0	o The development is unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR064 Site 2, Adjacent to Golf View, Ellon		Proposal: Erection of 104 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	o For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	--	o Ellon WWTW once upgraded and / Invercannie / Mannofield/Turriff WTW have capacity for this area. o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. o As a small watercourse runs through this site which floods (surface water) its effects on the water environment could be negative. o A watercourse runs through the site and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required. If allocated, these mitigations would be stated as part of the development requirements of the opportunity site.	-/?
Climatic Factors	0/-	o Given the location of the site and there is only one bus service passing the site, the development could have a medium-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. o Land to the west and south of the development is in an area identified at risk from surface water flooding and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. The proposed SuDS pond would help to mitigate flooding downstream as a result of the housing development.	0/-
Soil	-/0	o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	-/0

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A small part of the site includes prime agricultural land and will result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss. 	
Biodiversity	0/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA is set to the southeast. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying sites and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species. o The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. o Construction of the site is likely to disturb species in and around the golf course, which has records of red squirrels, but the effect would be temporary. o Mitigation measures, such as compensatory planting or a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. If the site is allocated, the need for compensatory planting and/or a buffer strip will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site. 	0
Landscape	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development is a moderately sized extension into the landscape and would have a negative impact on the setting of Ellon and the landscape character, as much of the edge of Ellon in this area is screened by mature trees. Given the sensitivity of the site, the effect is likely to be medium-term (i.e. if screening through strategic landscaping occurs). o The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness will change. o The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. o It may be possible to mitigate through strategic planting. If allocated, a visual and landscape impact assessment will be required and stated in the development requirements for the site. 	-/?
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Public sewage drainage is required, which will have a temporary affect subject to resolving these conditional matters. o The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on other local infrastructures in the short-term – Ellon Academy is forecast to be at 93% by 2022. 	-/?
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o House types are to be confirmed. The indicative plan shows individual plots (no flats), thereby it could provide only a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health for people. o The development would have no positive or negative impact on human health. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development is unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR075 Parkview, Broomfield		Proposal: 3 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. ○ Developments of this scale are unlikely to have any effect on air quality. 	0
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ellon WWTW once upgraded and / Invercarnie / Mannofield/Turriff WTW have capacity but due to its location, septic tanks are required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short term. 	-
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There would be minimal CO₂ emission from general heating and travel due to scale of development. ○ The development is in an area identified at surface water flood risk and may have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. It is very likely this could be mitigated through suitable SuDS. A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) may also be required, and if allocated, these mitigations would be stated as part of the development requirements for the site. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ There would loss of agricultural land, although it is minimal. This is not prime agricultural land. 	0
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ The development is not likely to maintain or enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed. 	0
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development would have a negative impact on the landscape character and the effect is likely to be long-term. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness will change. ○ The landscape would be altered, and a group of housing would be formed which would lose the identity of rural character. Screen planting is not likely to mitigate against this loss. 	-
Material Assets	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access and drainage, which will have a temporary effect, subject to resolving these conditional matters. 	0
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. Although proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types, at this small scale there would be limited positive impact. 	-
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health for people. ○ The development would have no positive or negative impact on human health. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development is unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
		+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect	

Key	- = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect	
------------	---	--

Site Ref: FR076 Hornhillock Broomfield, Ellon		Proposal: 3 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. ○ Developments of this scale are unlikely to have any effect on air quality. 	0
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ellon WWTW once upgraded and / Invercannie / Mannofield/Turriff WTW have capacity but due to its location, septic tanks are required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. 	-
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There would be minimal CO₂ emission from general heating and travel due to scale of the development. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ There would loss of agricultural land, although it is minimal. This is not prime agricultural land. 	0
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ The development is not likely to maintain or enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed. 	0
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development would have a negative impact on the landscape character and the effect is likely to be long-term. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness will change. ○ The landscape would be altered, and a group of housing would be formed which would lose the identity of rural character. Screen planting is not likely to mitigate against this loss. 	-
Material Assets	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access and drainage, which will have a temporary effect subject to resolving these conditional matters. 	0
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No mix of house types is proposed, resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. Although proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types, at this small scale there would be limited positive impact. 	-
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health for people. ○ The development would have no positive or negative impact on human health. 	0

Cultural Heritage	0	o The development is unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR084 North of Waterton House, Ellon		Proposal: 10 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	0	o Developments of this scale are unlikely to have any significant effect on air quality.	0
Water	0	o WWTW connection to public drainage has been agreed (Invercannie WTW would service this development), although there is no capacity for WWTW in the area.	0
Climatic Factors	0	o The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, the site has good proximity to business land and public transport network which could reduce the need for travel.	0
Soil	--	o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. o There would be a loss of prime agricultural land and will result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	--
Biodiversity	0	o Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA is set to the southeast. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying sites and drainage is likely to have an impact on the qualifying species. There may also be issues through drainage, visitor pressure and impact on geese grazing grounds. o However, planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. Recreational access to the site is actively managed by the RSPB. SNH advise that there should be no additional pressures from visitors where facilities and visitor management plans are in place. No significant issues from increased public access is foreseen. No significant loss of land for geese foraging or roosting is anticipated. o The development is not likely to maintain or enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed. o Agricultural land has low biodiversity value and biodiversity enhancements are proposed.	0/+
Landscape	-	o The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change.	0

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The impact could be mitigated by strategic landscaping, and if allocated, this will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site or designated as protected land. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	
Material Assets	0/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal is not expected to lead to a significant increase in pressure on local infrastructure. ○ In terms of conformity with existing assets, the siting is not compatible with the adjacent large area of business land allocated. 	0/-
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No mix of house types is proposed. However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types. 	+/0
Human Health	0/+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This would not result in the loss of open space/core paths – new improvement proposed by adding connections to segregated paths. 	0/+
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

FOVERAN

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP3 (FR065) South of Turin Way		Proposal: 36 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Small scale proposal, not likely to have substantial impacts. ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	-/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site is located in a SEPA waste water drainage hotspot and Blairrythan Septic Tank has no capacity, but a growth project has been initiated – until complete, the proposal would rely on private drainage, which would have a negative impact. ○ Invercarnie / Mannofield/Turrieff WTW has capacity. Local mains reinforcement may be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ Small drainage ditch to the northwest is unlikely to be impacted on and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, this mitigation would be stated as part of the development requirements of the opportunity site. 	-/0
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There would be minimal CO₂ emissions from general heating and travel. ○ The site is not within a flood risk area. ○ Individual houses can incorporate technology to minimise their carbon footprint, but it is small scale proposal. 	0
Soil	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site is on Class 3.1 prime agricultural land, the proposal would result in its loss and will result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss. 	-
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ Limited opportunities for enhancement due to small site. 	0
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site fits into the settlement pattern. ○ Given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure in the long-term. ○ School roll is low, and new housing would help sustain Foveran Primary School. The local shop has reportedly closed, but more housing could sustain it should it re-open. 	+
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Limited information, plot sizes are fairly consistent, but a good mix of house types could be easily achieved, and proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types. 	+

Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: OP4 (FR066) Site 2, Land at Blairythan Terrace		Proposal: 20 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The small site/development is unlikely to have any significant impact. ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	-/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site is located in a SEPA waste water drainage hotspot and Blairythan Septic Tank has no capacity, but a growth project has been initiated – until complete, the proposal would rely on private drainage, which would have a negative impact. ○ Invercarnie / Mannofield/Turrieff WTW has capacity. Local mains reinforcement may be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. 	-/0
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There would be minimal CO₂ emissions from general heating and travel. ○ The site is not within a flood risk area. ○ Individual houses can incorporate technology to minimise their carbon footprint, but it is small scale proposal. 	0
Soil	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site is on Class 3.1 prime agricultural land; the proposal would result in its loss. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss. 	-
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ Limited opportunities for enhancement due to the small site. 	0
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site would fit into the settlement pattern if the adjacent site is brought forward as housing (bid site FR065), otherwise it will be somewhat disconnected. ○ Given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure in the long-term. 	+

		o School roll is low, and new housing would help sustain Foveran Primary School. The local shop has reportedly closed, but more housing could sustain it should it re-open.	
Population	+	o Limited information, plot sizes are fairly consistent, but a good mix of house types could be easily achieved, and proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types.	+
Human Health	0	o It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	0	o Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: OP5 (FR082) Land Adjacent to Former A90, North of Westfield Road		Proposal: 14 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	0	o Small scale proposal, not likely to have substantial impacts. o For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	-/0	o The site is located in a SEPA waste water drainage hotspot and Blairythan Septic Tank has no capacity, but a growth project has been initiated – until complete, the proposal would rely on private drainage, which would have a negative impact. o Invercarnie / Mannofield/Turrieff WTW has capacity. Local mains reinforcement may be required. o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	-/0
Climatic Factors	0	o There would be minimal CO ₂ emissions from general heating and travel. o The site is not within a flood risk area. o Individual houses can incorporate technology to minimise their carbon footprint, but it is a small-scale proposal.	0
Soil	-	o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases o The proposed development would result in some loss of prime agricultural land on part of the site. The site is on Class 3.1 prime agricultural land, the proposal would result in its loss. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-

Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ Small-scale biodiversity enhancements are proposed. 	0
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure in the long-term. ○ The school roll is low, and new housing would help sustain Foveran Primary School. The local shop has reportedly closed, but more housing could sustain it should it re-open. ○ The site will fit well with the settlement pattern once OP1 has been built out. ○ Access arrangements require clarification: consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. 	+
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Potential mix of house types resulting in housing choice for all groups of the population - proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types. 	+
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ The site promotes active travel opportunities. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: FR067 Site 3, Land East of Tippetty Industrial Estate, Tippetty		Proposal: 38 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Small site/development, unlikely to have any significant impact. ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	-/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site is located in a SEPA waste water drainage hotspot and Blairythan Septic Tank has no capacity, but a growth project has been initiated – until complete, the proposal would rely on private drainage, which would have a negative impact. However, an indicative layout shows a treatment plant included on the site, nonetheless there would be a negative impact. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Invercarnie / Mannofield/Turriff WTW has capacity. Local mains reinforcement may be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ A small drainage ditch to the northwest is unlikely to be impacted on and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, this mitigation would be stated as part of the development requirements of the opportunity site. 	-/0
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There would be minimal CO₂ emissions from general heating and travel. ○ The site is not within a flood risk area. ○ Individual houses can incorporate technology to minimise their carbon footprint, but it is a small-scale proposal. 	0
Soil	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site is on Class 3.1 prime agricultural land, the proposal would result in its loss. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss. 	-
Biodiversity	0/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA is set to the northeast. The site has no connection to the qualifying site and would have an effect indirectly through drainage, visitor pressure and impact of geese grazing grounds. ○ However, planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. Recreational access to the site is actively managed by the RSPB. SNH advise that there should be no additional pressures from visitors where facilities and visitor management plans are in place. No significant issues from increased public access is foreseen. No significant loss of land for geese foraging or roosting is anticipated. ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ Limited opportunities for enhancement due to small site and lack of surrounding habitat to extend/enhance. 	0

Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It would alter the entrance/exit from Foveran on Blairythan Terrace, currently an open agricultural aspect, but development is consented across the road so it would not be alien or out of character. ○ And, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure in the long-term. ○ School roll is low, and new housing would help sustain Foveran Primary School. The local shop has reportedly closed, but more housing could sustain it should it re-open. 	+
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Limited information, plot sizes are fairly uniform, but a good mix of house types could be easily achieved and proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types. 	+
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR109 Land to South West of Foveran		Proposal: 580 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have long-term negative effects on air quality. 	-
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Part of the site is located in a SEPA waste water drainage hotspot and Blairythan Septic Tank has no capacity. If there are capacity constraints these could be mitigated through growth projects and developer obligations. A potential growth project for Balmedie WWTW is currently under investigation, which will include Foveran. This is a reversible medium/long-term impact. ○ Invercannie / Mannofield/Turriff WTW has capacity. Local mains reinforcement may be required. ○ Surface water drainage hotspots are scattered in some parts of the site. ○ With the information on the quality of water around the site, the effects could be significant in the longer-term. 	--
Climatic Factors	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. ○ The development can be identified as an area of flood risk and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. A Flood Risk Assessment may be able to provide some mitigation to this constraint. 	-

Soil	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. o The proposed development would result in the significant loss of prime agricultural land. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. 	--
Biodiversity	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. 	-
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. o The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. o Significant scale development that would further alter the character of the area and is beyond what could be easily consolidated. 	-
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely drainage, which will have a temporary affect. A development of this scale would be required to make significant contributions through developer obligations that would mitigate for the impact of the development in terms of education, community facilities and infrastructure. 	0
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A limited mix of house type is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, the LDP policies requires a mix of house types and affordable homes. 	+
Human Health	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. o It would provide opportunities for open space. o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	+
Cultural Heritage	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Rubbing stones are on the site. The proposal would need to avoid this site and protect its setting if allocated. However, given the scale of the proposal, the stones are likely to be negatively affected. 	-
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR142 Land West of A90 (Phase 1), North of Blairythan, Foveran		Proposal: 150 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0

Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Half of the site is located in a SEPA waste water drainage hotspot and Blairythan Septic Tank has no capacity. However, a growth project has been initiated – the proposal would rely on private drainage until WWTW capacity was confirmed, which would have a negative impact. This impact is likely to be medium/long-term. ○ Invercarnie / Mannofield/Turriff WTW has capacity. Local mains reinforcement may be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. 	-/?
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, the site is near/next to a busy bus route, which could reduce commuter traffic. 	-/0
Soil	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The site is on Class 3.1 prime agricultural land, the proposal would result in its loss. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss. 	--
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA and Sands of Forvie SAC are set to the north. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying sites and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species. The development would have an effect indirectly through recreation pressures, land take for development, and impact on geese grazing areas. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. Recreational access to the site is actively managed by the RSPB. ○ The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ However, the site has potential to provide biodiversity enhancements to offset the impact of development. 	0/+
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ The development would create an unnatural extension to the north of the settlement which would erode the character or the original form of the settlement. If the site is allocated, a visual impact assessment will be required and stated in the development requirements for the site. ○ The impact is likely to have long-term effects. 	-/0
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely drainage which will risk a medium/long-term effect. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. A new school is proposed as part of the development. 	-/+
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The mix of house types proposed will result in a better housing choice for all groups of the population. 	+
Human Health		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. 	

	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The site has potential to provide open space proportionate with the scale of the allocation. o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	+
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A SMR is within the site (a farmstead still in use). o Invariably, the allocation will adversely affect the built features, their context, pattern of past historic use, and the setting in which they sit, in landscapes and within the soil (archaeology), and also in our towns, villages and streets. o However, it is expected that the development design layout could accommodate the building and use the opportunity to enhance sense of place. As such, the development is unlikely to have any significant effects on the historic environment in the long-term. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR143 Land West of A90 (Phase 2), North of Blairythan, Foveran		Proposal: Housing (mixed) estimated 410 home	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Due to the scale of the development it is likely to have a medium/long-term negative effect on air quality. o The site is near a bus route which could help reduce commuter traffic. 	-/0
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Half of the site is located in a SEPA waste water drainage hotspot and Blairythan Septic Tank has no capacity. However, a growth project has been initiated – the proposal would rely on private drainage until WWTW capacity was confirmed, which would have a negative impact. This impact is likely to be medium/long-term. o Invercannie / Mannofield/Turriff WTW has capacity. Local mains reinforcement may be required. o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. o The site is adjacent to a watercourse and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, this mitigation would be stated as part of the development requirements of the opportunity site. 	-/?
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, the site is near/next to a busy bus route, which could help reduce commuter traffic. 	-/0
Soil	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The site is partially on Class 3.1 prime agricultural land; the proposal would result in its loss. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss. 	
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA and Sands of Forvie SAC are set to the north. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying sites and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species. The development would have an effect indirectly through recreation pressures, land take for development, and impact on geese grazing areas. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. Recreational access to the site is actively managed by the RSPB. o The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. o However, the site has potential to provide biodiversity enhancements to offset the impact of development. 	0
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. o The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. o The development would create an unnatural extension to the north of the settlement which would erode the character or the original form of the settlement. If the site is allocated, a visual impact assessment will be required and stated in the development requirements for the site. o The impact is likely to have long-term effects. 	-/0
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely drainage which will risk a medium/long-term effect. o Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. o The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. A new school is proposed as part of the adjacent development (Bid Site FR142), which would comprise phase 1 of this development. 	-/+
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The mix of house types proposed will result in a better housing choice for all groups of the population. 	+
Human Health	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. o The site has potential to provide open space proportionate with the scale of the allocation. o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	+
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

FYVIE

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP1 (FR125) Land Northeast of Peterwell Road		Proposal: 30 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the most part individual developments of this scale are likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects on air quality, largely limited to the construction period. 	0
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Fyvie WWTW has limited capacity – a growth project will be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Due to the scale of the development proposed and the latest information, this is unlikely to be an issue and private drainage would be acceptable. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody and the extent to which the allocation connects to the public sewage infrastructure. 	0/?
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There would be minimal CO₂ emissions from general heating and travel. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ The development is not likely to maintain or enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed. 	0
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ There will be an impact on Fyvie Gardens and Designed Landscape. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could support Fyvie Primary School and Turriff Academy which are both forecast to be under capacity by 2022. 	+
Population	+/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development offers a housing choice in areas which are largely limited in terms of availability of housing. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Open space provision and enhancements proposed increases in accessibility to green space. 	0

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. o Opportunity to walk to services including the local shop and primary school. 	
Cultural Heritage	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development would have permanent negative effects on the Battle of Fyvie battleground. The development may weaken the sense of place, and the identity of existing settlements. o It could affect the setting of Fyvie Castle inventory garden and designed landscape. The development may weaken the sense of place, and the identity of the existing settlement. o New developments that deviate from existing designs, layouts and materials could adversely affect the setting of historic settlements in the long-term. 	-
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: FR126 Land West of Fyvie Primary School, Fyvie		Proposal: 30 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments	Effect – post mitigation
		Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	
Air	0	o For the most part, individual developments of this scale are likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects on air quality, largely limited to the construction period.	0
Water	-	o Fyvie WWTW has limited capacity – a growth project will be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. o The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody; the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to the public sewage infrastructure.	-
Climatic Factors	0	o There would be minimal CO ₂ emissions from general heating and travel.	0
Soil	0	o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	0	o The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. o The development is not likely to maintain or enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed.	0
Landscape	0	o The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change.	0

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Impact on Fyvie Gardens and Designed Landscape. o However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	
Material Assets	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Development could support Fyvie Primary School and Turriff Academy which are both forecast to be under capacity by 2022. 	+
Population	+/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Development offers housing choice in areas which are largely limited in terms of availability of housing, although proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Open space provision and enhancements proposed increases in accessibility to green space. o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. o Opportunity to walk to services including the local shop and primary school. 	0
Cultural Heritage	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development would have permanent negative effects on the Battle of Fyvie battleground. The development may weaken the sense of place, and the identity of the existing settlement. o Potentially adverse impacts on the setting of Fyvie Castle inventory garden and designed landscape. The development may weaken the sense of place, and the identity of the existing settlement. o New developments that deviate from existing designs, layouts and materials could adversely affect the setting of historic settlements in the long-term. 	--/-
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

GARMOND

Preferred Sites

None.

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: FR087 Site OP1 Garmond North		Proposal: 10 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Limited capacity at both septic tanks. A growth project would be required. However, a private sewer is proposed, otherwise it will have to connect to a public sewer. If the site is allocated, this will be specified in the Settlement Statement. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Turriff WTW has capacity. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. 	0
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. ○ However, the site is near a bus route, which could reduce commuter traffic. 	0
Soil	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the partial loss of prime agricultural land. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. 	-
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ The development is not likely to conserve, protect and enhance the diversity of species and habitats, and the natural heritage of the area. 	0

Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to have medium-term effects and will ultimately fall in line with the current pattern of development. 	0
Material Assets	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely waste water capacity, which will have a long-term or temporary affect. ○ The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. These include social infrastructure (schools, housing, healthcare facilities); previously developed land; minerals and aggregates (quarries); transport infrastructure (road, rail, paths, pipelines and bridges); water-delivery infrastructure; sewerage infrastructure; energy infrastructure (power stations, pylons, power cables, wind turbines and pipelines); natural environment (woodland, arable land, forests and agricultural land); tourism and recreation (caravan parks and camping sites); telecommunication infrastructure (telephone, masts, satellite television and broadband); waste management infrastructure (waste collection, transfer stations and composting facilities). 	0
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, this is consistent with the existing pattern of development observed in the settlement. ○ However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types and must match with the existing density of the settlement, which would be specified in the Settlement Statement (e.g. in the vision statement). 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	0
Cultural Heritage	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ New developments that deviate from existing designs, layouts and materials could adversely affect the setting of historic settlements and Garmond SMR in the long-term. 	-
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

KIRKTON OF AUCHTERLESS

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP1 (FR114) Small Site at Kirkton of Auchterless		Proposal: 5 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	+/0	○ The WWTW and WTW has capacity and is available for this development. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	+/0
Climatic Factors	0	○ The development is unlikely to lead to effects on climate.	0
Soil	-	○ The site contains prime agricultural land which would be lost to the development and this would be irreversible. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term.	-
Biodiversity	0	○ No significant loss or benefit to wildlife.	0
Landscape	0	○ The natural ridgeline would be breached but given the nature of the proposal impact it would not be so significant to warrant a negative effect on the landscape.	0
Material Assets	0	○ There would be minimal infrastructure requirements and no improvement would be required.	0
Population	-	○ There would be no real effect on population. ○ Like to be limited house types due to the number of homes proposed.	-
Human Health	0	○ It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	0	○ Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: R2 (FR144) Auchterless Turriff, Auchterless Car Park Project		Proposal: Auchterless Car Park Project	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	o Individual developments of this scale are unlikely to have any effect on air quality.	0
Water	0	o The site is not within an identified flood risk area.	0
Climatic Factors	0	o A proposal on this scale is unlikely to have any effect on CO ₂ emissions.	0
Soil	0	o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. o The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. o Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	0
Biodiversity	0	o The proposal would have a neutral effect as it is of a scale or in a location which is unlikely to negatively affect a nature conservation site or wider biodiversity.	0
Landscape	0	o The proposal is of a scale or in a location which is unlikely to have any effect on landscape quality.	0
Material Assets	0	o The proposal will not lead to a significant increase in pressure on local infrastructure.	0
Population	0	o Significance of effects on the population is likely to be minimal.	0
Human Health	0	o Development of the site is unlikely to have any significant effects on existing pathways or access to open space. o The population is not at risk from hazardous developments.	0
Cultural Heritage	0	o Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: FR115 Large Site at Kirkton of Auchterless, Turriff		Proposal: 12 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The WWTW/WTW capacity is limited for this area however development could not proceed as proposed without an upgrade being available. Therefore, as the site is unlikely to be allocated for a large number of units no effects are predicted. An upgrade to WWTW could have a detrimental effect on water. This is a reversible short-term impact. 	-/0
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Due to its scale the proposal is unlikely to adversely affect this topic. 	0
Soil	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development would involve the loss of 2ha of prime agricultural land. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. 	-
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity. There are enhancement options on site but no details provided by the application. Overall, this is neutral. 	0
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This would not be appropriate for a settlement at this scale as the site has a landscape impact due to it being formed in the space between the B992 road and higher ground towards the west of the site. ○ 	-
Material Assets	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure. 	0
Population	+/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The mix of house types promoted would be of some minor benefit as there is limited variation in the existing stock. Contributions to improved play space may have a material improvement in the settlement. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to have any effect on human health. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR137 Site Opposite Smallburn Cottage, Auchterless, Turriff		Proposal: 10 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In terms of air quality, the development is unlikely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality. ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The WWTW capacity is insufficient for this area and an upgrade to an adoptable standard would be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is next to the River Ythan where the quality of water is only moderate. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody; the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to the public sewage infrastructure. ○ With the information on the quality of water around the site, the effects could be significant in the longer term. 	0/-
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There would be minimal CO₂ emissions from general heating and travel. ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. 	0
Soil	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss. 	-
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. Some disturbance to the woodland is likely, especially during the construction phase. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. 	0/+
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In light of the scale and location of the proposal, it would have a negative impact on the landscape character and the effect is likely to be long-term. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, line, pattern, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0

Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The St Donans Cottages Septic Tank has capacity for less than 10 homes. o Unknown if private WWTW is possible given the proximity of the River Ythan and topography for the site. 	-
Population	-	o No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, the LDP policies require proposals to have a mix of house types.	+/0
Human Health	0	o It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths.	0
Cultural Heritage	0	o Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

METHLICK

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP1 (FR034) Cottonhillock		Proposal: 20 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Individual developments of this scale are unlikely to have an impact on air quality. Any impact on air quality would likely be limited to the construction phase. 	0
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Methlick WWTW has insufficient capacity available for this area and an upgrade to an adoptable standard would be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Turriff WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required. 	-/?
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development site is not situated within a known flood extent, or adjacent to watercourses and therefore is not likely to suffer fluvial flooding. ○ The site is generally well connected to the rest of the settlement (within 400m of various amenities including bus stops) and therefore it would encourage sustainable modes of transport. ○ Although, the site is more than 1km from the nearest employment sites, which may have a long-term negative impact due to emissions from private car usage, a proposal on this scale is unlikely to have any effect on CO₂ emissions. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ The development would present opportunities to enhance biodiversity through the planting of native tree species and formation of ponds/soakaways, which would provide a long-term benefit. ○ Opportunity to create and enhance habitats within the scheme through structural planting, open space and landscaping. If the site is allocated, these mitigations would be stated as part of the development requirements of the opportunity site. 	0
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0

Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. ○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access, WWTW and education provision at Methlick Primary School and Meldrum Academy, which will have a temporary effect. ○ However, consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ Development would contribute towards the community's housing goals and it has the potential to contribute to native tree planning and open space provision. 	+
Population	+/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A mix of house types is proposed resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population. 	+/0
Human Health	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ Good access to community facilities and general amenities (within 400m of the site), which would encourage sustainable forms of transport, leading to a positive impact on human health. 	+
Cultural Heritage	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development will have a long-term and permanent effect on the setting of gardens and designed landscapes. ○ The impact is likely to be limited through the siting of the development site on the edge of the Designed Landscape designation, and adjacent to the existing settlement – it would be read as a continuation of the urban form. The internal focus of the designed landscape (around Haddo House) would lessen the impact. ○ The impact could be partially mitigated through structural planting. 	-
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: OP2 (FR014) West of Black Craigs		Proposal: 8 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality, particularly in towns where air quality is approaching the EU objective. ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Methlick WWTW has insufficient capacity available for this area and an upgrade to an adoptable standard would be required. However, this has proven a constraint to OP2 development. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Turriff WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required. 	-

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. o The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (ground, coastal, transitional or loch) is high. 	
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development could have a short-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel (construction works) and increased emissions. o A proposal of this size is unlikely to increase CO₂ emissions in the long run, due to the scale of the site and location close to local services and facilities. o Part of the site is found to be at risk of surface water flooding, but this could form part of the open space provision. The potential for landscaped SuDS area providing feature open space, landscaped with native planting is identified. A FRA may also be required. If allocated these mitigations would be stated as part of the development requirements of the site. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases 	0
Biodiversity	-/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development would not have positive or negative effects on conserving, protecting and enhancing the diversity of species and habitats, and the natural heritage of the area. o The development is unlikely to adversely affect populations of protected species, including European Protected Species, their habitats and resting places or roosts. o The site is adjacent to ancient woodland and a buffer strip may be required to mitigate effects. o The development can maintain or enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed. Buffer planting adjacent to ancient woodland will enhance the existing green network. o The development will result in the loss of existing trees, woodland and hedges but suitable compensatory planting can mitigate this impact. 	0
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The nature of land use in the area will not be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. o The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. o However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	+/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. o The site is expected to enhance an extensive area of parkland to the north by linking up new footpaths and tree-lined streets throughout the development. o There are associated infrastructure constraints, namely a school capacity issue at Methlick Primary School and Meldrum Academy, and a WWTW issue, however consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. 	+/-
Population	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o House types are not known except for 3-4 bedroom houses. However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types. However, due to the scale of the site this is likely to be limited. 	+/0

Human Health	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	+
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There will be no impact on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: OP3 (FR040) Land at Sunnybrae Croft, Methlick		Proposal: 12 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Individual developments of this scale are unlikely to have any effect on air quality. 	0
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Methlick WWTW has insufficient capacity available for this area and an upgrade to an adoptable standard would be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. o Turriff WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. o The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (loch) is good. 	-/?
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A proposal on this scale is unlikely to have any effect on CO₂ emissions. o Part of the site found to be at risk from surface water flooding will not be included within an allocation and could be mitigated through SuDS and part of the open space provision. A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) may be required. If allocated, these mitigations would be stated as part of the development requirements for the site. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases 	0
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity. o The proposal would have a neutral effect as it is of a scale or in a location that is unlikely to negatively affect a nature conservation site or wider biodiversity. o New tree planting is proposed. 	0
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. o The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. 	0

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Development to the east will have a localised negative impact on the setting of the town. However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. The site is a logical extension to the existing allocation and impact could be mitigated by strategic landscaping, and if allocated, this will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site. 	
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. o There are associated infrastructure constraints, namely a school capacity issue at Methlick Primary School and Meldrum Academy, and a WWTW issue. However, consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. o Development provides new homes of an appropriate mix that would contribute to a sustainable community. 	-/+
Population	+/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A positive impact is anticipated as a mix of house types is proposed resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Development of the site is unlikely to have any significant effects on existing pathways or access to open space. o The population is not at risk from hazardous developments. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development will be unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: OP4 (FR046 & FR047) Site Adj to Belmuir Lodge Methlick		Proposal: 63 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. o The scale of development would not have a major negative impact on air quality. 	0
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Methlick WWTW has insufficient capacity available for this area and an upgrade to an adoptable standard would be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. o Turriff WTW has capacity, but local mains reinforcement may be required o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. o The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (loch) is good. 	-

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The site is adjacent to a watercourse and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required. If allocated, these mitigations would be stated as part of the development requirements of the opportunity site. 	
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development could have a short-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel (construction works) and increased emissions. o A proposal of this size is unlikely to increase CO₂ emissions in the long run due to the scale of the site and location close to local services and facilities. o Part of the site is found to be at risk of surface water flooding, but this could form part of the open space provision. The potential for landscaped SuDS area providing a feature open space, landscaped with native planting is identified. A FRA may also be required. If allocated these mitigations would be stated as part of the development requirements of the site. 	-
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development of a greenfield site is likely to have an adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats or habitat fragmentation or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. o The development shall not enhance existing green networks; however, it will improve connectivity or create new links where needed. o The development shall enhance biodiversity via providing wildflower, drystone walls and open space. 	0
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced due to the topography at the north of the site. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. o The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. o The site would be relatively visually prominent in the landscape. It is proposed that access would be made by cutting through a hill which will alter the landscape character. It is unlikely that strategic planting will sufficiently mitigate this effect. 	-
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access, WWTW and education provision at Methlick Primary School and Meldrum Academy, which will have a temporary effect. o However, consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. 	-/0
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A mix of house types is not proposed. However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. o The population is not at risk from hazardous development. 	0
Cultural Heritage	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development will have a long-term and permanent negative effect on the setting of listed buildings and gardens. The development risks weakening the sense of place and identity of the existing settlement. o New developments that deviate from existing designs, layouts and materials could adversely affect the setting of historic settlements in the long-term. o It would not be possible to mitigate against erosion of sense of place/place identity through new developments. 	-

Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect	
------------	--	--

Alternative Sites

None.

NEWBURGH

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP3 (FR029 and part of FR028) Land North of School Road, Mill of Newburgh		Proposal: 160 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Individual developments of this scale are unlikely to have any effect on air quality. Newburgh is not at risk from poor air quality and there is good public transport provision (buses). 	0
Water	- /?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is insufficient capacity at Balmedie WWTW. A potential growth project is currently under investigation for Balmedie WWTW and this will consider Newburgh. Local sewer reinforcement may be required. DIA may be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Invercarnie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity. Local water mains reinforcement may be required and WIA required. No issues regarding reservoir capacity. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ With the information on the quality of water around the site, the effects could be significant in the longer term. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, and the extent to which the allocation connects to the public sewage infrastructure. 	- /?
Climatic Factors	-/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are several services in the village, but development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements to major service centres (e.g. Ellon or Aberdeen, to go to shops and areas of employment) and increased emissions. The village already suffers congestion; however this could be mitigated if a bypass is built and this development could contribute to that. ○ However, the effects will be less as Newburgh is on a main bus route to Peterhead, Aberdeen and Ellon. 	0
Soil	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the significant loss of prime agricultural land. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. 	--
Biodiversity	0/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sands of Forvie SAC; Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA and Buchan Ness to Collieston Coast SPA are set to the northeast. The site is at a close proximity to the qualifying sites and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species from foul water drainage and recreation impacts. The site may represent geese feeding ground. 	0/+

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ However, planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. Access to the site is managed by the RSPB. SNH advise that there should be no additional pressures from visitors where facilities and visitor management plans are in place. No significant loss of land for geese foraging or roosting is anticipated. Appropriate drainage provisions will need to demonstrate that no impact will result on the SPA and SAC sites. ○ The development is adjacent to the international protected Ythan Estuary but is not likely to affect international and national conservation objectives and natural features. The main types of effects include disturbance to geese, recreational impacts on tern colonies, and erosion of dunes. All these effects would be long-term. ○ The development will enhance biodiversity through the creation of public open space, which will have a long-term positive effect. It does not link to other habitats as the land around it is agricultural or residential. 	
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal can be accommodated within the large-scale landscape and will not affect any of its key features. ○ Given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	-/ - -	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is an education infrastructure constraint at Newmachar Mathers Primary School. Its school roll is rising, and this proposal will have a long-term effect unless a solution to increase the school's capacity can be found. ○ There is uncertainty if there is a sewage issue, as data from Scottish Water's website on Newburgh is unavailable. If resolved, these effects would be temporary. ○ No other services are proposed within the site. 	-/?
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A mix of house types is proposed resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population. 	+
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development will have no impact on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: FR027 Land Southwest of Red Inch Circle, Newburgh		Proposal: 80 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Individual developments of this scale are unlikely to have any effect on air quality. 	0

Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody, the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding. Part of the site is at risk of flooding so a Flood Risk Assessment would be required to assess if any mitigation would be possible. ○ There is insufficient capacity at Balmedie WWTW. A potential growth project is currently under investigation for Balmedie WWTW and this will consider Newburgh. Local sewer reinforcement may be required. DIA may be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Invercannie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity. Local water mains reinforcement may be required and WIA required. No issues regarding reservoir capacity. 	-/?
Climatic Factors	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development is in an area identified at flood risk and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. A Flood Risk Assessment may be able to identify mitigation measures. 	-
Soil	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ Prime agricultural land is found within the proposed site. It will result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. 	-
Biodiversity	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. Loss of a greenfield site can be mitigated through provision of good quality open space that can enhance biodiversity. ○ Sands of Forvie SAC; Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA and Buchan Ness to Collieston Coast SPA are set to the northeast. The site is at a close proximity to the qualifying sites and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species from foul water drainage and recreation impacts. The site may represent geese feeding ground. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the designations. 	0
Landscape	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ The negative impact on landscape character could be partially mitigated with shelterbelts and screening. 	0
Material Assets	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. These include community facilities. Where a need is identified as a result of the development, developer obligations would be sought to mitigate for the effects of the development on the wider community. 	+
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A mix of house types is proposed resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population. 	+
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No impact on cultural heritage. 	0

Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect	
------------	---	--

Site Ref: FR050 Land to the North of Oceanlab, Newburgh		Proposal: 60 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> reversibility or irreversibility risks duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. Newburgh is not at risk from poor air quality and there is good public transport provision (buses). 	0
Water	- /?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is insufficient capacity at Balmedie WWTW. A potential growth project is currently under investigation for Balmedie WWTW and this will consider Newburgh. Local sewer reinforcement may be required. DIA may be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. Invercannie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity. Local water mains reinforcement may be required and WIA required. No issues regarding reservoir capacity. Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. With the information on the quality of water around the site, in particular the Ythan Estuary, the effects could be significant in the longer term, and adverse impacts on the watercourse to the west of the site could potentially be mitigated through a buffer strip. 	--/?
Climatic Factors	-/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are several services in the village, but development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements to major service centres (e.g. Ellon or Aberdeen, to go to shops and areas of employment) and increased emissions. The village already suffers congestion; however this could be mitigated if a bypass is built and this development could contribute to that. However, the effects will be less as Newburgh is on a main bus route to Peterhead, Aberdeen and Ellon. 	0
Soil	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. 	--
Biodiversity	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA and Sands of Forvie SAC are set to the east. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying sites and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species. There may also be issues through drainage, visitor pressure and impact of geese grazing grounds. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. The proposal would need to connect to a public sewer to mitigate effects on the designations. 	--/0

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development will enhance biodiversity through the creation of public open space, which will have a long-term positive effect. However, it does not link to other habitats as the land around it is agricultural or residential. 	
Landscape	- -	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. o Given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	-
Material Assets	- -	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There is an education infrastructure constraint at Newmachar Mathers Primary School. Its school roll is rising, and this proposal will have a long-term effect unless a solution to increase the school's capacity can be found. This could be mitigated through developer obligations contributing to an upgrade to the school. o There is uncertainty if there is a sewage issue, as data from Scottish Water's website on Newburgh is unavailable. If resolved, these effects would be temporary. o No other services are proposed within the site. 	-
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A mix of house types is proposed resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population. 	+
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	0
Cultural Heritage	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development will have long-term and permanent negative effect on the site/setting of a category B listed Ythan Lodge. The development may weaken the sense of place, by obstructing views across the Ythan Estuary and towards Newburgh. o New developments that deviate from existing designs, layouts and materials could adversely affect the setting of historic settlements in the long-term. 	-
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR052 Site Adjacent to Waterside Cottages, Newburgh		Proposal: 5 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. Newburgh is not at risk from poor air quality and there is good public transport provision (buses). 	0
Water	- /?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There is insufficient capacity at Balmedie WWTW. A potential growth project is currently under investigation for Balmedie WWTW and this will consider Newburgh. Local sewer reinforcement may be required. DIA may be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. 	- /?

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Invercannie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity. Local water mains reinforcement may be required and WIA required. No issues regarding reservoir capacity. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody (in this case the Ythan Estuary), and the extent to which the allocation connects to the public sewage infrastructure. 	
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are several services in Newburgh, and it is unlikely to have any effect on climate and the water environment. The A975 is on a main bus route to Peterhead, Aberdeen and Ellon. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	-/?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA and Sands of Forvie SAC are set to the east. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying sites and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species. There may also be issues through drainage, visitor pressure and impact of geese grazing grounds ○ The main types of effects include disturbance to geese, and recreational impacts on tern colonies. Despite the small scale of the proposal, its proximity to the estuary and sand dunes means it could have long-term effects. Potential mitigation measures are unclear for a such a unique habitat, however discussions with the environment team could make these clearer. 	-/?
Landscape	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site overlooks the Ythan Estuary, and while views from it are obscured by trees, the landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, and naturalness will change. ○ Given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	-
Material Assets	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is an education infrastructure constraint at Newmachar Mathers Primary School. Its school roll is rising, and this proposal will have a long-term effect unless a solution to increase the school's capacity can be found. This could be mitigated through developer obligations contributing to an upgrade to the school. ○ There is uncertainty if there is a sewage issue, as data from Scottish Water's website on Newburgh is unavailable. If resolved, these effects would be temporary. ○ No other services are proposed within the site. 	-/?
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No mix of house types is proposed resulting in limited housing choice for all groups of the population. ○ This would be mitigated as the Local Development Plan will only permit sustainable mixed developments with a minimum of 25% affordable housing. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No impacts of note. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No sites will be affected. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: Infill (FR093) Site at Former Smithy, Main Street, Newburgh		Proposal: 1 home (Infill)	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. Newburgh is not at risk from poor air quality and there is good public transport provision (buses). 	0
Water	0/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The WWTW and WTW capacity is unknown for this area. The 2017 LDP states “There is insufficient capacity at Balmedie Waste Water Treatment Works to treat all sites allocated at Balmedie, Belhelvie, Newburgh and Potterton. Scottish Water will initiate a growth project, should demand from committed development exceed available capacity.” Neighbouring planning application installed a septic tank. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody (in this case the Ythan Estuary), and the extent to which the allocation connects to the public sewage infrastructure. On its own, the proposal should not have any significant impact on water quality. 	0
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The eastern edge of the site is in an area identified as at flood risk, but is unlikely to have any effect on climate and the water environment given that most of the site is unaffected. Being next to an estuary, there will be no downstream impacts. ○ The proposal is located immediately adjacent to Newburgh, which is on a bus route and has several services. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA and Sands of Forvie SAC are set to the east, but the proposal is not likely to affect the international and national conservation objectives and natural features. The main types of effects include disturbance to geese, recreational impacts on tern colonies, and erosion of dunes. Given the small scale of the proposal, and its proximity to the estuary and sand dunes means that it could have long-term effects, but this is unlikely. 	0
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The scale and location of the proposal is unlikely to have any effect on landscape quality. ○ Given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is an education infrastructure constraint at Newmachar Mathers Primary School. Its school roll is rising, but this proposal is unlikely to have any effect on material assets. ○ There is uncertainty if there is a sewage issue, as data from Scottish Water’s website on Newburgh is unavailable. An adjacent planning application that was approved for a single house proposed a septic tank. ○ No other services are proposed within the site. 	0
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Single house proposed. 	-

Human Health	0	o No impacts of note.	0
Cultural Heritage	0	o No sites will be affected.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

OLDMELDRUM

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP1 (FR119) Land north of Distillery Road		Proposal: 88 homes (increased from 50 homes)	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality, particularly in towns where air quality is approaching the EU objective. The development would result in increased traffic flow through Oldmeldrum. ○ The site is next to a busy bus route, which may help reduce commuter traffic. 	-/?
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Capacity at Oldmeldrum WWTW is not currently available for this area however an upgrade is due 2022-23. Given the site is already allocated in the LDP it can be expected that there will be capacity for this site. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Invercannie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity. Local water mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of WIA. No issues regarding reservoir capacity. ○ There is a possibility for some localised impacts on the watercourse; however, this is opportunity site provides SuDS to deal with existing surface water flood risk and to increase riparian areas to allow for improvements in water quality. This should balance any negative effects resulting from the development. ○ Also, buffer strips would be required along watercourse on either side of the site to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, these mitigations would be stated in the development requirements of the opportunity site. 	0
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development is not in a flood risk area. ○ Although development could have some negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel to some services and other areas of employment) and increased emissions, the site is well connected within Oldmeldrum. The site is also near a bus route, which may help reduce commuter traffic. 	0/?
Soil	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development would result in the significant loss of prime agricultural land. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. ○ Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss. 	--
Biodiversity	0/+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A buffer strip next to the watercourse would provide a biodiversity enhancement opportunity. 	0/+
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site is well screened and within the town and there would be no discernible impact on the landscape. 	0
Material Assets	+/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal would introduce community facilities (church). 	+

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is insufficient secondary school capacity, and secondary road access is required. Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects i.e. provide road solution and education provision. 	
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development could facilitate a greater mix of housing in this area and assist in permeability of the settlement. Due to the site's central location in the settlement the development would allow integration of people; where they live and work. 	+
Human Health	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing in a central location within the town, pedestrian links would be improved. Provides opportunities for new path links (e.g. to King Street). 	+
Cultural Heritage	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development risks a visual impact on the setting of the adjacent Oldmeldrum Conservation Area. If allocated, a proposed mitigation would be stated as part of the development requirements for the site, namely that the design of buildings on the site should seek to reflect the surrounding local architectural styles and be respectful of the townscape and potential visual impact of height and scale of the development on the surrounding streets. 	-/0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: OP4 (FR069) Land at Chapel Park, Oldmeldrum		Proposal: 68 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> reversibility or irreversibility risks duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality, particularly in towns where air quality is approaching the EU objective. The development would result in increased traffic flow through Oldmeldrum. The site is next to a busy bus route, which may help reduce commuter traffic. 	-/?
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity at Oldmeldrum WWTW is not currently available for this area however an upgrade is due 2022-23. Given the site is already allocated in the LDP it can be expected that there will be capacity for this site. This is a reversible short-term impact. Invercannie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity. Local water mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of WIA. No issues regarding reservoir capacity. Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. 	0
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development is not in a flood risk area. Although development could have some negative impacts due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel to some services and other areas of employment) and increased emissions, the site is well connected within Oldmeldrum. The site is also near a bus route, which may help reduce commuter traffic. 	0

Soil	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. o The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss. 	--
Biodiversity	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Buchan Ness to Collieston Coast SPA, Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA and Sands of Forvie SAC are likely to be affected through indirect drainage. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. o The development will enhance biodiversity through redevelopment of brownfield land. o Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of woodland would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities (woodland on site protected by condition on the consent granted on site already). 	+
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Minimal landscape impact as the development fits within the existing tree belt. o Given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, any effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal will lead to some pressure on local infrastructure however a WWTW upgrade is due 2022. o Meldrum Academy will be over capacity, however, consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. 	0/?
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A mix of house types is proposed resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population. 	+
Human Health	0/+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. o Links to an existing settlement already exist. o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	0/+
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: OP5 (FR061) Newbarns		Proposal: 146 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A proposal of this scale will lead to a decrease in air quality (i.e. through increases in concentrations of air pollutants) as it will increase traffic flow through Oldmedrum, a town where air quality is approaching the EU objective. A long-term negative effect on air quality, is anticipated. 	-

Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Capacity at Oldmeldrum WWTW is not currently available for this area however an upgrade is due 2022-23. It is anticipated that provision would be made for a new development. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Invercannie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity. Local water mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of WIA. No issues regarding reservoir capacity. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ A watercourse runs through the site (Burn of Gownor) and field drain along eastern boundary. A buffer strip would be required alongside all watercourses to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, these mitigations would be stated as part of the development requirements of the opportunity site. 	-/?
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Although development could have some negative impacts due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel to some services and other areas of employment) and increased emissions, the site is well connected within Oldmeldrum. ○ The development is in an area identified at risk from surface water flooding and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. This could be mitigated through SuDS and a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). If allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA may or will be required. 	0
Soil	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss. ○ Partially overlaps with an area of carbon rich soil and peatland. 	--
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity. ○ The development has potential to maintain or enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed: the site is adjacent to ancient woodland which could be protected with a buffer strip and/or extended into the site. ○ Mitigation measures, such as compensatory planting or a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or watercourse would reduce potential negative effects of the development and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. If the site is allocated, the need for compensatory planting and/or a buffer strip will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site. 	+
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal is in a location which is unlikely to have any effect on landscape quality. ○ Although the nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced, and the relationship between landforms and land use, field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal will have significant negative effects on existing infrastructure by exceeding the capacity of the sewage network and the education provision. However, consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. 	-/0
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The mix of house types proposed results in housing choice for all groups of the population. 	+
Human Health	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Development of the site is unlikely to have any significant effects on existing pathways. There is potential for improved access to a nearby recreational path (the Den of Gownor track). 	+

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. o The population is not at risk from hazardous developments. 	
Cultural Heritage	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There is potential for an adverse impact on Scheduled monument, The Temple Stones, stone circle northeast of Potterton House. An assessment will be required to ascertain likely impacts on its setting. 	?
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: OP2 (FR068) Coutens		Proposal: 85 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality, particularly in towns where air quality is approaching the EU objective. The development would result in increased traffic flow through Oldmeldrum. o The site is next to a busy bus route, which may help reduce commuter traffic. 	-/?
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Capacity at Oldmeldrum WWTW is not currently available for this area however an upgrade is due 2022-23. Given the site is already allocated in the LDP it can be expected that there will be capacity for this site. This is a reversible short-term impact. o Invercannie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity. Local water mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of WIA. No issues regarding reservoir capacity. o A buffer strip would be required along the watercourse that runs adjacent to the site to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, this mitigation would be stated in the development requirements of the opportunity site. 	0
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development is not in a flood risk area. o Although development could have some negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel to some services and other areas of employment) and increased emissions, the site is well connected within Oldmeldrum. The site is also near a bus route, which may help reduce commuter traffic. 	0/?
Soil	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. o The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land to the south of the site. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss. 	--
Biodiversity	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Buchan Ness to Collieston Coast SPA, Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA and Sands of Forvie SAC are likely to be affected through indirect drainage. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. 	+

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development may maintain or enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed. o Biodiversity enhancements are proposed, and the site will enhance biodiversity through redevelopment of brownfield land. 	
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. o However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal will lead to significant pressure on local infrastructure, namely WWTW and education. However, a WWTW upgrade is due 2022, and consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects i.e. provide road solution and education provision. o The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. o Development would enhance green networks and make good provision of open space. 	-/0
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. o However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types. 	+
Human Health	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal provides open space proportionate with the scale of allocation. o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	+
Cultural Heritage	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development will have long-term and permanent negative effects on the battlefield that lies on the south part of the site (Battle of Barra): the development may weaken the sense of place, and the identity of an existing settlement. o Due to nearby sites of historic and archaeological interest, and the potential for unrecorded archaeology, a programme of archaeological works is likely to be required. 	-/?
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: FR083 Land at Colpy Roundabout, Oldmeldrum		Proposal: Employment land	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	-/?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality, particularly in towns where air quality is approaching the EU objective. The development risks are increased traffic flow through Oldmeldrum. ○ The development of employment land is likely to worsen air quality due to the nature of potential uses and vehicular transport to and from the site. 	-/?
Water	0/?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Capacity at Oldmeldrum WWTW is not currently available for this area however an upgrade is due 2022-23. The demand for wastewater capacity will depend on the business use - early engagement with Scottish Water is encouraged. ○ Invercarnie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity. Local water mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of WIA. No issues regarding reservoir capacity. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (ground, coastal, transitional or loch) is good. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody; the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to the public sewage infrastructure. 	0/?
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. 	-
Soil	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss. 	--
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. 	0
Landscape	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal is likely to have a significant negative impact on the setting of Oldmeldrum. Significant strategic planting would be required to reduce its visual impact from the road. 	--/?

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. o The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. 	
Material Assets	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal is not expected to lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure. o The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. Would enhance/maintain supply of employment land with good transport links. 	+
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development would allow integration of people; where they meet and work. Employment opportunity in the town. 	+
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. 	-
Cultural Heritage	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development will have a direct effect on the land uses around the Barra Battlefield site. o The development may weaken the sense of place, and the identity of the settlement given its distance from the centre, however the effect is in part lessened by the adjacent land uses and topography. o Nonetheless, the site is located within an important area associated with the battle and close to an area of fighting (i.e. The Bruce's Stone and the Comyn Lines). It sits within an area of high archaeological potential, and may result in the encroachment of modern development towards the centre of the battlefield. o Due to development impacting on a site of historic and archaeological interest with the potential for unrecorded archaeology, a programme of archaeological works would be required. 	--
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR111, Site 2, Land Adjacent to Millburn Road & B9170 Oldmeldrum		Proposal: 200 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A proposal of this scale will lead to a decrease in air quality (i.e. through increases in concentrations of air pollutants) as it will increase traffic flow through Oldmedrum, a town where air quality is approaching the EU objective. A long-term negative effect on air quality, is anticipated. 	-
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Capacity at Oldmeldrum WWTW is not currently available for this area however an upgrade is due 2022-23. A further growth project may be required to accommodate this development. This is a reversible medium/long-term impact. o Invercarnie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity. Local water mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of WIA. No issues regarding reservoir capacity. 	-/?

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. o The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (ground, coastal, transitional or loch) is good. o A watercourse runs adjacent to the site. A buffer strip would be required alongside all watercourses to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, this mitigation would be stated as part of the development requirements of the opportunity site. 	
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) with associated increased emissions. o Part of the site is identified as being at flood risk and risks long-term effects on climate and the water environment. However, through appropriate design it could lead to decreased run-off. However, using the principals of SuDS, and by avoiding development of areas at risk close to the burn this could be avoided. Increased planting on site may reduce run-off rates from the current agricultural use. A FRA may also be required. If allocated, these mitigations would be stated as part of the development requirements of the opportunity site. 	0
Soil	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases o The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss. 	--
Biodiversity	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity. o The development has potential to maintain or enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed: site adjacent to ancient woodland which could be protected with a buffer strip and/or extended into the site. o Mitigation measures, such as compensatory planting or a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or watercourse would reduce potential negative effects of the development and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. If the site is allocated, the need for compensatory planting and/or a buffer strip will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site. 	+
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal is in a location which is unlikely to have any effect on landscape quality. o Although the nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced, and the relationship between landforms and land use, field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. Given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal will have significant negative effects on existing infrastructure by exceeding the capacity of the sewage network, road access and the education provision. However, consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. 	-/?
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types. o The development may allow integration of people; where they live and work. 	+
Human Health	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Opportunities exist to improve walking and cycling links, and provide additional linkage and improvement to open space provision o It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths, with opportunity to greatly enhance core path access and recreation associated with a riparian setting. 	+

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. o The population is not at risk from hazardous developments. 	
Cultural Heritage	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Despite the battlefield designation, subject to retaining the riparian area with the potential to enhance access to the Meadow Burn, there is potential for increasing understanding of the site as part of the history of Barra Battlefield. 	-/0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR012 Driving Range, Oldmeldrum		Proposal: 12 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Capacity at Oldmeldrum WWTW is not currently available for this area however an upgrade is due 2022-23. A further growth project may be required to accommodate this development. This is a reversible short-term impact. o Invercarnie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity. Local water mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of WIA. No issues regarding reservoir capacity. o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. 	0/?
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There would be minimal CO₂ emissions from general heating and travel. 	0
Soil	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. o The proposed development would result in a significant loss of prime agricultural land. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss. 	--
Biodiversity	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development is not likely to conserve, protect and enhance the diversity of species and habitats, and the natural heritage of the area. o The development is not likely to maintain or enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed. o The development will enhance biodiversity through redevelopment of brownfield land. 	+
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. 	0

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, any effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	
Material Assets	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal will lead to pressure on local infrastructure. Notably, the WWTW, and there are education constraints as Meldrum Academy will be over capacity by 2022. Road access improvements would also be required. o However, consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. o The site is also relatively remote from the settlement and local services. 	0/-
Population	+/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A mix of house types is proposed resulting in housing choice for all groups of the population. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. o Close proximity to sports facilities and potential active travel opportunities. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No impact on cultural heritage 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR062, Newbarns Phase 2 Oldmeldrum		Proposal: 146 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A proposal of this scale will lead to a decrease in air quality (i.e. through increases in concentrations of air pollutants) as it will increase traffic flow through Oldmeldrum, a town where air quality is approaching the EU objective. A long-term negative effect on air quality is anticipated. 	-
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Capacity at Oldmeldrum WWTW is not currently available for this area however an upgrade is due 2022-23. A further growth project may be required to accommodate this development. This is a reversible medium-term impact. o Invercannie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity. Local water mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of WIA. No issues regarding reservoir capacity. o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. Any potential impacts on the water environment can be mitigated by SuDS. 	-/?
Climatic Factors	0/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The site is not in a flood risk area. o The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel and increased emissions. 	0/-

Soil	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in a significant loss of prime agricultural land and it partially overlaps with an area of carbon rich soil and peatland. This will result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss. 	--
Biodiversity	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ The development has potential to enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed as there is ancient woodland close by. If the site is allocated, mitigation measures, such as compensatory planting would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities and if the site is allocated, these mitigations will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site. 	+
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No significant landscape impact is anticipated. ○ Given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, any effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal will lead to pressure on local infrastructure. Notably, the WWTW, and there are education constraints as Meldrum Academy will be over capacity by 2022. Road access improvements would also be required. ○ However, consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. There are disadvantages associated with the site, including the need for schoolchildren to cross the A947 and the impact that development may have on the opportunities for an “eastern by-pass”. ○ The site is also relatively remote from the settlement and local services. 	-/?
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The mix of house types proposed results in housing choice for all groups of the population. 	+
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Development of the site is unlikely to have any significant effects on existing pathways or access to open space. Access to existing recreational area is expected. ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing in a central location within the town, pedestrian links would be improved. ○ The population will not be at risk from hazardous developments. 	0/+
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR073 Land at Parkside Piggery, Oldmeldrum		Proposal: 10 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects, the site is small scale. ○ Quite an isolated site, no pedestrian links to Oldmeldrum, no bus stop close by which means reliance on private cars. However, developments of this scale are unlikely to have any effect on air quality. 	0
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Capacity at Oldmeldrum WWTW is not currently available for this area however an upgrade is due 2022-23. A further growth project may be required to accommodate this development. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Invercannie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity. Local water mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of WIA. No issues regarding reservoir capacity. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. 	0
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No flood risk. Small-scale surface water issues only, that would be resolvable through an appropriate drainage system. ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, a development of this scale is unlikely to have any effect on emissions. 	0
Soil	+/?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in remediation of potentially contaminated soil. 	+/?
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development will enhance biodiversity through redevelopment of brownfield land. 	0/+
Landscape	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Redundant piggery buildings, which appear unsightly in the wider landscape, would be redeveloped 	+
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access and education capacity at Meldrum Academy. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. However, road may not be upgradeable to an adoptable, which may have a long-term effect. ○ Quite isolated site, no pedestrian links to Oldmeldrum, no bus stop close by. 	-/?
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No mix of house types identified, but small proposal could deliver a diverse offering, inclusive of affordable housing provision. These would be required through the 'Shaping Places' policies within the Local Development Plan. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment 	0

Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect
------------	--

Site Ref: FR088 Land at Parcock Quarry, Oldmeldrum		Proposal: 10 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	0	For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Capacity at Oldmeldrum WWTW is not currently available for this area however an upgrade is due 2022-23. A further growth project may be required to accommodate this development. This is a reversible short-term impact. o Invercannie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity. Local water mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of WIA. No issues regarding reservoir capacity. o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. 	0/?
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There would be minimal CO₂ emissions from general heating and travel. 	0
Soil	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. o The proposed development would result in remediation of potentially contaminated land. 	+
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development will enhance biodiversity through redevelopment of brownfield land. 	0
Landscape	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Creation of houses with landscaping would make a more positive contribution to the landscape than its previous use as a quarry. 	+
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal will lead to pressure on local infrastructure. Notably, WWTW and there are education constraints as Meldrum Academy will be over capacity by 2022. Road access improvements would also be required. o However, consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. o Although the site benefits from existing access and transportation links, the site is relatively inaccessible to the range of local services in Oldmeldrum. o However, the site is adjacent to core paths that link the site to a footpath network. 	-/+
Population	+/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A mix of house types is proposed resulting in housing choice for all groups of the population. 	+/0

Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR110 Site 1, Land Adjacent to B9170, Oldmeldrum		Proposal: Employment land	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	-/?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of employment land is likely to worsen air quality due to the nature of potential uses and vehicular transport to and from the site. 	-/?
Water	0/?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Capacity at Oldmeldrum WWTW is not currently available for this area however an upgrade is due 2022-23. The demand for wastewater capacity will depend on the business use - early engagement with Scottish Water is encouraged. ○ Invercarnie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity. Local water mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of WIA. No issues regarding reservoir capacity. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (ground, coastal, transitional or loch) is good. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody; the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to the public sewage infrastructure. 	0/?
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. 	-
Soil	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss. 	--

Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. 	0
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal would lead to some degree of landscape change as it would significantly extend the settlement to the south. Oldmeldrum has quite a unique situation within the landscape. This could be mitigated to some extent by boundary and landscaping within the bid site and the site is relatively flat and would only be prominent from the B9170. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	+/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal is not expected to lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure. ○ Infrastructure requirements may require some alterations to B9170, but these are likely to be relevantly scaled to the site. Further discussion with Roads Development may be required here. ○ Development provides supply of employment land. 	+/?
Population	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development would allow further employment land in the village, which is within 1km of the core of the village and has good cycle and pedestrian links close to the site. However, it is not in close integration to housing areas and may promote more car usage than alternative sites which are closer to residential areas. 	0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. 	0
Cultural Heritage	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development will have a direct effect on the land uses around the Barra Battlefield site. It would be located in the vicinity of an area of fighting and important places associated with the battle (i.e. The Bruce Field and the Comyn Lines). ○ The development may weaken the sense of place, and the identity of the settlement given its distance from the centre. However, the effect is in part lessened by the adjacent land uses and topography. ○ Due to the development impacting on a site of historic and archaeological interest, with the potential for unrecorded archaeology, a programme of archaeological works would be required. 	--/?
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR135 Site Adjacent to Gownor, Oldmeldrum		Proposal: 40 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In terms of air quality, the development is likely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality, particularly in towns where air quality is approaching the EU objective. The housing numbers are unknown, but the development is likely to result in increased traffic flow through Oldmeldrum. 	-/?
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Capacity at Oldmeldrum WWTW is not currently available for this area however an upgrade is due 2022-23. A further growth project may be required to accommodate this development. This is a reversible short/medium-term impact. ○ Invercarnie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity. Local water mains reinforcement may be required depending on outcome of WIA. No issues regarding reservoir capacity. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. 	-/?
Climatic Factors	0/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site is not in a flood risk area. ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel and increased emissions. 	0/-
Soil	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss. 	--
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ The development has potential to maintain or enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed as there is ancient woodland close by with potential to plant a buffer strip adjacent to this. If the site is allocated, the need for such a buffer strip would be stated as part of the development requirements of the site. 	0
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No significant landscape impact, as the site is well contained. ○ Given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, any effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal will lead to pressure on local infrastructure. Notably, a WWTW and there are education constraints as Meldrum Academy will be over capacity by 2022. Road access improvements would also be required. ○ However, consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. The site does not currently connect well with the settlement. 	-/?

Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A poor mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. o However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing in a central location within the town, pedestrian links would be improved. o The population will not be at risk from hazardous developments. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR136 Site Opposite Auquhorthies Croft, Oldmeldrum		Proposal: 6 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	0	Although the proposal would promote the use of the private car it is unlikely that the scale of the proposal would lead to a significant effect on air quality.	0
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The WWTW/WTW capacity is unknown for this area and it is likely that a private sewer is required. If the site is allocated, this will be specified in the Settlement Statement. This is a reversible short-term impact. o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. o The site is adjacent to a watercourse and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, this mitigation would be stated in the development requirements of the opportunity site. 	0/?
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Significant distance from facilities. o Although the proposal would promote the use of the private car it is unlikely that the scale of the proposal would lead to a significant effect on climate or that climatic factors would place the site at risk. 	0
Soil	-	o The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. Prime agricultural land is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss.	-
Biodiversity	0	o Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. If the site is allocated, such mitigation measures will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site.	0

Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced but through sensitive design, landscape impact could be minimised. o However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access, WWTW and education capacity at Meldrum Academy. o Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. However, the road may not be upgradeable to an adoptable standard, which may have a long-term effect. o Quite an isolated site, no pedestrian links to Oldmeldrum and no bus stop close by. 	-/?
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Unlikely to have a significant effect on human health. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

PITMEDDEN AND MILLDALE

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP2 (FR006 and FR007) Land Southwest of Pitmedden		Proposal: 219 homes and new primary school	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A proposal of this scale will lead to a decrease in air quality. Given the nature of the development this is considered to be long-term and permanent. 	-
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Pitmedden WWTW is not available for the whole of the site. This is a reversible short-term impact. Scottish Water will initiate a growth project once development meets the 5 growth criteria. A DIA is required. ○ Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity, but a WIA will be required. Raitshill Pitmedden Service Reservoir has below 18 hours storage capacity and a growth project is planned. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies is medium. This could be mitigated by an appropriate SuDS scheme. 	0
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site is adjacent to an area predicted by SEPA to flood and may have pockets of localised drainage issues. These are known and will be planned around through the provision of appropriate SuDS. It is unlikely to have any impacts on water quality. ○ A proposal of this scale may cause an increase in CO₂ emissions through increased car travel. This would be a medium-term risk. 	0
Soil	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A development of this scale will have a significant impact on soil identified as prime agricultural land. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. Arguments presented by the developer that all because the site is identified as "prime", does not mean it is utilised as such and that it should also impede development. It cannot be argued that a public benefit identified for one site automatically applies to all others. 	--
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal would have a moderately positive effect through conserving and enhancing significant habitats, and maintaining and enhancing habitat connectivity. 	0
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. 	0

		o However, the area is currently very well hidden from surrounding areas and this is unlikely to be an issue. Effects are only likely to be medium-term.	
Material Assets	+	o Proposals of this scale could have a positive effect through provision of affordable housing, waste water infrastructure and creation of the community woodland. Any negative impacts could be mitigated through contributions via developer obligations.	+
Population	?	o Specification is not given for the mix of house types proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. This is not a material concern as the Local Development Plan policies on housing and affordable housing stipulate a mix of tenure with a minimum of 25% of the housing stock being classified as affordable.	+/0
Human Health	-	o The proposal is partly located in a health and safety outer consultation zone for oil/gas pipelines. The impacts from this would be medium-term but could be managed through good design. This would need to be considered within the design process and presented as part of the planning application.	0
Cultural Heritage	?	o There is potential for an adverse impact (A listed, Udny Castle). An existing tree belt should be maintained to protect its setting.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: OP3 (FR108) Mill of Allathan		Proposal: 68 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	o Development is of a scale which may have an effect on air quality.	-
Water	-	o Pitmedden WWTW is not available for the whole of the site. This is a reversible short-term impact. Scottish Water will initiate a growth project once development meets the 5 growth criteria. A DIA is required. o Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity, but a WIA will be required. Raitshill Pitmedden Service Reservoir has below 18 hours storage capacity and a growth project is planned. This is a reversible short-term impact. o Subject to avoidance of the riparian area and associated flood risk area there would be no effect on water quality o There is potential for contamination from the nearby landfill but effective remediation would lead to a potentially positive effect. Overall, the impact is likely to be neutral.	0
Climatic Factors	0	o Subject to avoidance of flood risk, the proposal is unlikely to have any impact on or be at risk from climatic factors.	0
Soil	-	o The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land. Again, potential for contamination to be removed but overall still a negative effect. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term.	-

Biodiversity	+	o Mitigation measures could reduce potential negative impacts and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. Such measures would be in accordance with the Parks and Open Space Strategy.	0
Landscape	-	o There could be minor impacts on the immediate landscape setting of Ptimedden as the development would be on a prominent slope above the settlement. The proposal would have some detrimental effects on the landscape character albeit at a small scale. Negative landscape impacts could potentially be mitigated through strategic planting.	0
Material Assets	0	o Other than secondary school capacity, the proposal would have largely neutral impacts.	0
Population	+/0	o The development would have no significant effect on population other than providing a mix of housing. This would be a requirement at planning permission stage in order to comply with the LDP policies.	+/0
Human Health	0	o It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. The site is located within HSE's outer pipeline consultation zone.	-
Cultural Heritage	0	o Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: OP4 (FR015) Land at Cloisterseat		Proposal: 10 homes and 0.8ha of employment land	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	o Individual developments of this scale are unlikely to have any effect on air quality.	0
Water	0	o The proposal is unlikely to have any significant effect on water quality as it will be connected to a public sewer and will not exceed sewage treatment capacity, and it does not propose private water abstraction.	0
Climatic Factors	0	o The site is not within an identified flood risk area. o A proposal on this scale is unlikely to have any effect on CO ₂ emissions. o Use of biomass for district heating will have a positive effect on neutralising CO ₂ emissions.	0
Soil	0	o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. o The proposal is not on prime agricultural land or carbon rich land.	0
Biodiversity	0	o The development is of a scale or in a location which is unlikely to negatively affect a nature conservation site or wider biodiversity.	0
Landscape	0	o The proposal is of a scale or in a location which is unlikely to have any effect on landscape quality and any adverse impacts could be mitigated through design.	0

Material Assets	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal will make a small contribution to sustaining Pitmedden Primary School. ○ The proposal includes woodland expansion and/or creation. 	+
Population	+/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The mix of house types proposed will result in housing choice for all groups of the population. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Development of the site is unlikely to have any significant effect on existing pathways or access to open space. ○ The population is not at risk from hazardous developments. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: FR008 Land allocated for Hall OP1 South West of Pitmedden		Proposal: 5 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A proposal of this scale is unlikely to impact on air quality. 	0
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The WWTW is not available for the whole of the area. This is a reversible short-term impact. 	-
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site is adjacent to an area predicted by SEPA to flood. This will be planned through the provision of appropriate SUDS. It is unlikely to have any impact on water quality. A Flood Risk Assessment could identify mitigation measures. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This development is unlikely to have an impact on soils other than short-term and temporary impacts at the construction phase. 	0
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal has modest improvements to existing biodiversity. 	0
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ However, the site is currently within the urban area and this is unlikely to be an issue. Effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Proposals of this scale have no material benefits for the community. ○ The loss of a site for the public hall represents a significant disadvantage for this proposal. 	-

Population	?	o Specification is not given for the mix of house types proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, planning permission would be granted in accordance with the LDP policies therefore providing a sustainable mixed development with a minimum of 25% affordable housing.	+/0
Human Health	0	o There are no impacts on human health.	0
Cultural Heritage	0	o The proposal is unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR094 Land for housing at Norse Yard, Pitmedden		Proposal: 10-15 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	0	o In terms of air quality, the development is unlikely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality. o For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	0	o The WWTW/WTW has capacity for this area. o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. o The watercourse that runs past the development and feeds into a watercourse where the quality of water at Bronie Burn is poor. o The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody; the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to the public sewage infrastructure. With the information on the quality of water around the site, the effects could be significant in the longer term.	0
Climatic Factors	0/-	o There would be minimal CO ₂ emissions from general heating and travel. o The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. o The development is in an area that is partially identified at fluvial water flood risk and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment.	0/-
Soil	+	o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. o The proposed development could result in remediation of contaminated soil.	+

Biodiversity	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation, but as it is surrounded by mature trees, this could disturb species that use the site as a habitat. However, almost half of the site is in use for storage, so the impact is likely to be low. ○ The development's open space proposes SuDS next to the watercourse, which could enhance the diversity of species and habitats, and the natural heritage of the area. ○ The development is not likely to maintain or enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. 	+
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In light of the scale and location of the proposal, it would have a negative impact on the landscape character and the effect is likely to be long-term. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change within this sensitive landscape. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure. ○ Proposes the removal of employment land. 	0
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, the LDP policy requires a mix of house types. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The adjacent core paths will not be affected. ○ Any contaminated soil would be removed. 	0
Cultural Heritage	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development will have long-term and permanent negative effects on the setting of Pitmedden's gardens and designed landscape. The development may weaken the sense of place, and the identity of Pitmedden, by infilling development between the walled garden and the B999. With the exception of the existing warehouse on the bid site, land between the walled garden and the B999 is generally uninterrupted from Pitmedden to the crossroads. ○ The proposal may have a potential impact on views from the Great Garden, which could affect the setting for both the A listed building and the designed landscape. ○ Invariably, the allocation will adversely affect the built features, their context, pattern of past historic use, and the setting in which they sit, in landscapes, and also in Pitmedden and adjacent development. ○ New developments that deviate from existing designs, layouts and materials could adversely affect the setting of historic settlements in the long-term. 	-
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR095 Land for Mixed use at Norse Yard, Pitmedden		Proposal: 12 homes and commercial land	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments	Effect - post mitigation
		<p>Effects should be assessed in terms of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In terms of air quality, the development is unlikely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality. ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The WWTW/WTW has capacity for this area. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The watercourse that runs past the development and feeds into a watercourse where the quality of water at Bronie Burn is poor. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody; the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to the public sewage infrastructure. ○ With the information on the quality of water around the site, the effects could be significant in the longer term. 	0
Climatic Factors	0/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There would be minimal CO₂ emissions from general heating and travel. ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. ○ The development is in an area that is partially identified at fluvial water flood risk and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment. 	0/-
Soil	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development could result in remediation of contaminated soil. 	+
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation, but as it is surrounded by mature trees, this could disturb species that use the site as a habitat. However, almost half of the site is in use for storage, so the impact is likely to be low. ○ The development's open space proposes SuDS next to the watercourse, which could enhance the diversity of species and habitats, and the natural heritage of the area. ○ The development is not likely to maintain or enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. 	0
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In light of the scale and location of the proposal, it could have a negative impact on the landscape character and the effect is likely to be medium-term. 	0

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change within this sensitive landscape. o However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	
Material Assets	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure. 	0
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. o The development would allow integration of people; where they live and work. Employment opportunity in the village. o This can be mitigated through Local Development Plan policies that ensure that developments are made up of mixed sustainable communities with a minimum of 25% affordable housing 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The adjacent core paths will not be affected. o Any contaminated soil would be removed. 	0
Cultural Heritage	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development will have long-term and permanent negative effects on the setting of Pitmedden's gardens and designed landscape. The development may weaken the sense of place, and the identity of Pitmedden, by infilling development between the walled garden and the B999. With the exception of the existing warehouse on the bid site, land between the walled garden and the B999 is generally uninterrupted from Pitmedden to the crossroads. o The proposal may have a potential impact on views from the Great Garden, which could affect the setting for both the A listed building and the designed landscape. o Invariably the allocation will adversely affect the built features, their context, pattern of past historic use, and the setting in which they sit, in landscapes, and also in Pitmedden and adjacent development. o New developments that deviate from existing designs, layouts and materials could adversely affect the setting of historic settlements in the long-term. 	-
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR096 Land at West and North West Pitmedden		Proposal: Erection of 90 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o In terms of air quality, the development is unlikely likely to have a long-term negative effect on air quality. o For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Pitmedden WWTW is not available for the whole of the site. This is a reversible short-term impact. Scottish Water will initiate a growth project once development meets the 5 growth criteria. A DIA is required. 	0

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity, but a WIA will be required. Raitshill Pitmedden Service Reservoir has below 18 hours storage capacity and a growth project is planned. This is a reversible short-term impact. o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. o The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody; the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to the public sewage infrastructure. 	
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel distances to services) and increased emissions. o This impact could potentially be mitigated through improved public transport. 	0
Soil	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. o The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. 	-
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development is likely to maintain or enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed. o Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. 	0
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. o The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. o However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. o Significant scale development that would further alter the character of the area. The impact could be mitigated by strategic landscaping. 	0
Material Assets	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Unlikely to have a notable impact. o The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. These include social infrastructure (schools, housing, healthcare facilities); previously developed land; minerals and aggregates (quarries); transport infrastructure (road, rail, paths, pipelines and bridges); water-delivery infrastructure; sewerage infrastructure; energy infrastructure (power stations, pylons, power cables, wind turbines and pipelines); natural environment (woodland, arable land, forests and agricultural land); tourism and recreation (caravan parks and camping sites); telecommunication infrastructure (telephone, masts, satellite television and broadband); waste management infrastructure (waste collection, transfer stations and composting facilities). 	0
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A mix of house types is proposed resulting in a choice for all groups of the population. 	+
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No impacts of note. o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	0

Cultural Heritage	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development will have long-term and permanent negative effects on the site/setting of scheduled monuments; and/or listed buildings; and/or gardens and designed landscapes and/or archaeological sites. The development may weaken the sense of place, and the identity of existing settlements. ○ The proposal may have a potential impact on views from the Great Garden, which could affect the setting for both the A listed building and the designed landscape. ○ Invariably, the allocation will adversely affect the built features, their context, pattern of past historic use, and the setting in which they sit, in landscapes and within the soil (archaeology), and also in our towns, villages and streets. ○ New developments that deviate from existing designs, layouts and materials could adversely affect the setting of historic settlements in the long-term. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR107 Milldale, Pitmedden		Proposal: 9 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	○ Individual developments of this scale are unlikely to have any effect on air quality.	0
Water	0	○ The proposal is unlikely to have any significant negative effects on water quality as it will be connected to a public sewer and will not exceed sewage treatment capacity and it does not propose private water abstraction.	0
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site is not within an identified flood risk area. ○ A proposal on this scale is unlikely to have any effect on CO₂ emissions. 	0
Soil	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ Part of the site is within prime agricultural land. However, the loss would not have any negative impact on the wider area. It will result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. 	-
Biodiversity	-/?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development is of a scale or in a location which is unlikely to negatively affect a nature conservation site or wider biodiversity. ○ There is, however, a risk associated with woodland and habitats/wildlife, which needs to be considered at the detailed planning stage. ○ These impacts could be mitigated through good design including green corridors, that will enhance biodiversity. 	+
Landscape	0	○ The proposal is of a scale, and in a location, that is unlikely to have any effect on landscape quality.	0

Material Assets	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal will make a small contribution to sustaining Pitmedden Primary School. ○ The proposal includes woodland expansion and/or creation. 	+
Population	+/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The mix of house types proposed will result in housing choice for all groups of the population. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Development of this site is unlikely to have any significant effects on existing pathways or access to open space. ○ The population is not at risk from hazardous developments. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR132 Quarry Field Site, Land at Mill of Allathan Farm, Udney		Proposal: 24 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Development is of a scale which individually is unlikely to have any effect on air quality. 	0
Water	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is potential for contamination from the nearby landfill, but effective remediation would lead to a potential positive effect. Overall, the effect is likely to be neutral. The WTW has capacity and is available for this area. WWTW is not currently available. 	0
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Subject to avoidance of flood risk, the proposal is unlikely to have any impact on or be at risk from climatic factors. 	0
Soil	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development will result in the loss of prime agricultural land, but there is the potential for contamination to be removed. However, overall, still a negative effect. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. 	-
Biodiversity	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is unlikely to be any significant impact on biodiversity. The development would be required to provide open space in accordance with the Parks and Open space strategy which could enhance biodiversity by providing green corridors, for example. 	+
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There could be minor impacts on the immediate landscape setting of Pitmedden as the development would be on a prominent slope, seen on the approach, and would have some detrimental effects on the landscape character. 	-
Material Assets	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Other than secondary school capacity the proposal would have a largely neutral effect. 	0
Population	+/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development would have no significant effect on population other than providing a mix of housing, including affordable housing in accordance with the LDP policy. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. 	0

Cultural Heritage	0	o Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR133 Quarry Road Site, Land at Mill of Allathan Farm, Udry		Proposal: Employment (Private Business and offices)	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	o For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. The scale of development is small and could result in more people using non-motorised transport to access the site.	0
Water	0	o There is unlikely to be a significant effect on the water environment.	0
Climatic Factors	0	o The development could contribute towards, create or be put at risk by climatic factors. The development is in an area identified at flood risk and is likely to have a long-term effect on climate and the water environment.	0
Soil	0	o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	0	o The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat.	0
Landscape	-	o The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The site is prominent and making it suitable for employment land may have a negative effect on the setting of Pitmedden. This could be partially mitigated through screening.	0
Material Assets	0	o The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure.	0
Population	0	o The development would allow integration of people; where they live and work. Employment opportunity in the village.	0
Human Health	0	o Unlikely to have a significant effect on human health.	0
Cultural Heritage	0	o Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

POTTERTON

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP1 (FR140 and FR141A) Land North of Denview Road		Proposal: 172 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is insufficient capacity at Balmedie WWTW. A potential growth project is currently under investigation for Balmedie WWTW and this will consider Potterton. This is a reversible short-term impact. Network investigations may be required by new developments in Potterton. A growth project will be initiated once development meets Scottish Water's five growth criteria. ○ Invercannie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment may be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody; the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to the public sewage infrastructure. 	0
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. 	-/0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. 	0
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. ○ The site is found in the greenbelt. 	0

Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely Balmedie Primary School which will have a long-term or temporary affect. ○ Access relies on a C class road. ○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure. ○ The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. These include social infrastructure (schools, housing, healthcare facilities); previously developed land; minerals and aggregates (quarries); transport infrastructure (road, rail, paths, pipelines and bridges); water-delivery infrastructure; sewerage infrastructure; energy infrastructure (power stations, pylons, power cables, wind turbines and pipelines); natural environment (woodland, arable land, forests and agricultural land); tourism and recreation (caravan parks and camping sites); telecommunication infrastructure (telephone, masts, satellite television and broadband); waste management infrastructure (waste collection, transfer stations and composting facilities). 	0
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The mix of house types proposed would result in a housing choice for all groups of the population. 	+
Human Health	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	0
Cultural Heritage	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. ○ Invariably, the allocation will adversely affect the built features, their context, pattern of past historic use, and the setting in which they sit, in landscapes and within the soil (archaeology), and also in our towns, villages and streets. ○ New developments that deviate from existing designs, layouts and materials could adversely affect the setting of historic settlements in the long-term. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: OP2 (FR141B) Land Northwest of Denview Road		Proposal: 61 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0

Water	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is insufficient capacity at Balmedie WWTW. A potential growth project is currently under investigation for Balmedie WWTW and this will consider Potterton. This is a reversible short-term impact. Network investigations may be required by new developments in Potterton. A growth project will be initiated once development meets Scottish Water's five growth criteria. ○ Invercarnie, Mannofield and Turrieff WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment may be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody; the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to the public sewage infrastructure. 	0
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, its scale lessens this impact. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. 	0
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. ○ The site is found in the green belt. 	0
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely Balmedie Primary School which will have a temporary affect. ○ Access relies on a C class road ○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure. 	0
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The mix of house types proposed would result in a housing choice for all groups of the population. 	+
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. ○ Invariably, the allocation will adversely affect the built features, their context, pattern of past historic use, and the setting in which they sit, in landscapes and within the soil (archaeology), and also in our towns, villages and streets. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: FR037 A & B Land at Gourdieburn, Potterton		Proposal: 135 homes over 2 areas (FR037A 45 homes and FR037B 90 homes)	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is insufficient capacity at Balmedie WWTW. A potential growth project is currently under investigation for Balmedie WWTW and this will consider Potterton. This is a reversible short-term impact. Network investigations may be required by new developments in Potterton. A growth project will be initiated once development meets Scottish Water's five growth criteria. ○ Invercannie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment may be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ SuDS would mitigate any flooding impacts. 	0
Climatic Factors	-/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. These negative impacts could be mitigated by the promotion of sustainable transport modes and public transport. ○ The site is in an area identified as low/medium risk of flooding, but impacts are likely to be localised. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	0/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development may result in the small-scale loss of existing trees, woodland and hedges. ○ The development will enhance biodiversity through SuDS and public open space provision in accordance with the Aberdeenshire Council Parks and Open Space Strategy. 	+/0
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. These include infrastructure and community facilities. Where a need is identified, this negative impact could be mitigated through developer obligations. ○ Affordable housing will be provided in accordance with the LDP policy and the development will need to be a mixture of sustainable housing. 	+

Population	-	o No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. Any new developments will be required to accord with the LDP policy, and therefore providing a mixed sustainable community with a minimum of 25% affordable housing.	+
Human Health	+	o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. o Proposes new public open space in accordance with the Parks and Open Space Strategy hierarchy.	+
Cultural Heritage	0	o Invariably, the allocation will adversely affect the built features, their context, pattern of past historic use, and the setting in which they sit, in landscapes and within the soil (archaeology), and also in our towns, villages and streets. o New developments that deviate from existing designs, layouts and materials could adversely affect the setting of historic settlements in the long-term.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR104 Land South of Laingseat Road, Potterton		Proposal: 100 Homes and Community Centre	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	o For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	0	o There is insufficient capacity at Balmedie WWTW. A potential growth project is currently under investigation for Balmedie WWTW and this will consider Potterton. This is a reversible short-term impact. Network investigations may be required by new developments in Potterton. A growth project will be initiated once development meets Scottish Water's five growth criteria. o Invercannie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment may be required. o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	0
Climatic Factors	-	o The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, the site is well connected to the settlement and an improved public transport service could help to mitigate this impact.	-
Soil	0	o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction	0
Biodiversity	-	o Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA and Sands of Forvie SAC are set to the north. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying sites and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species. The development would have an effect indirectly through recreation pressures, land take for development, drainage and impact on geese grazing areas.	0

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ However, planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. Recreational access to the site is actively managed. by the RSPB. SNH advise that there should be no additional pressures from visitors where facilities and visitor management plans are in place. No significant issues from increased public access is foreseen. No significant loss of land for geese foraging or roosting is anticipated. ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ The development would be able to conserve, protect and enhance the diversity of species and habitats, and the natural heritage of the area. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. 	
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access and education provision at Balmedie Primary School, which will have a short-term effect. ○ The proposal will lead to significant pressure on local infrastructure. ○ The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. These include infrastructure and community facilities. Any shortfall in such provision created as a result of the development could be mitigated through developer obligations. 	-
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A mix of house types proposed would result in a housing choice for all groups of the population. 	+
Human Health	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	+
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. ○ New developments that deviate from existing designs, layouts and materials could adversely affect the setting of historic settlements in the long-term. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR105 Land East of Manse Road, Potterton		Proposal: 100 homes, employment uses and school site	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is insufficient capacity at Balmedie WWTW. A potential growth project is currently under investigation for Balmedie WWTW and this will consider Potterton. This is a reversible short-term impact. Network investigations may be required by new developments in Potterton. A growth project will be initiated once development meets Scottish Water's five growth criteria. ○ Invercarnie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment may be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody; the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to the public sewage infrastructure. ○ Some surface water flooding on the site. This can be mitigated by appropriate SuDS. 	0
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. These adverse impacts could be mitigated through the promotion of sustainable transport modes and improved public transport services. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA and Sands of Forvie SAC are set to the north. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying sites and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species. The development would have an effect indirectly through recreation pressures, land take for development, and impact on geese grazing areas. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. Recreational access to the site is actively managed by the RSPB. ○ The development is not likely to maintain or enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to an area of woodland or watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. 	0
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. ○ The site is isolated and prominent within the landscape. Careful landscaping would provide mitigation in the long-term 	-

		o The site is in the green belt.	
Material Assets	-	o There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely education provision at Balmedie Primary School, and the road access which is inadequate for a development of this scale, however, these constraints could be overcome.	0
Population	+	o The development would allow integration of people; where they meet and work. Employment opportunity in the village. o The proposal would provide a mix of house types providing housing choice for all groups of the population.	+
Human Health	0	o It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	-	o The development may weaken the sense of place and the identity of existing settlements. o Invariably, the allocation will adversely affect the built features, their context, pattern of past historic use, and the setting in which they sit, in landscapes and within the soil (archaeology), and also in our towns, villages and streets.	-
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR106 Land East of B999 and North of Potterton, Potterton		Proposal: 100 homes and Business Units	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	o For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	-	o There is insufficient capacity at Balmedie WWTW. A potential growth project is currently under investigation for Balmedie WWTW and this will consider Potterton. This is a reversible short-term impact. Network investigations may be required by new developments in Potterton. A growth project will be initiated once development meets Scottish Water's five growth criteria. o Invercarnie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment may be required. o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. These are impacts that can be mitigated in the longer term.	0
Climatic Factors	-	o The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. o These impacts could be mitigated through the promotion of sustainable transport modes and improved public transport services.	0

Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA and Sands of Forvie SAC are set to the north. This site is at a very close proximity to the qualifying sites and likely to have an impact on the qualifying species. The development would have an effect indirectly through recreation pressures, land take for development, and impact on geese grazing areas. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. Recreational access to the site is actively managed by the RSPB. ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ Biodiversity could be enhanced through the provision of good quality open spaces including natural greenspaces and green corridors. 	0
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. ○ This can be considered a fairly significant scale development that would further alter the character of the area. The site is relatively prominent and would alter the landscape on the approach from the north. The impact could be mitigated by strategic landscaping. 	0
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely education provision at Balmedie School. This could be overcome in the longer term. ○ The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. These include infrastructure and community facilities, and where a shortfall is identified, as a result of the development, these impacts could be mitigated through developer obligations. 	0
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development would allow integration of people; where they meet and work. Employment opportunity in the village. ○ The proposal would provide a mix of house types providing housing choice for all groups of the population. 	+
Human Health	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	+
Cultural Heritage	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. ○ Invariably, the allocation will adversely affect the built features, their context, pattern of past historic use, and the setting in which they sit, in landscapes and within the soil (archaeology), and also in our towns, villages and streets. ○ New developments that deviate from existing designs, layouts and materials could adversely affect the setting of historic settlements in the long-term. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR120 Land North and South of Gourdie Park Site A, Potterton		Proposal: 435 homes, 750sq meters of Retail Space and land for education / community facilities	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A proposal of this scale will lead to a decrease in air quality, with the effects taking place over a medium to long-term period. ○ The inclusion of retail floor space will create small-scale employment opportunities in the vicinity. Due to the scale it is unlikely this will have a significant impact on air quality (through providing local amenity and employment). ○ A site of this scale is likely to take a number of years to develop – with the bid form stating the site is not likely to be complete for 10+ years. The construction is likely to have a negative impact on air quality over a medium to long-term period, although this would partially abate upon completion of development. 	0
Water	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is insufficient capacity at Balmedie WWTW. A potential growth project is currently under investigation for Balmedie WWTW and this will consider Potterton. This is a reversible short-term impact. Network investigations may be required by new developments in Potterton. A growth project will be initiated once development meets Scottish Water's five growth criteria. ○ Invercarnie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment may be required. ○ The proposal makes provision for suitable buffer strips adjacent to Blackdog Burn along the west of the site, which will mitigate the risk of long-term contamination of the water environment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. 	0
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There would be minimal CO₂ emissions from general heating. ○ The proposal is generally well sited in terms of active travel opportunities, with many amenities and facilities (including bus stops) within 400m – reducing reliance on private modes of transport and reducing CO₂ emissions. ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances for employment, via private transport) and increased emissions. ○ The development site lies out with the known flood extent, and dependent upon the provision of a suitable SuDS scheme would have a neutral impact on flooding. ○ The bid seeks to include renewables in the form of 'technology available at the time of construction' to create an efficient development. The impact of this remains uncertain as the scheme is unknown at this stage. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	+/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA and Sands of Forvie are set to the northeast. The site is at a relatively close proximity to the qualifying sites and would have an effect indirectly through drainage. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. ○ The development will result in the loss of hedges. 	+

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to a watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. ○ Additional measures to enhance biodiversity have been proposed including bat/bird/insect boxes, native tree planting, wildflower verges and nectar rich species, which would enhance the biodiversity of the area. 	
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In light of the scale and location of the proposal, it would have a localised negative impact on the landscape character and the effect is likely to be long-term. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. 	-
Material Assets	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access and education provision at Balmedie Primary School, which will have a temporary effect. ○ The development makes provision of land for a primary school; however, no discussions have taken place with the Education Service to confirm interest in the site. If identified as a suitable site by the Education Service and delivered this would have a significant positive effect, however due to uncertainty the effect is taken as unknown. ○ The development seeks to realign the B999, with a roundabout provided on the northern site – this is likely to have a short to medium-term negative impact on traffic flows, dependent upon the timescale for delivery. Upon delivery this is likely to have an impact upon traffic patterns, however it is not possible to determine whether this is positive or negative at this stage. ○ The development site contains areas for community facilities, further details are not available. If this addresses a community aspiration or need, this would prove to be a positive long-term effect. ○ The development makes provision for 25% affordable units (or other amount as required by policy) – this would equate to 108 units. This would provide a significant long-term benefit. 	+
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development would provide a range of house types and tenures, suitable for a range of populations. This would have a long-term positive impact on the community. ○ The development would allow integration of people; where they meet and work. Employment opportunity in the village. This would have a long-term positive impact on the community. 	+
Human Health	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. ○ The development would incorporate 40% public open space, providing suitable access for residents of the development. Pathways would link the development to the rest of the settlement, increasing public open space provision – this would have a long-term positive impact on human health. ○ The development is likely to cause a reduction in air quality during construction and due to increased traffic movements post-construction, this is likely to have a long-term negative impact on human health. ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing, which shall have a long-term positive impact. 	+
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect		

0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect

Site Ref: FR121 Land North of Gourdie Park (Site B), Potterton		Proposal: 109 homes, 750sq meters of Retail Space and land for education / community facilities	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A proposal of this scale will lead to a decrease in air quality, with the effects taking place over a medium to long-term period. ○ The inclusion of retail floor space will create small-scale employment opportunities in the vicinity, due to the scale it is unlikely this will have a significant impact on air quality (through providing local amenity and employment). ○ A site of this scale is likely to take a number of years to develop – with the bid form stating the site is not likely to be complete for 5+ years. The construction is likely to have a negative impact on air quality over a medium to long-term period, although this would partially abate upon completion of development. 	0
Water	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is insufficient capacity at Balmedie WWTW. A potential growth project is currently under investigation for Balmedie WWTW and this will consider Potterton. This is a reversible short-term impact. Network investigations may be required by new developments in Potterton. A growth project will be initiated once development meets Scottish Water’s five growth criteria. ○ Invercarnie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment may be required. ○ The proposal makes provision for suitable buffer strips adjacent to Blackdog Burn along the west of the site, which will mitigate the risk of long-term contamination of the water environment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. 	0
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There would be minimal CO₂ emissions from general heating. ○ The proposal is generally well sited in terms of active travel opportunities, with many amenities and facilities (including bus stops) within 400m – reducing reliance on private modes of transport and reducing CO₂ emissions. ○ The development site lies out with the known flood extent, and dependent upon the provision of a suitable SuDS scheme would have a neutral impact on flooding. ○ The bid seeks to include renewables in the form of ‘technology available at the time of construction’ to create an efficient development. The impact of this remains uncertain as the scheme is unknown at this stage. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	+/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA and Sands of Forvie are set to the northeast. The site is at a relatively close proximity to the qualifying sites and would have an effect indirectly through drainage. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. ○ The development will result in the loss of hedges. 	+

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to a watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. ○ Additional measures to enhance biodiversity have been proposed including bat/bird/insect boxes, native tree planting, wildflower verges and nectar rich species, which would enhance the biodiversity of the area. 	
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In light of the scale and location of the proposal, it would have a localised negative impact on the landscape character and the effect is likely to be long-term. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. 	-
Material Assets	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access and education provision at Balmedie Primary School, which will have a temporary effect. ○ The development makes provision of land for a primary school; however, no discussions have taken place with the Education Service to confirm interest in the site. If identified as a suitable site by the Education Service and delivered this would have a significant positive effect, however due to uncertainty the effect is taken as unknown. ○ The development seeks to realign the B999, with a roundabout provided on the northern site – this is likely to have a short to medium-term negative impact on traffic flows, dependent upon the timescale for delivery. Upon delivery this is likely to have an impact upon traffic patterns, however it is not possible to determine whether this is positive or negative at this stage. ○ The development site contains areas for community facilities, further details are not available. If this addresses a community aspiration or need, this would prove to be a positive long-term effect. ○ The development makes provision for 25% affordable units (or other amount as required by policy) – this would equate to 108 units. This would provide a significant long-term benefit. 	+
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development would provide a range of house types and tenures, suitable for a range of populations. This would have a long-term positive impact on the community. ○ The development would allow integration of people; where they meet and work. Employment opportunity in the village. This would have a long-term positive impact on the community. 	+
Human Health	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. ○ The development would incorporate 40% public open space, providing suitable access for residents of the development. Pathways would link the development to the rest of the settlement, increasing public open space provision – this would have a long-term positive impact on human health. ○ The development is likely to cause a reduction in air quality during construction and due to increased traffic movements post-construction, this is likely to have a long-term negative impact on human health. ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing, which shall have a long-term positive impact. 	+
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect		

0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect

Site Ref: FR122 Land North of Gourdie Park (Site C), Potterton		Proposal: 185 Homes, 750sq metres of Retail Space and land for education/community facilities	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A proposal of this scale will lead to a decrease in air quality, with the effects taking place over a medium to long-term period. ○ The inclusion of retail floor space will create small-scale employment opportunities in the vicinity, due to the scale it is unlikely this will have a significant impact on air quality (through providing local amenity and employment). ○ A site of this scale is likely to take a number of years to develop – with the bid form stating the site is not likely to be complete for 5+ years. The construction is likely to have a negative impact on air quality over a medium to long-term period, although this would partially abate upon completion of development. 	0
Water	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is insufficient capacity at Balmedie WWTW. A potential growth project is currently under investigation for Balmedie WWTW and this will consider Potterton. This is a reversible short-term impact. Network investigations may be required by new developments in Potterton. A growth project will be initiated once development meets Scottish Water’s five growth criteria. ○ Invercannie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment may be required. ○ The proposal makes provision for suitable buffer strips adjacent to Blackdog Burn along the west of the site, which will mitigate the risk of long-term contamination of the water environment. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. 	0
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There would be minimal CO₂ emissions from general heating. ○ The proposal is generally well sited in terms of active travel opportunities, with many amenities and facilities (including bus stops) within 400m – reducing reliance on private modes of transport and reducing CO₂ emissions. ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances for employment, via private transport) and increased emissions. ○ The development site lies out with the known flood extent, and dependent upon the provision of a suitable SuDS scheme would have a neutral impact on flooding. ○ The bid seeks to include renewables in the form of ‘technology available at the time of construction’ to create an efficient development. The impact of this remains uncertain as the scheme is unknown at this stage. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	+/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA and Sands of Forvie are set to the northeast. The site is at a relatively close proximity to the qualifying sites and would have an effect indirectly through drainage. 	+

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development will result in the loss of hedges. ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to a watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. ○ Additional measures to enhance biodiversity have been proposed including bat/bird/insect boxes, native tree planting, wildflower verges and nectar rich species, which would enhance the biodiversity of the area. 	
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In light of the scale and location of the proposal, it would have a localised negative impact on the landscape character and the effect is likely to be long-term. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. 	-
Material Assets	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access and education provision at Balmedie Primary School, which will have a temporary effect. ○ The development makes provision of land for a primary school; however, no discussions have taken place with the Education Service to confirm interest in the site. If identified as a suitable site by the Education Service and delivered this would have a significant positive effect, however due to uncertainty the effect is taken as unknown. ○ The development seeks to realign the B999, with a roundabout provided on the northern site – this is likely to have a short to medium-term negative impact on traffic flows, dependent upon the timescale for delivery. Upon delivery this is likely to have an impact upon traffic patterns, however it is not possible to determine whether this is positive or negative at this stage. ○ The development site contains areas for community facilities, further details are not available. If this addresses a community aspiration or need, this would prove to be a positive long-term effect. ○ The development makes provision for 25% affordable units (or other amount as required by policy) – this would equate to 108 units. This would provide a significant long-term benefit. 	+
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development would provide a range of house types and tenures, suitable for a range of populations. This would have a long-term positive impact on the community. ○ The development would allow integration of people; where they meet and work. Employment opportunity in the village. This would have a long-term positive impact on the community. 	+
Human Health	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. ○ The development would incorporate 40% public open space, providing suitable access for residents of the development. Pathways would link the development to the rest of the settlement, increasing public open space provision – this would have a long-term positive impact on human health. ○ The development is likely to cause a reduction in air quality during construction and due to increased traffic movements post-construction, this is likely to have a long-term negative impact on human health. ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing, which shall have a long-term positive impact. 	+
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect			

Key	- = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect	
------------	---	--

Site Ref: FR123 Land at Wester Hatton, East of Potterton		Proposal: Roadside services including hotel, convenience retail provision and future business uses.	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	-	o A proposal of this scale will lead to a significant decrease in air quality (i.e. through increases in concentrations of air pollutants) if it is for industrial use, i.e. energy generation from biomass or waste. Effects are likely to be medium/long-term.	-
Water	--	o The proposal is likely to have a significant negative effect as it will exceed public sewage treatment capacity in the area. Effects are likely to be localised and long-term, however the negative impacts could be mitigated through developer obligations and a Scottish Water growth project.	0
Climatic Factors	-	o The site is within an area identified as low flood risk. Impacts are likely to be localised and medium/long-term. o A proposal on this scale has potential to cause an increase in concentrations of CO ₂ emissions through increased car travel. Effects are likely to be medium-term.	-
Soil	0	o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	+	o The proposal will have a positive effect if it proposes to maintain and enhance existing habitat connectivity (i.e. green networks) and/or create new connections.	+
Landscape	0	o The proposal is of a scale or in a location which is unlikely to have any effect on landscape quality.	0
Material Assets	+	o The proposal could have a positive effect through provision of transportation infrastructure. o The proposal will have negative effects on existing infrastructure as it is of a scale which increases the pressure on the sewage network. o The proposal will have a positive effect as it is located in vacant or derelict land and will contribute to its redevelopment.	+
Population	0	o There would be no impact on populations.	0
Human Health	0	o Development of the site is unlikely to have any significant effect on existing pathways or access to open space. o The population is not at risk from hazardous developments.	0
Cultural Heritage	0	o There is potential for an adverse impact on Scheduled monument The Temple Stones, stone circle northeast of Potterton House. An assessment on its setting will be required as part of an EIA.	--/?
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

RASHIERIEVE FOVERAN

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP1 (FR129) Land west of Rashierieve Cottages		Proposal: 8 live/work residential units	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments	Effect – post mitigation
		<p>Effects should be assessed in terms of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ An individual development of this scale is unlikely to have any effect on air quality. 	0
Water	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is no public Waste Water Treatment Works in Rashierieve. The nearest public treatment is in Foveran (1.5km away), where a growth project has been initiated. If any new development wishes to use private treatment SEPA will need to be consulted and full authorisation and relevant licensing sought. The preference would be for a single adoptable WWTW serving the OP1 site with the capacity for SR1 to connect at a future date. 	0
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development size and location mean it is unlikely to have any significant effect either on or from climatic factors. 	0
Soil	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. 	-
Biodiversity	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of the site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity and the improvement to the riparian area could have minor beneficial effects on biodiversity. 	+
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced but given the low sensitivity of the landscape this is not considered to be significant. 	0
Material Assets	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure. 	0
Population	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal is specific but could provide employment opportunities, overall the location of the site would neither lead to significant effects on local populations either positively or negatively. 	0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There would be no material change to human health. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative Sites

None.

ROTHIENORMAN

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP1 (FR026) Site to west of Blackford Avenue		Proposal: 12 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is available capacity at Rothienorman WWTW. Potential growth project under investigation. DIA required. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Whilst the proposed development is in close proximity to a watercourse, there would be no impacts arising as a result. 	0
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is unlikely to have any significant climatic effects. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ However, the site is a logical extension to the settlement in terms of proximity to services and meeting housing needs. 	0
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ The development is not likely to conserve, protect and enhance the diversity of species and habitats, and the natural heritage of the area. ○ The development proposes biodiversity enhancements. 	0
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, any effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	+/?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely WWTW and education provision at Rothienorman Primary School and Meldrum Academy which will have a temporary effect and is subject to consultation with relevant infrastructure providers to identify mitigation measures. If allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. 	+/-
Population	+/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A good mix of house types is proposed resulting in housing choice for all groups of the population. ○ 100% affordable housing proposal. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ The development promotes active travel opportunities. 	0

Cultural Heritage	0	o Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: OP2 (FR056) Site West of Forgue Road		Proposal: 1.5 ha Employment Land	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development of employment land is likely to worsen air quality, if that development is for heavy and chemical processing. o Biomass/quarrying, etc, could worsen air quality in the area. o For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects, but this is unknown. 	0/?
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Rothienorman WWTW has capacity for this area. The demand for water and wastewater capacity will depend on the business use. Early engagement with Scottish Water is encouraged. o The development of employment land could worsen air quality depending on developments coming forward. The impact would be controlled through development management procedures. 	0/?
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, site water budgets, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development of a greenfield site is likely to have long-term irreversible adverse impacts on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. o However, biodiversity enhancements are proposed by the development. 	0
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. o The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. o However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. o Consultation with relevant infrastructure provider for WWTW will be required to identify mitigation measures. 	+
Population	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development would allow integration of people; where they live and work. Employment opportunity in the village. 	0

Human Health	0	o The development would not result in the loss of open space/core paths.	0
Cultural Heritage	0	o The development of the site is unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative sites

Site Ref: FR033 Adjacent to Blackford Avenue, Rothienorman		Proposal: 40 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	o A proposal of this scale is unlikely to have any effect on air quality. o For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	--	o There is available capacity at Rothienorman WWTW. Potential growth project under investigation. DIA required. This is a reversible short-term impact. o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. o The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody; the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to the public sewage infrastructure. o The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (ground, coastal, transitional or loch) is moderate. Impacts may be long-term in duration.	-/?
Climatic Factors	0	o A small part of the site is within an area identified as low flood risk. Impacts are likely to be neutral due to the landscaping proposed (a buffer strip along the watercourse on the southern boundary). o A proposal on this scale is unlikely to have any effect on CO ₂ emissions.	0
Soil	0	o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	+	o The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation. o The proposal would have a positive effect as it conserves, protects and/or enhances significant species/habitat and maintains or enhances existing habitat connectivity (i.e. green networks) and creates new connections.	+

Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. o The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. o However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term effects. o The proposal is of a scale or in a location which is unlikely to have any effect on landscape quality. 	0
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal will have negative effects on existing infrastructure, particularly waste water treatment and education. These issues would have to be resolved before development could commence. Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. 	0/?
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types. 	+/?
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Development would result in improved access to existing open space (i.e. new path). o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development is unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR112 Land adjacent to Drumsinnie Drive, Rothienorman		Proposal: 15 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There is available capacity at Rothienorman WWTW. Potential growth project under investigation. DIA required. This is a reversible short-term impact. o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. o The proposed development on a greenfield site is near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (ground, coastal, transitional or loch) is moderate. 	0/?

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The effect on the water environment also depends on: potential deterioration of a waterbody; the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to the public sewage infrastructure. It is not anticipated there will be long-term impact. 	
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A development of this scale is unlikely to have any effect on CO₂ emissions. 	0
Soil	0/?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. o The proposed development is likely to result in remediation of contaminated soil. 	0/?
Biodiversity	0/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development of a former quarry site could have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. o Biodiversity enhancements are proposed. 	0
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. o The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. o However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access, waste water treatment and education provision at Oldmeldrum Academy and Rothienorman Primary (the latter has capacity for 15 units, but not for a higher density of 40 homes), which will have a temporary affect. o Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. 	0/?
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A reasonable mix of house types is proposed resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population. 	+/0
Human Health	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths – new path network links and active travel would be promoted by this development. o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	+
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment: although, the quarry site is listed as an archaeological site of local interest on the southwest corner, there will be no impact. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

ST KATHERINES

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP2 (FR098) Land North of St Katherines		Proposal: 35 homes and 1ha of employment land	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments	Effect – post mitigation
		<p>Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	
Air	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of employment land is likely to worsen air quality if the development is for heavy and chemical processing. ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The WWTW is not available for this area. SEPA would need to be consulted and full authorisation sought for relevant licensing of private treatment, although SEPA's preferred solution is for a single WWTP serving all properties built to adoptable standards. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ There is currently sufficient capacity at Turriff WTW. Development will connect directly to trunk main. 24-hour storage will be required. Mains extension required. Early engagement with SW is advised. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. 	0
Climatic Factors	-/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions, although its scale lessens this impact. 	-/0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mitigation measures, such as well-designed open space that enhances biodiversity (e.g. green corridors) could mitigate against any adverse effects of the development. 	+
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed site would be a significant extension to the village and would effectively double its size. The site is exposed and would require significant landscaping to the north to mitigate effects. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	-
Material Assets	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure. 	0

		o The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. These include infrastructure and community facilities.	
Population	+	o The development would allow integration of people; where they meet and work. Employment opportunity in the village.	+/0
Human Health	0	o It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths.	0
Cultural Heritage	0	o Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative sites

Site Ref: FR091 Site West of Gateside, Lambhill, St Katherines		Proposal: 8 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	o For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	-	o The WWTW is not available for this area. SEPA would need to be consulted and full authorisation sought for relevant licensing of private treatment, although SEPA's preferred solution is for a single WWTP serving all properties built to adoptable standards. This is a reversible short-term impact. o There is currently sufficient capacity at Turriff WTW. Development will connect directly to trunk main. 24-hour storage will be required. Mains extension required. Early engagement with SW is advised. This is a reversible short-term impact.	0
Climatic Factors	0	o The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions, although its scale reduces its impact. Due to the location of the proposal this is unlikely to be mitigatable.	0
Soil	0	o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	0	o The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat.	0
Landscape	-	o The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change.	0

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. o These impacts could potentially be mitigated through good landscape design. 	
Material Assets	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure. o The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. These include infrastructure and community facilities. 	0
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. This will be mitigated as all applications should comply with the LDP policies that stipulate sustainable mixed housing with a minimum of 25% affordable housing. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

TARVES

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP3 (FR058) Land at Braiklay Croft, Tarves		Proposal: 19 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is limited capacity at Tarves WWTW. A growth project will be required once developments meets Scottish Water's growth criteria. DIA will be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Turriff WTW has capacity. Local mains reinforcement may be required depending on the outcome of a WIA. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ There is a small area at the southeast of the site and any potential risks should be mitigated during the development. 	0
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to cause significant climatic impacts. 	0
Soil	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ Prime agricultural land is found within the proposed site. It will result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. 	--
Biodiversity	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. There impacts could be mitigated by providing good quality open space as part of the development including those that enhance biodiversity and habitats such as green corridors and semi-natural spaces. 	0
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0

Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely education provision at Tarves Primary School and Meldrum Academy. ○ The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. <p>Pressure on existing community facilities and infrastructure could be mitigated (where a need is identified) through developer obligations.</p>	0
Population	+/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A mix of house types is proposed resulting in housing choice for all groups of the population. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No impact on cultural heritage. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: FR009 Land North of Bain's Park, Tarves		Proposal: 10 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is limited capacity at Tarves WWTW. A growth project will be required once developments meets Scottish Water's growth criteria. DIA will be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Turriff WTW has capacity. Local mains reinforcement may be required depending on the outcome of a WIA. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody; the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to the public sewage infrastructure. There is a small area of the site at risk of surface water flooding, this could be mitigated by a SuDS system. 	0
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Part of the site is at risk of surface water flooding, however it is proposed that this would be mitigated through a SuDS system. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. This short-term negative impact is mitigated by the remediation of a brownfield site. 	0

Biodiversity	+	o The development will enhance biodiversity through redevelopment of brownfield land.	+
Landscape	0	o Unlikely to cause significant effects.	0
Material Assets	+	o The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. These include infrastructure and community facilities. Where a need is identified any additional pressure on this infrastructure would be mitigated through developer obligations.	+
Population	+/0	o A mix of house types is proposed resulting in housing choice for all groups of the population.	+/0
Human Health	0	o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	0	o No impact on cultural heritage.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR002 Land South of Tarves, Tarves		Proposal: 200 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	-	o A proposal of this size will lead to a decrease in air quality due to it being detached from the settlement and will therefore encourage unsustainable modes of transport. The community council have reported that the bus service is unreliable and timetabled at inconvenient times for commuting, so public transport is not viewed as being a viable mitigation measure.	-
Water	-	o There is limited capacity at Tarves WWTW. A growth project will be required once developments meets Scottish Water's growth criteria. DIA will be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. o Turriff WTW has capacity. Local mains reinforcement may be required depending on the outcome of a WIA. o Some localised impacts on watercourses on the South and Southeast boundary would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, site water budgets, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. o The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody; the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to the public sewage infrastructure. o A buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse/name of watercourse and should/will be integrated as positive feature of the development."	0

Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. This could potentially be mitigated through improved public transport measures, the addition of core paths and cycle routes and promotion of sustainable transport modes such as low emission cars. 	-
Soil	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ Prime agricultural land is found within the proposed site. It will result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. 	--
Biodiversity	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is likely to have long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ Mitigation measures, such as compensatory planting would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities to mitigate for the loss of prime agricultural land. If the site is allocated, the need for compensatory planting and/or a buffer strip will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site, <u>however this does not mitigate the loss of prime agricultural land</u>. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. 	-
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structures will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	-
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely WWTW, road capacity and educational capacity, both at Tarves Primary School and Meldrum Academy, which will have a long-term effect. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. 	-
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A mix of house types is proposed resulting in housing choice for all groups of the population. 	+
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No impact on cultural heritage. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

TIPPERTY

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP1 (FR071) Site 1 Land East of Tipperty Industrial Estate		Proposal: 0.76ha employment land	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the most part, the proposal is small scale (under 2ha), and whilst industrial/commercial in nature, the impacts are not likely to be significant, particularly in the context of the A90 being dualled and the potential impacts that will have on air quality. 	0
Water	0/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is no suitable WWTW in Tipperty. If allocated the settlement statement will encourage early engagement with SEPA and Scottish Water ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. 	0
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development is in an area identified as low flood risk (surface water) and it could have a short-term effect on climate and the water environment. It is expected that this could be managed on site through SuDS. If allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that suitable SuDS and a FRA may be required as mitigation measures. ○ As a small-scale development there is unlikely to be significant CO₂ impacts. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development will enhance biodiversity through redevelopment of brownfield land (site partially brownfield). ○ The development is not likely to conserve, protect and enhance the diversity of species and habitats, and the natural heritage of the area. ○ The development is not likely to maintain or enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed. ○ Small-scale biodiversity enhancements are proposed. 	0/+
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It would appear as an extension to an existing industrial/employment site, adjacent to a main trunk road. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal is not expected to lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure, however WWTW requires confirmation. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. 	+

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. It is expected that access would be achieved from the A90 through an existing employment site, and the proposal would be an extension to the established BUS site. ○ The site is well connected to an existing settlement with easy transport links to Ellon and beyond. 	
Population	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development would allow integration of people; where they live and work. Employment opportunity in the village. 	0
Human Health	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths, and it would not impact on air quality or the general environment/sense of place. ○ The development is within the Health and Safety Executive outer and middle pipeline consultation zones: the pipeline is out with the site and from the information available it is not expected that this would constrain the proposed development, but it is subject to satisfying HSE requirements. 	?
Cultural Heritage	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development is on a former tile works site which is SMR listed but not a regionally significant site. The development is likely to provide benefits in terms of brownfield development and the impact on an historic site is minimal. 	-/0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: OP2 (FR070) Land to the South of Tippetry Industrial Estate, Tippetry		Proposal: 1.7ha Employment land	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the most part, the proposal is small-scale (under 2ha), whilst industrial/commercial in nature, the impacts are not likely to be significant, particularly in the context of the A90 being dualled and the potential impacts that will have on air quality. 	0
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is no suitable WWTW in Tippetry. If allocated the settlement statement will encourage early engagement with SEPA and Scottish Water ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The site is adjacent to a watercourse (Tarty Burn) and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects and if allocated, this mitigation would be stated as part of the development requirements of the opportunity site. 	-/0
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development is in an area identified as low flood risk (fluvial) and it could have a medium-term effect on climate and the water environment. This could be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), and if allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA may or will be required. ○ As a small-scale development, there is unlikely to be significant CO₂ impacts. 	-/0

Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. o Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to a watercourse to the south would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. A range of other biodiversity measures are also proposed. If the site is allocated, the need for a buffer strip will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site. o The development is not likely to conserve, protect and enhance the diversity of species and habitats, and the natural heritage of the area. o The development is not likely to maintain or enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed. 	0/+
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o It would appear as an extension to an existing industrial/employment site, adjacent to a main trunk road. o However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal is not expected to lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure. Although, the WWTW needs confirmation. o Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. o The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. It is expected that access would be achieved from the A90 through an existing employment site, and the proposal would be an extension to the established BUS site. o The site is well connected to an existing settlement with easy transport links to Ellon and beyond. 	+
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development would allow integration of people; where they live and work. Employment opportunity in the village. 	+
Human Health	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development would not result in the loss of open space/core paths, and would not impact on air quality or the general environment/sense of place. o The development is within Health and Safety Executive outer and middle pipeline consultation zones: the pipeline is out with the site and from the information available it is not expected that this would constrain the proposed development, but the development is subject to satisfying HSE requirements. 	?
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: FR044, Bridgend, Tippetty		Proposal: 2 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments	Effect – post mitigation
		<p>Effects should be assessed in terms of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site will lead to car dependency due to the distance from key services, leading to increased CO₂ emissions. However, due to the scale of the development, air quality is likely to have short-term insignificant effects. 	0
Water	-/?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is no suitable WWTW in Tippetty. If allocated the settlement statement will encourage early engagement with SEPA and Scottish Water. Septic tanks are proposed, but this needs to be confirmed. This is a reversible short-term impact. 	-/?
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site has no land at flood risk. ○ Proposals of this scale are unlikely to have any effect on CO₂ emissions. 	0
Soil	0/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ Prime agricultural land would be lost as a result of this development. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. This is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss, however, the loss is minimal. 	0/-
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA is set close to the site. The development would have an effect indirectly through drainage, visitor pressure, impact of geese grazing grounds. ○ However, the proposal would be unlikely to negatively affect a nature conservation site or wider biodiversity. ○ The potential for biodiversity enhancement is minimal due to the scale of the development. 	0
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. ○ The setting of the village may be impacted upon from the south (the site is adjacent to an area protected to conserve the landscape setting of the settlement and open space). Landscape mitigation measures such as strategic planting would not be applicable on such a small-scale development. 	-
Material Assets	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal will lead to pressure on local infrastructure, notably WWTW, this requires confirmation and there are road and foot access issues. ○ Access to south bound public transport is not possible without significant risk. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ There are no localised services and facilities to sustain. 	0

Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. o There is potential for negative cumulative effects on the variety of house types, as only two detached houses are proposed in the countryside and there are other similar-sized single houses adjacent or nearby. 	-
Human Health	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development of the site is unlikely to have any significant effects on existing pathways or access to open space. o The population is not at risk from hazardous developments. o The site is within the HSE consultation zone. The development would need to comply with HSE requirements. 	0/?
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development is unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR045, Bridgend, Tippetty		Proposal: 1 home	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The site will lead to car dependency due to the distance from key services, leading to increased CO₂ emissions. However, due to the scale of the development, air quality is likely to have short-term insignificant effects. 	0
Water	-/?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There is no suitable WWTW in Tippetty. If allocated the settlement statement will encourage early engagement with SEPA and Scottish Water. Septic tanks are proposed, but this needs to be confirmed. This is a reversible short-term impact. 	-/?
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The site has no land at flood risk. o Proposals of this scale are unlikely to have any effect on CO₂ emissions. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal would be unlikely to negatively affect a nature conservation site or wider biodiversity. o A range of biodiversity enhancements are proposed but the impact would be minimal due to the scale of the development. 	0
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. o However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. o The setting of the village may be impacted upon from the south (site is adjacent to an area protected to conserve the landscape setting of the settlement and open space). Landscape mitigation measures such as strategic planting would not be applicable on such a small-scale development. 	-

Material Assets	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal will lead to pressure on local infrastructure. Notably, WWTW, this requires confirmation and there are road and foot access issues. o Access to south bound public transport is not possible without significant risk. o Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. o There are no localised services and facilities to sustain. 	0
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. o There is potential for negative cumulative effects on the variety of house types, as only one detached house is proposed in the countryside and there are other similar-sized single houses adjacent or nearby. 	-
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Development of the site is unlikely to have any significant effects on existing pathways or access to open space. o The population is not at risk from hazardous developments. o The site is within the HSE consultation zone. The development would need to comply with HSE requirements. 	0/?
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development is unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR072 Site 2 Land East of Tipperty Industrial Estate Tipperty		Proposal: Leisure & tourism	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Potential traffic generation through visitors/users of the site - for the most part, air quality is likely to decrease. There are no measures available to mitigate against this effect. 	-
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There is no suitable WWTW in Tipperty. If allocated the settlement statement will encourage early engagement with SEPA and Scottish Water. This is a reversible short-term impact. o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. o The site is adjacent to a watercourse (Tarty Burn) and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, this mitigation would be stated as part of the development requirements of the opportunity site, and that it should be integrated as a positive feature of the site. A FRA may also be required. 	-/0
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o High likelihood of increased CO₂ emissions due to increased vehicular movements due to the nature of the development. 	-/0

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development is in an area identified as low flood risk for fluvial with some surface water flooding, and it could have a medium-term effect on climate and the water environment. This could be mitigated by ensuring the flood risk area is included as part of the open space provision. A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) may also be required. If allocated, these mitigations would be stated as part of the development requirements for the site. 	
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction. 	0
Biodiversity	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could enhance biodiversity ○ Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to a watercourse could reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. ○ The nature of the proposal being tourism/leisure signalling intention for outdoor pursuits, presents an opportunity for enhancements to landscape and habitat creation. 	+
Landscape	+/?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. Although the site is not overly prominent or in a sensitive area, the impact depends on the level of development and final site design. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are relatively minor, and the nature of the proposal could potentially enhance the local landscape and encourage active engagement with the land. 	?
Material Assets	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal may add pressure on local infrastructure, notably roads, and WWTW requires confirmation. Road access would likely need a significant upgrade to cope with the volume of traffic associated with proposed use of the site. ○ The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. It is expected that access would be achieved from the A90 through an existing employment site, and the proposal would be an extension to the established BUS site. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ The site is well connected to an existing settlement with easy transport links to Ellon and beyond. ○ Potential positive impacts from recreation/leisure pursuits and habitat enhancement, diversifying the mix of land uses within the settlement 	+
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development would allow integration of people; where they meet, play and work. A recreational opportunity in the village, and wider region. 	0
Human Health	+/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Development would not result in the loss of open space/core paths, and not impact on air quality or the general environment/sense of place, and development is expected to enhance open space provision. ○ Development is within the Health and Safety Executive outer and middle pipeline consultation zones: the pipeline is out with the site and from the information available, it is anticipated that this development would not satisfy HSE requirements. 	+/-
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

TURRIFF

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP1 (FR078) Adjacent to Wood of Delgaty		Proposal: 450 homes, 10 ha employment land, commercial land and community facilities	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	-/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ While developments of this scale are likely to affect air quality, Turriff's air quality is not a significant issue, and a possible distributor road is safeguarded. The site is next to a frequent bus service. 	0/-
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is currently insufficient capacity available at Turriff WWTW to meet the demands of all development allocated in the LDP. Scottish Water would be required to initiate a growth project once development meets their five growth criteria. Impacts are likely to be localised and medium/long-term. DIA will be required. ○ There is currently sufficient capacity at Turriff WTW. Local mains reinforcement may be required depending on the outcome of a WIA. 	0
Climatic Factors	-/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site is not within an identified flood risk area, but it is unlikely to have any effect on CO₂ emissions. The site is next to a frequent bus service and a mix of uses are proposed that would mitigate effects. 	-/0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Troup, Pennan and Lion's Heads is set to the north. The development would have an effect indirectly through drainage. Provision of change with no or minimal effects. Planning controls on construction and operation will mitigate impacts. ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ The development could result in the partial loss of ancient woodland, and compensatory planting pursued to account for any trees removed. New footpaths are proposed through it. 	--/?
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. Due to the proximity to town, these will be long-term but insignificant. ○ The landscape will undoubtedly be affected due to the sale of the development. However, extensive landscaping is proposed to mitigate effects in the long-term. 	0
Material Assets	-/+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal could lead to a significant increase in pressure on local infrastructure due to the scale of the development proposed. This would be mitigated through the provision of required community infrastructure via developer obligations. 	+

Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development would allow integration of people; where they meet and work. Employment opportunity in the village. ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	+
Human Health	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Development of the site is likely to have positive effects by creating new pathways and open space, and enhancing the core path network. 	+
Cultural Heritage	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site includes the remains of a possible ring cairn, comprising a patch of stones with a very slight hollow. Effects could be mitigated by requesting an archaeology survey. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: OP3 (FR134) Adjacent to Bridgend Terrace		Proposal: 40 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is currently insufficient capacity available at Turriff WWTW to meet the demands of all development allocated in the LDP. Scottish Water would be required to initiate a growth project once development meets their five growth criteria. Impacts are likely to be localised and short/medium-term. ○ There is currently sufficient capacity at Turriff WTW. Local mains reinforcement may be required depending on the outcome of a WIA. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. 	-/0
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There would be minimal CO₂ emissions from general heating and travel. ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. ○ There is surface water flood risk to some parts of the site. ○ There is fluvial flood risk adjacent to the site. ○ A Flood Risk Assessment would be required to identify any mitigating measures. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0

Biodiversity	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development is likely to adversely affect populations of protected species, including European Protected Species, their habitats and resting places or roosts such as red squirrel, elm and badger. A habitats and wildlife assessment would be required to mitigate effects. ○ The development may affect existing trees and woodland. 	0/-
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site poorly relates to Turriff/Little Turriff. The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0/-
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely education provision at the primary school, which will have a temporary to long-term effect. This could be mitigated through developer obligations being sought where a need is identified. ○ The proposal may not lead to any significant pressure on water supply and drainage infrastructure subject to upgrading the network. However, a growth project is being planned, so early discussions with Scottish Water would be required. 	0
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Very little mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. The development would be required to comply with the LDP policy that stated a sustainable mix of housing is required including a minimum of 25% affordable housing. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths and links would be made to existing core paths. ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing, or those who are seeking affordable housing. 	0
Cultural Heritage	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development will have long-term and permanent negative effects on the grade C listed building (Bridgend Farmhouse – 50m from site). The development may weaken the sense of place, and the identity of existing settlements. ○ In mitigation, the building can be protected via suitable screening. 	-
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: OP5 (FR001) South of Colly Stripe, Smiddyseat Road		Proposal: 27 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0

Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There is currently insufficient capacity available at Turriff WWTW to meet the demands of all development allocated in the LDP. Scottish Water would be required to initiate a growth project once development meets their five growth criteria. Impacts are likely to be localised and short/medium-term. o There is currently sufficient capacity at Turriff WTW. Local mains reinforcement may be required depending on the outcome of a WIA. o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. o The site has a watercourse to the north and west, and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse/name of watercourse and should/will be integrated as a positive feature of the development." o The effect on the water environment also depends on; potential deterioration of a waterbody; the extent to which the allocation is at risk from flooding; and the extent to which the allocation connects to the public sewage infrastructure. o With the information on the quality of water around the site, the effects could be significant in the longer term. 	+
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The northwest part of the development is in an area identified as medium to high risk of surface water flooding. o This could be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), and if allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA may or will be required. o For a development of this scale there would be minimal CO₂ emissions from general heating and travel. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. o Mitigation measures, such as a buffer strip next to the Colly Stripe or watercourse would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. If the site is allocated, the need for a buffer strip will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site. 	+
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development fits well within the settlement and is unlikely to have any negative impacts on the landscape quality. 	0
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There is WWTW capacity for 10 homes, so if the number of homes is increased, the WWTW capacity would need to be provided to accommodate this. o There is adequate educational provision. o The primary school is capable of being extended and this could be mitigated through developer obligations. 	0
Population	+/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal includes 30% affordable housing which is more than the required amount in the LDP. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o This would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. o The development is unlikely to have any significant effects on existing pathways or access to open space. o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	0
Cultural Heritage	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Part of the proposed site is the SMR (NJ74NW0071 – Colly Stripe Crop Marks). o Archaeology should be consulted about the layout of the development and careful design could mitigate any negative impacts on the SMR. If allocated, this will be stated in the development requirements for the site. 	0

Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect	
------------	--	--

Site Ref: OP6 (FR086) Land North of Cornfield Road		40 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is currently insufficient capacity available at Turriff WWTW to meet the demands of all development allocated in the LDP. Scottish Water would be required to initiate a growth project once development meets their five growth criteria. Impacts are likely to be localised and short/medium-term. ○ There is currently sufficient capacity at Turriff WTW. Local mains reinforcement may be required depending on the outcome of a WIA. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. 	0
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal is unlikely to have any significant impact on water quality. The WWTW at Turriff have limited capacity so this would need to be overcome as part of the development. 	0
Soil	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases ○ The proposed development would result in remediation of contaminated land. 	+
Biodiversity	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development is not likely to conserve, protect and enhance the diversity of species and habitats, and the natural heritage of the area. However, this can be mitigated by providing good quality open space in accordance with the Parks and Open Space Strategy. ○ The development will enhance biodiversity through redevelopment of brownfield land. 	+
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area would be compatible with uses surrounding the site – improvement in landscape from current yard area to new housing. Trees at the rear of the site are to be retained. 	0
Material Assets	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure. ○ A proposal of this scale could have a positive effect through provision of affordable housing, water/waste water infrastructure, transportation infrastructure. 	+
Population	+/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A mix of house types is proposed resulting in housing choice for all groups of the population. 	+/0
Human Health		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. 	0

	0	o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	
Cultural Heritage	0	o The proposal is unlikely to have any negative impacts on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: FR003 Site OP3 Turriff		Proposal: Employment land	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	0	o At < 1Ha, an individual development of this scale is unlikely to have any effect on air quality. o The development of employment land is likely to worsen air quality if that development is heavy and chemical processing.	0
Water	--	o Turriff WWTW does not capacity for this site. A growth project would be required. Network investigations may be required depending on business use and waste water flows. Impacts are likely to be localised and medium/long-term. o There is currently sufficient capacity at Turriff WTW. Local mains reinforcement may be required depending on the outcome of a WIA.	0
Climatic Factors	0	o The site is not within an identified flood risk area and is unlikely to have any effect on CO ₂ emissions.	0
Soil	0	o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. These will be short-term and considered neutral in effect.	0
Biodiversity	0	o Unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity.	0
Landscape	0	o The proposal is to the north of existing employment land. However, it is on an upward slope so there will be some landscape impact. Due to the proximity to the town, these will be long-term but insignificant.	0
Material Assets	0	o The proposal will not lead to a significant increase in pressure on local infrastructure.	0
Population	0	o Proposals will have a long-term and positive impact on employment opportunities in the village.	0
Human Health	?	o Development of the site is unlikely to have any significant effects on existing pathways or access to open space. o It is not known if the population will be at risk from hazardous development.	?
Cultural Heritage	0	o Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment.	0

Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect	
------------	--	--

Site Ref: FR004 OP4, Turriff		Proposal: Employment land	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	0	o Individual developments of this scale are unlikely to have any negative effects on air quality.	0
Water	--	o Turriff WWTW does not capacity for this site. A growth project would be required. Network investigations may be required depending on business use and waste water flows. Impacts are likely to be localised and medium/long-term. o There is currently sufficient capacity at Turriff WTW. Local mains reinforcement may be required depending on the outcome of a WIA.	-
Climatic Factors	0	o The site is not within an identified flood risk area and is unlikely to have any effect on CO ₂ emissions (subject to proposal).	0
Soil	0	o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	0	o The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat.	0
Landscape	0	o The site is on a fairly prominent slope that would be very visible when approaching Turriff from the northeast and the landscape in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use will significantly change. Due to the proximity to the town, these will be long-term but insignificant.	0
Material Assets	0	o The proposal will not lead to a significant increase in pressure on local infrastructure.	0
Population	0	o The development would allow integration of people; where they meet and work. Employment opportunity in the village. This is in line with community aspirations.	0
Human Health	0/-	o Development of the site is not likely to have any significant effects on existing pathways or access to open space. o There is a core path to the south of the site that should be retained/enhanced, but development of the proposed site will not encroach on it.	0
Cultural Heritage	0	o Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR005 Knockieland, North of Slackadale Gardens, Turriff		Proposal: 60 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Turriff WWTW does not capacity for this site. A growth project would be required. Impacts are likely to be localised and medium-term. o There is currently sufficient capacity at Turriff WTW. Local mains reinforcement may be required depending on the outcome of a WIA. The WWTW has limited capacity. o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. o The Burn of Knockiemill is located at the northern boundary of the site and a buffer strip would be required to mitigate against any effects. If allocated, the development requirements of the opportunity site would include a statement, e.g. "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the Burn of Knockiemill and should be integrated as positive feature of the development." A Flood Risk Assessment may also be required. 	0
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development is adjacent to fluvial flood extent from Brodie Burn on the eastern boundary. o This could be mitigated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), and if allocated, the development requirements for the site would state that a FRA may or will be required. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	- /0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. The development will result in the loss of woodland at the southeast of the site. o Where possible, the woodland should be retained. If some tree loss is absolutely necessary, this could be mitigated by compensatory planting. o The development is likely to maintain or enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed. 	0
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, and naturalness will change. 	0

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. The site is relatively flat and would appear to be a logical extension to the existing allocation. The impact could be mitigated by strategic landscaping, and if allocated, this will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site. 	
Material Assets	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The quality of new assets, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. The site is of a scale to contribute towards affordable housing, open space and new facilities. o Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects, although the scale may not be sufficient to overcome the issue. 	0
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The mix of house types has not been specified in this bid. o However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types, amount and type of open space and contribution to other community facilities, where a need has been established. 	+
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. o There is a core path to the south of the site. However, in line with the LDP policy it would not result in the loss of open space/ core paths, and would provide open space in proportion with the size of the development. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR020 Land at Markethill, Turriff		Proposal: 16 homes and a cemetery	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o In terms of air quality, the development is unlikely to have long-term negative effects on air quality. 	0
Water	-/?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Turriff WWTW does not capacity for this site. A growth project would be required. Impacts are likely to be localised and medium-term. o There is currently sufficient capacity at Turriff WTW. Local mains reinforcement may be required depending on the outcome of a WIA. The WWTW has limited capacity. o Due to the risk of private water supply contamination, connection to sewers is not a preferred option and if the site is allocated, more detailed studies showing disconnection would be required. o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. 	-

		o With the information on the quality of water around the site, the effects could be significant in the longer term.	
Climatic Factors	0	o The development is not within an area at risk from flooding. o A cemetery could attract a lot of periodic car journeys, but the effects, although long-term, are unlikely to be significant.	0
Soil	0	o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	0	o The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats, habitat fragmentation or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat.	0
Landscape	-	o The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness will change, as the site is not immediately adjacent to Turriff, but is separated by a field on the east side of the minor road. o However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term.	0
Material Assets	+/-	o Proposes a cemetery, an important asset that will have long-term benefits. o There is a WWTW constraint that will need to be mitigated, which will have a medium-term temporary effect.	+
Population	0/-	o Very limited detail on the mix of house types is proposed. This could be mitigated by proposing a sustainable mix of house types in accordance with the LDP policy.	+/0
Human Health	+	o It would result in creation of open space. o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	+/0
Cultural Heritage	?	o The overall development is unlikely to affect the listed bridge, but its integrity will be monitored by the Roads Service as part of their programme of reviewing bridges. o New developments that deviate from existing designs, layouts and materials could adversely affect the setting of historic settlements in the long-term. As a potential gateway site, there would be an opportunity to ensure the proposal is in keeping with the vernacular red stone and in keeping with existing houses in the locality.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR030 Part OP1 site		Proposal: 61 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	o For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0

Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Turriff WWTW does not capacity for this site. A growth project would be required. Impacts are likely to be localised and medium-term. o There is currently sufficient capacity at Turriff WTW. Local mains reinforcement may be required depending on the outcome of a WIA. The WWTW has limited capacity. o This could be mitigated through a Scottish Water growth project although the timescale for this is unclear. 	-
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development site is not within an area identified as flood risk. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. Impacts are likely to be localised and in the medium to long-term. o There would be loss of greenfield agricultural ground (not prime) and associated soil erosion. o However, the site is a logical extension to the settlement in terms of proximity from services and meeting housing needs, and would offer potential benefits in terms of increased biodiversity. 	0
Biodiversity	0/+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Troup, Pennan and Lion's Heads is set to the north. The development would have an effect indirectly through drainage, but the likelihood of development affecting the SPA is remote. o The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have long-term irreversible adverse impacts on biodiversity through the loss of habitats, habitat fragmentation or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. o The development proposes to introduce native tree planting, ponds and soakaways and will be required to meet open space mix and quantity in accordance with the LDP policy. 	0/+
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The nature of land use in the area will be changed and the agricultural land shall be lost. However, the development would blend in with the existing residential area adjacent to it and would blend in well. o In the long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be short-term. 	0
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There is limited capacity in Turriff Primary. o There is very limited capacity of waste water treatment within the public sewer system. o The development would increase traffic congestion in the long run, particularly on the A947. o Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these impacts. 	+
Population	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Mix of house types is unknown resulting in a presumption of limited housing choice for all groups of the population. o The LDP policy would require the development to provide a sustainable mix of house types and tenures. 	+
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o It would result in new open space/core paths that will connect to other paths and the town. o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development would not have any negative impact on built heritage. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR127 Lower Smiddyseat, Turriff		Proposal: 50 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Individual developments of this scale are unlikely to have any negative effects on air quality. 	0
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Turriff WWTW does not capacity for this site. A growth project would be required. Impacts are likely to be localised and medium-term. o There is currently sufficient capacity at Turriff WTW. Local mains reinforcement may be required depending on the outcome of a WIA. The WWTW has limited capacity. 	0
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The site is not within an identified flood risk area and is unlikely to have any effect on CO₂ emissions (subject to proposal). 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o It should be noted that while all developments are likely to have adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during the construction phase, these will be short-term and should be considered a neutral impact. 	0
Biodiversity	+/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. o To mitigate for the negative impact of loss of a greenfield site, biodiversity enhancements and improvements to the green network are proposed. 	+/0
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. Due to the proximity to the town, these will be long-term but insignificant. o The landscape will undoubtedly be affected due to the scale of development. However, extensive landscaping is proposed to mitigate the effect in the long-term. 	0
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal could lead to a significant increase in pressure on local infrastructure due to the scale of development proposed, but this could be mitigated by securing developer contributions, where a need is identified. The development will also provide affordable housing. 	0
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development would allow integration of people; where they live and work. o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. o The proposals incorporate a good mix of housing types and tenures including affordable housing. 	+
Human Health	0/+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Development of the site is unlikely to have any significant effects on existing pathways or access to open space. The development will provide a mix of public open space in accordance with the LDP policy. 	0/+
Cultural Heritage	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal is sited where there is a SMR (Colly Stripe – crop marks), archaeology have been consulted and have advised that this is not a constraint to development. 	0
+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect			

Key	- = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect
------------	---

Site Ref: FR074 Site adjacent to Rosehall, Turriff		Proposal: 7 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	o For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects.	0
Water	-	o Turriff WWTW does not capacity for this site. This could be mitigated through a Scottish Water growth project. Impacts are likely to be localised and medium-term. o There is currently sufficient capacity at Turriff WTW. Local mains reinforcement may be required depending on the outcome of a WIA. o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	0
Climatic Factors	0	o The proposed site is not within an identified flood risk area.	0
Soil	0	o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse impacts on soil through erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	0	o The development is not likely to conserve, protect and enhance the diversity of species and habitats, and the natural heritage of the area. o The development is not likely to maintain or enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed.	0
Landscape	-	o The site is within the Deveron Valley Special Landscape Area and adjacent to a former designed landscape of Muireisk House. o The proposed site is considered inappropriate and may lead to suburbanisation of the countryside. o Effects could be partially mitigated through landscaping and natural boundary features.	-
Material Assets	0	o The proposal will not lead to a significant increase in pressure on local infrastructure.	0
Population	-	o No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. o However, the LDP policy requires a mix of house types to mitigate effects.	+/0
Human Health	0	o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing.	0
Cultural Heritage	-	o The development will have long-term and permanent negative effects on the setting of gardens, designed landscapes and archaeological sites. The development may weaken the sense of place, and the identity of existing settlements. o Invariably, the allocation will adversely affect the built features, their context, pattern of past historic use, and the setting in which they sit, in landscapes and within the soil (archaeology), and also in our towns, villages and streets.	-

Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect	
------------	---	--

Site Ref: FR085 Land at Kinnaird House, Turriff		Proposal: Extension to settlement boundary	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	0	○ The extension to the boundary of Turriff would have a neutral impact on the air quality; unless developments occur and only then the air quality would be required to be assessed again.	0
Water	0	○ The WWTW and WTW would be kept as existing. ○ There is a burn to the north of the site and a SEPA map indicates a surface water drainage issue concern. However, as no additional housing is proposed, there would be no topographical change to the existing situation.	0
Climatic Factors	0	○ There would be minimal CO ₂ emissions from general heating and travel.	0
Soil	0	○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	0	○ The proposal would not have any impact on biodiversity.	0
Landscape	0	○ In light of the scale and location of the proposal, it would have no impact on the landscape character for the long-term.	0
Material Assets	0	○ There would be no infrastructure constraint associated with the site.	0
Population	0	○ No change to the existing population.	0
Human Health	0	○ It would have no impact on paths/core paths and air quality.	0
Cultural Heritage	0	○ Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR099 Land at the Old School House, Ardmiddle, Turriff		Proposal: 30 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Turriff WWTW does not capacity for this site. This could be mitigated through a Scottish Water growth project. Impacts are likely to be localised and medium-term. ○ There is currently sufficient capacity at Turriff WTW. Local mains reinforcement may be required depending on the outcome of a WIA. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ In mitigation, suitable levels of surface water treatment will be required to protect The Burn of Garble. 	0
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. 	-
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ Burn of Garble runs along the southern boundary. A buffer strip would be required, which could enhance biodiversity including habitat connectivity (e.g. green corridors) as part of the open space provision. 	+
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site is located on the edge of the Deveron Valley SLA. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ A significant scale development that would further alter the character of the area. The impact is unlikely to be mitigated by strategic landscaping. 	-
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access, and waste water treatment. ○ The proposal will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure. ○ The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. These include social infrastructure (schools, housing, healthcare facilities); previously 	0

		developed land; minerals and aggregates (quarries); transport infrastructure (road, rail, paths, pipelines and bridges); water-delivery infrastructure; sewerage infrastructure; etc. These impacts could be mitigated where there is identified need through securing developer obligation contributions.	
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. o The development would not allow integration of people; where they meet and work. No employment opportunities. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Development of the site is unlikely to have any significant effects on existing pathways or access to open space. o The population is not at risk from hazardous developments. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

UDNY GREEN

Preferred Sites

None.

Alternative Sites

None.

UDNY STATION

Preferred Sites

None that are new sites.

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: FR021 Land at Udney Station East, Udney		Proposal: Mixed use including 40 Homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments	Effect – post mitigation
		<p>Effects should be assessed in terms of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Individual developments of this scale are unlikely to have any effect on air quality. 	0
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Udney Station WWTW has insufficient capacity for this area and an upgrade to an adoptable standard would be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ There is currently sufficient capacity. Local mains reinforcement may be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. 	-/0
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site is not within an identified flood risk area. ○ A proposal on this scale is unlikely to have any effect on CO₂ emissions. 	0
Soil	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ However, development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land which is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss. 	-
Biodiversity	0/+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal is of a scale and a location which is unlikely to negatively affect a nature conservation site or wider biodiversity. ○ Development proposes biodiversity enhancements, and the site has potential to augment woodland to the west. 	0/+
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Due to the scale of the development, the proposal risks having a negative impact on the townscape/setting of the town with long-term effects. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. 	-/0

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. However, the site is not highly exposed and would appear to be a logical extension to the existing allocation. ○ The impact could be mitigated through a well-designed development with strategic landscaping, and if allocated, this will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site or designated as protected land. 	
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely on WWTW (capacity unknown), and schools such as Cultercullen Primary School and Meldrum Academy are both set to be over capacity by 2022 which will have a temporary effect overall. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. The site will provide housing and employment land to meet the needs of the local community. ○ The development provides opportunity to add biodiversity and link to adjacent woodland. 	?/+
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. ○ However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types which would be specified in the Settlement Statement. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Development of the site is unlikely to have any significant effects on existing pathways or access to open space. ○ The site has potential to provide path links to adjacent woodland to the west. 	0/?
Cultural Heritage	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal will have a negative impact on key features of cultural heritage. This will be long-term and permanent. ○ The site is immediately adjacent to/encloses ROC (WWII) observation posts. These should be avoided by development. If the site is allocated, the preservation of these features would be stated in the LDP as developer requirements of the opportunity site, on the basis that these could be factored in as positive features of the overall design of the development. 	-/+
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR138 Site OP1 Land North East of Udney Station Park		Proposal: 35 houses and 1Ha employment land	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	0	Individual developments of this scale are unlikely to have any effect on air quality.	0

Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Udney Station WWTW has insufficient capacity for this area and an upgrade to an adoptable standard would be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ There is currently sufficient capacity. Local mains reinforcement may be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. 	0
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site is not within an identified flood risk area. ○ A proposal on this scale is unlikely to have any effect on CO₂ emissions. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	0/+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal is of a scale and a location which is unlikely to negatively affect a nature conservation site or wider biodiversity. ○ The site presents an opportunity to improve habitats for biodiversity. 	0/+
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal is of a scale or in a location that is unlikely to have any effect on landscape quality. 	0
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely on WWTW (capacity unknown) and schools such as Cultercullen Primary School and Meldrum Academy are both set to be over capacity by 2022 which will have a temporary effect overall. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. The site will provide housing and employment land to meet the needs of the local community. ○ Development provides an opportunity to improve play areas, provide new walking routes and add biodiversity enhancements. 	?/+
Population	+/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A mix of house types is proposed resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population. ○ The development will allow integration of people; where they live and work. Employment opportunity in the village. 	+/0
Human Health	0/+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Development of the site is unlikely to have any significant effects on existing pathways or access to open space. ○ New walking routes are proposed. ○ The population is not at risk from hazardous developments. 	0/+
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development is unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR139 Land Northeast of Udney Station Park		Proposal: 65 houses and 1ha employment land	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A proposal of this scale will lead to a decrease in air quality (i.e. through increases in concentrations of air pollutants) impacts are likely to be permanent and long-term in duration: site risks increasing traffic flow through Ellon. ○ However, the site is near a bus route that may help mitigate increased traffic. 	-/?
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Udney Station WWTW has insufficient capacity for this area and an upgrade to an adoptable standard would be required. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ There is currently sufficient capacity. Local mains reinforcement may be required. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. 	0
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site is not within an identified flood risk area. ○ A proposal on this scale has potential to cause an increase in concentrations of CO₂ emissions through increased car travel. ○ The connectivity of the proposed site must be taken into account when assessing impact. A mixed-use proposal on a bus route may also help mitigate transport related emissions. However, there are no existing services and facilities and currently development in this location would therefore promote car dependency. Effects are likely to be medium-term. 	-/0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	0/+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal is of a scale and a location which is unlikely to negatively affect a nature conservation site or wider biodiversity. ○ The development proposes a range of biodiversity enhancements, with potential to augment woodland to the east. 	0/+
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Due to the scale of the development, the proposal risks having a negative impact on the townscape/setting of the town with long-term effects. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. However, the site is not highly exposed and would appear to be a logical extension to the existing allocation. ○ The impact could be mitigated through a well-designed development with strategic landscaping, and if allocated, this will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site or designated as protected land. 	-/0

Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely on WWTW (capacity unknown), and schools such as Cultercullen Primary School and Meldrum Academy are both set to be over capacity by 2022 which will have a temporary effect overall. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. The site will provide housing and employment land to meet the needs of the local community. ○ Development provides an opportunity to improve play areas, provide new walking routes and add biodiversity enhancements. 	?/+
Population	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A mix of house types is proposed resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population. ○ The development will allow integration of people; where they live and work. Employment opportunity in the village. 	+
Human Health	0/+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Development of the site is unlikely to have any significant effects on existing pathways or access to open space. ○ New walking routes are proposed. ○ The population is not at risk from hazardous developments. 	0/+
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development is unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

WEST PITMILLAN

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP1 (FR118) West Pitmillan		Proposal: 3.1ha Employment Land	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A proposal of this scale will lead to a decrease in air quality (i.e. through increases in concentrations of air pollutants) as it is for industrial use. 	-
Water	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is no WWTW in Westfield Foveran, but a growth project has been initiated by Scottish Water at Foveran WWTW (1.4km away). All sites in West Pitmillan will connect to the public sewerage system in Foveran once the growth project is complete. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Proposed development can connect directly off the trunk main. 24-hour water storage will be required on site. A mains extension with pressure management is also required. This is a reversible short-term impact. 	0
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development is relatively well-connected to the A90 and traffic impact would be reflective of the other businesses that are already located there. 	0
Soil	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. 	--
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of this intensive farmland is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. 	0
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced but the site is not particularly significant in a landscape context and the nature of the area has been affected by the A90. 	0
Material Assets	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The allocation will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure. 	+
Population	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The allocation would not have any significant effects on the population. 	0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The allocation would not have any significant effects on the population. 	0/+
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No significant effects on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: FR117 Land West of Enerfield Business Park, Foveran, Newburgh		Proposal: Employment land	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments	Effect – post mitigation
		<p>Effects should be assessed in terms of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	
Air	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A proposal of this scale will lead to a decrease in air quality (i.e. through increases in concentrations of air pollutants) as it is for industrial use. 	-
Water	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is no WWTW in Westfield Foveran, but a growth project has been initiated by Scottish Water at Foveran WWTW (1.4km away). All sites in West Pitmillan will connect to the public sewerage system in Foveran once the growth project is complete. This is a reversible short-term impact. ○ Proposed development can connect directly off the trunk main. 24-hour water storage will be required on site. A mains extension with pressure management is also required. This is a reversible short-term impact. 	0
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements, as the proposal is distant from residential areas, which will increase the need to travel long distances to services and increased emissions. 	-
Soil	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development would result in the loss of prime agricultural land. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. 	-
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of this intensive farmland is unlikely to have a long-term adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. 	0
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The allocation will not lead to any significant pressure on local infrastructure. 	0
Population	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The allocation would not have any significant effects on the population. 	0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The allocation would not have any significant effects on the population. 	0
Cultural Heritage	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Whilst the proposal would likely destroy a site of regional significance it is unlikely to have significant effects on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

WOODHEAD

Preferred Sites

None.

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: FR042 Land at Fyvie Road, Woodhead of Fyvie		Proposal: 5 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Individual developments of this scale are unlikely to have any effect on air quality. 	0
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o WWTW is not available for this area and the site is in a SEPA waste water drainage hot spot (i.e. poor ground conditions for soakaways) and it is not desirable to have septic tanks. They would need to connect to a public sewer; however, this may not be feasible. o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short term. 	-
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the likelihood of increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, a proposal on this scale is unlikely to have any effect on CO₂ emissions. o The development is not in an area identified at flood risk. 	0
Soil	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. o The development will cause loss of prime agricultural land which is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss. 	-
Biodiversity	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. o The development could affect the conservation objectives and natural features of a locally important designated site (development site is within Windyhills LNCS). No intervention is available to mitigate against the loss of a locally important nature conservation designation. 	-

Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal will lead to significant pressure on local infrastructure in relative terms due to the lack of WWTW. ○ The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. As there are no local services or facilities locally, the development may help sustain services and facilities elsewhere (although this requires the need to travel). ○ The development may help sustain the schools as Fyvie Primary School and Turriff Secondary School are projected to have spare capacity, however there are other infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely WWTW. Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures – if any are possible – and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ The site connects well to the existing settlement with potential to enhance the footpath network. 	-/+
Population	+/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The self-build housing proposed enhances opportunities to access affordable housing (one 3 bed unit to be incorporated). However, this will not make a significant increase in housing choice. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ Opportunities to enhance and extend footpaths. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No impact on cultural heritage. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR043 Site North of Woodhead Farm, Woodhead of Fyvie		Proposal: 5 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Individual developments of this scale are unlikely to have any effect on air quality. 	0

Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ WWTW is not available for this area and the site is in a SEPA waste water drainage hot spot (i.e. poor ground conditions for soakaways) and it is not desirable to have septic tanks. They would need to connect to a public sewer; however, this may not be feasible. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. 	-
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the likelihood of increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, a proposal on this scale is unlikely to have any effect on CO₂ emissions. ○ The development is not in an area identified at flood risk. 	0
Soil	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The development will cause loss of prime agricultural land which is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss. 	-
Biodiversity	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ The development could affect the conservation objectives and natural features of a locally important designated site (development site is within Windyhills LNCS). No intervention is available to mitigate against the loss of a locally important nature conservation designation. 	-
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	-/+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal will lead to significant pressure on local infrastructure in relative terms due to the lack of WWTW. ○ The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. As there are no local services or facilities locally, the development may help sustain services and facilities elsewhere (although this requires the need to travel). ○ The development may help sustain the schools as Fyvie Primary School and Turriff Secondary School are projected to have spare capacity, however there are other infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely WWTW. Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures – if any are possible - and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ The site connects well to the existing settlement with potential to enhance the footpath network. 	-/+
Population	+/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The self-build housing proposed enhances opportunities to access affordable housing (one 3 bed unit to be incorporated). However, this will not make a significant increase in housing choice. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	0

		o There are opportunities to enhance and extend footpaths.	
Cultural Heritage	0	o No impact on cultural heritage.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR053 Land adjacent to Braefield, Woodhead of Fyvie		Proposal: 3 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	o Individual developments of this scale are unlikely to have any effect on air quality.	0
Water	-	o WWTW is not available for this area and the site is in a SEPA waste water drainage hot spot (i.e. poor ground conditions for soakaways) and it is not desirable to have septic tanks. They would need to connect to a public sewer; however, this may not be feasible. o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	-
Climatic Factors	0	o The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, a proposal on this scale is unlikely to have any effect on CO ₂ emissions. o The development is not in an area identified at flood risk.	0
Soil	0	o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases.	0
Biodiversity	-	o The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. o Biodiversity enhancements are proposed.	0
Landscape	0	o The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. o The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. o However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term.	0

Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal will lead to significant pressure on local infrastructure in relative terms due to the lack of WWTW. o The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. As there are no local services or facilities locally, the development may help sustain services and facilities elsewhere (although this requires the need to travel). o The development may help sustain the schools as Fyvie Primary School and Turriff Secondary School are projected to have spare capacity, however there are other infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely WWTW. Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures – if any are possible - and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. o The site has potential to help consolidate the settlement pattern. 	0
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types. Nonetheless, this is small-scale, self-build housing with limited opportunity to provide a good housing mix and choice. 	-
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No impact on cultural heritage. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR054 Land adjacent to Hillview, Woodhead of Fyvie		Proposal: 2 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Individual developments of this scale are unlikely to have any effect on air quality. 	0
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o WWTW is not available for this area and the site is in a SEPA waste water drainage hot spot (i.e. poor ground conditions for soakaways) and it is not desirable to have septic tanks. They would need to connect to a public sewer; however, this may not be feasible. o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. 	-
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, a proposal on this scale is unlikely to have any effect on CO₂ emissions. o The development is not in an area identified at flood risk. 	0

Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. o The development could affect the conservation objectives and natural features of a locally important designated site (development site is within Windyhills LNCS). No intervention is available to mitigate against the loss of a locally important nature conservation designation. 	-
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. o The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. o However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal will lead to significant pressure on local infrastructure in relative terms due to the lack of WWTW. o The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. As there are no local services or facilities locally, the development may help sustain services and facilities elsewhere (although this requires the need to travel). o The development may help sustain the schools as Fyvie Primary School and Turriff Secondary School are projected to have spare capacity, however there are other infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely WWTW. Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures – if any are possible – and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. o The site has potential to help consolidate the existing settlement. 	0
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The self-build housing proposed enhances opportunities to access affordable housing (one 3 bed unit to be incorporated). However, this will not make a significant increase in housing choice. 	-
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No impact on cultural heritage. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR130 Land to the West of Woodhead, Woodhead of Fyvie		Proposal: 24 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Individual developments of this scale are unlikely to have any effect on air quality. 	0
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o WWTW is not available for this area and the site is in a SEPA waste water drainage hot spot (i.e. poor ground conditions for soakaways) and it is not desirable to have septic tanks. They would need to connect to a public sewer; however, this may not be feasible. o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. 	--
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the likelihood of increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, a proposal on this scale is unlikely to have any effect on CO₂ emissions. o The development is not in an area identified at flood risk. 	0
Soil	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. o The development will cause loss of prime agricultural land which is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss. 	-
Biodiversity	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. o The development could affect the conservation objectives and natural features of a locally important designated site (development site is immediately adjacent Windyhills LNCS). A buffer strip would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. If the site is allocated, this mitigation measure will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site. 	-/0
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. o The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. o The proposal is likely to have a negative impact on the setting of the settlement. o Visual and landscape character impacts are expected as a result of the scale of development which is significant relative to the scale of the settlement, particularly on the approach to the village. 	-/0

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The impact could be mitigated by strategic landscaping, and if allocated, this will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site or designated as protected land. If necessary, a landscape and visual impact assessment will be required and will be stated in the development requirements for the site. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal will lead to significant pressure on local infrastructure in relative terms due to the lack of WWTW. ○ The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. As there are no local services or facilities locally, the development may help sustain services and facilities elsewhere (although this requires the need to travel). ○ The development may help sustain the schools as Fyvie Primary School and Turriff Secondary School are projected to have spare capacity, however there are other infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely WWTW. Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures – if any are possible – and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. ○ The site has potential to connect well to the existing settlement. 	-/+
Population	+/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Limited choice of housing proposed; however, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house type. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No impact on cultural heritage 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

YTHANBANK

Preferred Sites

Site Ref: OP1 (FR019) Michealmuir Croft, Ythanbank		Proposal: 5 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments	Effect – post mitigation
		<p>Effects should be assessed in terms of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is no public waste water treatment works in Ythanbank. The Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) will need to be consulted and full authorisation and relevant licensing sought for private treatment. Early discussions with SEPA may be required as approval of individual waste water discharges is unlikely. A single adoptable Waste Water Treatment Plant of sufficient capacity should be pursued, and investigation into ground water pollution may be required. ○ Invercannie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity, however early engagement with Scottish Water has been advised. 	-
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. However, a proposal on this scale is unlikely to have any effect on CO₂ emissions. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	0/+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development is not likely to conserve, protect and enhance the diversity of species and habitats, and the natural heritage of the area. ○ The development is not likely to maintain or enhance existing green networks and improve connectivity/function or create new links where needed. ○ Biodiversity enhancements are proposed. Individual SuDS schemes would also enhance biodiversity. 	0/+
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Landscape impact would be minimal and mitigated through landscaping and natural boundary features. ○ The scale and location of the development fits with the existing settlement. 	0
Material Assets	0/+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. ○ The development would help sustain Auchterellon Primary School (decreasing school roll). ○ Although the village lacks local services and facilities and therefore promotes car dependency, the development would help sustain services in Ellon. 	0/+

Population	-	o Self-build housing proposed of 4+bed homes suggested, which limits housing choice.	-
Human Health	0/+	o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. o Extends footpath in front of plots and potential to improve connectivity to the Ythanbank Reindeer Centre.	0/+
Cultural Heritage	0	o No impact on cultural heritage.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: FR048 Site 1, Land at Wood of Schivas, Ythanbank, Methlick		Proposal: 12 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	o For the most part individual developments of this scale are likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects on air quality, largely limited to the construction period.	0
Water	-	o There is no public waste water treatment works in Ythanbank. The Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) will need to be consulted and full authorisation and relevant licensing sought for private treatment. Early discussions with SEPA may be required as approval of individual waste water discharges is unlikely. A single adoptable Waste Water Treatment Plant of sufficient capacity should be pursued, and investigation into ground water pollution may be required. o Invercarnie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has sufficient capacity, however early engagement with Scottish Water has been advised. o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term.	-/?
Climatic Factors	0	o The site is not within an area identified as being at flood risk. o The site has poor connections to the public transport network (no bus stop within 400m) and therefore may increase reliance on private car usage. o A development of this scale is unlikely to have a significant impact on CO ₂ emissions.	0
Soil	0	o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases, however this impact would be limited to the short/medium-term.	0

Biodiversity	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ The development is not likely to conserve, protect and enhance the diversity of species and habitats, and the natural heritage of the area. ○ The development risks loss of existing trees (ancient woodland – plantation origin), woodland and hedges. The area of the site covered by Ancient Woodland should be retained as open space and woodland supplemented as required to mitigate against any negative impact and if allocated, this measure stated as part of the development requirements to be a positive feature of the opportunity site. ○ The development will enhance biodiversity through provision of open space, including the planting of native tree species, nectar rich species and wildflowers in the verges. 	-/+
Landscape	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. ○ However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term, and overall the site will not have a significant negative impact on the setting of the village. 	0
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access, education provision at Methlick Primary and Meldrum Academy, which will have a long-term effect. ○ Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. 	0
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population, although 25% affordable housing is proposed. However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house types. 	+/0
Human Health	+/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It would result in an increase of open space. ○ No impact on core paths. ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. ○ Poor connectivity to facilities and amenities would discourage the use of sustainable modes of transport, having a negative impact on health. 	+/-
Cultural Heritage	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development will have long-term and permanent, long-term negative effects on the setting of an archaeological site (Fedderat Cairn). As such, the development may weaken the sense of place, and the identity of existing settlements. Site topography and landscaping may help mitigate, nonetheless there would be a significant impact due to the development's siting on an area of regionally significant importance (Wood of Schivas – extensive rig and furrow area). 	-/?
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR049 Site 2, Land at Wood of Schivas, Ythanbank, Methlick		Proposal: 25 Homes and 2.5ha Employment Land	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the most part individual developments of this scale are likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects on air quality, largely limited to the construction period. 	0
Water	-/?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is no public waste water treatment works in Ythanbank. In the event that private waste water drainage is required for a development of this scale, it is likely to have a negative impact on water quality. To mitigate this, the Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) will need to be consulted and full authorisation and relevant licensing sought for private treatment. Early discussions with SEPA may be required as approval of individual waste water discharges is unlikely. A single adoptable WWTP of sufficient capacity should be pursued, and investigation into ground water pollution may be required. ○ Invercarnie, Mannofield and Turriff WTW has capacity, however early engagement with Scottish Water has been advised. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. 	-/?
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site is not within an area identified as being at flood risk. ○ The site has poor connections to the public transport network (no bus stop within 400m) and therefore may increase reliance on private car usage. ○ However, development on this scale is unlikely to have a significant impact on CO₂ emissions. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases, however this impact would be limited to the short/medium-term. 	0
Biodiversity	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ The development is not likely to conserve, protect and enhance the diversity of species and habitats, and the natural heritage of the area. ○ The development will enhance biodiversity through provision of open space, including the planting of native tree species, nectar rich species and wildflowers in the verges. The proposal also presents an opportunity for providing green corridor links. ○ The development will however also result in the loss of existing trees (ancient woodland – plantation origin), woodland and hedges. Native tree species planting proposed. Although, this would not offset the loss of ancient woodland but may offset other tree removal. ○ Compensatory planting is a mitigation measure that would reduce potential negative effects and provide biodiversity enhancement opportunities. If the site is allocated, the need for compensatory planting will be stated as part of the development requirements for the site. 	-/+

Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. o The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. o Potential loss of woodland and open field pattern. o Potential mitigation from compensatory planting, use of dry-stone walls. o However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There are a number of infrastructure constraints associated with the site, namely road access, education provision at Methlick Primary and Meldrum Academy, and uncertainty over WWTW capacity, which may have a long-term effect. o Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. o The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. The development would provide employment opportunity, housing choices, new walking routes but the site is poorly connected to existing settlements. 	+/?
Population	+/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A mix of house types is proposed resulting in a housing choice for all groups of the population. o 25% affordable housing is proposed. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o It would result in an increase of open space. o No impact on core paths – new walking routes are proposed. o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. o However, positive benefits are offset by poor connectivity to facilities and amenities would discourage the use of sustainable modes of transport, having a negative impact on health. o Although, an eastern section of the site lies within the outer consultation zone for a national grid pipeline. Therefore, the development would be subject to consultation. 	0/?
Cultural Heritage	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development will have long-term and permanent negative effects on the setting of scheduled monuments and archaeological sites. The development may weaken the sense of place, and the identity of existing settlements. o Invariably, the allocation will adversely affect the built features, their context, pattern of past historic use, and the setting in which they sit, in landscapes and within the soil (archaeology), and also in our towns, villages and streets. o New developments that deviate from existing designs, layouts and materials could adversely affect the setting of historic settlements in the long-term. o There are numerous Aberdeenshire SMRs within and adjacent to the site. Development is likely to impact the setting of these – site topography and landscaping may help mitigate, nonetheless there would be a significant impact due to the development's siting on an area of regionally significant importance (Wood of Schivas – extensive rig and furrow area). 	-/?
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

LANDWARD SITES – DRUM OF WARTLE

Preferred Sites

None.

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: FR036 Land at Greenway, Drum of Wartle (Business)		Proposal: 1.5 ha employment land (light industrial)	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of employment land could worsen air quality depending on developments coming forward. The impact would be controlled through development management procedures. 	0
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on potential deterioration of a waterbody, based on private drainage being proposed. 	0
Climatic Factors	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services) and increased emissions. This is not a well-connected area, so it is unlikely that the impact of emissions could be mitigated especially as the proposal is for employment land. 	-
Soil	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. These will be remediated in the medium-term. 	0
Biodiversity	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development of a greenfield site is likely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. Negative impacts can be overcome by good landscape design including green corridors. 	0
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. 	-

		o However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term.	
Material Assets	+	o The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire.	+
Population	0	o Employment opportunities would be created.	0
Human Health	0	o Unlikely to have any significant effects.	0
Cultural Heritage	0	o The development of the site is unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment.	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

LANDWARD SITES – FORGUE

Preferred Sites

None.

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: FR146 Land to East of South Balnoon Farmhouse, Forgue		Proposal: 10 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to have an impact due to its small scale. 	0
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No public sewers in the area. Proposer provides no details on sewage disposal. In the event that private waste water drainage is required, it must not have a negative impact on water quality. To mitigate this, the Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) will need to be consulted and full authorisation and relevant licensing sought for private treatment. Early discussions with SEPA may be required as approval of individual waste water discharges is unlikely. A single adoptable WWTP of sufficient capacity should be pursued, and investigation into ground water pollution may be required. ○ Turriff WTW has capacity, but a growth project may be required to accommodate future development. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ Minimal negative impact on water quality - the proposed development is on a brownfield site near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (ground, coastal, transitional or loch) is poor. However, the site is not immediately adjacent to a watercourse. 	0
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements as there are few services available locally. However, a development of this scale is unlikely to have any effect on CO₂ emissions. 	0
Soil	+/?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development may result in remediation of contaminated soil (existence of any contamination is unknown). 	+/?
Biodiversity	0/+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site is agricultural land of limited biodiversity interest. ○ Unlikely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. 	0/+

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development is not likely to conserve, protect and enhance the diversity of species and habitats, and the natural heritage of the area. o The development will enhance biodiversity through redevelopment of brownfield land with some biodiversity improvements. 	
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The site is in close proximity to Deveron Valley Special Landscape Area and within the Agricultural Heartland landscape character type, which features gently rolling landforms allowing for open views, and characterised by infrequent farmsteads and scattered settlements. o The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. o The landscape experience is likely to change – openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations. o There is potential cumulative impact on housing of an inappropriate scale on a farmstead (10 homes together with adjacent bid site for 4 homes) which would be intrusive by its relative scale. o The site is visible due to open nature of landscape: the development risks a suburban ‘cul de sac’ arrangement being imposed on this agricultural setting through the scale of the setting, although screening would help mitigate impact. o In this undulating agricultural heartland, mixed species woodland and shelterbelts could be planted to mitigate impact and reinforce landscape character. If allocated, this mitigation would be stated in the development requirements of the opportunity site. 	-/0
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. o Positive impact on Forgue Primary School which is currently over capacity but set to decline within 5 years. o There are very few facilities in the locality. o Long-term negative impact on the single-track road and junction onto the B9024. 	+/-
Population	+/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Mixed size of housing is proposed (2, 3 and 4 bedroom) resulting in a degree of housing choice, including affordable housing. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Development would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. o The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	0
Cultural Heritage	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Development is immediately adjacent to the site of a 19th century farmstead. New developments that deviate from existing designs, layouts and materials could adversely affect the setting of an historic setting in the long-term. If allocated, the need for sensitive design solutions would be specified as part of the development requirements of the site. 	-/?
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR147 Land to North and East of South Balnoon Farmhouse, Forgue		Proposal: 4 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to have an impact due to its small scale. 	0
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No public sewers in the area. Proposer provides no details on sewage disposal. In the event that private waste water drainage is required, it must not negative impact on water quality. To mitigate this, the Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) will need to be consulted and full authorisation and relevant licensing sought for private treatment. Early discussions with SEPA may be required as approval of individual waste water discharges is unlikely. A single adoptable WWTP of sufficient capacity should be pursued, and investigation into ground water pollution may be required. ○ Turriff WTW has capacity, but a growth project may be required to accommodate future development. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ Minimal negative impact on water quality – the proposed development is on a site that may be brownfield, near a watercourse where the quality of water bodies (ground, coastal, transitional or loch) is poor. 	0
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements as there are few services available locally. However, a development of this scale is unlikely to have any effect on CO₂ emissions. 	0
Soil	-/?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. ○ The proposed development may result in remediation of contaminated soil (existence of any contamination is unknown). ○ Development causes some loss of prime agricultural land which is a limited resource and cannot be replaced. It will also result in soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter. Impacts are likely to be localised and long-term. No intervention is available to mitigate against this loss. 	-/?
Biodiversity	0/+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site is agricultural land of limited biodiversity interest. ○ Unlikely to be a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. ○ The development is not likely to conserve, protect and enhance the diversity of species and habitats, and the natural heritage of the area. ○ The development will enhance biodiversity through proposed planting. 	0/+
Landscape	-/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site is located in agricultural heartland (upland ridges South of the Deveron) with gently rolling landforms allowing open views, characterised by infrequent farmsteads and scattered settlements. ○ The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. 	-/0

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations. ○ Inappropriate scale of housing on a farmstead (4 homes together with adjacent bid site for 10 homes) would be intrusive by its relative scale and result in a negative cumulative impact. ○ The site is visible due to the open nature of the landscape: the development risks a suburban arrangement being imposed on this agricultural setting, although screening would help mitigate the impact. ○ In this undulating agricultural heartland mixed species woodland and shelterbelts could be planted to mitigate the impact and reinforce landscape character. 	
Material Assets	+/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The quality of a new asset, created through the development of this site, depends on the availability of and its conformity with other assets in Aberdeenshire. ○ Positive impact on Fogue Primary School which is currently over capacity but set to decline within 5 years. ○ There are very few facilities in the locality. ○ Long-term negative impact on the single track road and junction onto the B9024. 	+/-
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Comprises of 4 detached houses (3 bedroom), no affordable housing proposed. (Note: two planning approvals for conversion of steading and bothy provide smaller accommodation as residential feu – related to this bid). However, proposals must accord with the design policies in the LDP and include a mix of house type. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Development would not result in the loss of open space/core paths. ○ The provision of new housing in conformity with new building standards can enhance good health and social justice for people with no previous access to housing. 	0
Cultural Heritage	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Development is immediately adjacent to the site of a 19th century farmstead. New developments that deviate from existing designs, layouts and materials could adversely affect the setting of an historic setting in the long-term. If allocated, the need for sensitive design solutions would be specified as part of the development requirements of the site. 	-/?
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

LANDWARD SITES – HATTONCROOK

Preferred Sites

None.

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: FR023 West Hattoncreek, Oldmeldrum		Proposal: 30 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Individual developments of this scale are unlikely to have any significant impacts. 	0
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal is likely to have a significant negative effect. As it exceeds public sewage treatment capacity, a private waste drainage system is proposed/required for more than 15 houses. Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) will need to be consulted and full authorisation and relevant licensing sought for private treatment. A single adoptable WWTP of sufficient capacity should be pursued, and investigation into ground water pollution may be required. Impacts are likely to be localised and medium/long-term. o This could also be mitigated through a growth programme should the proposal meet Scottish Water's growth criteria. 	-
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The site is not within an identified flood risk area. o A proposal on this scale is unlikely to have any effect on CO₂ emissions. o A proposal of this scale will cause a significant loss of valuable agricultural land (i.e. through increases in concentrations of a certain contaminant(s) in soil, soil sealing, structural change in soils and change in soil organic matter). Impacts are likely to be localised and medium/long-term. 	0
Soil	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. o A proposal of this scale will cause a significant loss of valuable agricultural land. Impacts are likely to be localised and medium/long-term. 	-
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal is of a scale and in a location, which is unlikely to negatively affect a nature conservation site or wider biodiversity. 	0
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The nature of land use in the area will be changed and displaced. The relationship between landforms and land use; field pattern and boundaries as well as buildings and structure will change. 	0

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, colour, texture, visual diversity, line, pattern, movement, sound, solitude, naturalness, historical and cultural associations will change. o The proposal will have a negative impact on a key feature of the landscape character area. o These negative impacts could be mitigated through good design and screening. 	
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal will have negative effects on existing infrastructure as it is of a scale which increases the pressure on the sewage network and the local primary/secondary school. o These negative impacts could be mitigated through a growth programme and developer obligations, if required. 	-
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, any applications will be required to be in accordance with the LDP policy, meaning there will be a sustainable mix of housing with at least 25% being affordable. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Development of the site is unlikely to have any significant effects on existing pathways or access to open space. o Population not at risk from hazardous developments. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development is unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

LANDWARD SITES – WHITECAIRNS

Preferred Sites

None.

Alternative Sites

Site Ref: FR016 Land to the rear of Dykeside, Whitecairns		Proposal: 6 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Individual developments of this scale are unlikely to have any effect on air quality. ▪ For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ WWTW is not available for this area and the site is in a SEPA waste water drainage hot spot (i.e. poor ground conditions for soakaways) and it is not desirable to have septic tanks. They would need to connect to a public sewer; however, this may not be feasible. ○ Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. ○ The proposed development on a greenfield site is near the Potterton Burn, which has a moderate water quality rating. ○ The effect on the water environment also depends on potential deterioration of a waterbody, and the extent to which the allocation connects to the public sewage infrastructure. ○ With the information on the quality of water around the site, the cumulative effects can be significant in the longer term for the Potterton Burn. 	-/?
Climatic Factors	0/-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development could have a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services), but its scale would only have a moderate increase in CO₂ emissions. 	0/-
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development is of a scale and in a location that is unlikely to negatively affect a nature conservation site or wider biodiversity. ○ Some moderate biodiversity enhancements are proposed, which would have a long-term positive impact. 	0

Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, line, pattern, solitude, naturalness will change. This could be mitigated by strategic landscaping. o However, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal will not lead to a significant increase in pressure on local infrastructure. o However, Balmedie Primary School will be over capacity (118% by 2024). Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. 	0
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. However, this would be mitigated by conforming with the LDP policy. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Development of the site is unlikely to have any significant effects on existing pathways or access to open space. o The population is not at risk from hazardous developments. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development is unlikely to weaken the sense of place, and the identity of Whitecairns, as it mostly comprises of detached houses, the oldest located at the T-junction and the newest to the north. The site contains former cottages, which are listed in the Sites and Monuments Record, but have been removed. An archaeology survey could be requested if the site is allocated. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR055 Chance Inn, Whitecairns		Proposal: 3 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect – post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Individual developments of this scale are unlikely to have any effect on air quality. 	0
Water	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o WWTW is not available for this area. The proposal is likely to have a negative effect as a private waste drainage system is proposed. The effects could be significant in the longer term. 	-
Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The site is not within an identified flood risk area. o A proposal on this scale is unlikely to have any effect on CO₂ emissions. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development of this greenfield site is unlikely to have a long-term irreversible adverse impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitats and/or habitat fragmentation and/or disturbance to species that use the site as a habitat. 	0

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Any negative impacts regarding development could be mitigated by the development plan being in accordance with the Parks and Open Space Strategy; in particular by procuring wold green space and green corridors. 	
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal would create ribbon development and will have a negative impact on a key feature of the landscape character. The impacts are likely to be long-term. 	-
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal will not lead to a significant increase in pressure on local infrastructure. o However, Balmedie Primary School will be over capacity (118% by 2024). Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. 	0
Population	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No mix of house types is proposed resulting in a limited housing choice for all groups of the population. 	-
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Development of the site is unlikely to have any significant effects on existing pathways or access to open space. o The population is not at risk from hazardous developments. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Unlikely to have any effect on the historic environment. 	0
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Site Ref: FR097 Land North of Drovers Place, Whitecairns		Proposal: 30 homes	
SEA Topics	Effect	Comments and mitigation measures Effects should be assessed in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversibility or irreversibility • risks • duration (i.e. permanent, temporary, long-term, short-term and medium-term) 	Effect - post mitigation
Air	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Individual developments of this scale are unlikely to have any effect on air quality. o For the most part, air quality is likely to have short to medium-term temporary insignificant effects. 	0
Water	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o WWTW is not available for this area and the site is in a SEPA waste water drainage hot spot (i.e. poor ground conditions for soakaways) and it is not desirable to have septic tanks. They would need to connect to a public sewer; however, this may not be feasible. However, a private reed bed system is proposed off-site on land in the ownership of the proposer. The feasibility of this is uncertain, which could impact watercourses o Some localised impacts on watercourses would occur during the development phase of this site i.e. change in water table, stream flows, silt deposition and water-borne pollution. The impact is likely to be short-term. o The proposed development on a greenfield site is near the Potterton Burn, which has a moderate water quality rating. o The effect on the water environment also depends on potential deterioration of a waterbody, and the extent to which the allocation connects to the public sewage infrastructure. o With the information on the quality of water around the site, the cumulative effects can be significant in the longer term for the Potterton Burn. 	-/?

Climatic Factors	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development risks a long-term negative impact due to the potential for increased travel requirements (the need to travel long distances to services). However, a development on this scale is unlikely to have any significant effect on CO₂ emissions. 	0
Soil	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposed development is likely to have short-term adverse effects on soil through soil erosion, desegregation, compaction and pollution during construction phases. 	0
Biodiversity	0/+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development is of a scale and in a location that is unlikely to negatively affect a nature conservation site or wider biodiversity. o Biodiversity enhancements are proposed, which would have a long-term positive impact. 	0/+
Landscape	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The landscape experience is likely to change - openness, scale, line, pattern, solitude, naturalness will change. This could be mitigated by strategic landscaping. o Furthermore, given that over a long-term, what gets developed becomes part of the landscape, the effects are only likely to be medium-term. 	0/-
Material Assets	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal will lead to a significant increase in pressure on Balmedie Primary School and need a new sewage treatment work. o Consultation with relevant infrastructure providers will be required to identify mitigation measures, and if allocated, the Settlement Statement will specify how to mitigate against these effects. o However, there are no services in this hamlet. 	0/-
Population	+/0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Mix of semi and detached homes from 1-4+ bedrooms are proposed resulting in a housing choice for most groups of the population. 25% of the site will be for affordable homes. 	+/0
Human Health	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A loop is proposed with some green space, with the play area next to the existing tree belt. A footpath link is proposed to the B999. o The population is not at risk from hazardous developments. 	0
Cultural Heritage	0/?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development is unlikely to weaken the sense of place, and the identity of Whitecaims, as it mostly comprises of detached houses, the oldest located at the T-junction and the newest to the north. o Nearby are former buildings that are listed in the Sites and Monuments Record, but most have been destroyed. An archaeology survey could be requested if the site is allocated. 	0/?
Key	+ = positive effect ++ = significant positive effect - = negative effect -- = significant negative effect 0 = neutral effect ? = uncertain effect		

Issue 62 Balmedie

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
57	Ms Ceri Kindley
209	Mr Stuart Gove
248	Lippe Architects + Planners
315	Belhelvie Community Council
342	Mr & Mrs John & Carol Cooper
373	case CONSULTING Limited on behalf of West Balmedie Estate
402	Halliday Fraser Munro on behalf of ANM Group Ltd & CHAP Group Ltd
446	DM Hall on behalf of B & J Dawson
462	Fiona Main
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
508	Bancon Homes Ltd
605	Mr Kevin Main
794	Norr on behalf of Stewart Milne Homes
796	Norr on behalf of Stewart Milne Homes
805	SEPA
862	Ms Susan Edwards
888	Mr Ewan Murray
920	Ms Emma Paterson
1004	Mrs Brenda Griffin
1009	Historic Environment Scotland

2. Issues

General

The respondent fully supports the Vision and Planning Objectives for Balmedie as described in the Main Issues Report (402).

A respondent seeks the removal of protected status for the small strip of woodland to the rear of Woodlands, site P2 (209).

A respondent recommends that the Plan should identify a site for the new primary school, to address the problem stated in the Vision for Balmedie (315).

A respondent considered that the roads in Balmedie would not cope with any additional development (1004). While another stated that all development should be restricted until implementation of the Scottish Water growth project (805).

A respondent has complained regarding the lack of replacement tree planting located between their property to the south of Balmedie and the A90 (57).

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has noted that a Scottish Water growth project is required, however they understand there is no firm date for the growth project (805).

Bid FR077 / Existing Site – OP1

There was a general objection to the inclusion of this site from one respondent (57).

The respondent identified an error in the supporting text for OP1 in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) as there is reference to 'R1' being used for access to the site, however 'R1' is a reserved site for community facilities in the village (402).

This response sought the change in allocation of OP1 currently in the Local Development Plan 2017 to 80 houses and 11ha of mixed use commercial development (Use Classes 1, 4, 5, 6 and 7). The inclusion of retail provision on the site would meet an identified need in Balmedie and will take advantage of the improved trunk road networks thereby minimising any impacts on the core of Balmedie (402).

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) has suggested a joint development brief is prepared for this site and site OP2 (bid FR124), with green infrastructure providing informal access routes into and between Balmedie Country Park, Local Nature Conservation Site (LNCS) and Balmedie. In addition, it is requested that natural heritage impacts should be mitigated and key opportunities for natural heritage and landscape enhancement is identified in the Plan including integration of green infrastructure reinforcing landscape character within future development (506). The site is located adjacent to a coastal Special Landscape Area (SLA), therefore due cognisance needs to be taken of special landscape qualities (506).

Bid FR124 / Existing Site – OP2

The respondent supports the increase in the housing allocation on OP2 to 220 houses (402).

SNH has requested that a site brief is prepared jointly with the adjacent OP1 with green infrastructure providing informal access routes into and between the neighbouring Balmedie Country Park, Local Nature Conservation Site (LNCS) and the main settlement of Balmedie. In addition, natural heritage impacts should be mitigated and key opportunities for natural heritage and landscape enhancement should be identified in the Plan (506).

The respondent highlights that the site is located adjacent to a coastal SLA therefore due cognisance needs to be taken of special landscape qualities (506).

Respondent 57 has a general objection to this site (57).

Existing Site – OP3

There has been an objection to the housing development proposed for Menie Estate. The respondent is of the view that applicants have not complied with the Scottish Ministers' conditions and environmental management advice (862).

Bid FR022

The respondent is supportive of the inclusion of bid FR022 which should be included in the Plan as a mixed use allocation for up to 500 houses, primary school, community facilities, and employment land. The site would have direct connectivity to the settlement through the grade separated junction. This site would not have any adverse traffic impacts on Balmedie unlike bids to the north which have to be accessed via Old Aberdeen Road. In addition, the site has access to Balmedie Waste Water Treatment Plant and the new trunk water main. Allocation of this site would address the shortfall of homes in the area to maintain a minimum 5 year effective housing land supply (373).

However, another respondent considered that this site was not appropriate for development due to its disconnected location west of the A90 (794).

SNH has recommended that consideration of this site should form part of a capacity assessment to inform future management of housing sites in and around Balmedie. The Plan should take account of the recent Aberdeen Landscape Study to avoid coalescence of these main population centres. If considered, a site brief should incorporate key principles of place-making, connect in character and informal access routes to the settlement of Balmedie, retain woodland and incorporate green infrastructure (506).

Another respondent raised concerns regarding the potential impact this site would have on the setting of the Scheduled monument The Temple Stones, stone circle to the North East of Potterton House (1009).

Bid FR079 and FR080

It is considered that these sites should be deleted from the Plan. The site is only accessible from Old Aberdeen Road (315, 373, and 920).

SEPA has commented that a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) may be required for bid FR079 due to the presence of a small watercourse which has been historically straightened. A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse which should be positively integrated into the development. Enhancement of the watercourse through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated (805).

Bid FR089

Respondents do not support FR089 as a future opportunity site as there is no existing or potential connectivity/active travel with the existing settlement and topographical

constraints restrict potential access points. It is considered that the A90 (T) provides a substantial visual and physical barrier between the site and the village. (315, 373, 506, 794).

There is disagreement with the Officers' assessment that there are 'multiple potential environmental and social benefits of the site', as these are not explained nor made apparent (315, 373). SNH is of the view that due to the higher ground, in open landscape, the impacts [on the landscape] are likely to be significant (506). This site cannot deliver the six qualities of successful places due to its location and will fail to deliver a quality place (794).

Another respondent suggested that this site should only be considered for development following the completion of the development at Balmedie South (OP1/FR077 and OP2/FR124) (402).

SNH has recommended that consideration of this site should form part of a capacity assessment to inform future management of housing sites in and around Balmedie and Potterton. Given the proximity of the City/Shire boundary this should take account of the recent Aberdeen Landscape Study to avoid coalescence of these main population centres. If considered, a site brief should incorporate key principles of place making, landscape character and informal access routes to the settlement of Balmedie, retain and enhance connectivity of the area of semi-natural woodland to the north east of the site and incorporate green infrastructure (506).

SEPA has identified that a Flood Risk Assessment may be required due to the presence of watercourses running through the site which have been historically straightened. Buffer strips will be required adjacent to the watercourses which should be positively integrated into the development. Enhancement of the watercourses through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated. In addition, the developer will have to cross the A90 to connect to the sewage works. Logistics of this should be clarified with Scottish Water as the AWPR has changed the road layout, and connection to the network may be complicated by this and any limitations/additional developer costs highlighted in the Plan. It is unlikely SEPA would be able to authorise any temporary private treatment works due to the proximity to the bathing beach (805).

Historic Environment Scotland has raised concern for potential significant impact on the setting of Scheduled monument SM3277 (Hare Cairn). Restricting development to the east (next to the road) may help mitigate impact (1009).

However, respondent 508 is supportive of allocating FR089 for immediate release (2021-2031) to meet the shortfall of housing due to constraints on the Menie site. It would be a positive contribution to Balmedie providing a primary school and other services and facilities (508).

Bid FR103

Respondents are of the opinion that capacity for this site should be reduced to 5 or 6 homes given its size and the possible requirement for each plot to have private drainage arrangements (315, 342, 373, and 1004). It has been suggested that the site is reduced to 10 houses (888), whilst other respondents consider that 27 houses is an unacceptable overdevelopment of the site (462, 605).

Concerns about the safety of the single track access road with no pavements or street lighting, have been raised by respondents (342, 462, 605, 888, and 920). Other respondents identified that the road cannot be widened as it would require the felling of trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order (888, 920).

Another respondent is of the view that development on this site would cause irreversible and irreplaceable impact on existing wildlife, and erode the natural beauty and character of the area (462).

A respondent stated that this site should be co-ordinated with proposed bid FR116 in order to deliver a phased released, rigorously designed scheme (796).

It has been highlighted by SEPA that a Flood Risk Assessment may be required due to the presence of a small watercourse which has been historically straightened. A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse which should be positively integrated into the development. Enhancement of the watercourse through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated (805).

Bid FR116

Respondents have expressed objections to the allocation of Bid FR116. It has been identified that bid FR116 is designated as coastal zone, where there is a presumption against development (315, 373, 462, 506, 605, 888). This site would adversely impact on wildlife, the special landscape area, the dunes system and character of the area (462, 605, 888 and 1004).

Respondents had concerns about the large scale of development with substantial adverse impacts on the existing settlement, including potentially more than 20 years of construction traffic (315, 373, 506, 888, and 1004). Several respondents had concerns that this site is associated with site OP3 resulting in one large sprawl of development (373, 888, 920). Respondents are of the view that the site is not required to meet housing targets in the forthcoming period or the following Local Development Plan (888, 920).

It is also considered that development would have unacceptable traffic impacts, including on Old Aberdeen Road (315, 462, 888). It would require substantial road infrastructure to connect into the AWPR (605, 888, and 462). A respondent is particularly concerned regarding the impact this site would have on traffic in addition to the 550 houses on the Menie Estate (315). One respondent considered that the

access road to Shady Neuk Gardens was not suitable to access this scale of development and the road could not be widened due to trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order (888). A comprehensive traffic mitigation scheme is delivered to avoid any adverse impacts on the existing settlement of Balmedie (315).

A respondent has stated that there is no connectivity to the existing settlement, with an area of land between the bid site and Balmedie that prevents integration (315, 888).

It was highlighted by a respondent that development would result in the loss of a significant area of prime agricultural land where it has not been demonstrated that the economic and social benefit outweighs the loss of the asset (888). Furthermore, education constraints would need to be addressed (605,462, 888).

SNH has identified that careful consideration is required with regard to how this site would relate to the surrounding development as it appears to be leading to coalescence and large scale suburban development. A strategic design framework is recommended to set out the capacity of the area in order to determine a sense of place and scale, land for development and detailed design and consideration of natural heritage issues, with significant enhancement measures required. There is also a possible need for a recreation management plan (506).

There was a view that this site should only be considered for development following the completion of development at Balmedie South (OP1/FR077 and OP2/FR124) (402). However, a respondent sought to have the site allocated within the next Local Development Plan. The site is located within the Energetica Strategy area where quality of design and development and quality of life are aims for delivery. It would deliver a community campus, a secondary school and primary school, sports facilities, and a health centre (796).

The respondent is of the view that the site possesses unique landscape capacity characteristics which endow it with a particular sense of identity. An ecological park will enhance the attractiveness of this location and provide benefits for the wider amenity of the area (796). In addition, the site would meet the housing density target of the Strategic Development Plan (796).

In support of this site, the respondent states that they have a solution to access, with traffic on the Old Aberdeen Road being significantly below the theoretical capacity. There is a viable access solution (796). The respondent commits to ensuring that the site is to be delivered without any impact on the interests at the Special Protection Area (SPA) at the nearby Ythan Estuary and other environmental concerns (796).

SEPA has identified that a Flood Risk Assessment may be required due to the presence of watercourses running through the site which have been historically straightened. Buffer strips will be required adjacent to the watercourses which should be positively integrated into the development. Enhancement of the watercourses through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated (805).

Bid FR128

Respondents have sought the inclusion of this site for commercial or retail uses and consider that due to its elevated position, noise from the A90 precludes housing. Furthermore, the site is accessible since the new A90 interchange junction (446, 794).

Bid FR148

Respondents considered that coalescence of existing small hamlets should be avoided to maintain rural landscape character and avoid over development (506, 794).

Another respondent proposes a new long term (reserved) site for employment retail and housing development to the Northwest to provide cohesion with sites FR079, FR080, FR089 and FR116 (248).

The inclusion of a new site for housing is proposed to the south of FR089 (446).

3. Actions

General

We do not propose to remove the protective status of site P2. The site is protected to conserve the woodland setting of the village as part of the green network for the village. Land protected for green network does not always mean to allow public access or to function as public open space. It can be protected for the ecological value and to prevent fragmentation of a woodland habitat. It is noted that the respondent has been maintaining and improving the site to protect the setting of their house and enjoyed as a woodland. Retaining the protected status of the land does not conflict with the respondent's use of the land and the Council's intent to retain and protect the woodland from inappropriate development in order to conserve the setting of the area.

With regard to additional allocations, in accordance with the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan sufficient additional housing and employment land allocations are identified in the Aberdeen Market Area. It is considered that Balmedie has an appropriate amount of land identified for housing and employment to meet local needs during the Plan period.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) does not propose to include a specific allocation for a school. Aberdeenshire Council's Education and Children's Services are a stakeholder in the preparation of the Proposed LDP and have advised that, in the first instance, they would seek to extend or reconfigure the existing primary school, alongside a wider strategic approach to primary school education in south Formartine. However, we are committed to continuously engage with Aberdeenshire Council's Education and Children's Services on the capacity of Balmedie Primary School.

Services and Infrastructure

Scottish Water would be required to initiate a growth project once development meets their five growth criteria.

With regard to the replacement tree planting along the A90, this is not a matter for the LDP process. Any issues regarding the A90 should be directed to Transport Scotland.

Bid FR077 / Existing Site – OP1

With regard to the changes sought to OP1 allocation, as identified in the Main Issues Report, these align with our proposed amendment to this allocation to allow 80 homes, 11 hectares of employment land, mixed commercial land, retail and hotel and a single Masterplan for Sites OP1 and OP2.

The respondent had correctly identified that the reference to R1 in the Draft Proposed LDP refers to the reserved land for new community facilities, and not the trunk road works. Reference to this will be removed from the allocation summary.

With regarding to green infrastructure, the Proposed LDP requires the development to provide green links to the wider green network of open space within Balmedie and Balmedie Country Park. As such no further action is required.

For consistency with other Settlement Statements in the LDP we do not agree that the “Natural and Historic Environment” section of the Settlement Statement should be amended to include “Balmedie is located within the Coastal Special Landscape Area”, as the settlement itself is not included within the boundaries of the ‘North East Aberdeenshire Coast’ Special Landscape Area designation.

Bid FR124 / Existing Site – OP2

With regard to green infrastructure, the allocation summary within the Draft Proposed LDP requires the development to provide green links to the wider green network of open space within Balmedie and Balmedie Country Park. In addition, the requirement for a Masterplan to be prepared for Site OP1 and OP2 is stated within the allocation summaries. As such no further action is required.

Existing Site – OP3

The respondent raised objection to the planning application rather than the principles of the land use. The LDP process cannot address the issues and complaints of current planning applications. As the site has an extant planning approval, the site should remain allocated within the Plan. No action is required.

Bid FR022

We maintain that the site is not a suitable extension to Balmedie at this time. We do not propose taking forward any sites to the west of the A90. This site on its own is too far detached from Balmedie’s current built form to be considered as a logical extension to the settlement, at this time. Furthermore, in accordance with the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan sufficient additional housing land allocations are identified in the Aberdeen Housing Market Area. It is considered that Balmedie has an

appropriate amount of land identified for housing to meet local housing needs during the Plan period.

Bid FR079 and FR080

In the interest of clarity and certainty in developing allocated sites within the LDP, sites reserved for future development will not be identified within the Proposed LDP. No action is required.

Bid FR089

In the interest of clarity and certainty in developing allocated sites within the LDP, sites reserved for future development will not be identified within the Proposed LDP.

Furthermore, in accordance with the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan, sufficient additional housing land allocations are identified in the Aberdeen Housing Market Area. It is considered that Balmedie has an appropriate amount of land identified for housing to meet local housing needs during the Plan period. No action is required.

Bid FR103

Whilst it is recognised that the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan sets a housing density at 30 houses per hectare, we would agree that a lower density of houses would be more appropriate for this location. The existing single track access road is constrained due to the trees that exist on the side of the road that contribute to the character of the area. In addition, the FR103 site would be an extension to the existing Shady Neuk development, as site FR116 is not being brought forward at this time. A high density of development would not be in keeping with the character and setting of the adjacent development and this rural location. While a development of 15 houses would be more appropriate in achieving a balanced development in this location, road access could not be delivered to allow the site to be developed. Considerable widening would be required.

Bid FR116

We maintain our position that site FR116 could be a viable development site in the longer term, subject to infrastructure issues being resolved. However, it is considered that Balmedie has an appropriate amount of land identified for housing to meet local housing needs during the Plan period. In the interest of clarity and certainty in developing allocated sites within the LDP, sites reserved for future development will not be identified within the Proposed LDP. However, this site could be considered within future plans. No action is required.

Bid FR128

We maintain our position that this site not suitable for housing at this time. It is acknowledged that the respondent considers the site would be suitable for commercial or retail uses due to its location near the A90. In isolation, the site is not a logical extension to Balmedie's built form and would have a significant adverse impact on the rural character of the wider area. This site could only be considered if other sites on

this side of the A90 were being brought forward. However, at this time, development is better placed to the north and south of Balmedie, on the east side of the A90. No further action is required.

Bid FR148

We maintain our view that this site is not suitable for residential development. Hill of Keir is a small cluster of approximately 18 houses. Hill of Keir does not meet the criteria as a settlement in the LDP as it does not provide any services or facilities. The proposed site would result in an unsustainable community that would depend on private cars to obtain services and facilities within Balmedie. The site is too large for the 21 houses proposed, thus potentially promoting a development that would fail to meet the 6 criteria of successful place making and the principles of the Energetica Framework. No further action is required.

Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

A number of changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed LDP on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below

4. Recommendations

1. Modify the Vision to reflect the local community's concerns regarding vehicle speeding within the town, provision for cycling, availability of a site for education, and lack of youth facilities.
2. Re-allocate existing site OP1 (bid FR077) for 80 homes, 11 ha employment land, mixed commercial land, retail and hotel, and amend allocation summary to replace "Access to the site will be achieved through trunk roadworks completed on the R1 site and via Eigie Road." with "Access to the site will be taken via Eigie Road."
3. Retain existing site OP3.
4. Remove bid FR103 for 15 homes.
5. Remove references to the Future Opportunity sites at FOP1, FOP2 and FOP3 and FOP4.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed, subject to the amendment of the maps to reflect the current road layouts, the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.

3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 63 Barthol Chapel

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
363	Mr George Bruce
487	Mr Phil Booth
554	Mr Robert N Barker
735	Ms Jane Barker
775	Ms Laura Watt
776	Mr Martin Watt
805	SEPA
1047	Mr & Mrs Katherine & Roger Williams

2. Issues

Housing allocation, with an “infill” style approach is welcomed (1047).

There are concerns regarding the Village Green in terms of parking, access, landscaping, functionality, also raised (1047) maintenance (363, 1047).

Extra car parking for the church should be considered on site FR059 (1047).

There are concerns on the entire allocation in terms of access to the site and the capacity of surrounding roads (363, 487, 554, 735, 775, 776) amenity, drainage, need for the development, (775, 776) loss of sites currently under a protected designation, ecological impacts (735) landscape, and lack of public transport (554, 735). The informal recreation area already exists with limited community benefits from development of the site and new routes to school (554).

Land ownership is disputed, with the tree belt and school grounds included within the proposed site (363, 487, 554).

The capacity of the school roll is disputed (487, 554.)

Additional tree planting should be provided (487).

The development constitutes potential ribbon development (363, 554).

SEPA has identified that a Flood Risk Assessment may be required due to the presence of the Burn of Keith which has been historically straightened. In addition, a buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse (805). SEPA note there is no reference to waste water drainage in the Draft Local Development Plan. Due to difficult site conditions a single WWTP of sufficient capacity and of a standard that can be adopted by Scottish Water will be a requirement (805).

3. Actions

The protected designation should remain in place around the school grounds and tree belt to protect existing amenities and ecology, the site boundary should be revised to suit and maintain this protection if required. Additional text shall be added to the Settlement Statement to ensure that increasing the quality of this area should be a requirement from the development.

Technical matters such as access, drainage, public transport as well as landscaping and/or visual impact can all be addressed through an appropriate application submission. Similarly, an appropriate submission would allow for sufficient car parking meaning no net impact upon the wider area. Maintenance of any open space (village green area) could be dealt with through a factoring agreement, if included within an application.

The proposal is not considered to pose any risk of ribbon development, any addition would reflect the character of the village and represent a natural addition.

4. Recommendations

1. Add to 'Services and Infrastructure' section of the Settlement Statement "Flood risk: there is no waste water treatment works drainage for Barthol Chapel. A single Waste Water Treatment Plant of sufficient capacity is required to serve all properties within the development and shall be of a standard that can be adopted by Scottish Water."
2. Site FR059 should be retained and allocated as OP1 with the boundary altered to take cognisance of the existing school grounds and existing woodland to ensure protection/retention.
3. Add to OP1 allocation summary: "A Flood Risk Assessment may be required due to the presence of the Burn of Keith which has been historically straightened. A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse which should be positively integrated into the development. The buffer strip will need to allow sufficient space for restoration of the Burn of Keith. Enhancement of the watercourse through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated."

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.

3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 64 Belhelvie

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
315	Belhelvie Community Council
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
795	John Handley Associates Ltd on behalf of Scotia Homes Ltd
805	SEPA
962	Graham + Sibbald on behalf of Leith Properties (Aberdeen) Ltd

2. Issues

General

One respondent was of the view that a site for a community centre should be identified and reserved within the settlement boundary or within bid sites in order to facilitate the community aspiration for this, as expressed in the Vision statement in the Main Issues Report and Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) (315). The respondent has also expressed concern regarding the increase in the capacity of bid sites FR131 and FR024 from 40 to 90 homes. They consider a lower capacity would be more consistent with the scale of the existing settlement (315).

It has been suggested that the names of existing sites OP1 (bid FR131) and OP2 (bid FR024) are swapped for clarity and consistency with the LDP 2017 preparation (795).

Existing OP1 site (East end of Park Terrace)

The OP1 allocation for 10 homes has been removed from the Draft Proposed LDP 2021. Planning permission for 14 homes at this site was granted on 1 April 2019 and a 'S75' has been signed. Therefore this allocation should be reinstated in the LDP 2021 (315).

Bid FR024

SNH has stated that site briefs should reinforce settlement identity with a focus on clearly established settlement boundaries given the pressures of large-scale change at Balmedie and Potterton (506).

One respondent has supported this site on the basis that it is effective and viable, meets local housing needs and is a logical extension to the settlement. The site has a range of access points, good connectivity with paths networks and public transport. Furthermore, surface water flooding can be addressed through drainage improvements within the site. Current capacity issues at Balmedie Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW) will be improved if required. At 1.88ha the site can accommodate 49 units with open space and landscaping to enhance biodiversity (795).

SEPA has highlighted that the site is adjacent to activities which are regulated by them under a Waste Management License, Pollution Prevention and Control (PPC) Permit or Controlled Activities (CAR) License. There may be co-location issues and advice should be sought from Environmental Health on the compatibility of these sites with existing adjacent regulated activities (805).

In addition, SEPA has noted that there is a quarry located less than 500m from the site resulting in possible noise and dust issues. A suitable buffer should be provided in line with Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) requirements between the licensed sites and the proposed development. This may impact the developable area available (805). SEPA has also requested that the two ponds on site should be positively integrated into the open space requirement for the development and that all development is restricted until implementation of a Scottish Water growth project is completed (805).

Bid FR025

SNH has highlighted that the site is adjacent to an area of semi natural ancient woodland as long established plantation origin (506).

Bid FR131

One respondent has supported this site and the increase in housing numbers from 15 to 41 (962).

SNH has stated that site briefs should reinforce settlement identity with focus on clearly established settlement boundaries given pressures of large scale change at Balmedie and Potterton (506).

SEPA has highlighted that the site is adjacent to activities which are regulated by them under a Waste Management License, Pollution Prevention and Control (PPC) Permit or Controlled Activities (CAR) License. There may be co-location issues and advice should be sought from Environmental Health on the compatibility of these sites with existing adjacent regulated activities (805).

In addition, SEPA has noted that there is a quarry located less than 500m from the site resulting in possible noise and dust issues. A suitable buffer should be provided in line with SPP requirements between the licensed sites and the proposed development. This may impact the developable area available (805).

3. Actions

General

With regard to the community aspiration for a community centre, the Draft Proposed LDP includes a reference to the community's aspiration for this. In addition, there is a site identified as R1 reserved for a future community centre. No further action is required.

The housing numbers proposed reflect the density of new housing development across Aberdeenshire to ensure the most efficient use of the land in order to deliver a good mix of housing type and size. The housing numbers are indicative and are dependent on the road layout, open space provision and drainage infrastructure. We do not propose to amend the housing numbers or site boundaries of these sites.

Existing site OP1 (East end of Park Terrace)

This allocation was proposed to be removed in the Draft Proposed LDP as the site was constrained in the Housing Land Audit 2018. However, since the site was granted full planning permission in March 2019 for the erection of 14 houses, this site shall be retained within the Proposed Local Development Plan as OP1.

Bid FR024 and Bid FR131

Logical numbering of these sites is appropriate.

The proposed site brief for each of these sites in the Draft Proposed LDP states that “The design of the homes should be in keeping with the other nearby residential properties and the character of the village”. However, the allocation summary will be amended to include appropriate boundary treatments to establish a strong settlement boundary for Belhelvie.

Regarding the quarry and waste management site, Aberdeenshire Council’s Environmental Health Team have confirmed that there are no co-location issues. In addition, it is considered that the distance between the quarry and the proposed allocated sites provides an adequate buffer. Therefore, the quarry and waste management site will not impact on the allocation or developable area of the allocation.

With regard to Scottish Water infrastructure, the need for a Growth Project shall be included in the Settlement Statement.

The ponds within this site FR024 are located on the southernmost part of the site. It is considered appropriate to incorporate these features into the open space provision as an opportunity to enhance biodiversity. This will be reflected in the allocation summary.

Bid FR025

We maintain our position that this site is not a suitable extension to the settlement. The site is not well connected to the existing settlement due to the woodland. As there are other, more suitable sites, this site is not being brought forward at this time. No further action is required.

4. Recommendations

1. Amend ‘Services and Infrastructure’ section to state: “There is insufficient capacity at Balmedie Waste Water Treatment Works to treat all sites allocated at Balmedie, Belhelvie, Newburgh and Potterton. Scottish Water will initiate a

growth project, should demand from committed development exceed available capacity.”

2. Retain existing site OP1 (East end of Park Terrace) for 14 homes.
3. Allocate Bid FR131 for 41 homes as OP2 and adjust settlement boundary accordingly.
4. Allocate Bid FR024 for 49 homes as OP3 and adjust settlement boundary accordingly.
5. Include the following text within the allocation summary for bid FR131 “As the site is at the edge of the settlement, landscaping should be utilised along the southeast and east boundaries to soften the impact of the development on the surrounding countryside and to define the settlement boundary.”
6. Include the following text within the allocation summary for bid FR024: “As the site is at the edge of the settlement, landscaping should be utilised along the south and east boundaries to soften the impact of the development on the surrounding countryside and to define the settlement boundary”.
7. Include the following text within the allocation summary for bid FR024: “There are two ponds located at the southernmost part of the site. These ponds should be retained and positively integrated into the design layout as part of the open space provision.”

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 65 Berefold

1. List of Respondents

None.

2. Issues

No issues were raised in respect of Berefold.

3. Actions

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

There are no protected areas or allocations in Berefold.

4. Recommendations

1. Remove Berefold from the Local Development Plan.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendation at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 66 Blackdog

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
28	Robert Lamb Architectural Services Ltd on behalf of Mr Ricky Greenhowe
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
603	Scott Hobbs Planning on behalf of Ashfield Land (Aberdeen) Limited
977	Graham + Sibbald on behalf of Leith Properties (Aberdeen) Ltd
805	SEPA

2. Issues

It was requested that the settlement boundary be amended at the southwest corner of Blackdog as the AWPR has divided the site making it almost useless for its original purpose (28).

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) supported the statement that the community aspires to provide a cycle link to Balmedie. They requested that the cycle link be included in the list of Services and Infrastructure which developers will be expected to make contributions towards. They also requested that the section Natural and Historic Environment should note the proposed marine extension to the Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA for feeding terns (506).

One respondent is generally supportive of the proposed settlement Vision for Blackdog within the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP). However, they believed that the Settlement Statement did not go far enough and omits reference to the town centre status. The Proposed LDP should also be updated to show the extent of the town centre (603).

Existing Site – OP1

The respondent is supportive of site OP1 and states the text is accurate (603).

SNH agreed with the Main Issues Report that housing on site OP1 would make this a destination rather than just part of the AWPR infrastructure. They suggested that the recently completed Aberdeen Landscape Study comments that capacity work at Balmedie and Potterton should be taken into account to facilitate a holistic proactive approach to management of change across this whole coastal area (506).

SEPA has highlighted that this site would require a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). In addition, buffer strips would be required adjacent to the watercourses which should be positively integrated into the development. Enhancement of the watercourses through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated (805).

SEPA questions the need to upgrade Strathbathie Waste Water Treatment Works as they believe it is being under-utilised and may not require upgrade as an increase in flow is likely to improve performance (805).

Bid FR113

A respondent sought the allocation of this site as a defined town centre for Blackdog to reflect the planning permission for this area. The respondent considered the statement suggesting that only existing and functional town centres can be listed is flawed and contrary to Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) that requires that emerging town centres should be identified in the Proposed LDP (603).

Bid FR057

A respondent promoted the inclusion of bid site FR057 within the Proposed LDP, disagreeing with the conclusions within the MIR that the site is in an undesirable location due to its significant expansion into the countryside and its detrimental impact on the landscape setting around Blackdog. The role of the AWPR as a transport corridor is fully recognised and the purpose of the proposed development is to provide service facilities for users of the transport corridor and to provide a safe and convenient place for drivers to rest and refuel. Road infrastructure (A90 and AWPR) acts as a physical barrier and separates the land from the wider countryside area. Sufficient landscaping through the provision of a landscaping plan could be specified as a policy requirement (977).

3. Actions

The proposed marine extension to the Ythan Estuary, Sand of Forvie and Meikle Loch Special Protection Area (SPA) could extend the existing SPA by approximately 1.5km to the south towards Aberdeen. The extension to this SPA is still pending and therefore the request to include it in the Settlement Statement for Blackdog is premature at this time. No direct action is required and Policy E1 Natural Heritage would provide suitable protection to such a site from development.

While comments from SNH regarding the “Aberdeen Landscape Study” are noted, its findings were taken into account in the identification of the Spatial Strategy for this area, but as no new development sites are proposed for Blackdog its relevance is limited.

Existing Site – OP1

With regard to the request that the cycle link should be included as a developer contribution these can only be made under strict terms of Circular 3/2012 “Planning Obligations and Good Neighbour Agreements”. Contributions towards a cycle path between Blackdog and Balmedie is not considered to be necessary to make the development acceptable. Therefore, contributions cannot be sought from developers. However, the community aspirations for a cycle link to Balmedie has been included in the Settlement Statement. No actions are required for site OP1.

The Draft Proposed LDP recognises that an FRA is required for this site. However, it is considered appropriate to amend the text to include buffer strips and enhancement of the watercourse within the allocation summary.

Bid FR113

At present this area of land is undeveloped greenfield land. It is acknowledged that this site is part of a larger area (site OP1) that has Planning Permission in Principle for mixed used development, a town centre, retail, leisure, businesses (Use Class 3) and industrial (Use Class 4, 5 and 6). However, the matters specified in the condition of this permission are still to be submitted. Therefore, there is no justification to identify the indicative land uses of the current planning permission within the Proposed Local Development Plan (Proposed LDP). This area of land, at present, does not function as a town centre as it provides no facilities or services that would usually be found within a town centre.

The agreed Masterplan and the Planning Permission in Principle are material considerations when determining a potential future application. The principles established in these documents are reflected within the Blackdog Settlement Statement that require the “Future development of the site should seek to develop in line with the agreed Masterplan”. The provision of a town centre is sufficiently safeguarded at present without specific inclusion within the Proposed LDP.

Bid FR057

It is not considered necessary to amend the settlement boundary at the south-west corner of Blackdog at bid FR057. This area of land is part of the greenbelt and functions well for its purpose. Inclusion of this site within the settlement boundary of Blackdog could potentially result in “infill” development and unjustifiable loss of greenbelt land. NESTRANS have advised they do not foresee a need for roadside services in this location.

It is maintained that this site is undesirable. The site is separated from the settlement and its existing and proposed services by the A90. The site is not considered to reflect the existing pattern of development and the direction of growth approved under current planning consents. It would require a large area of undeveloped land, currently designated as greenbelt, to accommodate the development. This would have a detrimental impact on the landscape setting around Blackdog and is not something that can be adequately mitigated by strategic landscaping. In addition the site is not considered to be “physically separated by the rest of the greenbelt allocation and wider countryside area by existing road infrastructure”. The land immediately to the south is also undeveloped greenbelt land within the boundaries of Aberdeen City and therefore, on the ground, the site does not appear to be “physically separated” from the wider countryside.

It is noted that the respondent’s desire is to develop this site to provide service facilities for users of the transport corridor and provide a safe place for drivers to rest and refuel. However, such services could be delivered within the existing allocation. It is noted

that there is a fuel station location less than 1km south of the site. As such, this is not sufficient justification for the removal of the greenbelt designation to accommodate new development.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

A number of changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed LDP on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below.

4. Recommendations

1. Modify the Vision within the Settlement Statement to reflect the aspirations as expressed in early consultation by local stakeholders, including the Community Council.
2. Add the following text to site OP1 allocation summary “Buffer strips will be required adjacent to the watercourses which should be positively integrated into the development. Enhancement of the watercourses through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated”.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 67 Collieston

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
506	Scottish Natural Heritage

2. Issues

The respondent requested that the section 'Natural and Historic Environment' should note the presence of the Sands of Forvie National Nature Reserve close to the south west of Collieston (506).

3. Actions

The Natural Heritage policies within the Local Development Plan requires that planning applications include an assessment to ensure that development does not have significant adverse effects on nationally designated sites and that the overall integrity of those sites are not compromised. It is considered to be reasonable to identify the national nature reserve located close to Collieston as well as the international designations.

4. Recommendations

1. Amend the Settlement Statement 'Natural and Historic Environment' section to include "The Sands of Forvie Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the Forvie National Nature Reserve is situated to the south-west of the settlement..."

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendation at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 68 Cultercullen

1. List of Respondents

None.

2. Issues

No issues were raised in respect of Cultercullen.

3. Actions

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

Cultercullen has a range of brownfield sites within its boundary. A number of changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below.

4. Recommendations

1. Amend the Vision in the Settlement Statement noting that the community believe that incentives should be provided to encourage the development of brownfield sites.
2. Protect the school and its recreation ground, and the landscaping to the east of Greenfields.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations, subject to the amendment of the maps to clarify that the designated open space was protected within the settlements, at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 69 Cuminestown

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
310	Mr & Mrs Graham & Susan
340	Ryden LLP on behalf of Mr Robert Ironside
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
805	SEPA

2. Issues

Concern regarding flood risk was raised, particularly in defining the developable area (310, 805). A Flood Risk Assessment is required (805). Drainage constraints need to be resolved (310) but can be overcome (340). There is a need to support local services (310).

Existing Site – OP1

The removal of the constrained OP1 site is welcomed (310, 340).

Bids FR038 and FR039

A respondent would like to see affordable housing promoted as well as care over layout/design. Additional landscaping would be desirable (310).

Bids FR038 and FR039 were supported (340, 506), conditional on ecological benefits along Teuchar Stank being realised and incorporated into any scheme, alongside an appropriate development pattern and links to recreation (506). Bids FR038 and FR039 should be combined. FR038 can be built out in a single phase, at a higher density (up to 70 units) and has sufficient room for a buffer strip (340).

There was no justification for the statement that part of the FR038 site may be constrained until 2031 (340).

It is considered that FR039 can be accommodated into the existing development pattern (340).

3. Actions

Existing site OP1

There is support for the removal of site OP1 as it is constrained.

Bid FR038 and FR039

Bids FR038 and FR039 can fill the potential gap in housing supply following removal of constrained OP1. These should be combined as a single allocation (40+20 = 60 units) to increase flexibility and co-ordination in delivery, which would assist in overcoming

delivery pressures and accommodating flood risk associated with the site. Given flooding constraints with the site, it is not considered appropriate to increase the allocation. Focus on accommodating ecological interest across the site should be retained, as well as the provision of a generous buffer strip.

Technical issues such as access, flooding, drainage, links to recreation and additional landscaping would be addressed through an appropriate planning application, as would affordable housing requirements. Similarly added flexibility through a single allocation as well as an appropriate planning application should ensure that aspects such as design/layout can be successfully accommodated in terms of respecting the character of the area and integrating with the characteristics of the site.

Statement that part of the site may remain constrained until post 2031 is based upon development/build rates and lack of finance or developer to pursue the site(s). This is considered to be realistic but should not represent a hindrance or obstacle to the allocation in the Proposed Local Development Plan.

4. Recommendations

1. Remove existing OP1 site for 50 houses as it remains constrained.
2. Combine FR038 and FR039 into a single site to increase flexibility and coordination of delivery to account for the characteristics of the site for a development of 60 homes.
3. Seek a Flood Risk Assessment and retain the ecological focus for FR038 and FR039.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 70 Daviot

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
312	John Wink Design on behalf of Mr John Forrest
396	John Wink Design on behalf of Mr Mark Young
804	Meldrum, Bourtie and Daviot Community Council
846	Meldrum, Bourtie and Daviot Community Council
876	Woodland Trust Scotland
805	SEPA

2. Issues

Respondents agreed with all of the Officers' recommendations in the Main Issues Report (MIR) (804, 846).

Existing Site – OP1

SEPA noted that there is no reference to waste water drainage in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) for Daviot. It is therefore presumed that there is sufficient capacity at the Sewage Treatment Works for this development of 8 houses (805).

Bid FR081

Ancient woodland should be excluded from the site boundary and an additional buffer added (876).

Site FR100

A respondent indicated that plots the subject of bid FR100 would be served by individual treatments plants to cover drainage, 3 additional units would not appear out of context despite separation from the settlement (396).

Bid FR101 and FR102

Ancient woodland should be excluded from the site boundary and additional buffer added (876). It was highlighted that the bid was for 12 units, not 37 as stated in the MIR and an appropriate housing mix can be provided. The prime agricultural land designation is acknowledged, at roughly 17% of the sites, but not suitable for farming (312).

3. Actions

The support on the proposed actions highlighted in the MIR is welcomed. All woodlands of long established origin (ancient woodland) require to be protected. No response was received to the exclusion of site FR018 from the Proposed LDP.

We acknowledge that FR101 is only for 12 units rather than the stated 37, but this is gross under-delivery on the site which can accommodate many more homes than this low density. On revision our standard calculation is that the 1.4ha site could accommodate 35 homes at 25 homes per hectare.

Prime agricultural land is a resource that requires to be conserved, and as stated in Scottish Planning Policy should be conserved unless absolutely necessary.

With regard to capacity within the sewage treatment works, Scottish Water has confirmed that there is sufficient capacity for the houses allocated within site OP1. In accordance with the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan sufficient additional housing land allocations are identified in the Rural Housing Market Area. It is considered that Daviot has an appropriate amount of land identified for housing to meet local housing needs during the Plan period.

The conclusions of the MIR are appropriate, no further allocation in the settlement is required. There are existing growth and permissions in place to support services while not adversely impacting upon drainage or education constraints.

A number of changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed LDP on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below.

4. Recommendations

1. Modification to the Vision for the settlement is promoted to reflect community aspiration.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendation at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 71 Ellon

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
242	Lippe Architects + Planners on behalf of CHAP Group Ltd
330	Ms Vivienne Wallace
405	Ms Glenda Simpson
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
508	Bancon Homes Ltd
515	Ryden LLP on behalf of Stewart Milne Homes
516	Ryden LLP on behalf of Stewart Milne Homes
517	Ryden LLP on behalf of Stewart Milne Homes
552	Ms Myra Fearnside
562	Scotia Homes Ltd
586	Mr Trevor Mason
660	Dr Barrie Seddon
805	SEPA
905	Ellon Community Council
1009	Historic Environment Scotland

2. Issues

General

Concern was raised regarding potential traffic impacts of a bridge over the Ythan and general road capacity for future development in Ellon (330).

The respondent generally supports the plan for homes provided there are affordable homes and recreational areas delivered (586).

It is considered that if any development is going to have a visual impact in some way, the assumption is that developers would be encouraged to reduce the impacts of their developments. There must be consideration in all cases for the town's infrastructure, including school provision, medical centres and water/waste treatment. All these must be expanded as the town grows and should not be considered a reason to hold back on development (905).

Within the Settlement Statement in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) the respondent recommends that the sixth planning objective should be reworded to say 'Preserve and enhance the amenity of the settlement, including its greenspace.' However, the statement in the Draft Proposed LDP that states greenspace will be protected and enhanced with new green networks identified, is welcomed (506).

Flood Risk

SEPA has advised that there may be surface water flooding issues from overland flow coming from the steep land above Ellon. This risk should be discussed within the Council's Flood Risk and Coastal Protection Team (805).

Existing Site - OP1 / Bid FR090

Concern has been raised that any further development of Ellon away from Cromleybank will have issues of connectivity, being split by either the A948, A90, Golf Course (north) or the Buchan-Formartine way (905).

There are also concerns regarding the scale of allocations in Ellon (515, 552). The 980 home site at Cromleybank has not started (515, 552). This allocation is not challenged, but the expectation of delivering 980 houses by 2031 is questioned (508). Another respondent considers that this site would alter the character and sense of place associated with Ellon. The proposals risk urbanisation and overdevelopment (515, 552). If only 386 units are proposed to be built by 2025 the site is not delivering the number of homes to meet the housing requirement in the Strategic Development Plan (515).

A preference that Cromleybank is developed ahead of other larger housing developments has been expressed. However, if the delays are ongoing for the foreseeable future, then having other sites developed first would be appropriate (905).

A respondent has objected to the proposed road being included as part of bid FR090. The road will infringe on residential privacy and increased noise. The development of the road will destroy woodland on the edge of Hillhead Road. Development will have a detrimental impact on wildlife. The Council should consider re-routing the proposed road. There are concerns that the road will create an infill opportunity to the north (405, 506, 552).

Another respondent requested that the proposed road be located further away from the Bredero properties, and the junction relocated further along the A920. In addition, noise reducing measures should be considered including the choice of materials for the road surface, speed limits, and planting of hedges and trees (552). Furthermore, it has been highlighted that Site FR090 includes, and is adjacent to, a small area of woodland listed in the Scottish semi-natural woodland inventory, but noted that a development framework has been agreed for this site (506, 552). Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) suggest that a site brief should also be developed to ensure a coherent sense of place is developed for a development of this scale (506).

The link road (southern bypass) would be the preferred addition which should relieve some of the traffic from the town centre and reduce congestion at bridge traffic lights. An ideal scenario would be to also have vehicular access across the Ythan River adjacent to Boatie Tams Bridge (905).

A respondent considered the proposed vehicular bridge and east/west links for the site not viable, and that the site is not a readily available and unconstrained site given its failure to provide any housing since its allocation in 2012 (515).

The statement about active travel is welcomed, but it is suggested by SNH that this should be 'required' rather than 'promoted'. The expectation for connectivity to the rest of the Ellon green network is also welcomed and SNH recommend that site briefs for the development should set out the green network within it and its connections outward (506).

Development on this site would put huge strain on already stretched resources in the town, including the doctor surgery and Ellon Academy. Amenities and services need to be improved before development could come forward (552, 905).

It was highlighted that existing site OP1 is subject to frequent flooding and it is identified as a floodplain (660, 905). The floodplain area was suggested as a protected area or parkland to match the parkland (Glebe Field) set on the opposite north bank of the River. However, it is considered this plan is not being recognised and this risks the building of houses on the floodplain (660).

The respondent supports retention of OP1/ bid FR090. It has been highlighted that discussions have been taking place with relevant infrastructure providers including Scottish Water, Transport Scotland, and the Council's Education Service to bring this site forward (562).

Support is given to site OP1/bid FR090 from another respondent. The new academy/community centre already in this location, therefore developing this site would reduce the sense of remoteness the academy current has from the town (905).

Historic Environment Scotland has raised concerns about the potential effect on Listed building LB31110 (Cat A) Old Bridge of Ellon as a result of development of site OP1. There is a need to address preservation of the bridge and its immediate setting including associated flood risk management (1009).

Existing Site - OP2

There is a desire to see the OP2 Former Ellon Academy sites developed in such a way that they enhance Ellon and provide the best available economic options for the town. Consolidation and expansion of the Council Offices within Ellon is welcomed. The new health centre is also welcomed as the existing facility does not have the capacity for the expanding town, and this central location would be beneficial to many (905).

However, the respondent would like to ensure that the intended developments are required and are not done just to make use of the sites. The respondent would prefer they remain undeveloped until a sound and feasible use is found for them (or in part), even it means waiting for a more favourable economic environment. To enhance the 'civic' space feel, various units could be included that function as public rentable spaces

for parties/functions, pop-up shops for community organisations or for youth club type venues that may be more appropriate and accessible (being town centre) than those available at the Community Campus. In addition, the respondent considers that for site 2, care would need to be taken to ensure that the area is seen as accessible for non-residents to pass from Golf Road or the woodlands to access the town centre, Health Centre or Ellon Castle Gardens (905).

The 'Ellon Now Ellon New' project should be consulted on the appropriate uses for the town before any decision is taken. In addition, there should be adequate parking to support the sites and their specific purposes, to ensure surrounding residents are not disadvantaged (905).

Existing Site - OP3 / Bid FR011

SEPA has identified that a Flood Risk Assessment will be required for this site due to the watercourse along the western boundary that has been historically straightened. A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse which should be positively integrated into the development. The buffer strip needs to allow sufficient space for restoration of the burn. Enhancement of the watercourse through re-naturalisation and removal of redundant feature should be investigated (805).

Existing Sites - OP4 and BUS

It is believed that business development options should be retained in the Plan in the event of an upturn in the economy (905). Increasing the size of the roundabout at A90 junction or creating slip roads may be required, and the respondent notes there are still a number of sites undeveloped within the BUS site which should be progressed before OP4 is developed (905).

SEPA has identified that the BUS site has a flood risk and therefore a Flood Risk Assessment is required. It is also requested that a buffer strip is required adjacent to the watercourse which should be integrated positively into the development (805).

Bid FR031

A respondent queries the need for further housing in Ellon. Cromleybank is a previously allocated site that has still not been built (330).

SEPA agrees the recommendation to not take bid site FR031 forward. The riverside and associated woodland with other habitats provide important green corridors for the area (506).

Others object to the development of site FR031 due to the potential adverse impact on Ellon Town Centre (330, 586). The development of this site would be less accessible than Ellon's town centre and would increase traffic from the west side of town and create more parking problems (586).

SEPA has highlighted concern about the development of this site due to its historical significance being in close proximity to Waterton Castle, together with flooding risks

associated with being a riverbank site. The current character should be maintained as an important feature of the local landscape. SEPA also recommend that this site is protected as green land (905).

However, other respondents have objected to the failure of the Main Issues Report to identify site FR031 for mixed use development (515, 516). This site is considered to be well located for retail and leisure uses, and has a sustainable location for the introduction of housing (516). The respondent suggests that 150 residential units should be transferred from the FR090, which demonstrates the suitability and capability of that site to accommodate a mixed use development.

In support of the development of site FR031 the respondent states that the site has features that provide distinctive character, creating an attractive landscape setting for the housing proposed. A landscape assessment concludes that retail development would result in a higher magnitude of change for key landscape and visual receptors, and the lower height and finer grain of a mixed use development would create a more appropriately scaled development that responds to existing built character and a lower magnitude of landscape impact. It is not accepted that retail is the most appropriate use for site FR031. A mixed use development is a more logical and appropriate solution for the site than purely retail. A mix of uses would ensure a sustainable development would be delivered within close proximity to services and employment areas, with less reliance on the private car. The prospective developer commits to future investigations in relation to waste water and water supply, and does not consider this an impediment to development (516).

Whilst one respondent stated that there is no additional road infrastructure required for site FR031 (515), another respondent states that a Transport Impact Assessment would be required and contributions to mitigate the development would be delivered (516).

Bid FR032

SEPA has highlighted that a Flood Risk Assessment is required for this site due to the presence of the Ythan and other small water courses. Buffer strips will be required adjacent to the watercourses which should be integrated positively into the development. The buffer strips will need to allow sufficient space for the River Ythan to follow its natural course. The smaller watercourses have been historically straightened. Enhancement of these through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated (805).

There is support for the continued inclusion of FR032 for Retail (Class1) and Leisure Facilities (Class 11). Ellon has capacity to accommodate a retail park, reinforced by the conclusions of the Town Centre Health Check 2011. However, housing should be introduced on the site to provide a mixed use development (517, 905). It is argued that introducing housing on the site will support the proposed retail and leisure uses, as well as create a sustained mixed use development with less visual impact (as detailed in the respondent's Landscape Assessment submitted with comments) (517). The site has suitable transport links to support the site for a range of uses. The respondent

acknowledges that the constraints regarding surface water flooding, waste water treatment and water supply can be overcome and should not be considered as impediments to development. Traffic measures and access feasibility assessment due to the site's location within the A920 and A90 corridors would be assessed at the planning application stage. There is also agreement that existing trees and mature wooded areas should be retained, and that buffer strips should be provided adjacent to the Ythan River and Broomie's Burn (517), as noted by SEPA.

Other respondents have objected to site FR032 due to the impact on Ellon town centre (330, 586). The site is less accessible than Ellon's town centre and would increase traffic from the west side of town and create more parking problems (586).

Bid FR063 and Bid FR064

One respondent has supported bids FR063 and FR064 as they feel that these sites can deliver the planning strategy for the Aberdeen to Peterhead SGA and Energetica Corridor, and can plug any housing deficiencies for addressing a low completion rate for houses noted in the Aberdeenshire Council's Monitoring Statement (2017-2018). The exclusion of this site is unjustified and there are anomalies and inconsistencies with assessments made in comparison with site FR092. The respondent considers site FR063 would fit within the landscape setting and the proposed landscaping would not have a detrimental impact on the setting of Ellon. Landscaping will lessen their visual impact and provide a setting for the proposed cemetery (242).

Another respondent is of the opinion that site FR063 is an opportunity to improve the golf course to attract more visitors to the town (586).

Another respondent has mixed views on these sites due to their remoteness from Ellon. However, with suitable foot/cycle infrastructure, particularly along the A948 and onto the Buchan-Formartine Way, the development could be seen as being part of Ellon. It should also be taken into consideration that Auchterellon and Meiklemill both have single road access from the housing estates into the town centre. However, the Cromleybank site remains the preferred site for development before other larger housing developments are progressed (905).

The respondent does not consider that co-location to the proposed cemetery is not desirable, as stated in the Main Issues Report. Although cemeteries tend to be located on the outskirts of towns, they are often overtaken by development and soon become within town boundaries e.g. Castle Road Cemetery (905).

Bid FR075

The respondent had no issue with this site being developed provided that these houses would implement suitable drainage/sewage facilities (905).

Bid FR076

The respondent had no issue with this site being developed provided that these houses would implement suitable drainage/sewage facilities (905).

Bid FR084

The respondent had no issues with this development remaining in the Plan provided that the development is carefully landscaped to fit in with the existing low-density housing surrounding it (905).

Bid FR092

Respondents did not support the allocation of Site FR092. The decision to reserve site FR092 is flawed as the Main Issues Report says nothing positive about the site as it is located beyond the A948 which acts as a physical boundary for the settlement, and would be more prominent and not fit in with Ellon or any landscape features (242, 506, 905). This site should not be reserved to plug any deficiencies within existing housing allocations, as there is no indication how this site can be delivered (242).

SNH has stated that if site FR092 is developed, this area would change the current boundaries of the settlement and potentially open up other areas to the north of Ellon for development. The gentle rising of the land would make this site a challenge to develop without incurring significant landscape and visual impacts. The location responds awkwardly to the existing settlement centre and further accentuates the need for unsustainable forms of car based travel and access to the core services of Ellon. If the site was taken forward, there should be a site specific brief demonstrating integration with Ellon in terms of greenspace and active travel routes, with protection and enhancement of the woodland (506).

In addition, a respondent had concerns regarding the impact on the busy bypass. Speed restrictions would need to be considered or the road would need to be re-classified (905).

A respondent has requested that FR031 should be allocated instead of site FR092 as it is well related to the existing settlement, contained by existing development, and would not extend the settlement boundary (516).

SEPA has stated that a Flood Risk Assessment may be required due to the presence of Broomie Burn on the eastern boundary which has been historically straightened (805).

3. Actions

General

With regard to general traffic impacts on the bridge over the Ythan and general road capacity within Ellon, this issue has been taken into consideration when planning for Ellon. Cromleybank is the largest proposed residential allocation for Ellon and transport links have been one of the matters which have delayed its implementation. The proposed development plan promotes active travel as opposed to use of private cars, with connections to existing path and green corridor networks being encouraged. No further action is required.

The support for new homes is acknowledged, provided there are affordable homes and recreational areas as required by development plan policies, and landscape impacts are addressed. Whilst we welcome the statement proposed for the Vision for Ellon within the Settlement Statement on protection of greenspace, policies also require that greenspace is protected and enhanced with new green networks identified.

Flood Risk

With regard to flooding, the flood risk identified within the Settlement Statement for Ellon in the Draft Proposed LDP has identified the flood risks which have been taken into account in assessing potential development sites including minor amendments which will be taken forward into the Proposed LDP. Through Flood Risk Assessment (as promoted by SEPA) layout design should not include development within areas at risk from flooding.

Existing Site - OP1 / Bid FR090

It is noted that no respondents have challenged the allocation of site OP1/FR090, however there are concerns regarding the ongoing delay in delivering the site. It remains the view that Ellon is a major service centre and is a key settlement in the Aberdeen to Peterhead Strategic Growth Corridor for the provision of new houses. Therefore, Ellon is a suitable settlement to sustain significant, appropriately managed growth for housing and employment land. With regard to location, the proposed site is considered to be suitably sited within the valley to minimise visual impacts on the wider area. In addition, the development improves the balance of development within Ellon, ensuring the key features such as the town centre and Ythan River remain centrally situated and accessible to all.

With regard to the timing of the development, this is not something that can be controlled. The Planning Service continues to work with developers in order to deliver the Local Development Plan.

It is proposed to reserve land for a potential link road to the west of Ellon from the B9005. The potential link road will be required to ensure the local road network provides the necessary capacity to accommodate east to west traffic by-passing the town and facilitate the development of site OP1. It is very unlikely that the route for this road will be shown as anything other than indicative at this stage, and outwith the settlement boundary. Development within the area of land between the defined boundary and the indicative road would be contrary to the Plan. Impacts would be managed as part of any planning application.

With regard to active travel, it is agreed this is required and not just promoted. As such amending the wording of the Settlement Statement to reflect this is proposed.

With regard to comments made on the strain that new development will place on resources within the Ellon, such as the Doctor's surgery and Ellon Academy, it should be noted that Local Development Plan policy requires developers to make contributions towards the provision of necessary infrastructure. However, the Settlement Statement

within the Draft Proposed LDP has identified there is a requirement for a new primary school within site OP1 and that all residential development make contributions towards a new health centre at Ellon. The development of site OP1 could make significant contributions towards services within Ellon.

While site OP1, may overlap with an area at risk from flooding, these areas can be incorporated into any development as areas of open space that contribute to the connectivity of the green network and creating an opportunity to enhance biodiversity. This would result in a visually appealing development that allows suitable, safe access and enjoyment of Ellon's key feature, the Ythan River. In any case, the Settlement Statement for site OP1 identifies that a Flood Risk Assessment, Water Impact Assessment and a Drainage Impact Assessment will be required which will inform the layout design for this site. No further action is required.

Likewise, we are content that impact on listed structures can be avoided by good layout, siting and design. No further action is required.

Existing Site - OP2

The comments provided by respondents are detailed and as such would be better placed as a response to any proposed Masterplan or planning application. It is acknowledged that there is a local desire to redevelop the site for appropriate mixed uses is generally supported and as such there is no further action required.

Existing Site - OP3 / Bid FR011

It is agreed that Site OP3 requires to have a detailed Flood Risk Assessment associated with it and an appropriate buffer strip adjacent to the existing watercourse. However, the text should be amended to also include the requirement to restore the burn and encourage enhancement of watercourse through re-naturalisation.

Existing Sites - OP4 and BUS

The support for site OP4 is acknowledged. The requirement to investigate the option for access to the site has been addressed within the Settlement Statement. While it is acknowledged that there are vacant plots within the BUS site, the LDP cannot ensure the completion of one site before the release of another when both sites are deemed appropriate for development.

With regard to Flood Risk, the proposed Settlement Statement for Ellon identifies the BUS site as being in a 1 in 200 year flood risk area. The Settlement Statement requires that a "detailed Flood Risk Assessment will be required to accompany any future development proposals for these sites and an appropriate buffer strip will be required adjacent to the existing watercourse". No further action is required.

Bid FR031

Bid FR031, as proposed, is not considered to be an appropriate addition at this time. The development of this site is considered to have a negative impact on the landscape character of this area. This site, at present, is considered to contribute positively to the

natural green network along the River Ythan and protecting the setting of Boat of Fechil Croft, its outbuildings and boathouse, which are 'B' Listed Buildings. The site to the north has been identified as suitable for retail and leisure uses. Development of this site for residential use may place restriction on the deliverability and operation of the existing CC1 site in the same location. No further action is required.

Bid FR032

The inclusion of this site for retail and leisure uses is generally supported as a reflection of the CC1 allocation in the current Plan. There is no concern regarding the impact on Ellon's Town Centre as the existing retail units within Ellon's Town Centre are generally small and therefore places restrictions on the town's ability to attract larger comparable stores to the settlement. Retail use of this site would encourage larger retailers to the settlement. In any event, proposed Policy B2 Town Centres promotes a "Town Centre First" principle and any developer must demonstrate that the proposal will not have a significant adverse impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre, when making a planning application.

A mix of residential development, retail and leisure uses is not recommended for this site. There is concern that the residential use places restriction on the deliverability and operation of the site and has the potential to limit the scale of retail and leisure uses sought. No action is required.

With regard to flooding, SEPA has identified that that a Flood Risk Assessment is required for this site. As such the text within the Settlement Statement for this allocation is required to be amended accordingly.

Bid FR063 and FR064

It is maintained that these sites are undesirable. It is considered that these sites are not appropriate as an extension of Ellon at this time. These sites would breach the brow of the hill, resulting in a prominent, exposed site that breaches Ellon's natural landscape capacity.

The respondent is of the opinion that the proposed cemetery to the north would improve the landscape setting of this area, allowing for appropriate infill development to occur. The position is retained that it is appropriate to locate a cemetery away from houses due to the sensitive nature of the land use. Commonly active cemeteries are located out with settlements to avoid the potential for construction works to disturb mourners (or mourners to disturb adjacent dwellers). The development of houses would be more intrusive on the wider landscape than any structure associated with a cemetery. As such the siting of a cemetery outwith the settlement boundary for Ellon does not justify infill development that is likely to have a detrimental impact on the setting of Ellon. No action is required.

Bid FR075 and FR076

These sites are not considered appropriate for development. These sites are not a logical extension and are physically detached from the settlement by agricultural fields.

Development of these sites would have a negative impact on the rural landscape character. It is recommended that these sites are not allocated within the Development Plan.

Bid FR092

It is agreed that the development of this site would have significant adverse impacts on the landscape of the area. Development of this area would breach the brow of the hill resulting in a prominent development from all approaches to Ellon. The A948 functions as a bypass for the settlement and presents a physical barrier to achieve safe pedestrian access to the School and other services and facilities within Ellon. As such this site should not be included in the Plan.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

A number of changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed (LDP) on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below.

4. Recommendations

1. Modify the Vision to include the community's concern about a lack of choice for places for social contact in the town centre, and desire for the development of public transport modes for commuting to Aberdeen.
2. Amend the 'Flood Risk' section to take into account BUS2.
3. Retain existing site R1 for a cemetery on the A948 at Yonderton.
4. Include new Reserved Land designation for a potential link road to the west of Ellon from the B9005.
5. Amend the allocation summary for site OP1 (bid FR090) to read: "Sustainable communities are to be encouraged, and key to this will be active travel. Permeability within the development for active travel is required, and connectivity to the rest of the Ellon green network is expected in this development with opportunities existing to link into the path network along the river."
6. Add to the allocation summary for existing site OP3 (bid FR011) the following text: "The buffer strip needs to allow sufficient space for restoration of the burn. Enhancement of the watercourse through re-naturalisation and removal of redundant feature should be investigated."
7. Amend the allocation summary for CC1 (bid FR032) to include: "A Flood Risk Assessment will be required", and add "Buffer strips will be required adjacent to the watercourses which should be integrated positively into the development. The buffer strips will need to allow sufficient space for the River Ythan to follow its natural course. Enhancement through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated."

8. Do not allocate Bid FR092.
9. Amend Ellon settlement map to show an indicative route for the southern bypass for the town from the B9005 to the A920 at Wineburn.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019, with the additional recommendation that sites FR063 and FR064 be included in the settlement statement for Ellon.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and agreed not to allocate bids FR063 and FR064 in the Proposed LDP.
3. At their meeting of 29 October 2019, Formartine Area Committee considered bid sites FR063 and FR064 on the basis that there had been circulated a report dated 10 October, 2019 by the Director of Infrastructure Services which advised the Committee of the recommendations adopted by the Infrastructure Services Committee (ISC) on the two sites, on the basis of late information provided by the Transportation Service as part of the Development Planning and Management Transport Appraisal Guidance Traffic Assessment. At their meeting, Formartine Area Committee agreed that the Committee: -
 - a) Express their dissatisfaction at the lateness of the comments provided by the Transportation Service and lack of opportunity for Formartine Area Committee to comment ahead of consideration by Infrastructure Services Committee;
 - b) Maintain support for the inclusion of sites FR063 and FR064 within the Local Development Plan;
 - c) Request that the appropriate decision-making body give fresh consideration of the officer recommendations in relation to sites FR063 and FR064 in light of the comments provided today by Formartine Area Committee;
 - d) Request that a report come forward to the Formartine Area Committee to update on the progress being made to identify improvements between the A90, Tipperty, the Toll of Birness and the roads linking these; and
 - e) That any further reports relating to the inclusion of sites FR063 and FR064 refer only to the new transportation information that has been provided.
4. At their meeting of 28 November 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of the Formartine Area Committee of 29 October 2019, following their consideration of the response received from Transportation regarding bids FR063 and FR064, which was received following the meeting of Formartine Area Committee on 10 September 2019 and reported as a late paper to ISC on 3 October 2019. Infrastructure Services Committee agreed to uphold the decision of ISC at its meeting on 3 October 2019, not to recommend to

Aberdeenshire Council bid sites FR063 and FR064 for inclusion in the Proposed Local Development Plan.

5. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Members considered proposals for the inclusion of bid sites FR063 and FR064 at Auchterellon Farm, Ellon in the Proposed Local Development Plan. Members voted as follows – 29 for the motion that the Council reinstate sites FR063 and FR064 in to the Proposed Local Development Plan 2020, and 52 for the amendment that the Council not include bid sites FR063 and FR064 in the Proposed Local Development Plan 2020. Five Members declined to vote.

The amendment was carried, and the Council agreed not to include bid sites FR063 and FR063 at Auchterellon Farm, Ellon in the Proposed Local Development Plan 2020.

Issue 72 Fintray

1. List of Respondents

None.

2. Issues

No issues were raised in respect of Fintray.

3. Actions

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

No changes to the proposal to delete Fintray from the Local Development Plan settlement list were received.

4. Recommendations

1. Remove Fintray from the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendation at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 73 Fisherford

1. List of Respondents

None.

2. Issues

No issues were raised in respect of Fisherford.

3. Actions

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

No objections were raised to the proposal to remove Fisherford from the Local Development Plan.

4. Recommendations

1. Remove Fisherford from the Local Development Plan.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendation at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 74 Foveran

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
121	Ryden LLP on behalf of Mr Graham Brown
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
565	Halliday Fraser Munro on behalf of Harper & Cochrane Ltd
805	SEPA
1020	Strutt & Parker on behalf of Mr Ian Ross

2. Issues

General

Foveran sits in the heart of the Energetica and Strategic Growth Area, and is therefore ideally located for investment and development (565).

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) has requested that within the 'Services and Infrastructure' section of the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) reference is made to green infrastructure and active travel routes to promote connectivity to other settlements and amenities in the vicinity. SNH has also suggested that the Masterplan for sites in the village should consider OP4/bid FR066, OP5/bid FR067 and OP6/FR067, and highlight green infrastructure and active travel routes (506).

The sites which have been identified as an Officers' preference would add 280 homes to the existing village during the next Plan period and would extend the current village to the south and west. It is considered that the proposed allocation of these sites solidifies the Council's aspirations for growth in Foveran and confirms the focus on new housing development, with associated employment uses in this accessible location during and beyond the LDP period (1020).

Existing site - OP1

SEPA has stated this site may require a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse which should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of watercourses through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated. The Draft Proposed LDP uses former text "growth project has been initiated at Blairythan Terrace septic tank". Scottish Water should confirm if the growth project has taken into account all the sites identified in this LDP. Development will be restricted until this upgrade is operational due to the Foveran Burn not having dilution capacity (805).

Existing site - OP2

SEPA has confirmed that they have no concerns regarding flood risk due to the site boundary being set back from the watercourse and the land being quite steep. The request for an FRA could be deleted if the Council's Flood Risk and Coastal Protection Unit agree. A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse on the northern boundary which should be integrated positively into the development.

Enhancement of these through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated (805).

Existing site OP3 / Bid FR065, Bid FR066, and Bid FR067

No comments were received on any of these three sites and the recommendations contained in the Main Issues Report for 36 homes, 20 homes and 49 homes are maintained.

However, bid FR067 cannot take access down through the current C class road and would be dependent on a new access to be formed to the south east of the site, passing through bids FR065 and FR066. As there remains third party land in the intervening land the delivery of this site must be questioned and in hindsight it has been recommended that it is not included in the Proposed Local Development Plan.

Bid FR109

It is considered that development of this site would result in the coalescence of Foveran and Rashierieve, which are two distinct settlements each with their own characteristics (121).

However, another respondent was of the view that this site will provide an opportunity to deliver strategic housing and employment allowances to contribute towards transforming the wider area into a high-quality lifestyle, leisure and global business location as part of the Energetica corridor. A 41 hectare site would extend the settlement in a planned manner for 1,000 to 1,200 homes in a mixed use development area, including 3ha for commercial or community use and 4ha for employment use. This is adjacent to the AWPR which is considered to act as an appropriate boundary for future growth aspirations. The site has a good relationship with the village core and is well connected and complements the existing residential development in the village. The respondent is not aware of any issues with waste water in the area and highlights the different assessment of FR067 located immediately adjacent to the site. Development on prime agricultural land would be permitted where it is required to meet an established housing need. The respondent considers that this site exhibits significantly more potential to deliver new homes in the future with fewer impacts than might be expected elsewhere within the Strategic Growth Area (1020).

Bid FR142 and FR143

Inclusion of these sites within the LDP has been sought as they enhance the vision expressed through the Westfield and Ardgill Masterplan 2013. The sites offer the potential to enhance the settlement's role as a service centre and create a well-connected, mixed use focal heart to the village that is currently lacking. The development would not 'create an unnatural extension to the north'. There is already an existing commercial hub at Westfield. These bid sites propose giving this a more central, diversified role by creating a mixed-use village centre (565).

The respondent has disagreed with the comments within the Main Issues Report that stated development on FR142 and FR143 could have a 'potential implication' on the existing road network. The existing local road network has been significantly improved following the opening of the Balmedie - Tipperty dual carriageway (A90) as part of the AWPR work (565). A Scottish Water Growth Project has been initiated

and the “waste water hotspot” should not be a barrier to the development of bid FR142 and FR143 (565). The respondent also considers that bids FR142 and FR143 should be assessed separately as they are different proposals and uses (565).

Bid FR142

The respondent has promoted bid FR142 (Foveran North phase 1) for 150 houses, village centre (retail / nursery) and community uses (potential school relocation / sports centre / playing fields) over a 13.8ha site as the next phase of development in Foveran. The existing retail offer at Westfield can serve the existing and future Foveran Community. This site offers the opportunity to further expand and diversify the range of facilities and services within Foveran to meet the aim of it becoming a ‘proper’ connected village with a mix of uses and associated community benefits. The Main Issues Report (MIR) assessment fails to mention and assess the proposed community and commercial uses that form part of the LDP bid. (565).

The MIR has highlighted that this bid site is prime agricultural land, however the respondent does not see the difference between this bid site and the sites identified as preferred options that are also prime agricultural land. It is claimed that the loss of this prime land can be justified (565).

Another respondent agrees with the comments in the MIR in relation to this site and states that the site would have a significant detrimental impact on the existing character, both of the settlement and surroundings, given that the landscape is largely flat with open views (1020).

Bid FR143

The respondent seeks to address that the scale of development proposed for this site was 140 homes and not 410 as referenced in the MIR (565).

The respondent continues to promote bid FR143 as a potential second phase, strategic reserve housing site that would take the form of infill development between FR142 and existing commercial development at Enerfield (OP1 / BUS). The allocation of this land as a second phase reserved residential site would safeguard the delivery of the overall vision for Foveran (565).

However, another respondent is in agreement with the comments in the MIR for this site. The site would have a significant detrimental impact on the existing character, both of the settlement and surroundings, given that the landscape is largely flat with open views (1020).

3. Actions

General

It is acknowledged that Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) identifies the need to significantly enhance green infrastructure networks, particularly in and around cities and towns. The Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) contains policies and settlement statements that promote active travel, the formation and enhancement of green networks, and improved access to open space within Aberdeenshire’s towns. However, Foveran is not a city or a town. While the Aberdeen City and Shire

Strategic Development Plan (ACSSDP) states that the LDP will play a key role in identifying existing and proposed new green networks and enhancement of existing networks, it does not state that green networks are required between all the settlements within Aberdeenshire. No “green network” annotation is provided for the area around Foveran in the ACSSDP. No further action is required.

A Masterplan for the delivery of bid sites FR066, FR067 and FR082 would not be required. The layout, design and connectivity within the settlement are issues that can be addressed with the submission of a planning application. No action is required on this matter.

Existing Site - OP1

Within the Settlement Statement for Foveran, the requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment for this site has been identified within the proposed LDP. There is agreement with the statement that “A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse which should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of these through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated.” This statement shall be included in the statement for Site OP1.

With regards to the Scottish Water Growth projects, Scottish Water would be required to initiate a growth project once development meets their five growth criteria. As part of this process the Scottish Water Drainage infrastructure will be upgraded to take account of all allocated sites. The current growth project will not take account of future, unallocated development sites. No further action is required.

Existing site – OP2

SEPA’s comments are noted and the suggested text will be included in the allocation summary. In order to identify all constraints within the site that impact on potential layout design, it is agreed that it is appropriate to include “A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse on the northern boundary which should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of these through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated” to the statement for site OP2.

Existing site OP3 / Bid FR065

No comments were received on the potential change of use of this land from 1.5ha employment land to 36 homes.

Bid FR066

No comments have been received on the preference in the Main Issues Report to allocate Bid FR066 for 20 Homes.

Bid FR067

No comments have been received on the preference in the Main Issues Report to allocate bid FR067 for 49 Homes.

Bid FR109

It is maintained that bid FR109 is not a suitable extension to Foveran at this time. In accordance with the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan (ACSSDP) sufficient additional housing land allocations are identified in the Aberdeen Housing Market Area. It is considered that Foveran has an appropriate amount of land identified for housing to meet local housing needs during the Plan period. This site cannot be successfully delivered with connectivity to the existing settlement until existing site OP3 and bid sites FR066 and FR067 have been brought forward.

In addition, the extent of the FR109 site would result in the undesirable coalescence of Foveran and Rashierieve. The bid site is intersected by the A90(T) and as such does not offer a logical and cohesive extension to the existing settlement. As this time the proposed allocations total 245 houses on other sites are considered to be appropriate growth for Foveran, while being significant for a small settlement located within the Strategic Growth Corridor. No further action required.

Bid FR142

It is maintained that this site is not a suitable extension to Foveran at this time. In accordance with the ACSSDP sufficient additional housing land allocations are identified in the Aberdeen Housing Market Area. It is considered that Foveran has an appropriate amount of land identified for housing to meet local housing needs during the Plan period.

Taking into account the existing built form of Foveran, developing a site on the opposite side of a public road is not considered a logical extension to the settlement, especially when other sites are more appropriate. The site is not centrally located to Foveran and therefore makes for a poor choice in delivering a "village centre". The existing businesses at the former Westfield Farm have been established through farm diversification and reuse of redundant farm buildings. This does not justify developing a planned "village centre" and residential development at this location. No further action is required.

Bid FR143

It is maintained that this site is not a suitable extension to Foveran at this time. In accordance with the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan sufficient additional housing land allocations are identified in the Aberdeen Housing Market Area. It is considered that Foveran has an appropriate amount of land identified for housing to meet local housing needs during the Plan period. In addition, this direction of development for Foveran would create an unnatural extension to the north, which would erode the character and built form of the settlement.

Bid FR143 is not recommended for allocation or reserved for development in the Proposed LDP.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

Changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed LDP on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below.

4. Recommendations

1. Amend the Vision to include the community's desire to see no more houses built in the village until a replacement school has been built.
2. Add the following text to the allocation summary for existing site OP1: "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse which should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of these through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated." at the end of the statement for site OP1 South of Westfield Farm.
3. Add the following text to the allocation summary for existing site OP2: "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse on the northern boundary which should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of these through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated".
4. Re-allocate existing site OP3 / bid FR065 for 36 homes
5. Allocate bid FR066 for 20 homes.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 75 Fyvie

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
292	Mr Gordon Duncan
1008	Savills on behalf of The Fyvie Estate
1009	Historic Environment Scotland
1011	Savills on behalf of The Fyvie Estate
805	SEPA

2. Issues

It was considered that an alleged historic battlefield in the area should not preclude development within the settlement at either bid sites FR125 and FR126, and there are other examples where this has happened elsewhere (292, 1008, 1011). However, Historic Environment Scotland have identified potential cumulative impacts upon the historic battlefield through potential development, with adverse impacts upon appreciation of the site and its landscape (1009).

It was noted that development would support local services and schools (292, 1008, 1011). Flooding issues in the settlement require to be addressed (292).

The description is incorrect as the Post Office has closed (292).

SEPA highlights that there is limited capacity at the Fyvie Waste Water Treatment Works so any development will require a growth project (805).

3. Actions

The reference to the Post Office in the Vision statement should be removed.

There are competing interests with regard to preserving the historic battlefield. While the importance of the national battlefield is not to be dismissed, there is a strong case for an allocation to be made in the village to promote its vibrancy and vitality. Other potential locations for development to support services in Fyvie (at Woodhead and St Katherines) have proved to be very difficult to support. Site FR125 could be seen as a logical extension to the form of the village and is likely to have the least impact on the perception of the area as a national battlefield site. Thirty homes should be considered for this site with strict interpretation of the need to conform to the variety of house styles found in Peterwell Road and access through a new protected area to the north of the burn adjacent to the B9005.

4. Recommendations

1. Remove reference to the Post Office in the Settlement description.
2. Allocate FR125 for 30 homes as a new allocation OP1.
3. Identify the small triangular field on the south west corner of the site, north of the B9005 and adjacent to bid FR125 within the allocation. This land should be “Reserved” once development has been completed.
4. Include the following text into the ‘Services and Infrastructure’ section “There is limited capacity at Fyvie Waste Water Treatment Works to treat all sites allocated. Scottish Water will initiate a growth project, should demand from committed development exceed available capacity.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 76 Garmond

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
310	Mr & Mrs Graham & Susan Neal
805	SEPA

2. Issues

General

One respondent wishes to see infill building done in a sensitive manner, to not impinge on the amenity of other properties (310).

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has noted that the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) states there is no public waste water treatment in Garmond. This is incorrect. Scottish Water should confirm the capacity status of the existing septic tank and any capacity issues should be highlighted in the LDP (805).

3. Actions

General

Design policies require all development to safeguard, where possible, amenity of surrounding buildings.

Services and Infrastructure

Confirmation has been sought over the status of public waste water drainage in the settlement and the text relating to treatment in Garmond should be modified.

4. Recommendations

1. The status of waste water disposal will be confirmed with Scottish Water and wording adjusted in the Settlement Statement accordingly.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendation at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.

3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 77 Kirkton of Auchterless

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
805	SEPA
815	John Wink Design on behalf of Mr Raymond Porter

2. Issues

Support was expressed for allocating bid FR137, on the basis that it would support local services, and strategic landscaping will ensure overdevelopment does not occur. The respondent acknowledged the loss of prime agricultural land, but recognised that there are limited opportunities for expansion without this loss. It was not considered that the site would be out of place in the context of the existing settlement and any issues could be resolved at the design stage (815).

With regard to bid FR114 and FR115, SEPA have questioned the sewage capacity to accommodate these sites (805).

SEPA has also requested that if site FR115 is brought forward that the allocation summary includes that “A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse on the northern boundary of the site which should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of the watercourse through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated.” In any case SUD’s will be required for all new development (805).

3. Actions

Site FR137 is detached and no appropriate justification has been provided for its inclusion. It is not considered to be an appropriate development site.

With regard to sewage connection, Scottish Water has confirmed that there is limited capacity in the St Donan's Cottages septic tank to serve bid FR114. However, if site FR115 was also brought forward a growth project would be required. We do not propose to bring forward site FR115 at this time.

A number of changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below.

4. Recommendations

1. Modification of the Vision and the descriptions of sites R1 and R2 to reflect the aspirations of the community.
2. Extend the settlement boundary to the extent of FR114 to allow infill development of 2 homes.
3. Reserve bid FR144 for a car park.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 78 Methlick

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
33	Ryden LLP on behalf of Neil & Sarah Purdie
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
697	Mr & Mrs Brian & Anita Thomson
720	Mr Wayne Gray
729	Mr Peter Dowswell
805	SEPA
856	Taylor Design Services on behalf of Mr John Catto
876	Woodland Trust Scotland
1009	Historic Environment Scotland
1014	Mr & Mrs Hugh & Elizabeth Stuart

2. Issues

General

Respondents have stated that there is no requirement for additional houses within Methlick (697, 1014) citing education constraints and concerns that local services are diminishing while housing is being promoted (697).

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has highlighted that Waste Water Treatment capacity issues are apparent and there is a need for a Scottish Water growth project (805).

Bid FR014

Respondents raised concerns with this site, highlighting potential impacts upon wildlife (1014), lack of sewer capacity (729, 1014), significant issues with the topography/slope of the site being inappropriate (729, 1014) which could subsequently restrict access and cause issues in terms of earthworks (506, 729, 1014). Related to this, impacts upon privacy of neighbours are highlighted (697, 1014). It was also stated that the site would not fit in with the general pattern of development in the vicinity, and that the expansion of the site is only proposed given historical support and that the nature of the site will not provide for a range of housing (729). Wider concerns including drainage, site runoff and water pollution (729), also flood risk (697, 729).

Regarding other aspects, the need to ensure there is no adverse impact upon ancient woodland results from any development has been highlighted (729). Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) believe that the buffer zone between the site and the woodland needs to be enhanced (506). It has also been stated that the drystone dyke should be restored along the roadside (729).

From a wider perspective, respondents have also contended that the allocation of the site would be contrary to the Strategic Development Plan (SDP), that there is no need for housing in the settlement and no education capacity (729).

SEPA has noted that the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment text is not aligned with requirements in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) (805).

In support of the site, one respondent stated they welcomed the site's inclusion, highlighting that there were no infrastructure constraints, the site can be accommodated into the school roll, and drainage can be successfully implemented. Maintenance and enhancement of woodland would be proposed and the site is accessible from bus routes. The site is considered to provide a mix of housing to fit demand (33).

Bid FR034 / Existing Site – OP1

SNH and Historic Environment Scotland have agreed that the Inventory Garden/ Designed Landscape will require a sensitive approach to design (506, 1009).

SEPA has noted that the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment text is not aligned with requirements stated in the Draft Proposed LDP (805).

Bid FR040

A respondent has raised concerns that the site represents more than the settlement needs in terms of proportionate growth (856)

SEPA has noted that the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment text is not aligned with requirements in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (805).

A respondent has commented that different parts of the site would allow for different styles of housing and would represent an asset to the settlement in terms of choice and growth (720).

Bid FR046

A respondent has stated that nearby ancient woodland should be protected and impacts upon this considered with any new development (876).

SNH has noted that the steep gradients mean the site would be challenging to develop without significant landscape and visual impacts (506).

Bid FR047

A respondent has contended that the site should be included, citing previous support and stating that it represents a sensible extension to the existing settlement core (856).

It has been stated that the development can be incorporated into the site gradient and that there are no impacts upon ecology, furthermore impacts could be assessed through the application process anyway (856).

SNH has note that the steep gradients mean the site would be challenging to develop without significant landscape and visual impacts (506).

3. Actions

General

Across Aberdeenshire there is a need for a modest number of homes, as obligated by the Strategic Proposed Development Plan.

Services and Infrastructure

Scottish Water infrastructure and any associated growth projects require to be considered in detail for the settlement. Housing allocations are relatively modest and could help support services within the settlement. Scottish Water would be required to initiate a growth project once development meets their five growth criteria. No action is required.

Bid FR014

A number of the concerns raised could be addressed through a detailed planning application, issues such as drainage, access, range of housing, impacts upon woodland and potentially education. The site has an implemented consent for which the site extension allows a more rational development pattern.

However, the topography of the site and associated impacts are significant. Neighbouring sites have not been preferred for this reason and given the steepness of the site, and probable significant cut and fill operations required alongside any associated landscape and visual impacts associated with building further up and back on the slope, there are significant concerns with the expansion of this site to incorporate further housing. As such the extension to this site should not be supported. Existing site OP2 should be removed from the LDP and retained as white land within the settlement boundary.

The text relating to flood risk would also require to be amended as requested by SEPA.

Bid FR034 / Existing Site – OP1

This is a currently allocated site. Specific reference requires to be made to protecting sensitive features such as the Inventory and Designed Landscape. The flood risk text would also require to be amended as requested by SEPA.

Bid FR040

The claim that the settlement cannot accommodate a modest development in this area is not supported, especially given the likely non-delivery of existing site OP2. The site is too big for the 12 homes sought and only the area east of Summerbrae Croft should be included in the Plan. The flood risk text would also require to be amended as requested by SEPA.

Bid FR046

No action is required, as the site is not considered appropriate for inclusion for reasons given in the Main Issues Report (that it would have significant landscape impacts and could impact on protected species), and there is no public support for its inclusion.

Bid FR047

No action is required, as the site is not considered appropriate for inclusion for reasons given in the Main Issues Report (that it would have significant landscape impacts and could impact on protected species) and there is no public support for its inclusion.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

A number of changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed LDP on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below.

4. Recommendations

1. Modify the Vision to reflect the community aspiration to have an outdoor multi-use games area, the desire for small housing developments with housing for older people and start up homes for young people, and that the community do not consider there is a need for business land allocations or additional wind turbines.
2. Amend text under 'Flood Risk' and within allocation summaries in accordance with SEPA requirements.
3. No material change is proposed to the existing site OP1 (Bid FR034).
4. Allocate the eastern part of bid FR040 for 14 homes.
5. Remove the existing OP2 allocation but make no change to the settlement boundary due to the existing implemented Planning consent.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019, with the exception of recommendation 4 which should be amended to "that bid site FR040 be allocated for 12 houses" and the additional recommendations for the inclusion of reference to existing site FR014 and the inclusion of sites FR046 and FR047 in the settlement statement.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 79 Newburgh

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
423	Ryden LLP on behalf of Stewart Milne Homes
460	Ryden LLP on behalf of Stewart Milne Homes
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
805	SEPA

2. Issues

General

One respondent has stated that there is no clarity on the scale of housing land required for the settlement with regard to achieving the requirements of the Strategic Development Plan, and highlights its strategic location for delivering housing in the Energetica Corridor (423).

Flood Risk

SEPA has advised that the text “Parts of Newburgh are in an area potentially vulnerable to flood risk as identified by the National Flood Risk Assessment. Flood Risk Assessments may be required” should be added to the Settlement Statement. SEPA also advise that the BUS site, as well as site OP1, may require a Flood Risk Assessment due to the presence of a small watercourse along the southern boundary. This is similar to site OP2 which may also require a Flood Risk Assessment due to historic downstream flooding – mitigation measures would also require to be set out. For all sites, a buffer strip adjacent to this watercourse would also be required along with the enhancement of the watercourse itself (805).

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has also highlighted that there are constraints with waste water provision and that private treatment works are unlikely to be acceptable due to the proximity to the bathing beach (805).

Bid FR028

A respondent has confirmed support for the inclusion of the bid site, stating that infrastructure provision can be shared, landscaping can be added along the boundary to create a welcoming gateway to the settlement, that the benefits of developing outweigh any loss of agricultural land, traffic issues in the settlement can be alleviated and similarly that there would be no adverse impacts on the A90/B9000 road junction – this and other matters such as education contributions could be addressed under a planning application (460).

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) has stated that a site brief is required to address placemaking principles (506)

SEPA considered that the constraints within the site should be better described. There are known flooding issues downstream and so it should be covered in any Flood Risk Assessment. Furthermore, it should be outlined that any Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) should also be robust as a result of this specific constraint. A buffer strip and watercourse enhancement, alongside appropriate flood mitigation would also be welcomed (805).

Bid FR029

One respondent has objected to the labelling of a small portion of this site as a “Future Opportunity Site” in the Proposed Local Development Plan, stating that this is not consistent with the Main Issues Report, stating that this portion of the site forms an important element, watercourse buffer and natural first phase of the wider site. It is also stated that the site would take access from the B9000, rather than the A975 as stated (460).

SNH has stated that a site brief is required to address placemaking principles (506).

SEPA considered the constraints within the site should be better described. There are known flooding issues downstream and so it should be covered in any Flood Risk Assessment, furthermore it should be outlined that any SUDS system should also be robust as a result of this specific constraint. A buffer strip and watercourse enhancement, alongside appropriate flood mitigation would also be welcomed (805).

Bid FR027

A single respondent has stated that the site is considered to be suitable for 80 houses and should therefore at least be identified for future development given it's logical location, the fact that there would be no landscape setting impact, an area that floods can be included as open space, the loss of prime agricultural land is not significant in a wider context, there would be no impacts upon protected species as informed by a 2012 Report and the site is required to provide a relief road for the settlement, which is considered to outweigh any negatives. Furthermore it is stated that access is not a constraint and that education constraints could be overcome as could reservations from the community (423).

3. Actions

General

It is accepted that the contribution that individual settlements make to the housing land supply has not yet been identified. This will be included in a separate Appendix in the Proposed Local Development Plan.

Flood Risk

The request made by SEPA for additional text to be added to the Settlement Statement is considered appropriate and should be included in the Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP).

Services and Infrastructure

Reference should be made to the issues concerning waste water provision in the Settlement Statement, as requested by SEPA.

Bid FR028

As noted above flood risk and waste water constraints will be identified in the Settlement Statement. Placemaking requirements should also be added, potentially in the form of a Masterplan requirement, including the provision of a local distributor road to the north edge of the site. It is agreed that education provision and specific transport/access issues can be addressed through a detailed planning application. The need for site briefs to address placemaking principles is accepted for this and all undeveloped sites.

At 11ha the site could accommodate 275 homes, not the 124 originally proposed. This is a very significant extension to Newburgh and could be phased into the town in the next Local Development Plan, post 2031. No future Opportunity sites are to be included in the Proposed Local Development Plan.

Bid FR029

As noted above flood risk and waste water constraints will be identified in the Settlement Statement. Placemaking requirements should also be added, potentially in the form of a Masterplan requirement that includes the provision of a local distributor road to the north edge of the site. It is agreed that education provision and specific transport/access issues can be addressed through a detailed planning application.

The splitting of this site is appropriate. At 6.5ha the site could accommodate 160 homes, not the 50 originally proposed. This should be amended and included within the wider allocation as per the Main Issues Report. A holistic approach to the delivery of the site, given the constraints present, is considered to be the appropriate way forward.

The site description and outline should be amended to include a better description of flooding and drainage constraints as well as cognisance of the need to protect and enhance the resident watercourse. Placemaking requirements should also be added, potentially in the form of a Masterplan requirement. The text should also be updated to state the correct access road (B9000).

This bid site should be allocated for a development of 160 houses.

Bid FR027

This site should not be included. The justification presented by respondents is not considered to outweigh the site constraints present. Issues such as flooding are of concern, the justification that the part of the site that floods could be Open Space is not accepted. Education, access and Prime Agricultural Land concerns are still apparent. The provision of a bypass in this location in the short term is not supported and thus is

not considered to be appropriate justification in terms of allocating this site. In addition, the community wish to see expansion to the west, which is reflected in the preferred sites – and so this southern site is not appropriate at this time.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

A number of changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below.

4. Recommendations

1. Modify the Vision to reflect that there is local community support for new development being located to the west of the settlement, but no support for the scale of development required to justify a by-pass.
2. Add the following text under 'Flood Risk': "Parts of Newburgh are in an area potentially vulnerable to flood risk as identified by the National Flood Risk Assessment. Flood Risk Assessments may be required".
3. Update 'Strategic drainage and water supply' to include reference to waste water constraints.
4. Allocate bid FR029 for 160 houses for immediate development. The allocation summary should make reference to flood risk, drainage, watercourse and placemaking requirements, and state the correct access road (B9000).
5. Amend settlement boundary to accommodate the single unit identified in bid FR093, rather than allocating the site specifically.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019, however with recommendation 1 amended to read "and the community aspiration of a future by-pass" instead of "but no support for the scale of development required to justify a by-pass".
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 80 Oldmeldrum

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
54	Ms Kerry Marr
245	Lippe Architects + Planners on behalf of Kirkwood Homes
246	Lippe Architects + Planners on behalf of Mr E Simmers
247	Lippe Architects + Planners on behalf of Mr E Simmers
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
712	Mr & Mrs Paul & Lindsay Baron
800	Scotia Homes Ltd
804	Meldrum, Bourtie and Daviot Community Council
805	SEPA
820	John Wink Design on behalf of Mr Alan Whiteford
841	John Handley Associates Ltd on behalf of The Church of Scotland General Trustees
846	Meldrum, Bourtie and Daviot Community Council
860	Mr Richard Bice on behalf of Ms Sandra Sim
876	Woodland Trust Scotland
894	Mr & Mrs Paul & Pamela Gray
963	Halliday Fraser Munro on behalf of Mr G Webster
1009	Historic Environment Scotland

2. Issues

General Issues

Care should be taken throughout to protect wildlife, and there are traffic impacts on the A947, including pedestrian interactions (894). Improvements are needed to education and healthcare through Developer Contributions (54, 846).

One respondent disputes the need to provide further housing (860) and further retail development (894) in the settlement. Bungalows and affordable housing are required (846).

SEPA consider that significant waste water capacity issues, may limit delivery and any future development is considered premature (805).

Existing Site – OP2

Objection was made to the continued allocation of this site as it is not deliverable and is detached from the settlement. The site should remain as open space/strategic landscaping (246, 247).

Bid FR012

Respondent expressed support for the Officers' recommendation ("not preferred") for bid FR012 (804, 846).

Bid FR061

Concerns are raised over the increased density of the site (963), lack of public transport (894), traffic/road safety/parking impacts including on A947 (712, 860, 894), and wildlife impacts (860, 894). There are also perceived to be education constraints (860). The site extends outwith the boundaries of the existing settlement (894, 860) and existing sites to be built out first (860). Development of this site would erode the sense of place in the area (860). Woodland should be protected and tree planting enhanced (876).

Development should be allocated alongside FR062 for added co-ordination (804, 846). SNH require a site brief to ensure biodiversity measures are identified, including protecting the adjacent woodland (506).

Bid FR062

Concerns were raised over the increased density of the site (963), lack of public transport (894), traffic/road safety/parking impacts including on A947 (712, 860, 894), and wildlife impacts (860, 894). There were also perceived to be education constraints (860). The site extends outwith the boundaries of the existing settlement (894, 860) and existing sites to be built out first (860). Development of this site would erode the sense of place in the area (860). There is a conflict with ancient woodland (876).

The site should be allocated alongside FR061 to ensure a co-ordinated approach (245, 846) and support is given for 200 houses on the site as this delivers housing, community benefits and is constraint free (245). It offers the same advantages as bid FR061. There is no need for an eastern bypass, as confirmed by the Council. It offers an extension to the amenity ground which has community support. Education constraints can be addressed through the planning application and developer contributions (245).

Bid FR068

Development would support the settlement (894). It should be for housing only, employment would be incongruous (846).

Historic Environment Scotland (HES) raised concern that there would be an impact upon the Barra Battlefield. Landscape impacts should be considered alongside cumulative and archaeological information (1009). SNH believed that biodiversity measures and enhanced green infrastructure would be required (506). There were conflicting views presented on the density of the site, with one respondent voicing concerns over the increased density (963), while another supports an increase (246).

Bid FR069

This allocation supports the settlement (894) and helps meet housing need (800). An increased allocation is welcomed (800). The provision of a transport interchange is supported (800), and should be secured early (804, 846). The waste water constraint can be resolved by 2021 (800). SNH believed that biodiversity measures and enhanced green infrastructure will be required (506).

Bid FR073

Support was expressed for the Officers' recommendation not to include this site (804, 846).

Bid FR083

Two respondents supported the allocation of this site (247, 804) and two respondents consider it should be released for immediate development as deliverable and accessible (247, 846). It fits well with the overall pattern of development (247).

HES are concerned that there would be an impact upon the Barra Battlefield (54, 1009). Landscape impacts should be considered alongside cumulative and archaeological information (1009). SNH note that it relates poorly to the settlement and that careful siting and design would be required for expansion of the settlement here. A Development Brief will be required to provide meaningful open space in this part of the settlement (506).

Bid FR088

This site should be allocated for 10 houses or as stated, bungalows. It is sustainable, deliverable and has previously been supported (804, 846, 963).

Bid FR110

Support was expressed for the allocation of bid FR110. It was considered that the site should be brought forward as all neighbouring land is already developed and so it would relate well to the settlement (804, 846).

HES raised concern that there would be an impact upon the Barra Battlefield. Landscape impacts should be considered alongside cumulative and archaeological information (1009).

Bid FR111

Support was expressed for the allocation of bid FR111 in order to provide a bypass (804, 846). SNH note that it provides the opportunity to create a welcoming entrance to the settlement (506).

HES were concerned that there would be an impact upon the Barra Battlefield and other adverse archaeological impacts. Landscape impacts should be considered alongside cumulative and archaeological impacts (1009). SNH advised against development on the lower slopes of the Hill of Barra and required green infrastructure along the burn, biodiversity measures, and active travel routes from the site (506).

Bid FR119

It was believed that development would support the settlement (894). The Proposed Local Development Plan is not clear on the status of community facilities and this needs clarified (841).

There were concerns over drainage and potential flooding, access and safety on this site (54). Further concerns over the proposed density and overdevelopment of the site are voiced (804, 841, 846) and concerns raised over education provision (54, 804, 846). The site should include a school (804, 846) and community facilities should remain allocated (841). SNH believed that the site should include greenspace and avoid overdevelopment (506).

The requirement for two access points should be removed (841).

Bid FR135

Support was expressed for the Officers' recommendation not to include bid FR135 (804, 846). However, it represents a natural extension to the settlement and can create a desirable place. It would represent wider expansion alongside neighbouring bid sites. Prime agricultural land is not a reason to prohibit development (820).

Bid FR136

Support was expressed for the Officers' recommendation not to include bid FR136 (804, 846).

3. Actions

General issues

General points made about the protection of wildlife and traffic impacts are standard issues resolved through the Development Management process. Education contributions are very difficult to articulate at the moment with the rate of development dictating the scale of education requirement that should be provided. NHS Grampian have advised us of immediate needs for healthcare across Aberdeenshire, but this does not include additional provision at Oldmeldrum at this time. Provision of bungalows would be market led and not something that we can specifically request on individual sites within the Plan. However policies within the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan request that developers deliver a good balance of house types.

In accordance with the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan sufficient additional housing land allocations are identified in the Aberdeen Housing Market Area. It is considered that Oldmeldrum has an appropriate amount of land identified for housing to meet local housing needs during the Plan period.

With regard to the request made by SNH to ensure that adequate provision is made for biodiverse open space, policies are also in place that require all development to enhance biodiversity and provide adequate public open space.

Waste water capacity issues relate to the water flows in the Meadow Burn and its ability to provide sufficient dilution to the added flow. This is a serious threat to future development in Oldmeldrum. Other than the existing allocated sites development may need to drain to the north east rather than into watercourses to the south. There is no immediate solution available for this issue. Only bid sites FR012, FR061, FR062, and FR135 are likely unaffected by this significant constraint. On allocated sites, solutions require to be agreed with Scottish Water through a growth project once development meets their five growth criteria.

Bids FR083, FR110 and FR111

Three of the sites in Oldmeldrum (bids FR083, FR110, and FR111) are within the designated National Battlefield site, and on this we agree with Historic Environment Scotland that these should not come forward, despite the views of the Community Council to the contrary. Bid FR083 in particular is incongruous and in a poorly related location with regard to the settlement as it is physically and visually detached.

Bids FR068, FR069, and FR119

Sites FR068, FR069, and FR119 are all sites currently within the Local Development Plan and identified as deliverable. We note the concern of Historic Environment Scotland on the allocation of the FR068 site but its context within the existing bypass lends itself to development. The suggestion that a section of the OP2 site should be retained as undeliverable open space would conserve part of the battlefield in perpetuity. Site FR119 is subject to a current planning application, which the Proposed Local Development Plan will respect. Comments made against the development of this site reflect the planning application currently being addressed, and not the long-established principle of development on the site. Likewise bid FR069 has a live consent but an alternative proposal is being submitted to increase the density of the development.

Bid FR088

Bid FR088 is an old quarry site which was considered at the LDP Examination on a previous Local Development Plan and dismissed. Providing a safe route to school from this site would prove very difficult and could lead to road safety issues. We do not propose to allocate this site, at this time.

Bid FR012

Bid FR012 is currently part of the Oldmeldrum Golf Course. Development of this site at this time would be detached from the current settlement. We do not propose to allocate this site, at this time.

Bids FR061 and FR062

Bids FR061 and FR062 could provide opportunity for a private sewage treatment works draining to the Den of Gownor and ultimately the Raxton Burn. The scale of the proposal for FR062 represents significant underdevelopment and a revised proposal is

promoted that restricts the land take at this time rather than increasing the size of the site and subjecting Oldmeldrum to significant new development. While the constraints identified are not inconsiderable, they are either resolvable through developer obligations or represent a misunderstanding of the likely impacts, particularly at the junction of Park Crescent and the A947, where road safety risks have been overstated by respondents. Loss of prime agricultural land is inevitable on all extensions to Oldmeldrum. FR061 and FR062 should not be promoted as a single entity to allow for better co-ordination and flexible approach to delivery. This would run the risk of promoting development that was not in scale with the needs of the community in the Plan period.

Bid FR135

Bid FR135 is currently detached from the settlement and will be for some years before the OP4/FR069 site is constructed. It is not, yet, a natural expansion to the town.

Bid FR073 and FR136

Bid FR073 and FR136 are rural sites that have no external support and are not favoured by the Community Council.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

A number of changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (Draft Proposed LDP) on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below.

4. Recommendations

1. Significant modifications are proposed to the settlement Vision to reflect community aspiration. Other minor changes are promoted to improve readability.
2. Take cognisance of waste water constraints in Oldmeldrum and highlight this for all developments.
3. Continue to pursue existing and preferred sites; bid sites FR068, FR069, and FR119 should be retained, with the addition of the new site FR061 to provide 146 homes.
4. Add to allocation summary for Site OP4 "A buffer is required along the eastern boundary to protect the trees along the boundary".

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019, with recommendation 4 to include the wording "and the encouragement to develop the context of a masterplan to encompass FR062 (already including the entirety of bid site FR061) as a whole, on the basis

of the work being phased". The Committee agreed the additional recommendation to be included "that additional developer contributions be sought in respect of the core path network for bid site FR119".

2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 81 Pitmedden and Milldale

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
148	Ryden LLP on behalf of Claymore Homes
149	Ryden LLP on behalf of Claymore Homes
150	Ryden LLP on behalf of Claymore Homes
266	Aurora Planning Limited on behalf of Pitmedden Property Limited
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
539	Stuart Milne Homes
540	Stuart Milne Homes
673	Udny Community Council
805	SEPA
854	Grant & Geoghegan on behalf of Mr & Mrs Murray
874	Udny Community Trust Ltd. (UCTL)
882	David Murray Associates
1009	Historic Environment Scotland

2. Issues

General

The respondents were generally supportive of the objectives on the Main Issues Report (MIR). The "Imagine Udny" Community Action Plan and Spatial Report was published February 2019 by Planning Advice Scotland. The Community Action Plan Report provisions the Vision and Strategy within which the community could move forward with these ideas. Priorities are central to village interventions; the creation of a new Community Hub; redevelopment of the existing Quarry site as a recreational park; development of new green spaces linking in with the existing paths network; a new Pitmedden green; traffic management measures to improve public safety and amenity; repurposing the village hall; upgrading of the football pitches; new community school; and a new gateway into the settlement. Any development around Pitmedden and Milldale should support these priorities (673, 874, 882). In addition, it is considered that further development should be located to the south of the village (673).

A respondent disagrees that Pitmedden and Milldale are seen as separate settlements, as the community see this as a single entity (874).

A new site is proposed to the north of Bonnyton Road and east of B999 to allow one home to be delivered on the site. A community garden or allotment could be included as part of the site (854)

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA understand there is limited capacity at Pitmedden Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP), therefore a growth project with Scottish Water will be required. This should be reflected in the Settlement Statement (805).

Existing Site - OP1

SEPA has stated that a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) may be required due to the presence of a small watercourse on the northern boundary that has been straightened.

A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse which should be integrated positively into the development. The buffer strip will need to allow sufficient space for restoration of the watercourse. Enhancement of these through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated (805).

Existing Site - OP2

SEPA has stated that an FRA will be required due to the fluvial flood extent on the lower edges of the site. Buffer strips will be required adjacent to the watercourses surrounding the site which should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of these through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated (805).

Bid FR006

The identification of bid FR006 as a reserved site is welcomed by a respondent. The site's designation as prime agricultural land is not considered to be an impediment to development as the benefits to habitats and core paths outweigh the loss of agricultural land. It is requested that the boundaries of sites FR006 (identified as FOP1 in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan) and FR007 require to be flexible to ensure that a high quality, well designed efficient development can be provided (148).

However, it is considered that this site could accommodate 355 homes (148 and 149). The respondent is of the view that there is an imbalance in housing numbers between the two sites (FR006 and FR007) and it may be appropriate to consider the two sites under a Masterplan approach to allow flexibility (149).

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) has requested that the site brief should take cognisance of the gently sloping landform to avoid significant landscape and visual impacts, setting out how biodiversity benefits would be achieved and showing green linkages to the surrounding area and maintaining and enhancing existing tree belts to provide a mature structure for future development. In addition, the site brief should include pedestrian routes through to Udney Castle Estate (506).

SEPA has identified a well on the site. An assessment of this well will be required and suitable mitigation put in place to ensure no pollution to ground water. There may have been a natural watercourse emanating from this well which is now culverted. Deculverting and enhancement of this watercourse should be investigated. In addition, buffer strips will be required adjacent to the watercourses in and around the site and should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of these through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated (805)

Historic Environment Scotland (HES) has stated that this site will impact on views from the Category 'A' Listed building at Udney Castle (1009).

There has been an objection to bids FR006 and FR007 on the grounds that a number of protected species have been found within these sites. The site would require a second access on to the B9000 that would involve the removal of woodland. These sites are visually prominent. It is recognised that site topography would create challenges for delivering a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS). The respondent is of the view that better sites exist elsewhere (540).

Bid FR007

The development of a new village hall or "community hub" on the FR007 site as a replacement for the existing village hall is supported (673, 882).

The allocation of 100 houses is supported by a respondent (149). Another respondent notes the increase in housing on this site to 110 houses and has raised concerns regarding sufficient space for a new community hub and potentially a new school (874).

It is the view of a respondent that space could be made over for allotments within this site (149).

SEPA has stated that buffer strips will be required adjacent to the watercourses surrounding the site which should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of these through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated (805).

Bid FR008

It is considered that this site to be constrained for the development of a community hall and reservation should be removed (150, 874). However, a respondent considers that bid FR007 is the preferred option for a community hub (874), with another of the view that the village hall could be located on bid site FR006 (150). The land should be allocated for 5 houses (150).

Bid FR094 and FR095 / Existing Site - BUS1

The recommendation not to reallocate BUS1 for housing or for a mixed use development has been contested (266). The respondent considers the site to be well connected to the settlement with safe access to local services and facilities. The site was previously deemed an appropriate location for [employment] development. Sensitive design and layout would ensure any development would not have any more of an impact on the setting of the designed landscape than the current employment use allocation, and indeed there is the potential to positively enhance the historic setting in a way that business development alone is unlikely to do (266).

It has been stated that the owner has not been able to secure a tenant for business use (for the new warehouse on the site), and is seeking a mixed use allocation, stating that an element of residential development would make a small scale commercial development (farm shop or start up business units) more viable (266).

The respondent has highlighted policy that places importance on giving priority to development of brownfield land, and that Officers have accepted that an existing

brownfield site should remain vacant making no contribution to the sustainability of the village, whilst large greenfield sites are allocated (266).

The respondent has noted the proposed change in designation on previously allocated employment land BUS2, to a revised allocation for 10 homes and business land, but does not consider that this site to be more favourable for residential development than bid FR094/FR095 (266).

SEPA has stated that an FRA may be required for this site. Text should be included to state the requirement of an adequate buffer along the watercourse which should be integrated positively into the development (805).

HES has identified that development of this site could have a potential impact on the views from and setting of the Category 'A' Listed Building LB15925 (Great Garden, Pitmedden House) and Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape (1009).

Bid FR096

HES has identified that development of this site could have a potential impact on the views from and setting of the Category 'A' Listed Building LB15925 (Great Garden, Pitmedden House) and Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape (1009).

SNH is of the view that this site has the potential to significantly impact on the setting of this nationally protected designed landscape and relates poorly to the existing settlement core (506).

Another respondent has given their support to this site above bids FR006 and FR007. The site would not have a detrimental impact on the setting of the village and would help strengthen the defensible boundary of the settlement. There will be no requirement for tree removal to accommodate development. In addition the site is within walking distance to the primary school (539).

Bid FR107

This site is now under construction for an agricultural shed, so is no longer a viable bid site (874, 882).

Bid FR108

The site fits with the community aspirations for development to the south of the village (882). The respondent considered that Prime Agricultural Land on this site can be set aside and as a form of compensation, a proportion of the public open space could be made over for allotments (874, 882).

Bid FR132 and FR133

SNH is in agreement that these sites are beyond the settlement boundaries, and encourages the coalescence of the two settlements (506). In addition, it is considered that the steeply sloping ground will increase the landscape and visual impact (506).

However, another respondent has promoted bid FR133 for development, stating it is not ribbon development but rather a new designed landscape comprising development on both sides of the B999. The site is not excessively steep and a

simple cut and fill operation would suffice to accommodate small scale business. The site conforms to the community's aspirations for local employment. In addition, a new footpath would provide connectivity to Pitmedden and Milldale (882).

3. Actions

General

The current LDP includes a statement within the Services and Infrastructure section that seeks developer contributions towards facilities that serve the community in Pitmedden and Milldale or towards facilities in the wider catchment area at Oldmeldrum. These may be identified in the Community Plan or relevant Community Action Plan. However, the efforts that have gone into preparing the Community Action Plan are recognised in Imagine Udney. It is considered appropriate to acknowledge the communities' aspirations within the Settlement Statement. In addition, it is proposed to identify the village green as shown within the Community Action Plan, protect the former quarry for recreational purposes, and include the provision of a community hub within bid site FR007 in line with the aspirations of the community. However, the existing primary school is operating within capacity and is not expected to reach capacity within this Plan period. Therefore, there is no requirement to replace or extend the school at present.

With regard to the proposed new site (Bonnyton Road and east of B999) , it is considered this site is not a suitable extension to Pitmedden at this time. The allocation of a 2.8 hectare site for a single house, with community garden or allotments, is of a density that is too low for the site to be allocated to make a significant and positive contribution to Pitmedden. In addition, the inclusion of this site for development does not conform with the built pattern for Pitmedden. This site may be considered for residential development should site bid FR096 be allocated in future plans. No further action is required at this time.

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has identified there is limited capacity in the Pitmedden Waste Water Treatment Plant. Scottish Water has confirmed that a growth project will be required for Pitmedden, as well as a Drainage Impact Assessment for new sites. Scottish Water's position will be reflected in the Settlement Statement.

Existing Site - OP1 and Bid FR008

The Settlement Statement and site brief currently make reference to flooding and the potential requirement of an FRA for this site. However, the request for a buffer strip along the watercourse shall be added to the site brief text as requested.

In addition, it is noted that bid site FR007 is the preferred site for a community hall/hub by the Udney Community Trust Ltd. However, there is no confirmation that a Community Hall will be delivered on site FR007 and while there is merit in protecting the land immediately southeast of Haddo Medical Centre for Community use, the existing OP1 site should also be retained for this potential use. This site will be identified as having potential for brownfield development when an alternative site is delivered. A new allocation can protect the land in bid FR007 as open space and if need be, part of the community hub or to extend the medical centre.

Existing Site - OP2

It is agreed to include the requirement for an FRA and buffer strips to be included within the site brief as requested by SEPA.

Bid FR006

The general support for this site as a reserved site is acknowledged. It is maintained that development of this site would provide a significant extension to Pitmedden. Careful consideration would be required to ensure ecological and historical interests would not be adversely impacted on as a result of development on this site. The issues regarding location of the well on site and the requirement for buffer strips along the watercourse have also been noted. This site is considered to be a logical extension to the settlement, however at present it is not considered essential to significantly extend Pitmedden. It is considered that Pitmedden and Milldale has an appropriate amount of land identified for housing to meet local housing needs during the Plan period. No further action is required.

Bid FR007

The support for this site is acknowledged. The concerns regarding the ability to accommodate 110 houses and a community hub is valid. Therefore, it is recommended that the housing numbers be reduced to 100 to accommodate the potential community hub.

With regard to provision of allotments, all developments over 50 houses must have at least 40% open space. Allotments can contribute to achieving the required open space within the Plan should there be demand.

The need for buffer strips adjacent to the watercourse is noted and the site brief shall be updated to reflect this, as requested by SEPA. This may also have an impact on the capacity of the site for development.

Bid FR015

No comments were received on bid FR015 and it remains supported for 10 homes and a BUS designation.

Bid FR094 and FR095 / Existing Site - BUS1

The view is maintained that the site is not well related to the settlement as it is situated approximately 125 metres north of the settlement boundary for Pitmedden. A residential development would be isolated from the main settlement, resulting in a development that conflicts with the built pattern of Pitmedden.

The respondent made a case that they have been unsuccessful in securing tenants for the approved warehouse on the BUS1 site, and seeks alternative development. While the respondent refers to the site as a brownfield opportunity site, not all the BUS1 site is brownfield. If the site was removed from the Plan, the landowner could develop the brownfield elements on the site for small scale employment or residential use. It is considered that small scale development of the brownfield land would be more appropriate for this site and would leave the Greenfield element of site BUS1 undeveloped to act as a buffer between any development and Pitmedden Gardens. The removal of a business land allocation of this size will not impact on the overall employment land supply.

Bid FR096

It is maintained that while the proposed site is well related to the existing settlements and provides an opportunity to improve links to Pitmedden Gardens, the site is given a high level of protection as a Designed Landscape for Pitmedden House.

Development of this site could significantly impact on the setting of the Pitmedden House. Therefore the site will remain unallocated for development.

Bid FR107

The position is maintained that this site is not suitable for development.

Bid FR108

Support for this site is acknowledged. However, at present there are other more appropriate sites identified to meet the local housing needs, and no additional sites are required at present. No further action is required.

Bid FR132 and FR133

It is maintained that these sites are not an appropriate addition to the settlement as this time. This area currently presents an attractive entrance to Pitmedden with an open aspect which will be enhanced by the community park proposed to the west. Development of this site would have an adverse impact on the character of the area and is therefore unsuitable for development. No action is required.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

A number of changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed LDP on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below.

4. Recommendations

1. Add the following text to Vision: “The Community Action Plan, Imagine Udney sets out the aspirations of the community. They include New Community Hub, Central Village Intervention, new and improved path network, enhancement of greenspaces, a new village green, repurposing of the village hall, and new gateways into the settlement.”
2. Modify text under ‘Strategic drainage and water supply’ to state: “An upgrade to the Waste Water Treatment Works at Pitmedden is required to support development. Scottish Water will initiate a growth project once one development meets their 5 growth criteria. A Drainage Impact Assessment is required for all development sites. A water impact assessment will be required for development to mitigate impact on Raitshill Pitmedden Service Reservoir.”
3. Add a new protected land designation to the south of the settlement, between the Bronie Burn and B999 “For the creation of a community park”.
4. Add a new protected land designation to the south of the settlement at Allathan quarry “For the creation of a recreational park”.
5. Protect land immediately southeast of Haddo Medical Practice for community use.

6. Remove BUS1 from the Settlement Statement.
7. Amend the Flood Risk section of the Settlement Statement to include reference to site OP2.
8. Retain existing site OP1, with the undeveloped part of the site OP1 reserved for a community hub, with the caveat that should a site be provided elsewhere in the village this site should revert to a brownfield development opportunity. Remove reference to community facilities from OP1 site brief.
9. Retain existing site OP2 and amend allocation summary to include the following text: "A Flood Risk Assessment will be required due to the fluvial flood extent on the lower edges of the site. Buffer strips will be required adjacent to the watercourses surrounding the site which should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of these through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated".
10. Allocate bid FR007 for "100 homes and a community Hub".
11. Add the following text to allocation summary for bid FR007: "The community would wish that the community hub should be designed to deliver a multipurpose hall for purposes such as sports, event space, accessible office space and library".
12. Add the following text to allocation summary for bid FR007: Land south west of Pitmedden "Buffer strips will be required adjacent to the watercourses surrounding the site which should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of these through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated".
13. Allocate bid FR015 for 10 homes and BUS land to the south.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed to accept the community plan as proposed by the Udney Development Trust, covering bid sites FR108, FR007, FR132 and FR133, as the settlement statement for Pitmedden and Milldale, with officers to further discuss the proposals in early course with the Trust; and to remove the reference to "Milldale" in the settlement statement title.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and agreed not to allocate bids FR132 and FR133 in the Proposed LDP. The Committee also agreed that part of bid FR006 be allocated in the Proposed LDP. The allocated part of FR006 should be incorporated into the adjacent bid FR007 site already recommended for inclusion.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan

2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 82 Potterton

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
3	Mr & Mrs Peter Watt
315	Belhelvie Community Council
486	Stewart Milne Homes
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
529	Ryden LLP on behalf of CHAP Group (Aberdeen) Limited
532	Ryden LLP on behalf of CHAP Group (Aberdeen) Limited
536	Ryden LLP on behalf of CHAP Group (Aberdeen) Limited
553	Stuart Milne Homes
595	Lippe Architects + Planners on behalf of Barratt Homes
792	Sirius Planning on behalf of FCC Environment
805	SEPA
876	Woodland Trust Scotland

2. Issues

General

A respondent is generally concerned that the scale of proposed allocations to be included in the Plan is excessive and at odds with the Vision for the settlement (315). There is no clarity in the scale of development required for Potterton and if the preferred site provides an accurate reflection of the level of housing required for Potterton as set by the SDP (532, 536).

A misprint in the Main Issues Report has been highlighted. The Gourdiepark development is west of the B999, not east (529, 536).

A view has been given that Potterton provides excellent access to strategic transport links north and south with direct access to the existing employment opportunities and amenities associated with the Bridge of Don Retail Park and Denmore Industrial Estate (532).

The preferred sites provide no community facilities or services to address the planning objectives contained within the Vision (532).

A greater scale of development would help Scottish Water to plan for wider growth and assist in infrastructure provision (595).

Bid FR037

It is considered that this site should be formally identified as Strategic Reserve Land as envisaged by the Strategic Development Plan (486). They consider that the site would not have a detrimental impact on the landscape character of Potterton. Respondents are of the view that there are no infrastructure constraints, and the site would provide a village green and deliver affordable housing (486, 553).

Another respondent does not support reserving site FR037B to avoid giving the site any premature development plan status and to allow the community to reflect further on the longer-term growth of the settlement (315).

SEPA has identified that a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) may be required due to fluvial flood risk from Blackdog Burn which has been historically straightened. A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the burn and should be integrated positively into the development. The buffer strip will need to allow sufficient space for restoration of the watercourse. Enhancement of these through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features should be investigated (805).

Bid FR104

It is the opinion of the respondents that this site is remote from the Post Office/shop and bus routes. Access to the site cannot be delivered without demolition of the existing community Resource Centre, and a second access is not achievable due to land control issues. The site is not deliverable (486, 553). Another respondent considered this site to be prominent and would have an adverse impact on the local road network (595).

The respondent did not support reserving this site (315).

Bid FR105

Support is given for the Officers' assessment of the site in the Main Issues Report (MIR). It would be difficult to integrate into the wider village and its viability is questioned (486, 553).

Bid FR106

Respondents did not support this site as it is detached from the village with no footpath and is a considerable distance from facilities. In addition, the site is adjacent to ancient woodland and has ecological value. There are better alternative sites (486, 553).

Bids FR120

It is considered that the site has excellent access to strategic transport links to the north and south, and it is located less than 3km from employment opportunities at Bridge of Don. A residential-led mixed-use development that would be a significant contribution to the identified planning objectives of Potterton (529).

This site would provide community facilities (including a primary school) for new and existing residents. Re-routing the B999 through the site would significantly improve the

sense of place, creating an attractive new gateway approach to the village, improving connectivity and road safety (529).

The respondent is of the view that the main reason for not allocating this site is the perceived landscape character impact of developing Potterton to the west, however existing landscape characteristics are already established through existing housing to the west of the village. This site would fit comfortably with the surrounding landscape and built form (529).

It was acknowledged by the respondent that this site is within the green belt, however this should not be considered to be a barrier to development. The MIR settlement strategy for Potterton has an identified need for growth. All bid sites in Potterton are on green belt designated land (529).

Bids FR121 and FR122

Sites FR120, FR121 and FR122 would introduce a scale of development which would be detrimental to the village. It would remove significant land from the green belt (486).

A respondent is supportive of site FR121 and FR122 as an allocation for development, in the short term. This site could accommodate a residential led mixed-use development that would make a significant contribution to the settlement. This site would create a more cohesive traditional village with opportunities for new community uses and services. There is no evidence that this site would have adverse impacts on landscape character, this site is not visible from 800 metres away (532). In addition, this site would mitigate any impacts on the primary school, by reserving an area for a new primary school and via developer obligations (532, 536).

The respondent considered that retail use on bid FR121 would not create road safety issues on the B999 and disagreed with the suggestion that the orientation of the village would change (532).

The respondent stated that the green belt around Potterton should not be seen as being a barrier to development (536).

Another respondent was of the view that bid FR120, FR121 and FR122 would have a detrimental impact on the setting of the settlement and would be detrimental to the existing scale and character of the village (3, 315, 595). In addition, the primary school is at capacity (3).

Bid FR123

One respondent considered this site a brownfield opportunity that would provide much needed services and niche retail outlets as well as providing potential employment uses and tourism use development to facilitate the Energetica vision of creating an internationally recognised location for businesses operating within niche markets (792).

Bid FR140

Respondents do not consider that developers have fully considered the viability of the proposal. It is detached from the village and outwith reasonable walking distance to the amenities. The site's location and bias to the AWPR will result in residents being physically and psychologically detached from the village. The site should not be taken forward. There is an ancient woodland which has ecological value. The site should not be taken forward into the Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) (486, 553).

SNH has stated that the site boundary in the Main Issues Report is drawn to exclude an area of ancient woodland. However, in the Draft Proposed LDP the boundary includes that woodland. The proposed LDP states that the woodland should be retained and go towards the allocation's open space provision. It is requested that protection and enhancement of the woodland, including connectivity with surrounding habitats, is included in the site brief (506).

The recognition of ancient woodland adjoining site FR140 and the requirement to consider it in the design/layout of the development is welcomed by Woodland Trust Scotland. Additional native tree planting should be encouraged to minimise potential adverse effects on woodland (876)

Respondents are generally supportive of Officer's views on the allocation of bids FR140 and FR141 (315, 595). Site FR141B is promoted. Development of only 172 units on sites bid FR140 and Bid FR141a over a 10-year period would only provide for 5 years land supply, and the addition of FR141B would increase that to 8 years. 237 homes are a more realistic and acceptable proposition (595).

In support of this site, the respondent has submitted a transportation report that concludes that the sites are well positioned to connect to the existing footpath and local road network, encourage cycling and directly connect to the AWPR at Blackdog through an upgraded C class road (595). In addition, the site is not in a prominent location in terms of landscape impact. Full allocation of these sites would be able to help with the delivery of education improvements (595).

Bid FR141A

Respondents did not support reserving this site (315, 553). This site is not in close proximity to the services within the settlement. The site also includes ancient woodland which has ecological value (553).

SEPA has stated that a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) is required as surface water affects a large part of the site. A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse on the western boundary of the site which should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of this straightened watercourse through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features will require to be investigated (805).

Bid FR141B

The respondent supported the inclusion of FR141B as allocations in the Plan (315).

Another respondent is not in support of this allocation. This site is not in close proximity to the services within the settlement. The site also includes ancient woodland which has an ecological value (553).

3. Actions**General**

With regard to housing numbers, the number of houses required for Aberdeenshire are defined in the Strategic Development Plan (SDP). The SDP allocates housing numbers to the broader areas known as the Aberdeen Housing Market Area and the Rural Housing Market Area. The SDP does not specify housing numbers to particular settlements. However, the SDP does identify strategic growth corridors located along the main transport routes and these are areas where development will be focused. Potterton is located within the Aberdeen to Peterhead Strategic Growth Area. In addition, Potterton is a commuter village for Aberdeen. As such, it is considered that Potterton remains ideally situated for measured, significant, sustainable development.

The misprint within the Main Issues Report is acknowledged.

Bid FR037

It is maintained that this site is not brought forward at this time. It is considered that development of site FR037B could have a detrimental impact on the character of the settlement, eroding the openness and obscuring the character of the Manse and Church buildings (the settlements' few traditional buildings) from the southern approach to Potterton on the B999.

With regard to bid FR037A, the view is maintained that this site is not a preferred location for housing at this time. Development would have an adverse impact on the open character and approach to the settlement from the south.

Bid FR104

While it is noted that several respondents did not support the allocation of this site, the view is maintained that the site is appropriately sited for long term future development. Development in this location reflects the existing pattern of development, retaining the village hall more centrally within the settlement. Development on this site would be less predominant in the landscape than other bid sites. However, inclusion of this site at this time would result in a very significant increase in the number of homes in the village and we do not propose to promote this bid in the Proposed LDP.

Bid FR105

The comments are noted. The position is maintained that this site is unsuitable for development. No further action required.

Bid FR106

The comments are noted. It is not proposed to allocate this site in the Proposed LDP. No further action is required.

Bids FR120, FR121 and FR122

Whilst comments in support of these sites are noted, the position is maintained that these sites should not be allocated within the Proposed LDP. The majority of the settlement is located on the east side of the B999. Placing services and facilities to the west of the B999 would divide the settlement with the potential for road and pedestrian safety issues. The B999 should continue to function as a road that passes by Potterton and not through it, retaining Panmure Gardens as the main road through the settlement. There are other, more suitable sites for Potterton to grow that better reflect the built form of the settlement and retain cohesion.

Bid FR123

The position is maintained that this site is not suitable for housing at this time. It is acknowledged that the respondent considers the site would be suitable for commercial or retail uses due to its location near the A90. This site is not a logical extension to the Potterton built form and would have a significant adverse impact on the rural character of the wider area. The respondent promotes this site as having the ability to promote services, facilities and employment uses, however these are uses that can be delivered within the existing allocations at Blackdog, should there be demand. No further action is required.

Bid FR140

The view is maintained that this site is an appropriate extension to Potterton. The site offers a natural extension to the village for residential development. The AWPR allows for improved access to this side of the village without bringing excessive traffic through the village. The site is located close to local businesses and public transport. In addition, there is existing footpaths that allows for access to the sports field and the local shop. This site should be allocated in the Proposed LDP.

With regard to the provision of a site for new community facilities, Bid FR140 could accommodate such facilities. The site is considered to be well connected to the rest of the settlement, with a good footpath network that leads from the west of the settlement via the playing fields to the "Steading" public house and Bid FR140, as well as existing footpaths from the eastern part of the settlement.

Bid FR141A

It has been highlighted that this site was not included within the Draft Proposed LDP, despite being a preferred site. This site is considered to be part of bid FR140 as it would bring similar benefits and can be potentially delivered as one. It is therefore recommended that this site be brought forward for development. It is considered appropriate to request a Masterplan for the delivery of the two sites, together with a proposal to enhance biodiversity, protect ancient woodland and deliver connectivity to the existing settlement.

The request made by SEPA for text to be including in the Settlement Statement is considered appropriate, and the stated requirements should be included in the Proposed LDP.

FR141B

This site is considered to be a logical extension to the future development of the settlement. However, this site will not be brought forward at this time. It is considered that there are sufficient additional housing land allocations identified in the Aberdeen Housing Market Area. It is considered that Potterton has an appropriate amount of land identified for housing to meet local housing needs during the Proposed Plan period.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

A number of changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed LDP on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below

4. Recommendations

1. Amend the Vision to highlight the community's desire for a new community hall and small business units near to the existing business land.
2. Allocate bid FR140 and bid FR141A for 172 homes and Community Facilities, and include in the allocation summary the requirement for a Masterplan for delivery of this site.
3. Include the following text in the allocation summary for bid FR140/FR141A: "A Flood Risk Assessment is required as surface water affects a large part of the site. A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse on the western boundary of the site which should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of this straightened watercourse through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features will require to be investigated".

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019, with the additional recommendation to allocate bid site FR141B, and the development of a Masterplan for the delivery of this site. The committee also agreed that the additional recommendation be added that reference to a health centre at Balmedie be removed from the narrative and plans.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.

3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 83 Rashierieve

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
121	Ryden LLP on behalf of Mr Graham Brown
251	Mr John Forbes
805	SEPA
1020	Strutt & Parker on behalf of Mr Ian Ross

2. Issues

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has highlighted that Rashierieve has no public Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW). SEPA should be consulted over any waste water proposals. The preference would be for a single adoptable Waste Water Treatment Works serving OP1 site with the capacity for SR1 to connect at a future date (805).

Land to North of Rashierieve (Part of Bid FR109)

One respondent has objected to the failure to extend the settlement boundary of Rashierieve northwards to include land lying to the north of the A975 as an opportunity site for development. The land is now detached from the main farm unit by the new dual carriage way and is no longer viable for farming purposes. The site is suitable for residential led mixed used development and would round off the existing settlement and consolidate it. It has good road and public links to Balmedie, Ellon, Peterhead and Aberdeen. Residential development would support the strategic aims for Rashierieve and provide housing in proximity to the existing and proposed employment uses. It would be efficient use of land left over from roads construction which has no other beneficial use and will enhance Rashierieve as a "place" (121).

The respondent also considered that development would comply with the advice of Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) by enabling high quality development and making efficient use of land to deliver long term benefits to the public. In addition, the site benefits from being within the Energetica Corridor (121).

In support of this site, the respondent has stated that there is no flood risk at this site. There is scope to connect to the local drainage system at Foveran, or provide a private drainage system if required (121).

Existing Site - OP1 / Bid FR129

There has been support given to bid FR129 as a preferred site (251, 1020). However, there is a request for an amendment to the allocation to allow a minimum of eight "Live Work" plots on the bid site. An allocation for mixed-use development would allow for flexibility of design (251).

Two respondents state that a Flood Risk Assessment may be required (121, 805). SEPA would require a buffer strip adjacent to the watercourse on the southern boundary of the site which should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of this straightened watercourse through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features will require be investigated (805).

Existing Site - SR1 / Bid FR109

The respondent is of the view that this site is not free of flood risk (121)

The Council should allocate the area currently identified as SR1 and extended it by 5ha as part of bid site FR109. The quality and capability of the land has been diminished by the construction of the AWPR which has also severed the land from its wider agricultural unit. It would result in a coherent approach to delivery of employment land in this area and support a concentration of uses to enable Rashierieve and Foveran to become a strategic location for employment within the Energetica Corridor (1020).

3. Actions

Services and Infrastructure

It is considered appropriate to amend wording to reflect the waste water treatment issues, as identified by SEPA.

Land to North of Rashierieve (Part of Bid FR109)

Rashierieve, while included as a Settlement Statement within the proposed Local Development Plan, does not have a settlement boundary. Rashierieve is a small grouping of four houses, car sales garage, a vet referral and engineering company. This grouping does not have a community function at present and therefore does not meet the criteria of a "settlement" within the Local Development Plan. It is not the intention to amend the Plan to give Rashierieve a defined settlement boundary. As such a settlement boundary cannot be extended.

With regard to allocating the site as a residential led mixed use, the site shall not be taken forward. This site is not considered an appropriate addition to Rashierieve at this time as the site is detached from the grouping by the A975. In accordance with the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan sufficient additional housing land allocations are identified in the Aberdeen Housing Market Area. It is considered that Rashierieve has an appropriate amount of land identified for housing to meet local housing needs during the Plan period. No action is required.

Existing Site - OP1 / Bid FR129

The suggested amendment to this allocation to eight live/work residential units is agreed. However, it is maintained that the boundary to site OP1 is retained.

In addition, the allocation summary for the site will be updated to include reference to waste water treatment and the provision of a buffer area at the water course as suggested.

Existing Site - SR1 / Bid FR109

It is maintained that bid FR109, or part thereof, for employment use is not an appropriate extension to Rashierieve. A development of this size is not in keeping with the scale and character of Rashierieve and its surrounding area. Bid FR109 site would result in the undesirable coalescence of Foveran and Rashierieve. The bid site is intersected by the A90(T) and as such does not offer a logical and cohesive extension to the existing settlement. No further action is required.

4. Recommendations

1. Update wording under 'Strategic drainage and water supply' to identify the preference for a single adoptable WWTW serving OP1 site with the capacity for SR1 to connect at a future date.
2. Re-allocate existing site OP1 for 8 live/work residential units.
3. Amend the allocation summary for OP1 to state that connection to public Waste Water Treatment Works should be sought, if unfeasible a single adoptable Waste Water Treatment plant serving this site will be required, and add the text "Flood Risk Assessment may be required. A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse on the southern boundary of the site which should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of this straightened watercourse through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features will require be investigated".

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019, with recommendation 2 to include text "noting that this number had been promoted by the developer themselves".
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 84 Rothienorman

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
292	Mr Gordon Duncan
1083	Eleanor Alexander Architect Ltd on behalf of John Farquharson
805	SEPA

2. Issues

General

There are major flooding issues within the settlement that will need to be addressed prior to new development (292).

SEPA understands there is limited capacity at Rothienorman Waste Water Treatment Plant so a developer will be required to initiate a growth project with Scottish Water in order to develop the full site (805).

Bid FR026

No comments were received for site FR026, and it is promoted for 12 homes.

Bid FR033 and Bid FR112

Technical constraints such as drainage and access associated with FR033 and FR112 can be overcome through the application process, with consultees already involved (1083).

SEPA has requested the allocation summary for bid FR033 should include a requirement for a buffer strip adjacent to the Black Burn (805).

Bid FR056

SEPA has identified that a Flood Risk Assessment may be required for this site. In addition they have requested that the allocation summary include reference to a buffer strip adjacent to the watercourse on the eastern boundary of the site (805).

3. Actions

The preferred sites should continue to be pursued in order to provide Rural Housing Market Area housing at a location with good services and amenities. Cognisance does need to be drawn to flooding and drainage issues however, with this referenced and solutions required in any allocations.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

A number of changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below.

4. Recommendations

1. Modifications are proposed to the settlement Vision to reflect the aspirations of the community.
2. Allocation of bid FR026 should be made for 12 homes.
3. Allocation of bid FR112 should be made for 40 homes highlighting within the development brief that solutions to drainage, flooding and access constraints will be required in the allocation summary for these sites.
4. Amend the Flood Risk section of the Settlement Statement to include, "A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the watercourse on the eastern boundary of the site which should be integrated positively into the development. Enhancement of this straightened watercourse through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features require to be investigated" for the BUS site (bid FR056).

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019 with the exception of recommendation 3.
2. The Committee agreed to the removal of the recommended inclusion of bid site FR112.
3. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
4. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 85 St Katherines

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
292	Mr Gordon Duncan
838	Baxter Design Company (Old Deer) Ltd on behalf of H P Sleigh & Son
805	SEPA

2. Issues

Respondents expressed support for bid FR098 on the basis that development would bring essential infrastructure improvements, as well as support to facilities within the settlement and surrounding area. Planning permission exists for part of the site. Landscape impacts are not apparent and can be mitigated through resolution of a planning application. Employment land provision would be beneficial to the settlement. Bid site can be further expanded in the future (838). The site is not overly car reliant with bus services available (292, 838)

A single Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP) of sufficient capacity to accept waste water from all properties within the development and can be adopted by Scottish Water will be a SEPA requirement. It is unlikely SEPA would approve any proposal for single individual waste water discharges (805).

3. Actions

No comments were received regarding site FR091.

The scale of bid site FR098 is not considered to be appropriate for addition at this time. Development of 35 homes and business use would result in inappropriate growth of St. Katherines, where there are no services to support such a development. It is difficult to see what infrastructure could be provided that would benefit existing residents. Even if landscape impacts can be mitigated it is unlikely that a housebuilder would find 35 houses in this location as a viable project, and its support would not represent the right development in the right place.

In line with SEPA's comments the text within the Settlement Statement will be amended accordingly.

4. Recommendations

1. Retain existing OP1 and do not allocate any further land at this point.
2. Amend the Services and Infrastructure section to include "A single Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP) of a standard that can be adopted by Scottish Water,

with capacity for all properties within the development will be a SEPA requirement.”

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019, with the additional recommendation of the inclusion of bid site FR098 in the settlement statement.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 86 Tarves

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
141	Ryden LLP on behalf of Michael Mountford & Iain Mathers
558	Norr on behalf of JoAnne Gracey
805	SEPA
944	Tarves Community Council

2. Issues

General

It has been contended that there is no need for further development in the settlement, with 140 houses already allocated proving sufficient (944).

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has highlighted that Scottish Water should be contacted early in the planning process to ensure that waste water capacity is available, and not initiate a growth project (805).

Existing Site – OP1

One respondent has advised that this site has an extant planning permission for 113 houses granted on appeal, which should be reflected in the text (558).

Bid FR009

One respondent has supported the inclusion of this site for 13 houses, commenting that education constraints can be resolved through an application, as can the requirement for a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS). Furthermore, the respondent contends that this is a brownfield site and confirms the ability to deliver within the Plan period (141). The brownfield nature of the site has been contested, and the respondent has stated that the land is naturalised after a temporary storage use (944).

Bid FR0027

It has been stated that bid FR002 is not required for the settlement, albeit this is not a proposed site in any case (944).

Other sites

One respondent considered there should be inclusion of a further development site of 72 houses within the Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP), however the identity of the site is not divulged and this does not accord with any proposal (558).

3. Actions

General

The scale of development proposed in the village is noted.

Services and Infrastructure

The request by SEPA regarding waste water treatment capacity is noted. Text should be amended in the Settlement Statement accordingly.

Existing Site – OP1

Text within the allocation summary should be updated to reflect the extant planning permission (Appeal Decision) for 113 houses (APP/2018/1262).

Bid FR009

This site should be allocated and reference to brownfield development removed to avoid confusion and contradiction with previous decisions. It is agreed that education and drainage issues can be dealt with through specific planning applications. The inclusion of 13 houses is also appropriate.

Other sites

No further new development sites are considered appropriate for inclusion.

Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

A number of changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed LDP on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below

4. Recommendations

1. Amend text under 'Strategic drainage and water supply' to state the developer requirement for early engagement with Scottish Water.
2. Update the allocation summary for existing site OP1 to reflect extant planning permission.
3. Retain existing site OP1.
4. Retain existing site OP2.
5. Re-allocate existing site OP3 as a housing allocation for 19 homes as per bid FR058.
6. Allocate Bid FR009 for 13 homes without reference to any potential as "brownfield" land.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019, with the exception of recommendation 6 which the committee agreed site FR009 to be removed. Additionally, the committee agreed that recommendation 3 should be amended to read “re-allocate existing site OP3 as a housing allocation for 19 homes as per bid FR058, developed to match the design of houses lying to the east of the site”.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 87 Tipperty

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
204	John Handley Associates Ltd on behalf of Shell UK Limited
805	SEPA

2. Issues

Bid FR070 and Bid FR071

One respondent has advised that sites FR070 and FR071 both fall within the consultation zone for the Shell NGL Pipeline system, but no reference has been made to this within the Main Issues Report text. It was suggested that text is amended to advise of the pipeline consultation zone and the relevant considerations required for any proposals as a result (204).

SEPA has advised that approximately 50% of the FR070 site is at risk from flooding from the Tarty Burn. It is stated that a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) would be required prior to allocation, or the site should be reduced and amended to exclude the flood risk areas. An FRA would also be required for any planning application. The poor physical condition of the burn will need to be addressed and it is stated that efforts should be made to enhance it, possibly by allowing it to realign, which may take up as much as 50% of the development site. It was also stated that no waste water issues have been identified, but that there are no facilities in Tipperty, and this would require to be addressed in any proposals (805).

SEPA has indicated that an FRA would be required prior to allocation, or the site should be reduced and amended to exclude the flood risk areas to avoid an objection from a statutory consultee. An FRA would also be required for any planning application (805).

3. Actions

Bid FR070 and Bid FR071

These bid sites should be included in the plan for 0.76 ha and 1.7ha of employment land. Health and safety concerns regarding employment sites are less onerous than for Housing Sites as the density of occupation of land is frequently quite low.

The text for both proposed FR070 and FR071 sites should highlight the significant flooding issues, while both sites should have their boundaries amended to exclude the areas at risk from flooding on the SEPA flood maps. The need for further FRAs should also be highlighted.

Furthermore, the presence of the Shell NGL Pipeline consultation zone should also be highlighted, with additional commentary on the need to liaise with HSE.

Reference will also need to be made to the lack of any public Waste Water Treatment facilities in the vicinity.

All other bid sites should not be included in line with the Officers' recommendations in the Main Issues Report.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

A number of changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed LDP on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below.

4. Recommendations

1. Allocate bids FR070 and FR071 for 0.76 ha and 1.7ha of employment land.
2. Amend site boundaries of FR070 and FR071 to exclude areas at risk from flooding as shown on the SEPA flood maps.
3. For both FR070 and FR071 allocation summaries, include reference to the need for a Flood Risk Assessment, the location of the sites within a pipeline consultation zone and associated requirements add reference to the need for consideration of waste water treatment solutions.
4. Retain the BUS site in the village, with boundaries redrawn to reflect the current extent of land currently used for business uses.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 88 Turriff

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
112	Mr & Mrs Dave & Marion Rothwell
241	Lippe Architects + Planners on behalf of Harbro Ltd
243	Lippe Architects + Planners on behalf of Mr E Morrison
244	Lippe Architects + Planners on behalf of Mr E Morrison
313	John Wink Design on behalf of Mr Kevin Davidson
398	Halliday Fraser Munro on behalf of Messrs Paterson & Rennie
413	Savills (UK) Ltd on behalf of Macbain Family
426	Mr Kevin Davidson
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
805	SEPA
876	Woodland Trust Scotland

2. Issues

General Issues

The ancient woodland should be protected and extra planting provided (876). The planning objectives for the settlement are generally supported, but the text for site OP1 is too detailed (398). Market constraints and lack of services in the settlement remain concerning (112).

SEPA understand the Turriff Waste Water Treatment Plant has very limited capacity and certainly does not currently have capacity for all developments identified in the Local Development Plan (805).

Existing Sites

The existing site BUS2 should not be removed as it is partially built out and is next to an existing development site (244).

SEPA confirm an FRA for site OP2 is not required as the burn is unlikely to pose a risk being in a deep gorge. However, a buffer strip will be required, adjacent to the Burn of Knockiemill, which should be integrated positively into the development (805).

Bid FR001

SEPA has identified that a Flood Risk Assessments (FRA) may be required for this site. A buffer strip will be required adjacent to the Colly Stripe which runs through the site and should be integrated positively into the development. The buffer strip will need to allow sufficient space for restoration of the straightened and partially culverted Burn. Enhancement through re-naturalisation and de-culverting. This will require to be investigated (805).

Bid FR005

SEPA have confirmed they will not require an FRA as the burn is unlikely to pose a risk being in a deep gorge. However, a buffer strip will be required, adjacent to the Burn of Knockiemill, which should be integrated positively into the development (805).

Bid FR020

SNH believed that bid FR020 requires further landscape and visual consideration as it sits outside the settlement on north facing slopes with poor relationship to the existing settlement (506).

This site appears to meet SEPA cemetery guidelines. However, it will require a 10m buffer from a field drain to the south west of the site (805).

Bid FR030

SEPA are pleased to note that a buffer is required around the spring (805).

Bid FR074

A respondent has requested that bid FR074 should be allocated in the Proposed Local Development Plan (Proposed LDP), as it was previously allocated and represents an opportunity to support local housing need, support local services, is sustainable and constraints can be overcome (241).

Bid FR078

A respondent has requested that bid FR078 should be allocated in the Proposed LDP. The simplification of allocation wording contained in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan is welcomed (398). The woodland should be protected, as it is irreplaceable (876).

SEPA would welcome the addition of "Enhancement of any straightened watercourses through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features will require to be investigated for this site" (805).

Bid FR085

A respondent has requested that bid FR085 should be allocated in the Proposed LDP. The respondent was of the view that the site is not considered detached from the settlement, given there are allocations up to the boundary with and adjacent to the site. Houses form part of the urban fabric of the settlement (243).

Bid FR127

The respondent is of the view that bid FR127 should be brought forward immediately for 50 houses (413).

Bid FR134

An objection has been raised to bid FR134 due to visual and sustainability concerns (241). SNH believe that further consideration of the site within the landscape is

required as it relates poorly to the settlement (506). However, two respondents believe that the site can be delivered to meet housing need and add to the sense of place and good design. Landscaping can be secured through a planning application (313, 426).

SEPA notes the request for a Flood Risk Assessment (805).

3. Actions

Existing sites

BUS2 extends beyond the Morrison's Motors Yard and the area considered for removal is currently used for car and caravan storage. It should remain in the Proposed LDP.

Bid Sites

Bid FR020 should not be taken forward for housing due to landscape/visual concerns and its poor relationship to the settlement. It should be retained as a preferred site for a cemetery.

Other preferred sites should continue to be supported, with cognisance of relevant ecological and landscape concerns noted where necessary. Specifically, protection of woodland on FR078 and further landscape and visual considerations noted for FR134.

The logic behind including FR085 is sound, albeit premature until neighbouring sites have been built out. At present the site is physically detached from the existing settlement.

No comments were received on the preferred bids of FR003, FR004, and FR030, and FR086.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

A number of changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed LDP on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below.

4. Recommendations

1. Modify the Vision within the Settlement Statement to reflect the aspirations as expressed in early consultation by local stakeholders, including the Community Council.
2. BUS2 should be retained in its entirety. Sites OP3 and OP4 should be removed.
3. Site OP1 should be retained, with the option of subdivision according to the approved Masterplan.
4. FR086 should be identified as an opportunity site for 40 homes.

5. Bid sites FR001, FR086 and FR134 should be taken forward to the Proposed Plan for 27 homes and 40 homes respectively.
6. Do not include the housing element of FR020 in the Proposed Local Development Plan.
7. Specific reference to tree protection should be made to development on bid FR078.
8. Specific reference to landscape and visual issues, alongside other ecological factors should be made for FR134.
9. Remove reference to Flood Risk Assessments from site OP2.
10. Amend allocation summary for Site OP2 to state “A buffer strip will be required, adjacent to the Burn of Knockiemill, which should be integrated positively into the development”.
11. Amend allocation summary for site OP1 to include “Enhancement of any straightened watercourses through re-naturalisation and removal of any redundant features will require to be investigated.”

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 89 Udney Green

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
805	SEPA
874	Udney Community Trust Ltd. (UCTL)

2. Issues

Vision

It has been identified that text stating that there is no public transport is incorrect as there are bus services available (874).

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has advised that whilst the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) states that a “Growth Project has been Initiated”, this is however noted as being older text and it was suggested that Scottish Water comment on the status of this and the associated capacity (805).

Existing Site – OP1

The retention of site OP1 has been considered appropriate (874).

3. Actions

Vision

Text should also be updated in order to remove the erroneous statement regarding the lack of public transport options.

Services and Infrastructure

Confirmation should be sought regarding the status of the Scottish Water growth project to better inform the Proposed Local Development Plan.

Existing Site – OP1

Support for retaining this site is noted.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

Changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed LDP on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below

4. Recommendations

1. Update Vision text to accurately reflect public transport options.

2. Seek confirmation from Scottish Water concerning growth project status and reflect this under 'Strategic drainage and water supply'.
3. Retain existing site OP1 for 15 homes.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 90 Udney Station

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
372	Case Consulting Limited on Behalf of Irvine Christie
429	Halliday Fraser Munro on behalf of Mr Ian Marr & Claymore Homes
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
805	SEPA

2. Issues

Services and Infrastructure

The existing Local Development Plan states that a growth project has been initiated, however the growth project is not complete (805).

Existing Site OP1/ Bid FR138

The existing OP1 site has been previously refused planning permission and has been unsuccessful at appeal on the grounds of insufficient access arrangements onto the Udney Station to Cultercullen public road (372).

Bid FR021

One respondent considered that this site should be allocated to substitute for the existing OP1 site. They further considered that the allocation of this site would contribute to maintaining a 5 year effective land supply later in the Plan period, as the existing OP1 site would not contribute homes until at least 2023-2024. In addition, the allocation could maintain local services including an existing public transport service. This site is not prime agricultural land or part of a viable agricultural unit and it is well connected to the settlement (372).

Another respondent states that FR021 would have an adverse landscape impact and double the size of village (429). Scottish Natural Heritage consider that the large size of the development would reduce cohesion of the existing small settlement extending development outwith the subtle confines of the broad hill land to the east, and recommends the majority of the site should be left undeveloped (506).

If this site is taken forward a site brief would be required to avoid development extending over the whole site, retain the existing settlement boundary. Protection should be given to the adjacent semi-natural woodland, to provide for biodiversity enhancements and landscaping (506).

Bid FR139

One respondent is in support of bid site FR139 as an extension to site OP1 to deliver a design that fits better with the existing settlement (429). Extension to allocated land should be identified as future housing land rather than entirely new sites. At present

OP1 is not conducive to creating a high quality layout due to the constraints imposed by the shape of the site. Site FR139 would deliver employment land; significant open space, footpath network with links to the Formartine and Buchan Way; a good mix of house types with appropriate phasing that would meet future housing needs; and affordable housing (429).

3. Actions

Services and Infrastructure

Information received from Scottish Water advises that a growth project is underway and is due for completion in 2021. While the completion of these works is in line with the adoption of the Local Development Plan additional text should be included to refer to this date.

Existing Site – OP1

While there has been no objection received to this site, the comments on previous refusal of planning permissions, and a successful appeal decision and access issues is acknowledged. It is maintained that site OP1 is an appropriate extension to the settlement. However, it would appear that the difficulty in delivering this site is due to the difficulty in providing an appropriate design layout for the site incorporating employment land. There is no evidence that the employment land element of OP1 has attracted any interest. The removal of the requirement for employment land could result in the delivery of a well-designed residential layout which integrates with the existing village. The removal of the requirement to provide employment land on this site does not preclude the delivery of community facilities, home and work proposals and small convenience shops on this site, should they be required.

Bid FR021

It is maintained the development of the site is very large in scale and would be a prominent extension to the settlement when there has not been a need identified. The existing OP1 site and current brownfield site within the settlement will deliver the number of houses over the next 10 years that is appropriate for a settlement of this size.

Bid FR139

It is maintained the development of the site would constitute overdevelopment of the village in a relatively short period of time. The existing OP1 site and current brownfield site within the settlement will deliver the number of houses over the next 10 years that is appropriate for a settlement of this size.

In accordance with the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan sufficient additional housing land allocations are identified in the Aberdeen Housing Market Area. It is considered that Udney Station has an appropriate amount of land identified for housing to meet local housing needs during the Plan period.

4. Recommendations

1. Minor modifications are proposed in the Vision to reflect community aspirations. The settlement Vision statement should be amended from “The planning objectives for the settlement are to meet local housing and employment land needs. Another objective is to support existing services and facilities.” to “The planning objectives for the settlement are to meet local housing and support existing services and facilities.”
2. Modification should be made to the infrastructure text to acknowledge the completion of a Scottish Water Growth project by 2021.
3. No new allocations or designations are recommended.
4. Remove “and 1ha of employment land” from site OP1 allocation within the Proposed LDP.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 91 West Pitmillan

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
805	SEPA
1020	Strutt & Parker on behalf of Mr Ian Ross

2. Issues

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has stated that whilst there is no Waste Water Treatment Works at the settlement, there is one at a neighbouring settlement 1.4km away and that the preference would be for everything to connect into that single sewerage system. This was also stated as being the case for existing site OP1 (FR118) (805).

Bid FR117

Concerns were raised by one respondent, stating that development would lead to an adverse landscape impact, adverse impact upon Prime Agricultural Land and would have access constraints. Additionally, there are reservations about air quality, climatic factors and soil impacts (1020).

SEPA has stated that a buffer strip adjacent to the watercourse running through the site will be required, similarly the watercourse should be enhanced and positively integrated into any development (805).

Bid FR118 / Existing Site – OP1

SEPA has advised that there is no Flood Risk Assessment requirement from SEPA for this site. Furthermore, it is stated that a buffer strip adjacent to the watercourse running through the site will be required, similarly the watercourse should be enhanced and positively integrated into any development (805).

3. Actions

Services and Infrastructure

Further clarity on solutions with regard to waste water treatment is required in order to provide added certainty for any developers and an optimal solution for the site moving forward. Confirmation over connection options and progress should be sought from Scottish Water.

Bid FR117

Site FR117 should not be included in the Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) at this point in time. It may be suitable for future development but this can be assessed after site FR118 has progressed. The concerns regarding environmental and visual

impacts could be better assessed at that point, furthermore the scale of the site appears out of context with the settlement.

Bid FR118 / Existing Site – OP1

The requirement to enhance and integrate the watercourse in the area should be stated in the allocation summary.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

Changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed LDP on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below.

4. Recommendations

1. Seek further clarity on a waste water treatment solution and reflect the current status under the 'Services and Infrastructure' section of the Settlement Statement.
2. Do not allocate bid FR117.
3. Retain existing site OP1 (bid FR118) and amend the allocation summary to include reference to requirements to enhance and integrate the watercourse.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 92 Woodhead

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
292	Mr Gordon Duncan

2. Issues

A single respondent commented that they agreed with the conclusions drawn regarding proposed new sites and the resultant omission of all bid sites, advising that water supply, drainage, waste water and public transport constraints are all present (292).

3. Actions

No change required.

4. Recommendations

1. No change is required.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendation at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 93 Ythanbank

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
805	SEPA
857	Taylor Design Services on behalf of M G Leslie & Son
876	Woodland Trust Scotland
1009	Historic Environment Scotland

2. Issues

Services and Infrastructure

SEPA has noted that there are no waste water treatment facilities available in the settlement and that a single adoptable facility should be pursued. Investigation into groundwater pollution should also be highlighted (805).

Bid FR048 and Bid FR049

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) has commented that bid sites FR048 and FR049 are physically and visually detached from the linear settlement as well as being positioned on a hill which contributes to the wider landscape character of the area. It is stated that significant landscape impacts would result (506).

One respondent supports the inclusion of the non-preferred bids FR048 and FR049 stating that these should be reconsidered as waste water impacts can be mitigated, as can negative impacts upon woodland and archaeological sites. Furthermore, the sites would provide community facilities (woodland walks) for the settlement and the site is not constrained by pipelines (857).

Woodland Trust Scotland has identified the ancient woodland present to the south of FR048 and FR049 (876), whilst Historic Environment Scotland has welcomed the fact that these are not preferred owing to the presence of a Scheduled Monument and potential impacts upon its setting (1009).

3. Actions

Services and Infrastructure

Waste water capacity issues are acknowledged and should be highlighted in the Settlement Statement.

Bid FR048 and Bid FR049

There are no further actions regarding bid FR048 and FR049 as it is maintained that these sites should not be included. The sites are physically and visually detached from

the settlement, do not fit in with the linear pattern of development and would have numerous adverse impacts including environmental, historical, visual, and in terms of drainage.

The Draft Proposed Local Development Plan

Changes were proposed in the Draft Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) on the basis of early consultation with stakeholders. These are captured in the recommendations below.

No comment was made regarding the inclusion of bid site FR019, and it is proposed to allocate this site for 5 homes. This is an increase from 4 homes that were proposed in the bid submission. For consistency across the Proposed LDP only developments of 5 homes or more are proposed to be allocated in settlements.

4. Recommendations

1. Modify the Vision to reflect the community's desire to limit new housing over the next 10 years, to encourage good design to retain the village's character, and to highlight that affordable housing is an issue.
2. Update text under 'Strategic drainage and water supply' to reflect that a single adoptable waste water treatment facility should be pursued, and investigation into ground water pollution may be required.
3. Retain existing site OP1 as a partially developed site for 10 homes.
4. Allocate bid FR019 for 5 homes.
5. Redraw the settlement boundary to incorporate the extents of recent development on the southern side of the B9005.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendations at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

Issue 94 Formartine Landward

1. List of Respondents

MIR Ref	Respondents
315	Belhelvie Community Council
376	case CONSULTING Limited on behalf of M & C Simmers
449	Colin Thompson Architect on behalf of Graham Watson
506	Scottish Natural Heritage
511	Colin Thompson Architect on behalf of Graham Watson
577	Whitecairns Estates Ltd
604	Baxter Design Company (Old Deer) Ltd on behalf of Mrs V Fowlie (landowner)
673	Udny Community Council
868	Mr & Mrs Howard & Linda Kershaw
874	Udny Community Trust Ltd. (UCTL)

2. Issues

Bid FR036, Drum Of Wartle

There is support for this site for employment uses on the basis that the site is small-scale and could promote start up units. The site is located away from houses and will not have a detrimental impact (449, 511).

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) has requested that if this site was considered further, measures should be included in the Local Development Plan (LDP) to avoid encroachment and adverse impacts to adjacent woodland (506).

Bid FR023, Hattoncrook

Having reviewed the Officers' assessment in the Main Issue Report, a reduced site has been proposed to accommodate a much smaller development. The respondent considers the area is entirely outwith the pipeline corridor safety zone. The revised site should be identified as an allocation in the LDP 2021 (376).

In support of this site the respondent proposes a new Waste Water Treatment Plant to serve the site and the existing adjacent development. In addition, there are no records of protected species within the site boundary, and the respondent considers that the development would not be visually intrusive, and is within 100m from a bus stop (376).

However, another respondent has expressed concern regarding the scale of development proposed (673, 874).

Bid FR016, Whitecairns

A respondent has welcomed the Officers' assessment that the site relates well to the settlement and considers that the site would be seen as a modest extension to the existing group of houses with no adverse impact upon the existing settlement or wider countryside. The site is well served by public transport and within easy cycling distance to Dyce. In addition, there are solutions available to resolve the education and drainage constraints (868).

Bid FR097, Whitecairns

There is disagreement with the Officers' assessment ("not preferred" site). One respondent supports this site for 20 homes as there is viable private drainage solutions and the site could be integrated into the landscape (315). Another respondent was of the view that Whitecairns would benefit from development to promote the desire for small businesses as well as residential areas (577). The site is accessible due to the proximity of the AWPR (577, 604).

Another respondent promotes this site as being suitable for residential and business land. They are of the view that education constraints can be resolved and the site could deliver a safer bus route (604).

3. Actions

Bid FR036, Drum Of Wartle

The position is maintained that allocating this site for employment purposes would promote development in an unsustainable location. However, we recognise the need to support sustainable economic development in remote rural locations. This site is located within the Rural Housing Area therefore there may be scope for small scale employment development under Issue 10 Shaping Rural Development in the Countryside.

However, landscape impact remains a concern. It is noted that those who promote this site for development suggest landscaping to mitigation impacts. However, landscaping is not the solution to making a development acceptable. Sensitive design, along with appropriate landscaping would be assessed as part of the planning application process considered through the application of rural development policies. No further action is required.

Hattoncrook and Whitecairns

Allocations for development that would more than double the size of these settlements are not justified as they would have a detrimental impact on the wider landscape and setting of the settlements. However, there may be scope for small scale development under Issue 10 Shaping Rural Development in the Countryside and Main issues 8 Organic Growth. This policy may potentially allow a qualifying settlement to grow by 20% of the size of the settlement, which is a reasonable expansion. No further action is required.

4. Recommendations

There are no recommendations.

5. Committee Decisions

1. Formartine Area Committee agreed the above recommendation at their special meeting on 10 September 2019.
2. At their meeting of 3 October 2019, Infrastructure Services Committee considered the views of Formartine Area Committee and no further recommendations were identified.
3. At the meeting of Aberdeenshire Council on 5 March 2020, Members agreed that the content of the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 provides the settled view of the Council on the Plan they wish to see adopted in 2021.

135017: Inclusion of bid sites FR067 (and support for part of bid site FR109) at land at Blairythan Terrace, Foveran on behalf of the Blairythan Partnership – Site Access Review Technical Note 30th July 2020

Introduction

1. This Technical Note has been prepared on behalf of the Blairythan Partnership in support of the inclusion of Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2020 (ALDP) bid site FR067 to the south of Blairythan Terrace, Foveran.
2. The Technical Note also considers the benefits of the inclusion of part of site FR109 to the south of Site FR067 in order to ensure delivery of the proposed new link road from the B977 to Blairythan Terrace, which has been identified by Aberdeenshire Council as a requirement for all proposed ALDP sites in Foveran.
3. A high level review of the access requirements for all of the proposed sites identified in the ALDP is discussed. This includes Sites OP1, OP2, OP3 and OP4. All relevant sites are identified in Figure 1 below.




Figure 1: ALDP Proposed Sites and Bid Sites

Existing Access Arrangements

4. Access to all existing development within Foveran is currently via Blairythan Terrace, which routes from the B977 (old A90) to the east and then continues to the west as the U11c towards the B999. 500m to the west of the FR067 site, the U11c provides access to the south which connects back with the B977, the A975 and the A90 AWPR Newburgh Interchange. Figure 2 identifies the existing access routes and the ALDP bid sites being considered.




Figure 2: Existing Access and ALDP Bid Sites

5. Site FR067 was originally included as a preferred site when the Main Issues Report was published, however when being reported to the Formartine Area Committee on 10 September 2019 the officer comment on site FR067 stated that *“bid FR067 cannot take access down the current C class road and would be dependent on a new access to be formed to the south east of the site passing through bids FR065 and FR066. As there remains third party land in the intervening land the delivery of the sites must be questioned and in hindsight it has been recommended that is not included in the Proposed Local Development Plan”*. For clarification, bids FR065 and FR066 are the ALDP preferred sites now referenced as OP3 and OP4 respectively as shown in Figure 1.

6. It was not considered that the existing access arrangements at Foveran restricted the access to site FR067 and further clarification was sought from the Council's Transportation Service as to the reasons for the site's removal. In response the Transportation Service stated that *"our advice to the LDP team was a second access to the B977 is required to support further development on Blairythan Terrace. Blairythan Terrace narrows to around 5m at some locations and has traffic calming along its length so we view it as equivalent in standard to a housing road with a single point of access to the B977. The single track road U11c road to the west is very narrow at some locations and the route to the A975 is convoluted so our view is that it can be considered as an 'emergency' access but not a second point of access. Therefore, based on our standards we could potentially allow up to 100 units access from Blairythan Terrace. It currently serves around 70 units so a further 29 more units may be supported by the current network prior to a second access being delivered. The existing OP2 allocation opposite is for up to 75 units. The formation of a B977 loop is also important for delivering bus services closer to the site."*
7. It is considered that this is an unjust assessment of the local road network and application of the Council's standards. The U11c road to the west provides a second point of access into Foveran and links to the B999, the A975, the B977 and the A90 AWPR. Whilst it may be classed as a single track road, this is not uncommon for rural areas and smaller settlements within Aberdeenshire, and indeed across the country. The route to the A975 is not considered to be convoluted (as can be seen in Figure 2) and there are opportunities for the provision of passing places and / or localised road widening if required. Passing places are already provided along the U11c to the west and the road could be widened accordingly along the FR067 site frontage to tie in with the existing traffic calmed scheme along Blairythan Terrace. This road widening would also be required for the allocated OP2 site which is located directly opposite the FR067 site. Further passing places could also be provided at appropriate locations on the U11c if required.
8. Similar access arrangements (single track roads) provide 2nd points of access to a number of settlements within Aberdeenshire that have over 100 houses. This is to be expected given the rural nature of Aberdeenshire and includes the settlements of Hatton, St Combs, Inverallochy, Gardenstown, Daviot, Sauchen, Auchenblae and Drumlithie.
9. The U11c is an adopted public road with no restrictions in vehicle use. It is used by existing residents within Foveran on a daily basis, not to mention the adjacent rural community in accessing Foveran and its existing facilities, and onwards to adjacent settlements such as Newburgh and Ellon and provides access to the strategic road network; the A90 AWPR. As can be seen in Figure 2 above, part of the A90 AWPR Newburgh Interchange road works included a new road link which provides access to the A975, the B977 and the U11c.

10. Whilst the Council have expressed that the existing road passing the FR067 site is not wide enough to serve the site, it could be upgraded to a sufficient width, as it has been for the adjacent sites at Blairythan Place and Turin Way that have recently been developed. This would also be required for the allocated OP2 site which is directly opposite site FR067. The existing 30mph speed limit could also be re-positioned further west, again as it has been recently for the adjacent developments and as it would be required for the OP2 site.
11. It is therefore not considered that the U11c route is equivalent to only an emergency access and it clearly already provides a second point of access for the existing settlement and surrounding area.

Proposed LDP Access Arrangements

12. The proposed ALDP for Foveran states that *“access to sites OP2, OP3 and OP4 should be considered collectively in order to provide a new link from the B977 to Blairythan Terrace.”* However specifically for site OP2, the proposed ALDP states that *“Blairythan Terrace requires to be upgraded to a suitable adoptable standard for the number of homes proposed, with footway provision on the north side to connect to the existing network. Proposals for a link across the Foveran Burn through OP1 in line with the site Masterplan are required to form a loop road from Blairythan Terrace and provide two points of access to the B977.”*
13. Site OP1 is located to the north of OP2 and a Masterplan which covers OP1 and OP2 was previously agreed and includes a road connection between both sites and therefore would provide an additional access to the B977.
14. With this link in place there would be a 2nd point of access to / from the B977 which would also provide a 2nd point of access to the FR067 site. Given the Council's stated position in regards to the number of houses that can be served by the existing road network, this 2nd point of access for the OP2 site would need to be delivered by the 30th house occupied. The ALDP proposed sites OP3 and OP4 are under the same ownership as the FR067 bid site and can provide access directly to the B977 and therefore do not need to link with Blairythan Terrace or require a new link road or a road connection between OP1 and OP2. The allocations for Sites OP3 and OP4 total 56 houses and therefore one point of access should be acceptable, however as the sites bound the B977 some frontage access could also be provided or alternatively an emergency or 2nd point of access could easily be provided.
15. Sites OP3 and OP4 can be delivered in full and by which time it would be likely that Site OP2 will have provided the vehicle link through to Site OP1 and therefore delivering a 2nd point of access to the B977. Site FR067 could therefore be developed without the need for a new link road to the south.

16. It is unclear therefore why there would be a need for the proposed link road as the agreed Masterplan for sites OP1 and OP2 provides the 2nd point of access to the B977 that the Council considers is required. The provision of the proposed Link Road to the south would therefore provide a 3rd point of access to / from the B977, which wouldn't be required to adhere with the Council's standards even on the basis that the existing U11c adopted public road is not considered an existing 2nd point of access.
17. However if there were to be difficulties in the delivery of the road link between OP1 and OP2, then the proposed link road to the south would be an alternative option for providing the 2nd point of access. The road link between OP1 and OP2 requires to cross the Foveran Burn and there could be unknown engineering and environmental difficulties in providing that link, and the preference / alternative may be to provide the 2nd point of access to OP2 via the Council's desired link road to the south. This is alluded to within the proposed ALDP which only identifies the indicative link road to the south, does not show any indicative link between the allocated sites OP1 and OP2 and further states that *"access to sites OP2, OP3 and OP4 should be considered collectively in order to provide a new link from the B977 to Blairythan Terrace."*

Desired Link Road to the South

18. The land which the desired link road to the south routes through is not all allocated for development within the proposed ALDP. Even with the inclusion of bid site FR067 there would still be a section of the desired link road that is located within unallocated land which is under separate ownership. Without the land required for the link road being allocated, it would be unlikely that the desired link road identified within the ALDP would be deliverable which would then question the delivery of the sites that have been allocated given that the Council's stated position is that they should be considered collectively in order to provide the indicative link road to the south.
19. However a larger ALDP bid (FR109) was also submitted on behalf of that land owner and discussions have progressed between the parties in order to develop a Masterplan layout that would see the delivery of the desired link road to the south through the allocation of the FR067 and an initial phase of the FR109 bid sites.
20. The Masterplan layout is enclosed and demonstrates that the Council's desired link road could be delivered and incorporated into the overall site layout and provide the access requirements internally as well as providing an additional access route to the south.
21. Assuming that a link between OP2 and OP1 to the north could also be delivered, then this would essentially provide a new link road from the B977 south of Foveran to

the B977 North of Foveran which would address the Council's desires for the formation of a B977 loop for delivering bus services closer to the allocated sites. Bus access directly via Blairythan Terrace is not considered feasible as the traffic calming and width restrictions through the existing settlement results in a road width of 5m in some locations. A road width of at least 6m is usually required for a bus route.

22. Only by allocating the FR067 and part of the FR109 bid sites can the delivery of a link road to the south be certain, which would secure the Council's desire for a B977 loop that is capable of delivering bus services closer to all of the new development land. The allocation of the bid sites identified will also facilitate the future development of the sites already allocated.

Conclusion

23. The U11c road already provides a second point of access for the existing Foveran settlement and surrounding area, providing access to the B999, B977, A975 and the A90 AWPR.
24. Blairythan Terrace / U11c can be upgraded to a sufficient width, as it has been for the adjacent sites that have recently been developed. This would also be required for the allocated OP2 site which is directly opposite site FR067.
25. A Masterplan which covers OP1 and OP2 was previously agreed and includes a road connection between both sites and therefore would provide an additional access to the B977. With this link in place there would be a 2nd point of access to / from the B977 which would also provide a 2nd point of access to the FR067 site.
26. The delivery of the road link through OP1 and OP2 would be required by the 30th house and would therefore need to be delivered within the early stages of any development on the OP1 allocated site. With this link in place there would be a 2nd point of access to / from the B977 which would also provide a 2nd point of access to the FR067 bid site.
27. The allocated sites OP3 and OP4 are under the same ownership as the FR067 bid site and can provide access directly to the B977 and therefore do not need to link with Blairythan Terrace or require a new link road or a road connection between OP1 and OP2.
28. There is no need for the proposed link road for the development of bid site FR067 or in order to achieve the Council's desire for a 2nd point of access to the B977 as the agreed Masterplan for sites OP1 and OP2 provides the 2nd point of access to the B977. However if the road link between OP1 and OP2 cannot be delivered then the link road to the south would be required at an early stage of any development in order to address the Council's stated position in regards to the number of houses that can be served from Blairythan Terrace.

29. The land which the proposed link road to the south routes through is not all allocated for development within the proposed ALDP. Even with the inclusion of bid site FR067 there would still be a section of the proposed link road that is located within unallocated land which is under separate ownership. Without the land required for the link road being allocated, it would be unlikely that the link road identified within the ALDP would be deliverable which would then question the delivery of the sites that have been allocated.

30. A Masterplan layout has been prepared that demonstrates how the desired link road could be delivered and incorporated into the individual development site layouts and there is no suggestion that there would be any engineering or environmental constraints in its delivery. Only by allocating the FR067 and part of the FR109 bid sites can the delivery of a link road to the south be certain, which would secure the Council's desire for a B977 loop that is capable of delivering bus services closer to all of the new development land.

Enclosures

Proposed Masterplan Layout

REVISIONS



SITE AREAS:

- FR067 - 32,942m²
- FR065/OP3 - 17,029m²
- FR066/OP4 - 7,155m²
- FR109 - 44,665m²

GRID REF: NJ 96865 23604

PROPOSED SITE PLAN

Scale 1:2000 at A2



PROJECT DETAILS


Land at
Blairythan Terrace
Foveran

for Blairythan Partnership

LDP SITE PLAN

Scale: 1:2000 @ A3
Date: JUL 2020
Drawn:em

CHECK	INITIALS	DATE
planning:		
warrant:		
tender:		



Ref: 5477/100



Overhill Farm | Mr Ian Ross | A Vision for Foveran & Rashierieve Foveran | Apr '19.

Executive Summary

LBA Architects and Strutt & Parker have prepared this document on behalf of Mr. Ian Ross of [REDACTED], [REDACTED], to provide contextual analysis and vision for future growth, in support of a submission to promote the allocation of land at Foveran and Rashierieve Foveran in the emerging Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2021. Mr Ross owns the land at Overhill Farm in addition to land to the west.

The site was promoted as part of the Call for Site stage in early 2018 however it was not included as Officer's preference in the Main Issues Report to which Aberdeenshire Council is currently seeking comments.

This document seeks to address the Council's assessment of the site and provides a wide-ranging vision based on an analysis of the existing site conditions and the potential future developments within the area.

We believe this provides a positive and achievable conceptual framework for appropriately scaled residential and employment development, which could be delivered in phases to meet the growing needs of the area and reflect its strategic location as a commuter town for Aberdeen City and along the Energetica corridor.

Contents

1.0 Introduction	3
2.0 The Sites	
2.1 Overview of Sites and Context	4
2.2 The Sites	5
2.3 Planning Considerations	6
2.4 Bid Submissions	7
2.5 Submissions in Proximity	8-9
2.6 Site Photographs	10-11
2.7 Site Analysis	12-14
3.0 The Vision - Site A - Foveran	
3.1 Site A Foveran - Vision	15
3.2 Site A Foveran - Phasing	16
3.3 Site A Foveran -Preliminary Development Framework Plan	17
4.0 The Vision - Site B - Rashierieve Foveran	
4.1 Site B Rashierieve Foveran - Vision	18
4.2 Site B Rashierieve Foveran - Preliminary Development Framework Plan	19
4.3 Site B Rashierieve Foveran - Phasing	20
5.0 Conclusion	21

1 Introduction

Overhill Farm | Foveran & Rashierieve Foveran

This Vision document has been prepared to illustrate our proposals for the sustainable growth of Foveran and Rashierieve Foveran to support a safeguarding in the LDP.

Our preliminary proposals have been designed to promote a balanced development strategy which responds to the local context and existing settlement form.

The proposals are presented as a high level Preliminary Development Framework Plan and this provides a basis for formulating more detailed proposals as appropriate at the appropriate stage.

Our Vision for Foveran and Rashierieve Foveran

- » **A balanced development strategy offering the potential for sustainable growth which complements the existing settlement form and responds to key views, landscape features and designations, drainage constraints and availability of community infrastructure.**
- » **Creation of a distinct settlement form, which has a real sense of place and identity.**
- » **Delivery of development across two sites under one land ownership.**
- » **Provision of approximately 1100 new homes, including a range of house types**
- » **Provision of a site for a new community/ education infrastructure.**
- » **Foster and encourage connectivity between the proposal, potential future development sites and existing settlement.**
- » **To support further economic development in this area by extending the existing employment allocations which are proposed to be carried forward.**
- » **This revised proposal seeks to build upon the demand identified in Energetica Corridor strategies.**

2.1 Overview of Sites and Context

Wider Site Context

The proposed sites are situated on the edge of the settlements of Foveran and Rashierieve Foveran, lying in a depression within the open countryside of eastern Formartine around Overhill Farm.

Foveran is characterised by its development along the A90 and by the Foveran Burn running through the centre of the village. Historic development largely runs from east to west with more recent development extending the settlement to the north.

Rashierieve Foveran, to the south boundary of Foveran is a small linear settlement incorporating mixed use development which consists of housing and businesses.


The sites are approximately 13 miles north of Aberdeen and 20 miles south of Peterhead in the Formartine settlements. They are well connected to both via the A90 with travel times approximately twenty minutes to Aberdeen and thirty minutes to Peterhead. The neighbouring larger villages and towns of Balmedie, Ellon and Newburgh are also in close proximity.

The connection to the Aberdeen Western Peripheral Route(AWPR), strategic road network and to the established public transport network places the sites in a strategic and advantageous position for new development.

The sites proposed for allocation consist of two areas which are under the same ownership and are proposed to have complimentary uses however are capable of being delivered independently.

Wider Context

- 1 Foveran
 - 2 Rashierieve Foveran
 - 3 Newburgh
- A - Land proposed for residential use with community infrastructure
- B - Land proposed for employment purposes



2.2 The Sites



Site A

—
Foveran



Site B

—
Rashierieve Foveran

2.3 Planning Considerations

Local Development Plan

The sites are located in both the Energetica Corridor and the Aberdeen to Peterhead Strategic Growth Area (SGA) as identified by the adopted Aberdeenshire LDP (2017). Due to the strategic location, there is development pressure to deliver homes and employment land in the settlement.

Opportunities have been identified for this area to deliver strategic housing and employment land. The LDP aspiration is that new development is to contribute to the transformation of the area into a high quality lifestyle, leisure and global business location.


Key Planning Objectives for Foveran were identified in the Main Issues Report January 2019 to be;

- Meet housing need in the wider strategic growth area as defined by the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan.
- To support community facilities and services.
- To support economic development in the Energetica Corridor.


Key Planning Objectives for Rashierieve Foveran were identified in the Main Issues Report January 2019 to be;

- To provide local employment opportunities.
- To support economic development in the Energetica Corridor.

The sites proposed for allocation aim to address the objectives above and aspirations for the area as shall be demonstrated later in this document.



**Extract from LDP 2017
Supplementary Guidance
No.3 Energetica**
—
Energetica Map 14
Proposed site outlined in red



2.4 Bid Submissions

Overview


In 2018 a proposal was submitted for the land at Overhill Farm to be considered as one of the allocated areas for development in the 2021 Local Development Plan. The proposal was for solely residential use and proposed 580 houses (290 three bed and 290 four bed) with the site area encompassing Rashierieve Foveran.

The submission was registered by the council as *FR109 - Land south west of Foveran*. However, this bid proposal (FR109) was not preferred by Planning Officers for the reasons stated below.


- *The density is too low for the size of the site*
- *The current primary school in Foveran does not have capacity to cope with a development of this scale.*
- *The site is divided by the Balmedie to Tippetty road scheme*
- *An area of the site lies within waste water hotspots*
- *The site is considered to be prime agricultural land*
- *It would be a considerable extension to the village and no measures have been identified to respond to this.*

The Council's response considered that the submission lacked due consideration of the existing circumstances. The revised proposal aims to address each of the points above as shall be demonstrated in Section 3 to 5 of this document.


*1 Extract from Main Issues Report (Jan 2019)
 *2 Extract from Draft Proposed Plan 2021 (Jan 2019)
 - sites proposed by others
 *3 Site area for bid FR109



Submissions for 2018 Call for Sites *1



Officer's Preference *2



Submission to Call for Sites *3

FR109

2.5 Other Submissions in Foveran - Site A

Proximity to Site A - Foveran

The following proposals are currently identified in the adopted LDP or are bid sites that are currently preferred by Officers, yet to be officially allocated, as opportunities for development within the Local Development Plan 2021.

Existing Allocations Proposed to be Carried Forward:

- **OP1** - South of Westfield Farm
- 100 houses.
(Under Construction)
- **OP2** - West of McBey Way
- 75 houses.

Submitted Bids - Officer's Preference

- **OP3** - (Bid FR 065) - Previously allocated for employment use in 2017 LDP however now proposed to be allocated for residential use.
- 36 houses.
- **OP4** - (Bid FR066) - proposed to be allocated for residential use
- 20 Houses.
- **OP5** - (Bid FR067) site to the west of Blairythan Terrace proposed to be allocated for residential use
- 49 Houses.

*1 Layouts extracted from Appendix 8 Local Development Plan 2017 p 315-316
 *2 Extract from Bid FR065 submission, site proposed by others
 *3 Extract from Bid FR066 submission, site proposed by others
 *4 Extract from Bid FR067 submission, site proposed by others



OP1 & OP2 *1

—
 OP1 Mixed use allocation / OP2 Residential



OP 3 *2

—
 Residential allocation



OP 4 *3

—
 Residential allocation



OP 5 *4

—
 Residential allocation

2.5 Other Submissions in Rashierieve Foveran - Site B

Proximity to Site B - Rashierieve Foveran

The sites proposed to be allocated in the emerging LDP - OP1 & SR1, have been carried forward from the 2017 LDP.

It has been identified that Rashierieve Foveran will play an important role in delivering areas of allocated employment land which align with its strategic location.

In response, the proposal for this area seeks to extend the existing allocations to the western boundary with the AWPR, in order to maximise the opportunity to provide well connected employment land within the Energetica Corridor and Strategic Growth Area.

Current Allocations

- **OP1** - Land west of Rashierieve Cottage
2ha employment land
- **SR1**
3.5 ha employment land

Pending Bids - May be considered Officer's Preference
FR129 - Site OP1 - 4 Live/work units & employment land



Officer's Preference

—
Extract from Draft Proposed Development Plan 2021 (Jan 2019) - Site proposed by others



OP1 - FR129

—
Extracts from Bid Submission FR129 - Site proposed by others



2.6 Site Photographs - Foveran



1
—
View looking South East over proposed site



2
—
View looking North East towards Foveran over proposed Site A



3
—
View looking West by Foveran over the proposed site A



4
—
View looking South from road through Foveran over proposed site A

2.6 Site Photographs - Rashierieve Foveran



1
—
View looking South West over proposed site B by Rashierieve Foveran



2
—
View looking West to access road for proposed Site B from Rashierieve Foveran



3
—
View looking South East over proposed site which backs on to existing development of Rashierieve



4
—
View looking South West across site B towards AWPR.

2.7 Site Analysis

Existing Settlement, Future Development & Access

- The proposed sites are situated adjacent to the existing settlements of Foveran and Rashierieve Foveran.
- The Balmedie to Tippetty Road scheme forming the AWPR (A90) is now complete and has the effect of creating two distinct areas suitable for residential and employment uses.

Topographical & Climatic

- Generally the site slopes down towards Foveran and Rashierieve Foveran from the south and west. Further assessment of the original bid site has reduced the area now proposed for development to take account of the severance created by the AWPR.
- There are no known drainage constraints on the sites. Detailed drainage investigations will be undertaken to inform any future planning applications.
- It is proposed that areas of tree planting and landscaping will provide shelter along the southern boundary of the site in order to shelter future development from the south westerly prevailing wind.


Drainage

The Council's response noted a wastewater issue on the site, however there is no current evidence of this. There are wider ranging proposals currently being developed for the village and we would seek to address any waste water issues in conjunction with the latest proposals at a later date.



Existing Settlement, Future Development & Access

Key	
1	Overhill Farm
2	Foveran - Hall & Playing fields
3	Foveran Primary School
4	Rashierieve Foveran
5	A90
6	Officer's Preference
- - -	Proposed Sites A and B



Topographical & Climatic considerations

Key	
→	SW Prevailing Wind
→	Slope down
●	High point
○	Sun path
- - -	Existing Drains
- - -	Existing Watercourse

2.7 Site Analysis

Flood Risk

As indicated in the extract from the SEPA flood maps adjacent the sites do not lie within any areas at risk from surface water, rivers or the sea.

Land Capability for Agriculture

The land proposed for development at Foveran and Rashierive Foveran is identified on mapping prepared by the Hutton Institute (formerly Macaulay Institute) as a combination of Class 3.1 and 3.2. We acknowledge that for planning purposes Classes 1, 2 and 3.1 are considered to be Prime Agricultural Land (PAL).

We note that the sites in Foveran and Rashierive Foveran that are identified in the Main Issues Report as being Officers' Preference for future development are also located on land classified as 3.1, i.e. Prime Agricultural Land.

We highlight that the land to the west of the proposed sites the subject of this submission is also in the same ownership - the LCA mapping confirms that this land comprises a combination of Class 3.1 and 3.2 and is actively farmed for arable purposes therefore any loss of PAL that would arise as a result of the proposed development would be relatively minor in the wider landscape context and would not impact on the viability of the overall farming unit.

*1 Flood Risk <http://map.sepa.org.uk/floodmap/map.htm>

*2 LCA - <http://soils.environment.gov.scot/maps/capability-maps/national-scale-land-capability-for-agriculture/>




Flood Risk *1



Land Capability for Agriculture *2

Key



2.7 Site Analysis

Scottish Natural Heritage

An extract from SNH’s interactive online database confirms the sites are not in proximity to nor affected by any designated areas (or areas proposed to be designated) of significant ecological importance such as Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), Special Protection Areas (SPAs) or Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs).

There are no features or habitats of local importance and no anticipated issues from an ecological perspective.


Ecological assessments would be undertaken as part of a detailed design stage to inform a future masterplanning exercise.

Historic Environment


The sites are not located within or adjacent to any conservation area, and there are no listed buildings or scheduled monuments on or within the sites or their immediate surroundings.

We note that Historic Environment Scotland’s online mapping tool identifies a small number of cattle rubbing stones in the area that are recorded on the Canmore records - items listed on Canmore records are not subject to the statutory protection afforded to listed buildings or scheduled monuments.

The stones first appeared on OS mapping from 1901 onwards but are not considered to impede nor constrain proposed development at this location. We believe that the construction of the AWPR has led to the removal of at least two of these stones.



Scottish Natural Heritage *3



Historic Environment *4

-
- Key
- Canmore
- Historic Environment Record

*3 Scottish Natural Heritage <https://sitelink.nature.scot/map>
 *4 Historic Environment - <https://pastmap.org.uk/map>

3.1 Site A | Foveran - Vision

The principles for Site A align with the planning objectives which were identified for Foveran within the Main Issues Report Jan 2019. These are stated below for reference.

Planning Objectives


- *Meet housing need in the wider strategic growth area as defined by the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan.*
- *To support community facilities and services.*
- *To support economic development in the Energetica Corridor.*

Proposed Principles

In response to the issues raised by Officer's with the previous submission made in 2018, the following principles have been incorporated in the revised proposal including;

- Ensure that the proposed density of housing aligns with the 30/ha as promoted in the Draft Strategic Development Plan.
- Reduces the site area proposed for allocation to take cognisance of the AWPR
- Provides a phased approach to the housing requirements of the area within a considered vision.
- Ensure that provision is made for future community/education infrastructure.
- Foster and encourage connectivity between the proposal, potential future development sites and existing settlement.

The diagram across begins to map out how these elements may occur and connect. These principles are integrated into the proposed phasing and overall development and this will be demonstrated in the following pages.



Concept Diagram

Connectivity between community facilities

- Connectivity between community facilities
- Proposed residential & future community facilities - 41ha

- 1 Community Hall
- 2 Playing field
- 3 Proposed Town Square - Previous Masterplan 2013
- 4 Proposed Square - Previous Masterplan 2013
- 5 Proposed area for education / community facility
- 6 Link to new green space- communal amenity

3.2 Site A | Foveran - Phasing




Yr 1-5

Phase 1

Area **4.0 ha** | 120 dwellings (@30houses /ha)

- Proposed development
- Possible Access
- Connectivity to Future Community/Education Infrastructure




Yr 5-10

Phase 2

Area **7.0 ha** | 210 dwellings (@30houses /ha)

- Proposed development
- Connectivity to Community/Education Infrastructure
- Proposed Access
- Growth Along Village Axis
- Community/Education Infrastructure (3ha provision)



Yr 10-20

Phase 3

- A Area **10.0 ha** | 300 dwellings (@30houses /ha)
- B Area **17.0 ha** | 510 dwellings (@30houses /ha)
- Proposed development
- Connectivity to Community/Education Infrastructure
- Proposed Access
- Community/Education Infrastructure (3ha provision)

3.3 Site A | Foveran - Preliminary Development Framework Plan

Overview

Phase 1	<i>No. dwellings</i> 120
Phase 2	<i>No. dwellings</i> 210
Phase 3A	<i>No. dwellings</i> 300
Phase 3B	<i>No. dwellings</i> 510
Total	<i>No. dwellings</i> 1140

Community / Infrastructure

There is currently no provision for education facilities proposed by the Main Issues Report published in January 2019.

The proposed site at Foveran seeks to respond to the likely demand for community/education infrastructure and an area of approximately 3ha has been safeguarded for within the proposal for such uses.

Preliminary Development Framework Plan

Diagram

- Key
- 1 Community/Education Infrastructure
 - 2 Landscaped buffer to shield prevailing wind and noise from the AWPR.
 - Proposed Access
 - Connectivity
 - Organic growth from existing settlement



4.1 Site B | Rashierieve Foveran - Vision

The site lies within the Energetica Corridor and Peterhead Strategic Growth Area as per the Local Development Plan 2017.

With access to the A90 in close proximity, the proposed site is well connected to the city of Aberdeen to the south and the town of Peterhead to the North which are key for businesses trade.

The principles for this area of the proposed site align with the planning objectives which were identified for Rashierieve Foveran within the Main Issues Report Jan 2019. These are stated below for reference.

Planning Objectives


- *To provide local employment opportunities.*
- *To support economic development in the Energetica Corridor.*

Proposed Principles

- To support further economic development in this area by extending the existing allocations which are proposed to be carried forward.
- This revised proposal seeks to build upon the demand identified in Energetica Corridor strategies.

These principles are integrated into the proposed phasing and overall development and this will be demonstrated in the following pages.

Key	
	Proposed Site
1	Aberdeen - 13 miles
2	Peterhead - 20 miles
3	Westhill - 20 miles
4	Ellon - 6 miles



4.2 Site B | Rashierieve Foveran - Preliminary Development Framework Plan

Overview

Areas of the site have been previously allocated and reserved for employment land. OP1 and SR1 have been carried forward from LDP 2017 indicating the importance of this area being designated for employment land.

Current Allocations

- **OP1** - Land west of Rashierieve Cottage
2ha employment land
- **SR1** - Strategic Reserve
3.5 ha employment land

The proposal looks to meet the demand for additional employment land allocation and maximise the strategic location of this site for employment development within Classes 4-6 in future.


It is proposed that both sites are accessed via existing road from A90.

Preliminary Development Framework Plan

- Diagram
- Key
- 1 Rashierieve Foveran
 - 2 SR1
 - 3 OP1
 -  AWPR Route
 -  Proposed Employment Land Allocation - 9ha
 -  Proposed Extension from existing allocations
 -  Proposed Access Point



4.3 Site B | Rashierieve Foveran - Phasing



Current Situation

1 OP 1 Area - 2ha

2 SR 1 Area - 3.5ha

■ ■ Proposal at Foveran (Site A)



Phase 1 Proposed short term employment site

Extension of OP1

Area 4 ha of employment land



Phase 2 Proposed med-long term employment site

Extension of SR 1

Area 5 ha of employment land

5.0 Conclusion

The Council's identification of a number of 'preferred sites' in both Foveran and Rashierieve Foveran confirm that this is an area of focus for both residential and employment development over time.

This submission looks to balance proposed allocations for residential use and employment land by presenting a vision of how land at Foveran and Rashierieve Foveran could be developed in the future.

It specifically addresses the Council's concerns in the following manner:

- By promoting a refined area of land in a phased approach which is based upon analysis of the existing village and its potential future capacities in terms of organic growth and connectivity.
- It takes cognisance of the AWPR proximity to provide new uses in line with the aspirations of the Energetica corridor.
- It proposes densities of approximately 30 dwellings per ha in line with the Proposed SDP requirements.
- It seeks to introduce community/education facilities to support the growth of the settlement.
- It supports further economic development in this area by extending the existing employment allocations which are proposed to be carried forward.
- It provides contextual analysis to support the allocation of the land.

We consider that the proposed land at Overhill Farm offer an appropriate response to the Council's requirement to deliver new residential development in the Aberdeen to Peterhead Strategic Growth Area and would satisfy the demand for additional employment provision within the Energetica Corridor. The sites form a logical extension to the existing built form of Foveran and Rashierieve Foveran respectively and would deliver a balanced development strategy offering the potential for appropriately scaled sustainable growth to complement the existing settlements.

We would anticipate that the sites would be delivered in a series of phases to facilitate organic growth of the settlements in a planned manner to meet forecast demand in the area, with a balance to be achieved between the delivery of residential development and associated community facilities at Foveran and the proposed employment development at Rashierieve Foveran.



Preliminary Development Framework Plan
Diagram

Map contents

Maps

Legend

Land capability for agriculture (partial cover)

- 1 - Land capable of producing a very wide range of crops.
- 2 - Land capable of producing a wide range of crops.
- 3.1 - Land capable of producing consistently high yields of a narrow range of crops and/ or moderate yields of a wider range. Short grass leys are common.
- 3.2 - Land capable of average production though high yields of barley, oats and grass can be obtained. Grass leys are common.
- 4.1 - Land capable of producing a narrow range of crops, primarily grassland with short arable breaks of forage crops and cereal.
- 4.2 - Land capable of producing a narrow range of crops, primarily on grassland with short arable breaks of forage crops.
- 5.1 - Land capable of use as improved grassland. Few problems with pasture establishment and maintenance and potential high yields.
- 5.2 - Land capable of use as improved grassland. Few problems with pasture establishment but may be difficult to maintain.
- 5.3 - Land capable of use as improved grassland. Pasture deteriorates quickly.
- 6.1 - Land capable of use as rough grazings with a high proportion of palatable plants.
- 6.2 - Land capable of use as rough grazings with moderate quality plants.
- 6.3 - Land capable of use as rough grazings with low quality plants.
- 7 - Land of very limited agricultural value.
- Urban

foveran

