

|   |  |                  |
|---|--|------------------|
| <b>Issue 12c</b>  | <b>Other Buckie LHMA – Cullen, Findochty</b>   |                  |
| <b>Development plan reference:</b>  | <p><b>Cullen Settlement Statement, page 130-134</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>OPP2 Seafield Road, page 131</b></li> <li>• <b>T4 Coastal Footpath, page 131</b></li> <li>• <b>Seafield Conservation Area, page 131</b></li> <li>• <b>General</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Findochty Settlement Statement, pages 181-183</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>OPP1 North Beach, page 182</b></li> </ul> | <b>Reporter:</b> |
| <b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>  |  |                  |
| <p><b><u>Cullen</u></b><br/> <b><u>OPP2 Seafield Road</u></b><br/> Ms Sally Anderson (0863)<br/> <b><u>T4 Coastal Footpath</u></b><br/> S Slater (0588)<br/> <b><u>Seatown Conservation Area</u></b><br/> S Slater (0588)<br/> <b><u>General</u></b><br/> Cullen &amp; Deskford Community Council (0134)<br/> NHS Grampian (0300)<br/> <b><u>Findochty</u></b><br/> <b><u>OPP1 North Beach</u></b><br/> Mr John Trevor Wilson (0681)<br/> Mr Stewart Bradbury (0953)</p>  |  |                  |
| <b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b>  | Statements showing sites proposed for development (other than housing), including descriptive texts outlining their purpose and design requirements, in the third tier settlements of Cullen and Findochty.  |                  |
| <b>Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):</b>   |  |                  |
| <p><b><u>Cullen</u></b><br/> <b><u>OPP2 Seafield Road</u></b><br/> Ms Sally Anderson (0863)<br/> Objects to designation as it is an important area of open space and should be re-designated as ENV1 Public Park. Considers that site is not underused and is essentially a village green being the only sizable open space in the centre of Cullen contributing to the settlement's character. Identifies the space as an important green pedestrian route and recommended route for school children. Concern that removal will lead to requirement of children to walk on Seafield Road pavement which is confined and narrow. OPP2 designation contradicts</p> |  |                  |

Local Development Plan objectives to promote and safeguard open spaces. Concern that no indication is given as to what constitutes acceptable uses now that site is no longer required for health centre. Considers there is no requirement for housing as two allocated sites meets needs, considerable commercial premises and shops are available and school has sufficient expansion land. Considers development would adversely impact on character and entrance will lose identity and views up Seafield Road through the conservation area from the viaduct will be affected. Concern that access issues are not raised given that there are access difficulties and alternatives would impact on other junctions and remove open space and car parking.

#### **T4 Coastal Path**

S Slater (0588)

The Moray Coastal Trail needs to be re-routed or a replacement bridge across the burn provided as the existing bridge is cracked and unsafe.

#### **Seatown Conservation Area**

S Slater (0588)

Conservation area boundary should be redrawn to exclude new housing.

#### **General**

Cullen & Deskford Community Council (0134)

Desire to see plans appropriate to Cullen implemented and will keep watching brief.

NHS Grampian (0300)

The reuse of site R2 Seafield Road for residential development is welcomed now that a new health care centre is no longer required. However, it is unlikely that the existing health centre can be expanded on site to accommodate increased growth and therefore, developer contributions should be secured to aid the delivery and maintenance of healthcare facilities within Cullen.

#### **Findochty**

##### **OPP1 North Beach**

Mr John Trevor Wilson (0681)

Consider the site, apart from bakehouse, is unsuitable for development or any substantial buildings as the area is at a significant risk of flooding and buildings are at risk of storm damage. Photographs provided.

Mr Stewart Bradbury (0953)

Seeks exclusion of western area including the former industrial building from designation as this is scheduled for private domestic use. Considers that the site has a defined purpose for leisure and recreation and queries why it has been identified for development particularly given it is not vacant or derelict and is maintained

**Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

**Cullen**

**OPP2 Seafield Road**

Ms Sally Anderson (0863)

Re-designate OPP2 to ENV1 Public Park.

**T4 Coastal Footpath**

S Slater (0588)

Replace the bridge or re-route the coastal trail path.

**Seatown Conservation Area**

S Slater (0588)

Redraw conservation area boundary to exclude new properties.

**General**

Cullen & Deskford Community Council (0134)

Comments noted.

NHS Grampian (0300)

Infers securing developer obligations to mitigate impact of new development on health provision.

**Findochty**

**OPP1 North Beach**

Mr John Trevor Wilson (0681)

Remove site OPP1.

Mr Stewart Bradbury (0953)

Exclude western part of site from OPP1 and redefine status from opportunity to recreation and leisure.

**Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

**Cullen**

**OPP2 Seafield Road**

Cullen has a number of green spaces capable of accommodating a variety of uses that are relatively evenly distributed throughout the village. Therefore, the loss of this space is not considered to adversely impact on the variety or access to green spaces. The design of proposals will be required to take account of the site's key location on the main thoroughfare and proximity to the conservation area. Policy PP3 Placemaking is a primary policy of the Plan requiring high standards of design in all new developments. Transportation matters will be addressed at the planning application stage. To provide clarity on the types of uses considered acceptable, the Council is amenable to the inclusion of the following text "The site is suitable for residential, commercial and small scale business uses" should the Reporter be so minded.

If the Reporter is so minded, the Council would have no objection to the modification outlined above.

#### **T4 Coastal Path**

The Moray Council Economic Development and Infrastructure Services Committee at its meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> August 2014 approved the construction of a replacement bridge upstream of the existing bridge (BD/12c/1). The replacement of the bridge is therefore being considered through that route and cannot be addressed through the Local Development Plan process. Re-routing the footpath onto the main A98 is not an option as the road (as it goes under the viaduct) is not wide enough to accommodate a new footpath. The bridge is inspected on a three monthly basis to monitor its condition.

No modification is proposed.

#### **Seatown Conservation Area**

A comprehensive appraisal of conservation areas is to be undertaken. The appraisals will identify amendments, where appropriate, to the conservation area boundary.

No modification is proposed.

#### **Health Provision**

Site R2 includes an area formerly identified for a new health centre which NHS Grampian has confirmed is no longer needed. Developer Obligations will be sought in accord with Policy IMP3 Developer Obligations and the five tests set out in Circular 3/2012 (CD36).

No modification is proposed.

#### **Findochty**

##### **OPP1 North Beach**

##### **Flooding**

Policy EP7, Control of Development in Flood Risk Areas, ensures that potential risk from flooding will be adequately considered through planning applications and satisfactory mitigation measures put in place, where necessary.

#### **Alternative Use**

It is accepted that the site has a recreational function and therefore it is proposed to include further clarity within the designation text as to what the acceptable uses for complementary development may be. Should the Reporter be so minded, it is suggested the designation text is amended to the following "The site at North Beach has retained its Opportunity Site status, in an attempt to promote the redevelopment of the site. The eastern area of the site has potential for leisure, recreational or tourism uses whilst the redundant building on the western part of the site is also suitable for residential use." The former industrial building on the western edge of the site does not have planning consent for domestic use and therefore, it is appropriate to continue to include this area within the opportunity site.

If the Reporter is so minded, the Council would have no objection to the modification outlined above.

**Reporter's conclusions:**

|  |
|--|
|  |
|--|

**Reporter's recommendations:**

|  |
|--|
|  |
|--|