

PLA/20/233 Aberdeen Planning Guidance: Draft Loirston Development Framework (2020)

TABLE 1: Summary of responses and issues arising from public consultation held from 11 November 2019 to 9 December 2019

<i>Key issue</i>	<i>Officers Response</i>	<i>Action as a result of Representation</i>
1. The Presbytery of Aberdeen		
1.1 The Presbytery and the Kirk Sessions of South St Nicholas Church and Torry St Fittick's Church wish to engage with the Council in future discussions and note interest in being part of community development in the area.	Comments noted and we welcome engagement in the Loirston development.	No action proposed.
1.2 We are currently starting consultation in the area with a view to considering the creation of a new Multi Use Church Centre close to or in the Loirston Area.	Potential space within the Loirston town or neighbourhood centres could accommodate a multi-use church space.	Advise the Presbytery of Aberdeen to begin engagement with masterplanning consultants and the landowner(s) to explore potential opportunities at the Loirston site.
2. Churchill Homes prepared by THE Architecture & Planning consultants		
2.1 Churchill Homes controls 26.2ha, a significant proportion, of the Loirston OP59 site, but are disappointed they have not been involved in the review of the Loirston Development Framework.	Comment noted and it is appreciated that Churchill homes hold interest in a substantial proportion of the Loirston site. Further engagement requirement is agreed.	Recommend further engagement between landowners and the masterplanning consultants. This was subsequently carried out over the summer of 2020 and additional comments

		received. Please see additional response below.
<p>2.2</p> <p>Are preparing plans for an application for the land under their control based on the existing Loirston Development Framework. Have produced an updated housing schedule to demonstrate how the amended block plan (Figure 1 of response) and housing numbers fit into the overall plan. Consideration should be given to this design development in the revised DF.</p>	<p>The proposed revised layout is considered to be a departure from the previously agreed layout presented in earlier iterations of the Loirston Development Framework. This layout has already been subject to design testing and consultation and therefore this updated development framework would not look to alter this established layout. The land to the west of Redmoss Road is outwith the existing Planning Permission in Principle boundary (PPiP P130892). Any site-by-site amendments to the strategic level guidance on the Development Framework for land to the west of Redmoss Road can be proposed, negotiated and secured through future phased masterplan and detailed planning application processes for that land.</p> <p>See response in section 2.9 below regarding primary school and housing numbers.</p>	<p>No amendment proposed.</p>
<p>2.3</p> <p>The Access and Junction Strategy (Page 39) does not match the road pattern (Page 76). Ensuring vehicular connections to our client's land is essential for the delivery of the whole allocation. It is requested that the connection along Redmoss Road is retained as shown on Page 39 and other plans are updated to ensure that they reflect this strategy to ensure consistency of road network and retain main street structure for accessibility for all land owners.</p>	<p>Accepted and agreed, one of the drawings shows a gap but this is a drawing error. Page 39 of the Draft Loirston Development Framework: Access and Connectivity drawing is correct and a link to Redmoss Road at this point is proposed.</p>	<p>Amend drawing error and review all diagrams in Draft Development Framework to ensure consistency.</p>
<p>2.4</p> <p>Opportunity to consider short-term access from existing road networks to allow for the development to proceed concurrently with linkage provided as an early phase.</p>	<p>Short-term access requirements for development can be considered alongside a phased approach and as part of individual masterplans, planning applications or Matters</p>	<p>Add text to 'Access' section of Development Framework as per Officer Response.</p>

	Specified in Condition, in consultation with the Council's Roads Development Management team.	
<p>2.5</p> <p>Understood that phasing has been updated to reflect the delivery approach set out in the Matters Specified in Conditions application. Section 6.1 of the Loirston Development Framework goes beyond this, altering phasing for land in Churchill Homes control, to be delivered after completion of other land parcels, which was not the intent of the original Development Framework. The relevant development blocks have been changed as follows:</p> <p>C1 moved from phase 2 to 4 C2 moved from phase 2 to 3 C3 moved from phase 2 to 4 C4 moved from phase 2 to 3 C7 moved from phase 2 to 3</p>	Comments agreed, the land north of Redmoss Road is shown to be phased later than previously shown and agreed.	Amend phasing in Draft Loirston Development Framework to revert to previously agreed phasing for land north of Redmoss Road.
<p>2.6</p> <p>There is combined vehicular access infrastructure required to deliver the entire proposal (required through Condition 34 of PPiP reference P130892) requiring that no work will be completed beyond the 400th units unless vehicular connection and pedestrian footpath are taken to the relevant legal boundaries of the application site.</p>	Comments noted, the land north of Redmoss Road is shown to be phased later than previously shown and agreed.	Amend phasing in Draft Loirston Development Framework to revert to previously agreed phasing for land north of Redmoss Road.
<p>2.7</p> <p>Understand the phasing strategy set on Page 76 is indicative only, but it should be reflective of the land ownership interests and provide equal opportunity for development to be taken forward. Figure 5 (in response) identifies the location for the first phase of Churchill Homes' land close to</p>	Comments noted.	No amendment proposed.

<p>the existing and new access points. Development would then progress from this point. It would be expected that new access would be taken to the boundary of the site during the completion of Phase 1.</p>		
<p>2.8 The schedule of development blocks has been adjusted in the Draft LDF and sets the context for an increase in units to 1,129 an additional 217 units from the original LDF and highlight that the Planning Permission in Principle granted allows for the development of 1,067 units on specified blocks. No objection to increase the numbers, however It may be appropriate to acknowledge that the detail on housing numbers is to be flexible as per the allocation in the Local Development Plan to ensure that development potential on other landowners is not restricted.</p>	<p>The changes result in a potential increase in housing numbers within the PPIP area of up to 62 (1067 increased to 1129). There remains a degree of variation for delivery of these larger Opportunity Sites, which often take place over a number of years on a phased approach with market conditions subject to change. There is indeed some flexibility in housing numbers as per the Local Development Plan allocation, provided any alterations and increased accord with the layout and design principles of the Loirston Development Framework and the parameters of other key factors, such as transport assessments and developer obligations. Any proposed alterations to dwelling numbers will be evaluated alongside all other materials considerations through assessment of future planning applications and Matters Specified in Condition processes.</p>	<p>Include statement in the Draft Loirston Development Framework that: “There is some flexibility in housing numbers as per the Local Development Plan allocation, provided any alterations accord with the layout and design principles of the Loirston Development Framework and the parameters of other key factors, such as transport assessments and developer obligations. Any proposed alterations to dwelling numbers will be evaluated alongside all other materials considerations through assessment of future masterplans, detailed planning applications and Matters Specified in Condition processes”.</p>
<p>2.9 The original Framework included a primary school within block C2 which is now proposed to be moved to an alternative location.</p>	<p>At the time the previous development framework was progressed, the extent of works agreed for the school and therefore the interface between the Secondary School and the surrounding Development Framework was unclear and as such an element of flexibility was retained in relation to Primary School location. The Secondary School is now</p>	<p>Include statement in the Draft Loirston Development Framework that: “There is some flexibility in housing numbers as per the Local Development Plan allocation, provided any</p>

<p>There has been an inadequate replacement of housing units on block C2, resulting in an increase of 16 units but this (at low density) should equate to 36 units. A revised schedule to match our client's block plan has been attached including for an increase in housing units to reflect the relocation of the primary school from Block C2 for E9.</p>	<p>constructed and gypsy traveller site approved, therefore site boundaries are defined enabling relocation of the Primary School to benefit from co-location of community facilities.</p> <p>The developable area of land to the north of Redmoss Road has been slightly increased due to relocation of primary school. Block C2 has been identified as a low density block with unit number to reflect that, however, please response above in section 2.8 regarding flexibility in housing numbers, provided any alterations to blocks accord with the design principles of the Framework.</p>	<p>alterations accord with the layout and design principles of the Loirston Development Framework and the parameters of other key factors, such as transport assessments and developer obligations. Any proposed alterations to dwelling numbers will be evaluated alongside all other materials considerations through assessment of future masterplans, detailed planning applications and Matters Specified in Condition processes".</p>
<p>2.10 Some minor changes to the unit numbers in the blocks within our client's land and these are requested to be amended in line with the original LDF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 units swapped from E9 into the additional land at C2 where the primary school was previously located. • Single figure units have been removed from blocks C1, C3, F2, F8 totalling 7 units, which should be retained. 	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>Include statement in the Draft Loirston Development Framework that: "There is some flexibility in housing numbers as per the Local Development Plan allocation, provided any alterations accord with the layout and design principles of the Loirston Development Framework and the parameters of other key factors, such as transport assessments and developer obligations. Any proposed alterations to dwelling numbers will be evaluated alongside all other materials considerations</p>

		through assessment of future masterplans, detailed planning applications and Matters Specified in Condition processes”.
3. Historic Environment Scotland		
3.1 In terms of our remit we note that there are no such designations within the boundary of the development framework. We can therefore confirm that we have no comments to offer on this occasion.	Comments noted.	No action required.
4. Scottish & Southern Electricity Networks		
4.1 The Loirston site is oversailed at the north west corner by a critical 132kV overhead electricity transmission line which links electricity transmission substation at Craigiebuckler and Redmoss, supplying Aberdeen City and surroundings.	Comments noted.	No action required.
4.2 There has been no change in relation to the proposed uses under and adjacent to the overhead line from the previous Loirston Development Framework and Masterplan. The figure (Page 47) and description of uses (Page 48) has promoted the land beneath the overhead line for open space, Green Networks and Sustainable Urban Drainage purposes. On the basis of the information supplied, SHE Transmission has no reason to believe that the adoption of the proposed development framework would interfere with SHE Transmission’s interests.	Comments noted.	No action required.
5. A Watson		

<p>5.1 The suitability of the Loch for otter breeding should be protected through careful design to protect otter habitat features and connectivity structurally and from disturbance (also taking into account potential increases in recreational activity).</p> <p>Any further Habitats Regulations Appraisal of the development will have to consider the potential for likely significant effects on otter as a qualifying species of the River Dee Special Area of Conservation. In particular wide buffer areas around the Loch, particularly at the southern end should continue to be protected from future development and opportunities for habitat enhancements pursued.</p> <p>Although otters can become tolerant to human activity, I am concerned about the narrow width of buffer strips in the Burnside area along the watercourses. These should be free from artificial lighting and other disturbances to otters, however I note details in the approved 151073 and the pending 191469/MSC (for plot B3) so I appreciate that there may not be not be potential to seek amendments to designs in that area unless the developments are delayed and require further applications.</p>	<p>The Local Nature Conservation Site boundary has been taken as the key parameter which defines the area into which development blocks should not encroach (including provision of a buffer strip towards the southern end of the Loch) and any environmental improvements to be designed to have regard for any sensitive areas and be sympathetic to the existing habitats of the LNCS. In addition, there is a planning condition attached to the consent (PPiP P130892) stipulating the LNCS designation boundary shall be implemented in full throughout the construction, operation and decommissioning of the development.</p> <p>All development will be required to accord with Aberdeen City Council's Supplementary Guidance on 'Buffer strips adjacent to water'. In addition, a suitable planning condition attached to the consent (PPiP P130892) stipulates that no development shall be undertaken within any respective phase of the development until a scheme detailing the incorporation of appropriate buffer strips around water courses within that phase has been approved in order to protect and promote biodiversity and protect water quality.</p> <p>The plot layout represented in the approved 151073 and the pending 191469/MSC (for plot B3) follow the same development framework layout presented in this version and the previous 2012 iteration of the development framework, as well as the approved PPiP P130892.</p> <p>The corresponding Environmental Statement (as detailed in Scoping Opinion for Application Ref: P121437) and the Habitat Regulation Appraisal undertaken on the Draft</p>	<p>Advise masterplanning consultants and developer that the status of some protected species on the site may have changed and they should seek to obtain up-to-date ecological data with a view to continually update environmental studies associated with and to inform the development as it progresses and in line with the relevant licensing regime for protected species.</p> <p>Site specific Habitat Regulation Assessments may be required for planning applications as development on the site progresses.</p>
---	---	---

	<p>Loirston Development Framework has considered these issues in more detail. Construction phase activities which could pose disturbance issues including noise, vibration and light will be appropriately distanced from the river and potential otter habitats. Similar operational mitigation such as landscaping, use of buffers and sensitive lighting will address potential issues. The EIA addresses the specifics of such mitigation, however if otters are present, mitigation will include Species Protection Plan for Otter, pre-construction update survey, adequate buffers between watercourses and construction, and sensitive use of lighting to minimise disturbance.</p> <p>Ecological surveys were undertaken as part of the Planning Permission in Principle Process and established baseline data which covered habitats, trees, breeding and wintering birds, bats, otter, badger, red squirrel and higher plants. The results of which were used to assist with decision-making at that point in time. The protected status of otters still remains should they be found to be active at a later date.</p>	
<p>5.2 Nathusius' pipistrelle (bat) has been rarely recorded in the United Kingdom. Monitoring in recent years has found that the Loch of Loirston is used by this species. This species was not detected during the surveys reported in the Environmental Statement. Therefore, the Loch may be of higher value for bats than originally assessed. It is my belief that records will now be held by the North East Scotland Biological Records Centre; however, the developer may consider contacting the University of Aberdeen's School of Biological Sciences for details of student projects which</p>	<p>Comments noted. The proposed open spaces within the Draft Loirston Development Framework are aligned to retain natural greenspace corridors to the north west and south west of the Loch which ensures their potential for use by bats. Detailed design and landscaping proposals per development block will be determined as individual MSC and detailed planning applications come forward however, additional reference to types of environmental improvements can be included within this Draft Loirston Development Framework.</p>	<p>Advise masterplanning consultants to engage with the North East Scotland Biological Records Centre and other cited resources to obtain up-to-date ecological data with a view to continually update environmental studies associated with and to inform the development as it progresses and in line with the</p>

<p>monitored bats on the Loch, or contacting the North East Scotland Bat Group.</p> <p>Retaining shrub and tree cover around the Loch, and in corridors moving away from the Loch, is desirable. The small woodland belts to the north west and south west of the Loch are likely to be used as commuting routes by the bats.</p> <p>Although a matter for more detailed design a commitment could be made to ensuring that the lighting of development minimises light spill towards the water, retained woodlands and skywards.</p>		<p>relevant licensing regime for protected species.</p> <p>Add reference in Draft Loirston Development Framework (5.11 Lochside) which outlines desirability to retain shrub and tree cover around the Loch a commitment to ensuring that the lighting of development minimises light spill towards the water, retained woodlands and skywards.</p>
<p>5.3 Evidence suggests that badgers are using land on both sides of Redmoss Road. Fields to the west of Redmoss Road (Phases 3 and 4 of the Loirston Development Framework) have shorter grass and could be considered to offer primary foraging habitat opportunities. Later phases of the development should be supported by a more intensive badger survey which identifies sett(s) and associated territory.</p>	<p>Ecological surveys were undertaken as part of the Planning Permission in Principle Process and established baseline data which covered habitats, trees, breeding and wintering birds, bats, otter, badger, red squirrel and higher plants. The results of which were used to assist with decision-making at that point in time. The protected status of badgers still remains should they be found to be active at a later date.</p>	<p>Advise masterplanning consultants and developer that the status of some protected species on the site may have changed and they should seek to obtain up-to-date ecological data with a view to continually update environmental studies associated with and to inform the development as it progresses and in line with the relevant licensing regime for protected species.</p>
<p>5.4 The Striped stretch spider <i>Tetragnatha striata</i> species was found in vegetation in the south of the Loch and the Loch of Loirston remains at the time of writing the most northerly site in the UK for this species in the records published by the Spider Recording Scheme. This species is named as 'Striped</p>	<p>The area to the south of the Loch is part of the LNCS boundary and associated buffer strips which allows for continued protection of existing wetland areas adjacent to the Loch.</p>	<p>Update Figure of Page 47, Section 5.5.5 and 5.11 of the Draft Loirston Development Framework to include specific reference to ecology and measures to protect important</p>

<p>stretch spider' on the list of "important species associated with the Built Environment" in the North East Scotland Biodiversity Partnership habitat statement for Built Environment. Any changes to the Development Framework should ensure that the habitat continues to be protected from direct and indirect effects of development.</p>		<p>species and habitats at and around Loirston Loch.</p>
<p>5.5 The Kincorth Hill Local Nature Reserve Local Biodiversity Action Plan referenced in Section 5.5.5 was prepared in the 1990s and is out of date. The North East Scotland Biodiversity Partnership (NESBiP) has more recently developed habitat statements which include lists of important species associated with those habitats which should inform the development and its biodiversity enhancements.</p>	<p>Comments noted and agreed.</p>	<p>Update references within the Draft Loirston Development Framework to include NESBiP habitat statements in order to ensure important species and habitats are considered alongside the development and biodiversity enhancements.</p>
<p>5.6 Aberdeen City Council's operational staff should be consulted about any water edge access infrastructure that it would be likely to have to adopt in future. If water edge access infrastructure proceeds then it should not be lit to avoid additional disturbance to wildlife on the Loch.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>Consultation with relevant Council operational staff to be actioned when MSC or detailed planning application has been submitted concerning any lochside plots and/or water access.</p>
<p>6. Scottish Water</p>		
<p>6.1 Developers advised to submit Pre-Development Enquiries at their earliest convenience to Scottish Water to permit an accurate assessment of our current ability to service proposed sites. Pre and post development flows and other factors (such as the use of pumping stations) will determine</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>Advise masterplanning consultants and developer(s) to submit Pre-Development Enquiries to Scottish Water, potential requirement for Water and Drainage Impact</p>

<p>existing capacity within both the immediate water and wastewater networks in particular.</p> <p>Water and Drainage Impact Assessments may be required.</p> <p>Where network mitigation is identified following these assessments, upgrade works must be funded and carried out by developers. Scottish Water can contribute to upgrade works via Reasonable Cost Contributions. However, it should be noted that in some cases where significant upgrades are identified, all costs may not be fully recoverable.</p>		<p>Assessments and funding mechanisms for any necessary mitigation or upgrade requirements.</p>
<p>6.2</p> <p>Work carried out by the developer should conform to the standards as indicated in the Scottish Water publications, 'Water for Scotland and 'Sewers for Scotland' 4th edition. The document for Loirston refers to the 2nd Edition which is acceptable for sites that are underway. However, all new sites should be designed to comply with the most up to date iteration.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>Advise masterplanning consultants and developer(s) all work must conform to the standards as indicated in the Scottish Water publications, 'Water for Scotland and 'Sewers for Scotland'.</p> <p>Amend Draft Loirston Development Framework to refer to the 4th edition of this guidance.</p>
<p>7. Scottish Environmental Protection Agency</p>		
<p>7.1</p> <p>We suggest that the table in 6.2 Delivery is updated and revised to make it clearer for all parties what the requirements are and how and when the requirements will be delivered. Examples of revisions are given below:</p>	<p>This table has previously been agreed by all parties with timings and responsibilities identified as far as possible. Further detail is not necessarily available for completion within strategic level guidance documents, e.g. to be determined for each phase and portion of development,</p>	<p>No amendment proposed to Framework.</p>

<p>'when to be delivered' should be linked to specific planning applications/phases – rather than 'in parallel with associated development'; Site wide infrastructure requirements and a timetable for their implementation should be clearly identified as part of the masterplan; ACC to advise' should be completed by ACC</p>	<p>for each developer at relevant stage of phased development. This delivery table format matches the approach used in other local masterplanning guidance at this strategic level, outlining strategic requirements and key locations for infrastructure connections. The later phased masterplans and planning applications detailing specific infrastructure and developer obligations required at the relevant point in time.</p>	
<p>7.2 The 'Drainage Impact Assessment' should be completed and the results incorporated in the table</p>	<p>A Drainage Impact Assessment was completed for the PPIP application and incorporated into the proposal. We would not expect a DIA to be prepared for the full strategic area as part of the Development Framework. There is the requirement for all tiered and phased masterplans (and subsequent planning applications) to undertake required drainage impact assessments as part of the planning application process.</p>	<p>No amendment proposed to Framework. Future planning applications to encapsulate and monitor any further DIA requirements.</p>
<p>7.3 The mitigation requirements from the EIA should be identified & incorporated into the table including the specific opportunities to protect and improve the water environment and measures to mitigate the impact on existing water features</p>	<p>This table was drawn up for specific infrastructure requirements, rather than as a full summary of required mitigation from all supporting documents. The subsequent PPIP and Strategic Landscape Masterplan took these mitigation requirements into account and set out the agreed approach.</p> <p>There is the requirement for all tiered and phased masterplans (and subsequent planning applications) to undertake required mitigation and improvement opportunities as a result of the EIA process during the planning application process.</p>	<p>No amendment proposed to Framework. Future masterplans and planning applications to encapsulate and monitor mitigation requirements for all developers and landowners.</p>
<p>7.4</p>	<p>Further detail is not considered necessary for a strategic development framework level of guidance. There is the requirement for all tiered and phased masterplans (and</p>	<p>No amendment proposed to Framework. Future masterplans and planning applications to</p>

<p>Further details on the proposals to enhance/re-naturalize the Leggart burn and the burn which feeds in the loch, including re-meandering should be provided.</p>	<p>subsequent planning applications) to undertake required improvement proposals. Further detail on some aspects of this have already been included and assessed within subsequent PPIP and MSC applications for part of the Loirston site.</p>	<p>include detail of burn enhancement proposals.</p>
<p>7.5 An accurate plan of all water features and buffer strips with dimensions should be provided.</p>	<p>The level of detail provided in the previous version of the Loirston Development Framework (supplementary guidance) was agreed and Condition 7 of the PPIP (for portion of Loirston site around the loch) was require. The detail of which has been assessed and agreed with SEPA alongside purification of Condition 7.</p>	<p>No amendment proposed to Framework.</p>
<p>7.6 Lochside</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • any specific proposals for the loch should be detailed (the habitat around the loch could be improved by planting reeds around the loch (dark green area in picture in page 72). • details of environmental improvements to loch setting should be clearly identified • details of enhancement of sensitive wetland areas should be provided • details of boardwalk/decking/jettys should be provided • Burnside - details of improvements to watercourse corridor • Charleston - details of improvements to existing watercourse 	<p>The key and strategic design principles for the lochside have maintained the same as the previous version of the Loirston Development Framework. Centred around light touch and minimal intervention the design team steered away from proposing any additional planting within the LNCS area. The subsequent PPIP, MSC and Strategic Landscape Masterplan document which was produced to clear conditions of PPIP has been agreed and provides more detail on these aspects.</p>	<p>No amendment proposed to Framework.</p>
<p>7.7 Welcome the idea of increasing the number of wildflowers that attract pollinators not only in the green corridors but also on road verges for example. The seeds for these flowers should be from local provenance. This approach will</p>	<p>Advice welcomed and comments noted. The Draft Loirston Development Framework has strategically identified large areas of open space as natural green space and green corridors rather than amenity space in order to not only respect existing natural processes, but also reduce on-</p>	<p>No action proposed.</p>

<p>require to create 'poorer' soils in nutrients and won't need the addition of topsoil. This will help wildflowers to grow as well as reduce the amount of nutrients getting to the loch and, therefore, reducing the likelihood of blue-green algae blooms. The following guidance has more information on this. https://www.plantlife.org.uk/uk/our-work/publications/road-verge-management-guide The advice provided in this document is not only applicable to road verges but also to any other type of green space.</p>	<p>going maintenance burdens. This accords with the ACC Open Space Strategy for Aberdeen which identifies a desire for open spaces to be more natural. These areas are suitable for low maintenance landscape treatments, such as meadow grassland, native wildflower or woodland which are less expensive to manage; detail design and masterplan stages will develop landscape proposals in line with such principles.</p> <p>Condition 25 of PPIP P130892 (and associated conditions with reference to planting, trees and open space) specify the requirement for 'Strategic Landscape Masterplan'(s) to be submitted for each development plot, as Matters Specified in Condition. A portion of the Loirston site has provided this information which was approved under MSC application reference: 151073, including opportunities for wildflower planting.</p>	
<p>8. Landowner (within OP60)</p>		
<p>8.1 Astonished and disappointed that there has been no engagement whatsoever on the revised plans for OP60. I have not been approached or contacted or communicated. Did not receive notification of the consultation process for the original 2011 Development Framework and was not aware of the document until 2019.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Stakeholders, the public and other interested parties have had the opportunity to comment on the development of the Loirston site at many stages of the planning and design processes over the past decade. This includes the Aberdeen Local Development Plan preparation processes, a programme of consultant-led community and stakeholder engagement, and through statutory planning application consultation. Further details of the consultant-led events can be found on Pages 8-12 of the Development Framework (Appendix 1). The public and stakeholder consultation to date, including the most recent public consultation on the updated Framework, has</p>	<p>Recommend further engagement between landowners and the masterplanning consultants, which was undertaken during summer months of 2020. Please see additional response below.</p>

	<p>helped to shape and inform the content of the Draft Framework and development vision for Loirston.</p> <p>Landowner has been in consultation with the masterplanning consultancy over the summer months of 2020 and is now familiarised with the scope and purpose of the Loirston Development Framework. Additional concerns raised have been resolved, please see additional representation and response below in Section 10.</p>	
<p>8.2 Item 5.3 Access and Connectivity (p39) flags up that a minor street would ‘share’ our farm/home entrance. Is this correct and if so what measures would be used to mitigate our current good interface with the environment? Drainage would be a concern.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Further engagement between landowners and the masterplanning consultants was recommended to clarify and resolve this matter of concern.</p>	<p>Recommend further engagement between landowners and the masterplanning consultants, which was undertaken during summer months of 2020. Please see additional response below.</p>
<p>8.3 Understand that buildings up to four storeys are planned for OP60 west of our property and I would expect mitigating measures to be adopted to protect neighbour’s amenity and privacy that we currently enjoy.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Further engagement between landowners and the masterplanning consultants required to clarify and resolve this matter of concern.</p>	<p>Recommend further engagement between landowners and the masterplanning consultants, which was undertaken during summer months of 2020. Please see additional response below.</p>
<p>9. Landowner (to the north of Redmoss Road) prepared by Halliday Fraser Munro</p>		
<p>9.1 Own a substantial amount of land within the Loirston Development Framework area, development blocks C1 – C9 and F1 – F2, F5, F8 – 13, which amounts to circa 500 houses of a 1,500 house allocation, which have been previously promoted for development by Churchill Homes (Aberdeen) Ltd.</p>	<p>Comment noted and it is appreciated that the landowner owns a substantial proportion of the Loirston site which ownership of has been misidentified within the Framework.</p>	<p>Landownership plan within the Loirston Development Framework updated accordingly to reflect accurate ownerships and as a result of additional engagement process.</p>

<p>9.2 Would have appreciated more direct involvement in the process and was not party to the production of the updated development framework.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>Recommend further engagement between landowners and the masterplanning consultants, which was undertaken during summer months of 2020. Please see additional response below.</p>
<p>9.3 Suggest beneficial to undertake public consultation in 2019, the results of which could be fed into the updated Framework.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Draft Loirston Development Framework reflects material changes to associated developments (such as the new Cove Rangers site and Lochside Academy) however the vision for a high-quality new neighbourhood remains the same. The update also includes alterations to phasing and development block locations to reflect current site delivery options and external market factors. However, given the overall number of units, street structure, landscaping and design vision remain the same additional public consultation in addition to this exercise was not considered necessary.</p>	<p>No action proposed.</p>
<p>9.4 The update to the Development Framework to reflect recent developments and planning permissions, including the Calder Park Football Stadium, City South Academy, and the cessation of Aberdeen Football Club pursuing land at Loirston Loch for a new stadium is welcomed.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>No action proposed.</p>
<p>9.5 Note that the proposed primary school has been relocated from development block C2 to block E9 and we agree this is a sensible amendment in terms of grouping together educational facilities, and welcome residential in its place.</p>	<p>Comments accepted.</p>	<p>No action proposed.</p>

<p>9.6 Updated Framework seeks to amend the development phasing to change the majority of proposals on our client's land to Phase 4, the penultimate development phase. Moving the majority of our client's land into Phase 4 and Phase 3 from what was previously spread over Phases 2, 3 and 4 (in previous 2012 iteration of framework). We are not aware of any overriding justifications or reasons for this.</p> <p>9.7 Suggest including the 'C' development blocks as Phase 2, following on from the pending MSC application 191469/MS for 92 houses on development block B3. This would allow development to naturally progress in a south-east to north-west arrangement, alongside the recent developments to the north and south of the allocated land at Loirston.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The land north of Redmoss Road is shown to be phased later than previously shown and agreed.</p>	<p>Amend phasing in Draft Loirston Development Framework to revert to previously agreed phasing for land north of Redmoss Road.</p>
<p>9.8 States that the 'Framework has been developed 'ownership blind' with regard to density, land use and character', however are concerned that this is not the case when considering the development phasing indicated on our client's land.</p>	<p>Comments and concerns noted.</p>	<p>Amend phasing in Draft Loirston Development Framework to revert to previously agreed phasing for land north of Redmoss Road.</p>
<p>9.9 Suggest that further consultation is required on the proposals to allow our clients the opportunity to properly and effectively input into the Development Framework.</p> <p>If not, please regard this letter as an objection to the amendments proposed to the development block phasing on our client's land as described above, set out within the updated Loirston Development Framework 2019.</p>	<p>Comments noted and further engagement requirement agreed.</p>	<p>Recommend further engagement between landowners and the masterplanning consultants, which was undertaken during summer months of 2020. Please see additional response below.</p>

TABLE 2: Further comments received during landowner/developer sign-off

1. Landowner (within OP60) Comments in addition to Table 1 (Section 8) above		
1.1 Landownership plan not a true reflection of the key landownerships in the area.	Landownership plan to be updated to reflect discussions with landowner.	Update land ownership plan. Revised plan has been circulated for review and agreed with interested landowner by phone (26/10/2020).
1.2 Access and connectivity: concerned with location of tertiary street running through Block 78E which he feels will compromise his own property.	Tertiary street location not critical to access arrangements for Block 78E therefore can be omitted and further detail agreed through any subsequent masterplans/planning applications.	Access and connectivity plan updated to omit tertiary street. Revised 'Access and Connectivity' plan, Section 5.3 of Framework has been circulated for review and agreed with interested landowner by phone (26/10/2020) and email (7/11/2020).
1.3 Delivery: Concern at extent of requirements set out for 'Landowners' within delivery table.	Additional communications and explanation were given by the masterplanning consultants through engagement with the landowner. This outlined that that these requirements are only if land comes forward for development and that landownership is still within control of individual landowners when or if this is to be developed.	Resolved through consultation communications. No further action proposed.
1.4 Storey heights: Concern at proposed height parameters on Block 78E.	Additional communications and explanation were given by the masterplanning consultants through engagement with the landowner. This outlined the purpose and status of Development Framework as high level document which establishes key principles and that future proposals would be subject to further dialogue and planning process.	Resolved through consultation communications. No further action proposed.
2. Landowner (to the north of Redmoss Road) prepared by Halliday Fraser Munro Comments in addition to Table 1 (Section 9) above		

<p>2.1 This representation is in response to the Loirston Development Framework 2019, July 2020 Rev C. Our client welcomes the opportunity to make further comment on the amendments made following the 2019 consultation. 1.3.</p>	<p>Comments noted and welcomed.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>
<p>2.2 Own a substantial area of land to the north west of the allocated OP59 site. Included in this are development blocks C1-C4, C7, F1 and F2, F5, F8-F12, part of F13 and part of F14. Requested the Framework be amended to reflect accurate land ownership status. We welcome the update made to the Key Ownerships map on page 14 which now correctly identifies the land.</p>	<p>Comment noted and it is appreciated that the landowner owns a substantial proportion of the Loirston site which landownership of which has been misidentified.</p>	<p>Landownership plan within the Loirston Development Framework updated accordingly to reflect accurate ownerships and as a result of additional engagement process.</p>
<p>2.3 The 2019 updated draft Framework sought to amend the development phasing resulting in the majority of our client's land not coming forward for development until Phase 4, the penultimate development phase, which would be many years away. In the previously agreed 2012 Development Framework development was spread throughout phases 2, 3 and 4. Unaware of any justification for this change to the phasing and were concerned about the impact on interests in our clients land.</p>	<p>Comments agreed.</p>	<p>Phasing strategy to revert to that as previously agreed in the earlier 2012 and 2017 versions of the Framework and document amended accordingly.</p>
<p>2.4 We note that in the July 2020 Rev C of the Framework the phasing strategy has reverted to that in the earlier 2012 and 2017 versions of the Framework. We welcome this and consider it a more appropriate strategy allowing development to progress in a logical manner following on from the pending MSC application 191469/MS for 92 houses on block B3.</p>	<p>Comments noted and agreed.</p>	<p>Phasing strategy to revert to that as previously agreed in the earlier 2012 and 2017 versions of the Framework and document amended accordingly.</p>

<p>2.5 The phasing plan at 6.1.2 on page 77 sets out that development at Phase 1 is focussed around the new southern road access off Wellington Road and will deliver a portion of A, B and D development blocks. At 6.1.3 details for Phase 2 are given with one of the key aspects of Phase 2 listed as the second junction to the north of Wellington Road. Some further detail on the road network these new accesses connect to would be welcomed to provide clarity as to when development blocks C will be reached.</p>	<p>Expand description on page 77 of the Framework to provided clarity and / or further information on this point, or explanation when and by what mechanism this will be established.</p>	<p>Update Development Framework Phasing on page 77 accordingly, as per Officer response.</p>
<p>2.6 Condition 34 of APP/130892 requires a road network connection between OP59 and the southern section of Redmoss Road to ensure that development of the wider Loirston Development Framework area is not compromised, and the allocation may be delivered in full. We agree that securing the road connection in this location is crucial and we consider further clarity on the delivery of this is required rather than relying on statements such as that at 5.17 which refers to "...potential links between Redmoss Road and the Burnside area". One way to achieve this is to remove "potential" from 5.17.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Removal of word 'potential' from Section 5.17 and identification of where the anticipated connection between Redmoss Road and the southern section of the site is proposed to be delivered. It is appreciated that an exact road alignment is not known, but an indicative location, illustrated by similar 'pink bubble' graphic, as a minimum should be shown on the Access and Junction Strategy diagram on page 39 of the Loirston Development Framework.</p>	<p>Update Development Framework Access and Junction Strategy and associated text accordingly, as per Officer response.</p>
<p>2.7 Recognise that the primary means of accessing the site are via the two new junctions on Wellington Road, more detail regarding the existing access in the south of the site which links Wellington Road to Redmoss Road should be given.</p>	<p>The Access and Junction Strategy for the Loirston site outlined two main access points into the development, both from Wellington Road. This Access Strategy has also been previously subject to transport modelling and assessment. Detailed plans and proposals for Redmoss Road will be required alongside a phased approach and as part of individual masterplans, future planning applications or Matters Specified in Condition, in consultation with the Council's Roads Development Management team.</p>	<p>Update Development Framework Access and Junction Strategy and associated text accordingly, as per Officer response.</p>

It is important to note that Conditions 14 and 15 of P130892/PPiP require delivery of one junction prior to first occupation and the other prior to 300th occupation. If any level of access prior to delivery of the first junction was to be proposed, a Section 42 application would be required to be submitted. A scheme which was contrary to the conditions of the PPiP approval could not be considered by the MSC process.

The opportunities for Redmoss Road have been considered with a long term vision for the development of the whole Loirston site, with the Redmoss Road through-route connection back along to the north proposed to be bus, cycle and pedestrian access only and 'stopped up' at some point. However, this restriction would be intended to occur to the north east portion of the site, detailed location of which to be determined in future application(s), but most likely at the junction where the new primary road diverts off and follows south down through the site. At this point the remaining section of Redmoss Road (to the south) would be available to vehicular traffic and form part of the secondary street network. The Access and Junction Strategy can be updated to show an indication of the location where bus only restrictions may occur, illustrated by similar 'pink bubble' graphic, to help clarify this restriction is not intended along the whole extent of Redmoss Road. However, it is worth noting that as part of the new academy application at Calder Park (Ref 151082/DPP) this included provision for the pedestrianisation of a section of Redmoss Road between the existing residential dwellings and the nature reserve by use of closed gate, retractable bollards or similar at either side. Therefore, any alteration

	to this arrangement as part of any development proposal will require full assessment under a new application, in consultation with the Council's Roads Development Management team.	
2.8 We welcome that the proposed location of the primary school remains in development block E9 and in its previous location, block C2, residential development is now proposed.	Comments noted and welcomed.	No further action required.
2.9 In summary, we welcome the updates made to Rev C of the Loirston Development Framework with regards to phasing and ownership.	Comments noted and welcomed.	No further action required.
3. Churchill Homes (prepared by Brodies) Comments in addition to Table 1 (Section 2) above		
3.1 It is understood that the intention is to adopt the revised Development Framework as Supplementary Guidance pursuant to the emerging Local Development Plan which recently went through its public consultation period. We currently await clarification of the Council's position on any objections which were submitted to the draft Plan during that period. Since the revised Framework will not be able to be adopted pursuant to the new LDP Plan until the Plan itself has been adopted, can you confirm that all references to the 2017 LDP, particularly at page 6 of the Framework, will be amended to reference the new Plan? To this end we attach a copy of representations which were submitted jointly on behalf of the landowners and Churchill/Robertson to the draft Plan.	The Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2017 is currently supported by statutory Supplementary Guidance and non-statutory guidance such as Technical Advice Notes and Local Planning Advice. On 25 July 2019 the Planning (Scotland) Act 2019 was given Royal Assent and Section 9 of this Act has the effect of repealing the ability of Local Authorities to adopt Supplementary Guidance in connection with a Local Development Plan when that section comes into force. Within Aberdeen City Council a new title is proposed to incorporate new policy documents and existing supplementary guidance when Section 9 is enacted – 'Aberdeen Planning Guidance'. These documents would not be part of the Local Development Plan but, should Members choose to adopt them, would be non-statutory planning guidance and treated as a material consideration in the determination of applications. Officers recommend	No amendment proposed to Framework.

	<p>that the updated Loirston Development Framework should ultimately be taken forward as non-statutory Aberdeen Planning Guidance rather than Supplementary Guidance given this context.</p> <p>All policy references within guidance documents will be updated according at the relevant time, with reference to the associated Local Development Plan the guidance falls under.</p>	
<p>3.2 Linked to the allocation of the site in the LDP, it would be useful if the Framework made it clear that the 1500 homes allocated to the site in the LDP is an indicative capacity and not an upper limit.</p>	<p>There remains a degree of variation for delivery of these larger Opportunity Sites, which often take place over a number of years on a phased approach with market conditions subject to change. There is indeed some flexibility in housing numbers as per the Local Development Plan allocation, provided any alterations and increases accord with the layout and design principles of the Loirston Development Framework and the parameters of other key factors, such as transport assessments and developer obligations. Any proposed alterations to dwelling numbers will be evaluated alongside all other materials considerations through assessment of future planning applications and Matters Specified in Condition processes.</p>	<p>Include statement in the Draft Loirston Development Framework that: "There is some flexibility in housing numbers as per the Local Development Plan allocation, provided any alterations accord with the layout and design principles of the Loirston Development Framework and the parameters of other key factors, such as transport assessments and developer obligations. Any proposed alterations to dwelling numbers will be evaluated alongside all other materials considerations through assessment of future masterplans, detailed planning applications and Matters Specified in Condition processes".</p>
<p>3.3</p>	<p>Comments noted and agreed.</p>	<p>Policy references to Strategic Development Plan on page 6 of</p>

<p>In a similar vein, also on page 6, it is noted that the Framework still refers to the 2014 Strategic Development Plan which has of course now been superseded. Again, it is assumed that the Framework will be updated to make reference to the new Strategic Development Plan.</p>		<p>the Framework to be updated accordingly.</p>
<p>3.4 In Section 1.1.5 on page 7, it is noted that the Masterplan seeks to respond to 4 key issues for the City Council. These are stated to be context; identity; connection; and communication and engagement. We would have expected delivery of the development to be a key issue for the Council given the size of the allocation and as such we would suggest that paragraph 1.1.5 is amended to make reference to delivery as a key issue.</p>	<p>This section of the Framework has been prepared in direct response to the Council's adopted 'Aberdeen Masterplanning Process'. The review to the Framework was intended to reflect material changes to adjacent and associated developments, however the vision for a high-quality new neighbourhood remains the same as the original Development Framework (2012). It is not felt necessary to update the bullet points in this section of the Framework document given infrastructure and delivery is covered elsewhere in the document.</p>	<p>No amendment proposed.</p>
<p>3.5 On page 11 under Transportation Infrastructure, there is reference to a Transport Assessment currently being prepared by the Developer's Transport Consultants to support a future application for Planning Permission in Principle. That application has been approved and indeed Matters Specified by Condition consents issued thereafter. This section requires to be updated to reflect the current position. It is also noted that this section still refers to contributions towards the Strategic Transport Fund, which Fund was found to be unlawful. Reference to STF in the Framework should be removed.</p>	<p>Commented noted and agreed, references to Transport Assessment status to be updated to reflect current position and reference to Strategic Transport Fund removed.</p>	<p>Page 7 of Framework updated accordingly, as per Officer response.</p>
<p>3.6 Still on page 11, the text on Cove Rangers Football Club and Aberdeen Football Club requires updating since matters have moved on since this part of the Framework was</p>	<p>Comments noted and agreed, references to football clubs on pages 11 and 15 of the Framework to be updated to reflect current status and position.</p>	<p>Pages 11 and 5 of Framework updated accordingly, as per Officer response.</p>

<p>drafted. Related references on page 15 will also require updating.</p>		
<p>3.7 On page 14 at paragraph 2.2, it is confirmed that the Framework has been developed "<i>landownership blind</i>" and it goes on to advise that where delivery of key infrastructure is critical, ownership has been considered to ensure that proposals are pragmatic and realistic. Given the number of different owners and developers involved in the overall Loirston Development, it is submitted that the Framework needs to make it clear that all parties will require to work together to deliver the necessary infrastructure and no one party can ransom or delay another because of their failure or refusal to participate in the delivery of infrastructure. In this regard Aberdeen City Council must act not just as landowners who have an interest in developing parts of the Framework Area, but also as Planning and Roads Authority.</p>	<p>Comments noted and the importance of infrastructure delivery to unlock the whole of the Loirston is fully acknowledged. Section 2.2 of the Framework to include sentence highlighting "that all landowners will be required to work together to deliver the necessary infrastructure for delivery of the whole Opportunity Site allocation in line with the Phasing set out in the Framework".</p>	<p>Update Section 2.2 of the Framework accordingly, as per Officer response.</p>
<p>3.8 On page 34 at paragraph 5.1, my clients welcome the confirmation that the Framework establishes a flexible structure, but again this requires to be amended to make it clear that it reflects the timing and allocations set out within the emerging LDP. This section goes on to advise that the Framework sets out a clear infrastructure delivery strategy illustrating what, how, when and with the involvement of which parties, elements such as streets, paths, schools and open space will be delivered. With respect it is submitted that the Framework as currently drafted does not provide a clear infrastructure delivery strategy. Reference should be made to the comment in respect of page 14 above and in respect Section 6 below.</p>	<p>All policy references within guidance documents will be updated according at the relevant time, with reference to the associated Local Development Plan the guidance falls under.</p> <p>The overall infrastructure strategy and street structure remains as earlier versions of the Framework, with the locations of key access points/junctions and key infrastructure highlighted, such as schools. This document will remain and offer guidance at a more strategic level as the wider Loirston site develops over time. It is acknowledged that due to the timing of the updated Framework, some consents for parts of the Opportunity Sites at Loirston have already been progressed, which</p>	<p>No amendment proposed to Framework.</p>

	includes specific planning conditions on more details matters such as access connections.	
<p>3.9</p> <p>Section 5.3 and other related sections deal with the proposed access to the various development blocks within the Framework Area. The representation submitted by Churchill in December 2019 highlighted concerns with the vehicular connections to the Monro/Churchill land. Your response indicates that this was a drawing error and that page 39 "Access and connectivity" is correct and that the revised Development Framework updates the drawings to be consistent. With respect that does not appear to be the case. My clients' particular concerns relate to the break in the secondary street <i>ex adverso</i> blocks C8 and D6. On page 39 this is shown as a minor street. On page 35 it appears to be shown as a Core Path and on page 38 it is shown as a pedestrian/cycle route only and not part of the general street network. Paragraph 5.4.11 of the Framework indicates that minor streets give access to limited areas of development whereas secondary streets give access to development blocks. It is submitted that the street between block C8 and block D6 should be a secondary street as it is a continuation of the secondary street running from C9/D9 to C7/D4 and as such provides access to development blocks. There is no reason why there would a break in the secondary street network at this point.</p>	<p>The previous 2012 version of the Development Framework which all parties previously signed-up to, had the same street network proposed for this area at blocks C8 and D6. This being a problematic issue has not been highlighted before, however for clarity the proposed street network must ensure delivery of the site and offer permeable and coherent movement routes for the proposed development. In principle there is no issue for this section of the street network to be indicated as a 'secondary street' if it ensures connectivity and accords with other design principles established in the Framework.</p>	<p>Update Development Framework Access and Junction Strategy and associated text accordingly to include section between blocks C8 and D6 as part of the 'secondary street' network.</p>
<p>3.10</p> <p>On page 42 at paragraph 5.4.5, the Framework advises that the vehicular access points are still to be fully confirmed. It is understood that the access points have now been confirmed through the AMSCs and it is submitted that this part of the Framework requires to be updated to reflect</p>	<p>Comments noted and agreed. Section 5.4.5 of the Framework to be updated to reflect the current status for access points, where further exact confirmation is known.</p>	<p>Update Section 5.4.5 of the Framework accordingly, as per Officer response.</p>

<p>those accesses so that all parties know what is being delivered and where. When delivery occurs is dealt with below.</p>		
<p>3.11 On pages 49 and 50 the overall site has been divided into proposed residential densities. It is noted that the Framework acknowledges that the suggested densities should not be applied homogeneously within a development block, but rather there should be a mix of higher and lower densities. However, it goes on to advise that the sum of the densities should provide the desired number of units set out in section 5.6.3. It is submitted that sections 5.6 and 5.6.3 require amendments to confirm that the numbers in the table are indicative and the actual number of units for each block will be determined as part of the planning application process for the relevant part of the site, having regard to the housing market and demand at the time of application. The table should not be seen as setting an upper limit on the number of units in any block.</p>	<p>There remains a degree of variation for delivery of these larger Opportunity Sites, which often take place over a number of years on a phased approach with market conditions subject to change. There is indeed some flexibility in housing numbers as per the Local Development Plan allocation, provided any alterations and increases accord with the layout and design principles of the Loirston Development Framework and the parameters of other key factors, such as transport assessments and developer obligations. Any proposed alterations to dwelling numbers will be evaluated alongside all other materials considerations through assessment of future planning applications and Matters Specified in Condition processes.</p>	<p>Include statement in the Draft Loirston Development Framework that: “There is some flexibility in housing numbers as per the Local Development Plan allocation, provided any alterations accord with the layout and design principles of the Loirston Development Framework and the parameters of other key factors, such as transport assessments and developer obligations. Any proposed alterations to dwelling numbers will be evaluated alongside all other materials considerations through assessment of future masterplans, detailed planning applications and Matters Specified in Condition processes”.</p>
<p>3.12 On page 76, section 6.1.1 confirms that the Phasing Strategy is indicative only and aims to illustrate a preferred growth strategy for Loirston which balances development with the provision of key elements of infrastructure, public realm and landscape improvements. This flexibility is welcomed, however, we would highlight the comments made above</p>	<p>Comments noted and the importance of infrastructure delivery and phasing to unlock the whole of the Loirston is fully acknowledged. Section 6.1.1 of the Framework to include sentence highlighting “that all landowners will be required to work together to deliver the necessary infrastructure for delivery of the whole Opportunity Site</p>	<p>Update Section 6.1.1 of the Framework accordingly, as per Officer response.</p>

<p>whereby no landowner/developer should be able to ransom/delay another landowner/developer in the delivery of development on their land. It is critical that all parties work together for an appropriate phased delivery of infrastructure to serve the entire Framework area. Given the breakdown of densities and urban design within the site, it will be important to ensure that a number of different areas are opened up for development at the same time to provide an appropriate range and choice for prospective purchasers. This will improve the marketability/deliverability of the entire development.</p>	<p>allocation in line with the Phasing set out in the Framework”.</p>	
<p>3.13 On pages 77 and 78 there is high level reference to the key aspects of each Phase. We would wish the following additions to be made to the text:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6.1.2 Phase 1 – The southern access from Wellington Road requires to be taken up to the boundary of blocks C7/D4 as early as possible and no later than prior to occupation of the 100th unit within Phase 1. This is to ensure that the Monro/Churchill land is appropriately served at the earliest opportunity, particularly if there is a cost sharing infrastructure agreement between the parties as recommended below. • The second junction to the north of Wellington Road should be provided prior to occupation of the 300th unit within Phase 1 to correspond with the requirements of the Planning Permission in Principle. As such provision of this junction requires to move out of Phase 2 and into Phase 1. 	<p>The established Development Framework and the existing PPIp (P130892/PPIp) show the phasing of development blocks across the site. In this regard and more specifically, Conditions 14 and 15 of P130892/PPIp require delivery of one junction prior to first occupation and the other prior to 300th occupation and Condition 34 for delivery of vehicular connection to Redmoss Road. Full implementation of the PPIp consent ensures connections to the existing road network and to other parcels of land within the site are delivered, with Conditions 14, 15 and 34 being the mechanism for this delivery.</p> <p>The PPIp states that that no more than 300 houses on the application site shall be occupied unless the 2nd access has been implemented, it doesn't specifically refer to Phase 1, as the need for the access junction is based on the number of houses it serves, not their location in a given phase. The 2nd junction is also deemed to be the first step in delivering and unlocking phase 2. The Development Framework phasing section 6.1.4 highlights the completion of the southern side of the south end of</p>	<p>Update Framework text in Sections 6.1.2-6.1.3 accordingly as per Officer response, to reflect position of specific access points as per the PPIp Conditions (P130892/PPIp).</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6.1.3 Phase 2 – As noted above, the second junction to the north of Wellington Road should now be provided by the end of Phase 1. • In a similar vein the completion of the southern side of the south end of Redmoss Road requires to be provided by the completion of Phase 2 rather than it being provided at the end of Phase 3. 	<p>Redmoss Road as a key part of that phase of works, it does not specify the timing within that phase.</p> <p>The relevant text within Sections 6.1.2-6.1.3 can be revised to reflect position of specific access points as per the PPIp Conditions (P130892/PPIp). However, it should be noted that if any level of access prior to delivery of the first junction was to be proposed, a Section 42 application would be required to be submitted. A scheme which was contrary to the conditions of the PPIp approval could not be considered by the MSC process. Alternatively, any other alteration to the previously approved approach would require to be assessed separately as part of a new and standalone planning application.</p>	
<p>3.14 On pages 79, 80 and 81 under paragraph 6.2, there is a table referencing delivery. Simply stating that landowners/developers and Aberdeen City Council are involved in the delivery of infrastructure is not sufficient. Reference is also made in the table to the obligations set out in the Legal Agreement. However, this Agreement relates only to the land controlled by Hermiston. As outlined above, it is critical to the delivery of the development that no landowners/developer can ransom or delay another from the delivery of development on their</p>	<p>Comments noted. The overall phasing strategy has been revised to accord with and remains the same as earlier 2012 version of the Framework. The phasing and infrastructure delivery sections has previously been agreed by all parties with high-level timings and responsibilities identified. The importance of infrastructure delivery and phasing to unlock the whole of the Loirston is fully acknowledged, however a balance is required to be struck to enable the Framework document to remain and offer guidance at a more strategic level as the wider Loirston</p>	<p>No amendment proposed to Framework.</p>

<p>land. We would respectfully suggest that this section needs to make that clear and to make it clear that the Council in their capacity as Planning Authority and Roads Authority will work to ensure that all of the development blocks are suitably serviced at the earliest opportunity. It is recommended that the parties enter into an infrastructure delivery arrangement at the earliest opportunity and this should be referenced in the Framework.</p>	<p>site develops over time (without the need to continually update).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that due to the timing of the updated Framework, some consents for parts of the Opportunity Sites at Loirston have already been progressed, which includes specific planning conditions on more detailed matters such as access connections. Whereas the land to the west of Redmoss Road is outwith the existing Planning Permission in Principle boundary (PPiP P130892).</p> <p>However, further detail is not necessarily available or included within strategic level guidance documents, e.g. to be determined for each phase and portion of development, for each developer at relevant stage of phased development. The delivery table format and presentation in the Framework document matches the approach used in other local masterplanning guidance at this strategic level, outlining strategic requirements and key locations for infrastructure connections. The later phased masterplans and planning applications detailing specific infrastructure and developer obligations required at the relevant point in time.</p> <p>Officers do however recommend that further work is undertaken with all landowners and developers involved to ensure that an infrastructure delivery arrangement is developed in line with the agreed phasing of the development in the Framework. This can be mutually agreed between landowners and developers, to inform the planning application process as the Loirston site continues to be developed.</p>	
--	--	--