

ABERDEENSHIRE COUNCIL**BUCHAN AREA COMMITTEE****HYBRID MEETING – 7TH JUNE 2022**

Present: Councillors D Beagrie (Chair), A Simpson (Vice Chair), A Buchan, G Crowson, G Hall, M James, D Mair, L McWhinnie, H Powell, C Simpson and S Smith

Officers: Amanda Roe, Buchan Area Manager (Business Services); Lauren Cowie, Principal Solicitor (Business Services); Sally Wood, Senior Planner, Planning (Environment & Infrastructure Services); Alan Wood, Director of Environmental & Infrastructure Services; Paul Macari, Head of Service (Environment & Infrastructure Services); Christine Webster, Regeneration & Town Centres Manager (Environment & Infrastructure Services); and Theresa Wood, Area Committee Officer (Business Services)

1. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR

The Committee **agreed** that Councillor Dianne Beagrie be appointed as Chair to the Buchan Area Committee.

2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIR

The Committee **agreed** that Councillor Anne Simpson and Councillor Matthew James rotate the position of Vice Chair on a yearly basis, with Councillor Simpson taking the role of Vice Chair as of June 2022.

3. DECLARATION OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

The Chair asked Members if they had any interests to declare in terms of the Councillors Code of Conduct –

- (1) Councillor L McWhinnie for Item 7a by virtue of having submitted a representation in relation to this particular planning application. Having concluded that her interest was significant, Councillor McWhinnie left the meeting for that particular item,
- (2) Councillor G Hall for Item 7a by virtue of having submitted a representation in relation to this particular planning application. Having concluded that his interest was significant, Councillor Hall left the meeting for that particular item,

- (3) Councillor D Beagrie for Item 7a by virtue of knowing some of the individuals with an interest in this particular item. In determining that her interest was insignificant, Councillor Beagrie concluded that she had no interest to declare and remained in the meeting for that particular item,
- (4) Councillor D Beagrie for Item 9 by virtue of being Chair of PACT. In determining that her interest was insignificant, Councillor Beagrie remained in the meeting for that particular item, and
- (5) Councillor D Mair for Item 12 by virtue of his wife being Head Teacher at Kininmonth School . In determining that his interest was significant, Councillor Mair left the meeting for that particular item

4. STATEMENT ON EQUALITIES

In making decisions on the following items of business, the Committee **noted** the requirement, in terms of Section 149 of the Equality Act, 2010 –

- (1) to have due regard to the need to:-
 - (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation;
 - (b) advance equality of opportunity between those who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and
 - (c) foster good relations between those who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it
- (1) where an Integrated Impact Assessment was provided, to consider its contents and take those into account when reaching its decision

5. DRAFT MINUTE OF 19TH APRIL 2022

The Draft Minute of 19th April 2022 had been circulated and was **approved**.

6. DRAFT MINUTE OF SPECIAL MEETING OF 19TH APRIL 2022

The Draft Minute of the Special Meeting of 19th April 2022 had been circulated and was **approved**.

7. NEW PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee had before them reports by the Director of Environment & Infrastructure Services on planning applications for determination in terms of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Acts 1972 and 1997 and **agreed** to dispose of the applications as detailed in Appendix A attached to this Minute.

- (a) APP/2021/1711 Full Planning Permission for Erection of Café at Land adjacent to Harbour House, Harbour Street, Port Erroll, Cruden Bay
- (b) APP/2022/0036 Planning Permission in Principle for Erection of Dwellinghouse at Midtown of Hatton, Peterhead

- (c) APP/2022/0486 Planning Permission in Principle for Erection of Dwellinghouse at Site to the East of Deerkyne, Keplahill, Mintlaw

8. ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES PERFORMANCE UPDATE OCTOBER 2021-END OF MARCH 2022 (ABERDEENSHIRE PERFORMS)

A report by the Director of Environment & Infrastructure Services had been circulated providing the Area Committee with an update on key performance and outcome indicators which will help demonstrate how Environment & Infrastructure Services is delivering the Council's strategic priorities in the Area. The Committee was asked to consider the report and provide comment.

The Committee **agreed**:-

- (1) in relation to 'Void Rent Loss' to note the Committee's wish to see an improvement in performance,
- (2) to ask Officers to clarify the figure given for 'Investment in Economic Development and Tourism',
- (3) in relation to digital workstreams, to note that Officers will provide an updated briefing paper in the first instance, and thereafter an informal session will be arranged with the Digital Stakeholder Lead Officer in attendance, and
- (4) to request that the Director of Environment & Infrastructure Services continue to present performance reports to the Committee on a six-monthly basis in order to evidence progress with the delivery of the actions set out in the Area Plan 2021-2022

9. DEVELOPING EXCELLENCE IN OUR NORTH COAST COMMUNITIES – REGENERATION STRATEGY UPDATE REPORT

A report by the Director of Environment & Infrastructure Services had been circulated providing the Committee with an update on the regeneration strategy, highlighting the progress achieved since the last update in August 2021. The Committee was asked to consider and comment on the detail of the report.

The Committee **agreed**:-

- (1) to request that Officers meet with Buchan Area Committee Members for an informal session providing an update in relation to Drummers Corner,
- (2) to request a briefing paper in relation to the Strategic Transport Review - Toll of Birness,
- (3) to request updated 'Outcome Dates' for the actions listed in the appendix, and
- (4) to request that Officers report to Committee in 6 months with a further progress update

10. NOMINATIONS TO OUTSIDE BODIES

A report by the Director of Business Services had been circulated asking the Committee to nominate one Elected Member to join the Fairtrade Steering Group (Peterhead and Buchan) as an Observer.

Councillor S Smith put forward a motion, seconded by Councillor G Crowson, that Councillor Leeann McWhinnie be nominated to sit on the Fairtrade Steering Group (Peterhead and Buchan).

As an amendment, Councillor M James, seconded by Councillor Simpson, nominated Councillor Hannah Powell to sit on the Fairtrade Steering Group (Peterhead and Buchan).

The Members of the Committee voted:-

For the motion	(5)	Councillors Crowson, Mair, McWhinnie, Powell and Smith
For the amendment	(5)	Councillors Beagrie, A Simpson, Hall, James and C Simpson
Declined to vote	(1)	Councillor A Buchan

At this point, Councillor Powell requested that her nomination be withdrawn and proposed that Councillor Leeann McWhinnie be appointed to sit on the Fairtrade Steering Group (Peterhead and Buchan).

The Committee **agreed** to nominate Councillor Leeann McWhinnie to sit on the Fairtrade Steering Group (Peterhead and Buchan).

11. APPOINTMENTS TO WORKING GROUPS AND PARTNERSHIPS

A report by the Director of Business Services had been circulated seeking approval for the appointment of Members to the Buchan Area Community Planning Group, the appointment of Town Centre First Ambassadors and to nominate two Members to sit on the Peterhead Development Partnership.

The Committee **agreed** to appoint:-

- (1) the Chair, Councillor Dianne Beagrie, to the Buchan Area Community Planning Group,
- (2) Councillor Matthew James and Councillor Leeann McWhinnie as Town Centre First Ambassadors, and
- (3) Councillor Matthew James and Councillor Leeann McWhinnie to the Peterhead Development Partnership

12. APPOINTMENTS TO SCHOOL PLACINGS AND EXCLUSIONS APPEAL COMMITTEE

A report by the Director of Business Services had been circulated seeking the appointment of Elected Members to the School Placings and Exclusions Appeal Committee and consideration of appointing one or more additional external members.

The Committee **agreed**:-

- (1) to appoint Councillor Colin Simpson and Councillor Stephen Smith to the School Placings and Exclusions Appeal Committee, and
- (2) to intimate names of local residents to serve as external members of the School Placings and Exclusions Appeal Committee to the Area Manager in due course

13. ALLOCATION OF COMMUNITY COUNCIL FUNDING 2022-2023

A report by the Director of Business Services had been circulated advising that Aberdeenshire Council provides an annual Administration Grant to Community Councils towards their operating costs. The budget available for the Buchan Area for 2022/23 is £8,126. The Committee was asked to consider the allocation of an Administration Grant and Community Council Project Grant.

The Committee **agreed**:-

- (1) the allocation of an Administration Grant payment of £450 to each of the nine Community Councils in Buchan, totalling £4,050, on the proviso that the Community Council does not hold more than two years administration grant allocation, and
- (2) that the remaining sum of £4,076 be made available for Community Council Project Grant applications

14. STATEMENT OF OUTSTANDING BUSINESS AS AT 27TH MAY 2022

Having heard from the Area Manager, the Committee **agreed**:-

- (1) to note the updates provided within the Statement,
- (2) to note the verbal updates as provided by the Area Manager in relation to Items 14, 15, 17,
- (3) that Items 4, 8 10 and 12 now be removed,
- (4) to request a further update in relation to Items 1 and 2,
- (5) to request further detail in relation to Item 6,
- (6) to request detail in relation to New Pitsligo and Strichen Playparks having been placed on the reserve list,
- (7) to request that timelines be added to the actions

APPENDIX A

NEW PLANNING APPLICATIONS

- (a) **Full Planning Permission for Erection of Cafe at Land Adjacent to Harbour House, Harbour Street, Port Erroll, Cruden Bay**
For: Mr Iain Buchan, Harbour Dunes Café, 22 Millwood Road, Ellon
Per: Stephen G Brown Architect Ltd, 22 Millwood Road, Ellon
Planning Reference No: APP/2021/1711

In terms of Standing Order 6.5, the Area Manager had received two requests to address the Committee in relation to this application from (1) Mr John Ross, on behalf of Cruden Community Council, and (2) Mr Kris Chambers, on behalf of Port Erroll Heritage Group.

The Committee was asked if they wished to hear the representations. The Committee unanimously **agreed**.

The Committee first heard from the Senior Planner, who advised that there was an error in paragraph 6.8 of the report in that it stated that timber cladding has been used on the 'Harbour House'; this is incorrect and should read 'Salmon Bothy'.

The Committee heard from Mr Ross, on behalf of Cruden Community Council, as follows -

"Cruden Community Council, representing the community of Port Erroll and Cruden Bay, is against the application before you.

The reason for our objections are:

- 1) Port Erroll Harbour is a popular area for tourists and local delight and is often busy with traffic and pedestrians and parking. A café would add to the traffic chaos, parking issues and be a danger to pedestrians, particular to children and the infirm. There has already been one death at the corner and there have been numerous occasions where police have been called to try and control traffic in Harbour Street due to traffic congestion and inappropriate parking. We are concerned that this could impact on any emergency services accessing the area as it has done so before and notice that none of the Police, Fire Brigade, Ambulance or Coast Guard have been consulted over this application. Where Harbour Street has been changed into a single track road by parked vehicles, when two vehicles meet each other, the low kerbs allow the traffic to use pavements in front of houses. On many occasions, this has meant that when occupants opened their front doors and walked onto pavements, they have been met by oncoming traffic. Even when Harbour Street is not particularly busy, this occurs on a regular basis. This application could mean that on top of the 20 mph limit, further traffic calming measures may be required in the area.

- 2) The net drying area is an iconic area of Port Erroll and harks back to our history and heritage as a fishing village and currently as a conservation area. This historic location has been painted numerous times and has been used in LNER railway posters. To allow removal and the associated blindfold would amount to corporate vandalism. In the opinion of the community council, this is not an appropriate location as there are already hardstanding areas already in situ within the harbour footprint that would facilitate a café.
- 3) The plans show a modern building which would not be in keeping with the area and its conservation status. The choice of building materials and style of building are completely out of keeping with the area. Looking closely at the conservation area, we are at a loss to discover any other building on stilts. The Aberdeenshire Council Port Erroll Conservation Area planning advice and guidance leaflet states that further losses of traditional material and design will not be permitted in order to safeguard the remaining heritage assets, yet, this application would use aluminium frame window units and instead of lime based renders to the external walls, the use of grey timber cladding will be used instead. We are also surprised the use of grey painting is allowed in the conservation area as most buildings there are built with pink Peterhead granite.
- 4) Both the Salmon Bothy and the Ice House redevelopment were permitted due to the sea wall being upgraded. In the flood risk and coastal protection consultation, they are unable to provide comment on structural matters relating to the harbour wall and suggest consulting with the harbour department or structure department for advice on this aspect and any assessment for the application would be required to undertake; yet there is no reference to what the team has reported or recommended. Surely the condition of the sea wall must be considered for a new development on this site with any appropriate work a requirement for the applicant to undertake.
- 5) At no point has there been a public consultation on this building except from the applicant joining a community council meeting in August 2021. Lack of parking and traffic control were mentioned. The applicant stated that this was not their problem and they intimated that the remaining green space could be made into a larger car park, thus removing all of the harbour green space. The Community Council would also suggest that a site visit would be of use to the Buchan Area Committee as it would allow them to observe first hand some of the suggestions and points raised by concerned individuals and community council.
- 6) Finally, Cruden Community Council is not against the development of Port Erroll Harbour and recognises the need to provide funding for its repair and upkeep. However, a community enterprise would be more beneficial to that end with community agreement and input. A small community keeping with the conservation area and run by volunteers with all profits going into the harbour would be much more appropriate for our small harbour and village.”

The Committee then heard from Mr Kris Chambers, on behalf of Port Erroll Heritage Group –

“This is a deputation on behalf of Port Erroll Heritage Group to support our written objection. A little about us:

Port Erroll Heritage Group was formed 7 years ago to campaign for the retention of the Conservation status of the village. Since then, we have actively and successfully promoted the unique history and character of Cruden Bay and Port Erroll via numerous projects, photographic exhibitions and events; these have been made possible by modest grants, fundraising and the unstinting support of the local community, local business and Aberdeenshire Council.

The settlement of Port Erroll has fundamentally not changed in over a hundred years. If Bram Stoker was to walk down to the harbour now, he would see that little has changed since the first of his many visits in 1893. The net drying green with its iconic fishing poles remains as it always has, an evocative reminder of past times and the subject of numerous paintings and classic LNER railway posters. It is an open space enjoyed by residents and visitors alike and the Port Erroll Group wishes nothing more than for it to remain unchanged.

You will appreciate then our distress to find out that these tangible symbols of our heritage are at risk of permanent destruction. Half of the net drying green stands to be dug up and replaced by a building where none stood before and the fishing poles uprooted to make way for an expanse of car park.

This planning application arrived out of the blue. There was no consultation prior to its appearance on the Planning Application List. It should be noted that back in 2010, then an independent feasibility study was undertaken on a similar proposal at the harbour, an exhaustive consultation was held with the community and local stakeholders to gauge reaction. In stark contrast, there has been no consultation here. Engagement with stakeholders is key to success of any venture; this failure to consult with the people for whom, the developers claim, this venture will benefit, immediately had the effect of eliciting resentment.

To exacerbate matters, during a meeting with Cruden Community Council on 17th August 2021, the developers categorically refused to compromise or consider any other site for this development - even though it's been proven in previous feasibility studies that there are other options within the Harbour footprint that most certainly don't impact the drying green and fishing poles.

In the same meeting, when challenged about the management of traffic, the developers quite casually stated that if necessary, they would extend the carpark to accommodate more visitors. This would necessitate the total destruction of the last vestiges of the drying green and poles – and with it, our history. This comment demonstrated a disregard for those people who hold that area, and what it represents, most dear.

Our distress is compounded by the fact that the Planning Department report recommends approval of this development. We had strongly hoped that the department would conclude that the development would not sit well within the ethos of the conservation planning policy.

However, the report failed to take into account the impact to the local residents. Section 8.1 'Implications & Risk' states: An integrated impact assessment is not required because the granting or refusing of the application will not have a differential impact on the protected characteristics of the applicant or any third parties.

This Group strongly disagrees with this statement; this proposed development most certainly will have an impact on Port Erroll and its residents. 20 individuals from Port Erroll made comments during the consultation period. Critically, out of these 20 individuals, 18 were stating objections with only 2 in support.

Resident's well-reasoned objections can't be ignored as they have been made by the very people who will be most impacted and affected by this proposed development. We urge you please to read them.

In terms of viability of the proposal, the Group have key concerns: Cruden Bay village (within which Port Erroll sits) is not on a 'main route'. While the village is busy in summer, it is generally quiet otherwise. The population of the village, despite claims from supporters that the café is 'badly needed', will not, in our opinion, be enough to sustain the venture once the seasonal visitors stop. The current economic climate is not favourable for the success of this type of business and there is a high possibility of failure.

Possible failure of the venture focuses us to think of the consequences; what is worst case scenario? An abandoned building occupying a space which was once a site of natural and historical significance? Might it be demolished to make way for houses now that precedence has been set? That special piece of land can never be restored.

In conclusion, the developers have used the emotive and rather blunt argument that if the café does not go ahead, the harbour is at risk. The Heritage Group most certainly do not want to see the harbour crumble into the sea but consider that there are other funding avenues to explore

Finally, may we request that you take the opportunity to make a site visit before you make your decision. We would ask you to please to consider the effect of the needless loss of open space and in particular one of the unique features of the village. These are not just a group of old fishing poles on an area of grassland. They are our history. They contribute to what makes Port Erroll, Port Erroll.

Thank you for the opportunity to make representation here today. When making your decision, we respectfully ask you to consider not only the comments made by this group but also those comments made during the consultation by the Port Erroll residents represented by some of you here today."

Having considered the report, and the representations submitted, the Committee unanimously **agreed** to defer consideration of the application for a site visit to allow the Members to view the situation for themselves and assess the particular points raised and understand the division of opinion.

(b) **Planning Permission in Principle for Erection of Dwellinghouse at Midtown of Hatton, Peterhead**

For: Messrs J And M Cruickshank, Cromlabank, Hatton, Peterhead

Per: Arcus Design Ltd, Mavisbank, Old Deer, Peterhead

Planning Reference No: APP/2022/0036

In terms of Standing Order 6.5, the Area Manager had received one request to address the Committee in relation to this application from the Agent, Mr Philip Baxter.

The Committee was asked if they wished to hear the representation. The Committee unanimously **agreed**.

The Committee first heard from the Senior Planner, then heard from Mr Baxter -

“Firstly I would like to refer the committee to Item 2.3 of the report which states that the applicant (Michael Cruickshank) resides at Hatton Farm, however this is not correct as the applicant’s brother Ian stays at Home Farm and Ian is in partnership with Michael on the farm business, although this has been noted previously it appears to have been missed, but it is an important fact. Michael stays at the other farm, Cromlabank to the west of the proposed site. Home farm and Cromlabank are both active farms and are part of the combined farm unit. The proposed site is located in the centre of these two farms as noted in my sequential statement submitted. This statement justifies that it would make more sense to locate the proposed site in the centre of the two farms adjacent to a group of existing houses & buildings.

Moving onto Item 5.4 this refers to sustainability of development and by locating the site next to a group of houses we believe this makes it more sustainable for services arriving to the house such as deliveries and refuse collection etc. Approval of the site would also sustain the continuation of the farm unit.

Item 6.3 refers to sites being “small scale” up to 350m² in the countryside however I am not sure why this has been brought up as I cannot think of a site that has been approved by the council in the past 10 years in the countryside that has been smaller than 350m². This area would be smaller than most of the denser urban house sites built in the towns and villages which incidentally don’t have private drainage facilities to accommodate.

I would also note that the application following this on the agenda for a house at Keplahill has no mention of the 350m² and that site is 2200 m² in area, under the same policy and of a similar size to ours. Personally I think this is an error in policy wording of the current local plan as it appears not to have been brought through into the new proposed local plan.

We have proposed the site shape only to square-off the field so to speak and to allow adequate distance from the proposed house to the neighbours for a suitable landscaped buffer & privacy.

Item 6.4 notes that the location of any site should allow the retiring farmer to maintain a presence on the farm to support the enterprise which this proposal clearly does.

Item 6.7 refers to the desire to locate the proposed site within 400m of the farm hub but as noted previously the applicant does not stay at the farm hub but at the other farm; the site chosen is exactly equidistant to both farms which would allow an equal presence of the overall farm and be geographically perfect for them.

With regards to item 6.12 the site chosen forms part of a wedge shaped area of a field. This shape is not practical to farm and would therefore have less of an impact than if he had been on a more prime area. The fact that the site is located next to a group of houses & buildings with a mature boundary only helps the proposal blend into its surroundings as opposed to being sitting out on its own so to speak. This is also confirmed in item 6.16 as it is said that on balance the site would not have a significant impact on the landscape character of the area. It would be our intention to retain the existing mature boundary and reinforce this with appropriate planting if required.

It is also a policy of Aberdeenshire Council to direct proposed housing in the countryside nearer to groups of houses in preference to being on their own in the countryside. This is quoted in the last paragraph of item 6.3. So I find it odd that the siting has not been welcomed on this basis.

With regard to slide 16 being shown which shows a 200m buffer, there is no allocation available as this has all been taken up so this is not an option to follow this policy. Also roads department has no objection to the proposal.

On balance we feel that the site chosen is appropriate as it lies halfway between the two active farms and that as it is situated on an awkward shaped piece of farming land adjacent to a group of houses & buildings. This we thought would have been the preferred option for the planners and fit closest to council policy not to mention the preferred site for the applicant for his farming activities.

The applicant would therefore be pleased if the location he has chosen can be supported for obvious beneficial planning & farming reasons.”

Having considered the report and representation as submitted, the Committee **agreed:-**

- (1) that authority to Grant Planning Permission in Principle be delegated to the Head of Planning subject to relevant planning conditions, and
- (2) the reasons for departing from the Local Development Plan as follows –
 - (a) the proposed house is required for an appropriate and viable business in the countryside,
 - (b) it is an appropriate location for this type of development,

- (c) on the basis of what has been put forward, there is an established agricultural need,
- (d) in terms of sustainability and provision of services, the location is next to a group of dwellings, and
- (e) in respect of the size and shape, a boundary has been formed to allow management of the farming activity within the field

(c) **Planning Permission in Principle for Erection of Dwellinghouse at Site to the East of Deerkyne, Keplahill, Mintlaw**
 For: Mr Ryan Urquhart, Deerkyne, Keplahill, Mintlaw
Planning Reference No: APP/2022/0486

In terms of Standing Order 6.5, the Area Manager had received one request to address the Committee in relation to this application from the Applicant, Mr Ryan Urquhart.

The Committee was asked if they wished to hear the representation. The Committee unanimously **agreed**.

The Committee first heard from the Senior Planner, then heard from Mr Urquhart -

"I am Ryan Urquhart, applicant for this proposal where I hope to build a new house. I currently live at Deerkyne, next to the application site, part of the Keplahill community. Keplahill has a strong community feel, for example to celebrate the jubilee we had an outdoor party event for neighbours from most properties in the Keplahill area along with their families and friends who regularly hold events like this. Most properties can be seen from one another and all share the same access road as well. As can be seen from our site location plan this site sits centrally so we feel this is very much at the heart of our great wee community.

In terms of the local plan, the delay of this by the Government Reporter is a serious concern having an impact on local development and thus the local economy, which I am yet to see a valid reason for. However, it should be interpreted that the previous local plan ran from April 2017 until April 2022, the planners interpretation as noted in the report, is that the previous local plan remains valid allowing no scope for new development adding to clusters of housing like this or organic growth next to settlements, however it should be interpreted that the previous period has ended and a new period has begun, freeing up allocation for new development as was intended by the plan, not to continue to stall development and economic recovery from Covid. Section 6.6 of the report states that the local plan is out of date and this could prejudice development going forward however I would contest that this stance about the progression of clusters of homes and organic growth should cease until the local development plan catches up is prejudicing peoples lives and economic recovery when its needed most. We're told that it will take many months more for the new local plan to be agreed and commenced, so it is unacceptable to deem that allocations like this are delayed until we have a decision.

In terms of sustainability, this site continues a sustainable and organic pattern of growth and development of the area and in my view accords to the spirit of the plan in allowing a new small scale development in a timely manner, not all at once. I walk to work in Mintlaw along the continuation of the farm road that comes into Mintlaw at the Garden Centre, and all other residents use this path to get to the shops and such like, so it is also sustainable in that respect as well.

Although not currently part of the application as it is planning permission in principle, often referred to as outline planning, the intention is to build a house to almost Passivhaus standards beyond what I have done at Deerkyne, so that heating and electrical consumption is a fraction of that of older properties, having minimal carbon footprint so will also be sustainable in that respect.

I therefore ask that you approve this proposal on the basis of this following a sustainable and organic pattern of development adding to this cluster of homes and it is on an area of land which is not currently used for agricultural as it is just grassland.”

Having considered the detail put forward, the Committee **agreed** that being minded to Grant Planning Permission in Principle, that the application be referred to Infrastructure Services Committee for determination, on the basis that:-

- (a) the Buchan Area Committee disagrees with the cluster numbers put forward by the Planning Service, in that the proposal would contribute towards linear development, ie everything north shaded green on plan - Nos 1-11 North of treebelt would also be included in the cluster and so there is capacity in the current local plan and so is sustainable development.