

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
<p>3.1 Design Review Panel January 2010</p>	<p><b>1442 (Homes for Scotland).</b> The members of Homes for Scotland’s Grampian House Builders Committee object to the principle of the Design Review Panel.  <b>PROPOSED MODIFICATION</b>            Members request that housing developments are not subject to Design Review Panels.  <b>JUSTIFICATION</b>            Members of Homes for Scotland GHBC support the continued move towards creating better quality development and improvements in design and urban design. Policy D1 within the LDP (Architecture and Placemaking) states that: ‘To ensure high standards of design, new development must be designed with due consideration for its context and make a positive contribution to its setting.            It goes on to say: ‘To ensure that there is a consistent approach to high quality development throughout the City with an emphasis on creating quality places, the Aberdeen Masterplanning Process Supplementary Guidance will be applied.’            This Supplementary Guidance on Masterplanning together with national policy and guidance should be sufficient to establish what constitutes ‘good design’ and for planning officers to determine the</p>	<p>The Aberdeen City and Shire Structure Plan 2009 states highlights a target: For the quality and design of new developments in the city region to be nationally recognised, and a way to meet this target as start a design review process for masterplans and the most significant planning applications. The Local Design Review Panel is able to pick up on projects for review that would not be of significance enough for the A+DS review. Designing places states ‘Standards of design can be raised by providing opportunities for development proposals and design guidance to be discussed or assessed by people beyond the</p>	<p>No other amendments.</p>

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p>merits or otherwise of development proposals. In many instances, for large and complex sites, member house builders will employ (at a considerable cost), planning consultants and masterplanners to work up plans for areas that are required to be masterplanned. The purpose of employing a professional consultant in the first instance is to create a well structured and planned development proposal and one that is economically viable to deliver on the ground. Introducing a design review panel in a formal manner will create unnecessary complexities to the pre-application processes at a time when the national modernising planning agenda seeks to simplify and streamline planning processes.</p>	<p>immediate planning process.’ The panel has held reviews since End November 2010 and the process does not cause any more time or money for developers. The process has proven to be advantageous for a number of different projects for both the City and the Shire. The process can be carried out at any time, and a report is produced within 2 weeks and is treated as a material consideration to any planning application.</p>	
	<p><b>760 (Aberdeen City and Shire Economic Future).</b> We welcome the desire for high quality design and access to a design review panel for proposed developments. Aberdeen City Council has approved the launch of a design competition for the City Garden project. When the project progresses to the stage of assessing designs, consultation with</p>	<p>The positive comments relating to the Design Review Panel are welcomed. It should be noted that the project would be welcomed at the Design Review Panel but</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p>the Aberdeen City and Shire Design Review panel will be sought.</p>	<p>it would also be appropriate to have it considered by the A+DS National Design Review Panel, due to the scale of the project.</p>	
	<p><b>1464 (Stewart Milne Homes).</b> The design review panel should not be formed and the SG for design review panel would therefore become obsolete and removed from the suite of proposed plan supplementary guidance.                      Stewart Milne Homes object to the principle of the design review panel on the basis that design by its nature is subjective and so therefore, the panel selected cannot offer an unbiased consistent design review process using a pull or different panel members for each and every meeting. There will invariably be conflicts of interest.                      Aberdeen City Council's SG on masterplanning together with the suite of national policy should be sufficient to set a bench mark principle for the consideration of what constitutes 'good design' and for that then to be assessed through the planning process by professional officers.                      This process will create unnecessary complexities to the pre-application process at a time when the</p>	<p>The Aberdeen City and Shire Structure Plan 2009 states highlights a target: For the quality and design of new developments in the city region to be nationally recognised, and a way to meet this target as start a design review process for masterplans and the most significant planning applications. The Local Design Review Panel is able to pick up on projects for review that would not be of significance enough for the A+DS review. Designing places states 'Standards of design can</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	national modernising planning agenda seeks to simplify and streamline planning processes.	be raised by providing opportunities for development proposals and design guidance to be discussed or assessed by people beyond the immediate planning process.’ The panel has held reviews since End November 2010 and the process does not cause any more time or money for developers. The process has proven to be advantageous for a number of different projects for both the City and the Shire. The process can be carried out at any time, and a report is produced within 2 weeks and is treated as a material consideration to any planning application.	
3.2 Aberdeen	<b>1244 (Sport Scotland)</b> . Welcomes the aims of this	The list within M of the	No other

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
Master Planning Process	<p>document. In certain cases, masterplan sites may contain uses in respect of which sportscotland is a statutory consultee. Other sites are likely to have an impact on the demand for sports facilities and may require the need for new facilities. We have access to facility planning modelling, which can assist with the approach taken to new provision. We also support and advise Councils on the preparation of Sports Facility and Pitch Strategies, the Council have undertaken a Pitch Strategy but this is now somewhat out of date (completed in 2003) and we would suggest that the opportunity be taken as part of the Development Plan process to undertake a Facility Strategy and update the Pitch Strategy, both of which could inform masterplan sites. In Section 3 M) it is requested that specific mention is made to sportscotland, in order that any issues can be flagged and addressed early in the development process.</p>	Masterplanning process is not an exhaustive list.	amendments.
	<p><b>398 (Cults, Bielside, Milltimber Community Council).</b> We support the concept of masterplanning for 50 homes or more. As a result we are particularly concerned to see that planning briefs will be used for some sites of more than 50 homes. We seek reassurance that local communities will be engaged in the detail of these</p>	Whilst some aspects of the proposed approach set out in the representation are attractive we consider that the emerging Local Development Plan,	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p>planning briefs, as well as masterplans, to ensure that the appropriate challenges can be made on housing design, affordable housing, provision of the infrastructure and any traffic management issues. The above is indicative of the concern of the community council about the process surrounding masterplanning. We recognise that community councils, ward councillors and local residents are acknowledged as key stakeholders in the masterplanning process but we are concerned that our views will be marginalised in the discussions between the developers and the planning gain team. We see this as more likely in a climate of limited house building and pressure on developer costs.</p> <p>We wish to see a clear two-stage process written as procedures into the plan.</p> <p>1. The planning gain team acts as a facilitator between the developer and local residents (led by the community council and ward councillors) to review and agree the content of the masterplan/planning brief. This includes more detail than the outline infrastructure plans for masterplan zones currently in the LDP proposed on utilities, schools, road and cycle paths, public transport and community/retail facilities. It would also include</p>	<p>prepared under the new planning system, offers sufficient opportunities for local communities to participate and comment on development proposals and infrastructure requirements at plan preparation, masterplan and planning application stages. In addition, preparation of the Local Development Plan has recognised the importance of infrastructure delivery by identifying infrastructure required to support new development across the City and, for certain items of infrastructure, across the North East region as a whole. The identification of such requirements has involved working with partners involved in</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p>discussions on housing design, affordable housing and landscaping of the site. A further significant part of the discussion would be on infrastructure provisions outwith the immediate site necessary for the development to go ahead i.e. secondary schools, trunk sewage systems, and city road projects such as the AWPR.</p> <p>2.This would be followed by a negotiation between the developer and planning gain team in the full knowledge of the expectations of local residents. The community council does not expect to be involved in the detailed financial agreement between the developer and the local authority. However, we do expect the subsequent delivery plan for the site to be shared with local residents to enable challenge and support.</p> <p>We believe that the process above needs greater clarity with the roles and responsibilities/accountabilities of all stakeholders involved being clearly articulated. We recognise that local residents cannot place impossible demands on a developer but we are concerned that the planning gain team will compromise on the infrastructure provisions unless they feel accountable to the local community.</p>	<p>planning and delivering infrastructure to help determine:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the capacity of existing services;</li> <li>- the likely impact of development; and</li> <li>- the new or improved facilities therefore required to support development.</li> </ul> <p>These requirements have been identified in the Proposed Plan and therefore subject to full public consultation. Developers will need to provide further details on infrastructure delivery through Masterplans for specific developments, which will themselves be subject to further consultation with local communities, the Council and other stakeholders. Subsequent planning</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p><b>1579 (Kingswells Community Council).</b> KCC agrees that adjacent areas developed must be masterplanned together at the appropriate time with the involvement of all parties, especially the community.</p> <p>However, we feel that a more outward-looking view needs to be taken. In particular, it is essential that masterplanning involves a more joined-up and collaborative approach by both the City and the Shire to consider what is happening ‘just beyond the boundary’ between the two authorities.</p> <p>There is also a benefit to be gained from masterplanning the type of facility to be provide and not just the area.</p> <p>To avoid potential problems in the future, there should be a condition placed on every planning application for housing that ensures that the developer makes adequate provision for ground maintenance of public areas and open spaces.</p>	<p>applications will need to be agreed with the Council and also comply with the infrastructure delivery statement set out in the masterplan.</p> <p>Welcome supporting comment. The City Council and Aberdeenshire Council are committed to joint working and both produce Local Development Plans in accordance with the Aberdeen City and Shire Structure Plan 2009. The Cumulative Transport Appraisal of Aberdeen City and Shire LDP’s was a cross boundary exercise which assessed the cumulative strategic transport impacts associated with the scale and distribution of development proposals</p>	



EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
		<p>within both Local Authority areas. The first step of the Masterplanning process is to consider site context which includes an appraisal of the surrounding area. If a site does fall close to the City Council boundary we would consult Aberdeenshire Council as our neighbouring Local Authority at the planning application stage. The types of facilities required for each masterplan area are outlined in Appendix 4 of the Proposed Local Development Plan. The detailed design and location of these facilities would be agreed through the masterplanning stages for each site.</p> <p>To apply a blanket</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
		condition to all planning permission for housing developments would not comply with the Scottish Government’s Circular 4/1998 5 tests for fair, reasonable and practicable conditions. Each application must be assessed on it’s own merits.	
	<b>65 (Bucksburn and Newhills Communiy Council).</b> Agree that masterplans must be prepared prior to any development.	Welcome this support.	
3.4 Conversions of Steadings	No representations received.	N/A	No other amendments.
3.9 Landscape Strategy Part 2	<b>408 (Scottish Environmental Protection Agency).</b> We support the production of Supplementary Guidance which highlights the environmental benefits of landscaping within developments; however we consider that the guidance can be improved by incorporating the suggestions made below. The water environment can form a key part of any site context and therefore it is requested that in paragraph 5.3 (a) a reference is included in the	We welcome the support for this guidance. It is accepted that there should be reference to waterbodies in paragraph 5.3 (a) and paragraph 6.4 third bullet point. These paragraphs will be amended to make reference to waterbodies.	For ease of reading ‘Landscape Strategy Part 2’ will be removed from the title of the supplementary guidance leaving it called ‘Landscape Guidelines’.

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p>local context list to include waterbodies. Similarly it is requested that in paragraph 6.4 waterbodies are included in the 3rd bullet point under the list of natural resources.</p> <p>PAN 65 paragraph 18 highlights that open space should be capable of serving a number of functions and adapting to different uses while promoting a range of benefits such as biodiversity, active travel, flood control and Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS). We request that reference is made in paragraph 7.1 to the potential of multifunctional open space.</p> <p>We support the inclusion in paragraph 7.9 of bullet point 3 minimizing the use of hard ground surfacing and maximizing the use of more natural or permeable materials, but requests that through the use of SUDS is included to make a more explicit reference to the opportunity to incorporate SUDS into landscaping. We support bullet point 5 of paragraph 7.9 but again consider an explicit reference to the use of SUDS would improve clarity here. SUDS can provide the opportunity to provide multifunctional spaces which can contribute to a wider open space network throughout the area. We request that a clear link be made to the Buffer Strips Supplementary Guidance which highlights</p>	<p>It is accepted that there should be reference to the multifunctional nature of open space in paragraph 7.1. The paragraph will be amended to reflect this. It is accepted that there should be a more explicit reference to Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems under bullet point 3 and 5 of paragraph 7.9. These will be amended to make reference to SUDS.</p> <p>It is agreed that there should be a clear link to the Buffer Strips Supplementary Guidance. A paragraph has been added under section 7 Layout and Design to reflect the importance of water features and link to the Buffer Strip Supplementary Guidance. The Open Space</p>	<p>The document has been updated to reflect the most recent legislation and terms, and reference made to more up to date supplementary guidance and processes.</p>

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p>the important role placed by watercourses in the urban environment. We note that many open spaces already make a positive contribution to our broad objectives particularly with regard to achieving good water, air and land quality, and protecting, informing and engaging communities. Equally, new open spaces have the potential to make a similarly positive contribution to the wider environment and we are particularly keen to ensure that these new open spaces are consistent with and help deliver River Basin Planning and biodiversity objectives.</p> <p>We recommend that the list of heading of types of open space in paragraph 11.1 be amended to accord more closely with that set out in Figure 2 of the Council’s Open Space Development Guidelines for Greenfield sites namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Play space (formal and informal);</li> <li>-Outdoor sports areas;</li> <li>-Natural greenspace and green corridors;</li> <li>-Allotments or community gardens.</li> </ul> <p>We welcome the reference in paragraph 11.2 to the Council’s Open Space Development Guidelines for Greenfield sites. We have inputted to this guidance document and support the inclusion of natural greenspace and green corridors which can include</p>	<p>Development Guidelines for Greenfield sites has been superseded by the Open Space Supplementary Guidance. Paragraph 11.1 has been amended to outline all types of open space that that open space strategy covers. However, the four broad categorise as highlighted by SEPA are still relevant. Paragraph 11.2 makes reference to the Open Space Supplementary Guidance and the four headings have been added to this paragraph.</p> <p>The Open Space Development Guidelines for Greenfield Sites has been replaced by the Open Space Supplementary Guidance. Reference to this new</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p>the water environment in the categories of open space as these are likely to have significant environmental and social value in the urban setting. The definition of open space in PAN 65, paragraph 10, states that open space covers water and as water falls outside the term of 'land' it is requested that this Supplementary Guidance should highlight that all categories of open space should be included including natural greenspace and green corridors (including water).</p> <p>In paragraph 13.5 a presumption is made against using pavoirs in areas where vehicles will park. We highlight that porous paving is a SUDS measure recognised in CIRIA C697: The SUDS Manual and is particularly suitable for installation in high density developments (such as may be the case in a city context) as there is no additional land take. We would therefore not support the presumption against using porous paving for car park areas as such measures can contribute to the delivery of SUDS particularly in an urban setting where space is limited. Instead it is requested that paragraph 13.5 is removed.</p> <p>We support the references in Appendix 4 Landscape Guidelines checklist to flooding, site waste management, drainage, construction</p>	<p>supplementary guidance has been added to the text. Section 9 of the Open Space supplementary Guidance specifically covers natural greenspace and green corridors and included water. Therefore, references to natural greenspace and green corridors and included water do not need to be repeated within the Landscape Guidance Supplementary Guidance. It is accepted that the paragraph which makes reference to pavoirs should be removed from the supplementary guidance so that it complies more closely to CIRIA C697: The SUDS Manual.</p> <p>It is accepted that Appendix 4 should be</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p>operations and ongoing management of landscaped aspects. However we request that a criterion be included in the Siting/location section which highlights the need for consideration of the previous use of the land and any potential for the presence of old foundations, underground structures, obstructive artefacts and contamination which may influence the design and layout of any development and therefore landscaping on site. Furthermore we highlight that SUDS measures can form part of the landscaped area and that in some cases these may also be adopted by Scottish Water and so it is requested that they are added to the list of adoption bodies in the Post Construction section of the checklist.</p>	<p>updated to reflect consideration of previous use of the land and potential influences of design and landscaping. It is also accepted that Scottish Water should be added to the list of adopted bodies on the Post Construction list.</p>	
	<p><b>1573 (Paul &amp; Williamsons).</b> Where is Part 1? We understand Part 1 has been superseded by the Green Belt Review which forms part of this LDP process. The title should be amended to be clear that this is a stand alone document. This document has not been updated since 2003. It would be appropriate to update.</p>	<p>Part 1 is held within the technical appendices of the local development plan. Part 1 informed the Green Belt Review but has not been superseded by it. The Green Belt Review is a stand alone document.</p>	
<p>3.10 The Sub-division and</p>	<p><b>772 (Halliday Fraser Munro on behalf of Mr N MacRae).</b> We request that the supplementary</p>	<p>Scottish Planning Policy (CD3) paragraph 163 is</p>	<p>Insertion of text setting out the</p>

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
Redevelopment of Residential Curtilages	guidance is amended to include reference to the subdivision and redevelopment of residential feus in the Green Belt being an acceptable form of development. Suggested amendment: Change "All new dwellings should front onto an existing publicly maintained roadway" to "In most instances, the new dwelling should front onto an existing publicly maintained roadway, however in some cases it may be permissible for the development to take access from an existing private track."	clear on the type and scale of development that may be appropriate within the green belt. New build residential development is not considered appropriate. Some residential curtilages or land that may be considered to be brownfield sites in the green belt are large and could accommodate more than just small scale development. Even a single house in the wrong location can have a significant impact in a largely rural setting. The Scottish Planning Policy does allow for the conversion and re-use of traditional agricultural buildings. It also allows for the intensification of existing uses. However,	circumstances in which this supplementary guidance will be applicable.

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
		<p>the Scottish Planning Policy does not suggest that conversions to any use would be acceptable, only those outlined in paragraph 163. The Scottish Planning Policy also points out that the cumulative erosion of a green belt's integrity through the granting of individual planning permissions should be avoided. We would agree and Policy NE2 complies with this stance.</p>	
	<p><b>1487 (Robert and Maren Ruddiman).</b> The Supplementary Guidance is generally well written and is an extremely useful supplement to the Local Development Plan. However, the document could be improved in respect of the following:                      1.The Deeside settlements of Cults, Bielside and Milltimber contain a wide variety of properties, a number of which are listed and the Supplementary Guidance should be amended in 2 small areas to properly reflect the potential impact on listed</p>	<p>It is not considered necessary or appropriate to insert a reference to the Council's duty to protect the character and setting of Listed Buildings, as this duty is incumbent on the Council irrespective of inclusion within individual pieces of SG. The</p>	



EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p>buildings. The Local Plan and ancillary Technical Advice Notes do much to conserve local heritage but seem not to make the obvious connection. The changes will ensure that the Council is at all times mindful of its statutory duty which is primary to local planning issues but does not always seem to be fulfilled by planning officers/elected members. These specific changes are listed below.                      Introduction - In the 3rd paragraph add "Additionally, some of the buildings and structures are afforded statutory protection due to their listed status." This should be added in line 11 after the sentence ending "access".</p>	<p>Aberdeen Local Development Plan Proposed Plan includes policies D4 &amp; D5, which underline the importance of heritage designations and Aberdeen’s granite heritage in particular. The policies and SG of the LDP should be considered in the round, rather than expecting individual SG documents to be exhaustive and cover every eventuality.</p>	
	<p><b>1487 (Robert and Maren Ruddiman).</b> The document is not as thorough as it might be in respect of access both for occupants of properties and for the likes of utilities, delivery lorries, emergency services and, in particular, disabled access. The changes below address this.                      2 (a) Density Pattern and Scale of Development – In the 7th paragraph ((c)) the words "four houses" should be deleted as the optionality is not helpful and for the reasons stated above 3 houses should be the maximum which are safely served by a</p>	<p>(a) The SG cannot foresee every eventuality, and setting a firm maximum on the number of dwellings which may be served by a private driveway would fail to take account of other variables such as site context, development density etc. In practice, the number of dwellings</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p>driveway (rather than a road to adoptable standard) and this has been particularly apparent during recent adverse weather conditions.</p> <p>2(b) There should be inserted a new penultimate paragraph in this section which reads "Where any proposed development will impact or be within the curtilage of a listed building, then development should not be permitted unless compliant with the statutory protection afforded such listed building."</p>	<p>which may be accessed through such means will be for the case officer to determine, having due regard for all other material planning considerations.</p> <p>(b) It is not considered necessary or appropriate to insert a reference to the Council's duty to protect the character and setting of Listed Buildings, as this duty is incumbent on the Council irrespective of inclusion within individual pieces of SG. The Aberdeen Local Development Plan Proposed Plan includes policies D4 &amp; D5, which underline the importance of heritage designations and Aberdeen's granite heritage in particular. The policies and SG of the</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p><b>1487 (Robert and Maren Ruddiman).</b> The last 2 winters have been particularly severe and there has been a significant problem on the North Deeside Road with cars being parked by the roadside when the driveways to houses have not been passable for vehicular traffic. There should be restrictions placed on the number of houses that are approached by roads which are not adopted. Unadopted roads inevitably end up shared by vehicles and pedestrians and modern life dictates that the vehicles will be cars, vans and lorries. This is a serious safety issue which can be addressed in part by the small changes suggested. This will as a minimum reduce the increase of substandard access being shared by multiple users. Again, the changes below address this.</p> <p>Pedestrian, Vehicular Safety and Car Parking - a new sentence should be added - "Any development should take full account of the requirements to provide disabled access to and from any</p>	<p>LDP should be considered in the round, rather than expecting individual SG documents to be exhaustive and cover every eventuality.</p> <p>The SG cannot foresee every eventuality, and setting a firm maximum on the number of dwellings which may be served by a private driveway would fail to take account of other variables such as site context, development density etc. In practice, the number of dwellings which may be accessed through such means will be for the case officer to determine, having due regard for all other material planning considerations.</p> <p>Requirements for disabled access are largely the</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	development of whatever nature."	remit of Building Standards legislation. General accessibility will be a material consideration in the assessment of any development proposal, which is reflected through policy D3 ('Sustainable and Active Travel') of the proposed ALDP and the draft supplementary guidance on 'Transport and Accessibility'.	
	<p><b>1531 (Halliday Fraser Munro on behalf of Mr Charles Mitchell).</b> Broadly this guidance is supported however it needs to be more flexible.</p> <p>Modification Required:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Supplementary Guidance is amended to include reference to the subdivision and redevelopment of residential feus in the Green Belt being an acceptable form of development.</li> <li>2. That the wording of the Supplementary Guidance is amended (page 6 para 2) from, 'All new dwellings should front onto an existing publicly maintained roadway' to 'In most instances, the new dwellings</li> </ol>	Scottish Planning Policy, paragraph 163, is clear on the type and scale of development that may be appropriate within the green belt. Green belt designations are intended to direct development to suitable locations, and therefore land designated as green belt should not be considered suitable for	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p>should front onto an existing publicly maintained roadway, however in some cases it may be permissible for the development to take access from an existing private track'</p>	<p>new residential development, which can be better accommodated within existing urban areas or through land release. Even a single house in the wrong location can have a significant impact in a largely rural setting. The Scottish Planning Policy does allow for the conversion and re-use of traditional agricultural buildings. It also allows for the intensification of existing uses. The Scottish Planning Policy also points out that the cumulative erosion of a green belt's integrity through the granting of individual planning permissions should be avoided. We would agree and suggest that Policy NE2 and the</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
		<p>supplementary guidance on 'The Sub-division and Re-development of Residential Curtilages' comply with this stance, and that amendment as described would be inappropriate.</p>	
	<p><b>1531 (Halliday Fraser Munro on behalf of Mr Charles Mitchell).</b> The good sense in the SG should be supported and should have wider applicability. A more sensible, flexible approach should be built in. The supplementary guidance should be amended to include reference to the subdivision and redevelopment of residential feus in the Green Belt being an acceptable form of development. Wording should be amended (Pg 6 para 2) Remove 'All new dwellings should front onto an existing publicly maintained roadway' and replace with 'In most instances, the new dwelling should front onto an existing publicly maintained roadway, however in some cases it may be permissible for the development to take access from an existing private track.'</p>	<p>Scottish Planning Policy, paragraph 163, is clear on the type and scale of development that may be appropriate within the green belt. Green belt designations are intended to direct development to suitable locations, and therefore land designated as green belt should not be considered suitable for new residential development, which can be better accommodated within existing urban areas or through land release. Even a single house in the</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
		<p>wrong location can have a significant impact in a largely rural setting. The Scottish Planning Policy does allow for the conversion and re-use of traditional agricultural buildings. It also allows for the intensification of existing uses. The Scottish Planning Policy also points out that the cumulative erosion of a green belt's integrity through the granting of individual planning permissions should be avoided. We would agree and suggest that Policy NE2 and the supplementary guidance on 'The Sub-division and Re-development of Residential Curtilages' comply with this stance, and that amendment as</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
		<p>described would be inappropriate.</p> <p>The point raised regarding development fronting onto publicly maintained roads is acknowledged. The sentence in question is not consistent with the previous paragraph, which emphasises the importance of the surrounding setting and context. The previous paragraph adequately addresses the likely requirements for a frontage onto a publicly maintained road, so the text in question can simply be removed.</p> <p>The text 'All new dwellings should front onto an existing publicly maintained roadway and should not project forward of the building line of the</p>	



EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
		street (if there is one)' shall be replaced by text reading 'New dwellings should not project forward of the building line of the street (if there is one).'	
3.11 Stone cleaning	No representations received.	N/A	No other amendments.
3.12 Temporary buildings	No representations received.	N/A	No other amendments.
5.1 Affordable Housing	<b>665 (Scottish Government).</b> This states that 'In the case of social rented housing, the Council will wish to ensure that the properties remain as such, in perpetuity'. Also, that 'In the case of private sector developments, the Council will aim to ensure that housing remains affordable, in perpetuity.' Scottish Planning Policy is that innovative and flexible approaches will be required to deliver affordable houses in suitable numbers. In addition, Planning Advice Note 2/2010 describes the range of tenure types that contribute towards affordable housing and includes mid market or intermediate rented accommodation which may be provided over the medium or long term. Whilst local authorities should consider whether new affordable housing should remain affordable in the future and, if so, the	Supplementary Guidance on Affordable Housing has been provides more detail on the type of affordable housing, how the requirements are delivered, and more detailed information about the legal agreements that the Council will expect to enter into with developers. There are a range of affordable housing options available, including: social rented, shared ownership, shared equity, discounted	No other amendments.

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p>most appropriate means to achieve this outcome, models of affordable housing provision are increasingly fluid and additional flexibility is very likely to be required.</p> <p>We therefore recommend that you amend the supplementary guidance on this issue to allow greater flexibility, and not require affordable housing to remain affordable in perpetuity.</p> <p>The supplementary guidance states that 'delivering social rented housing is the Council's preference for affordable housing'. However, it also re-affirms that the HNDA demonstrates that intermediate housing will have a significant role to play in meeting housing need. The supplementary guidance does not provide a specific split between the provision of social rented and intermediate housing as it is stated that intermediate housing is sensitive to house prices relative to incomes, and so closely related to fluctuations in the housing market cycle. Planning Advice Note 2/2010 states that 'It is important that local authorities, developers and RSLs consider the full range of [tenure] options and apply them as appropriate.'</p> <p>We recommend that you remove the statement that 'Delivering social rented housing is the Council's preference for affordable housing'. In addition, we</p>	<p>low cost sale, housing without subsidy and mid-market rented accommodation. Each of these has a role to play in meeting housing need. The preference of the Council in the majority of cases will be to deliver social rented accommodation. However, this relies on public subsidy and is not always deliverable. Where public subsidy is not available, or will only meet part of the requirement, affordable homes built without public subsidy will have a role to play. The Housing Need and Demand Assessment provides an analysis of those people in housing need that could afford intermediate housing. Generally, the analysis</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p>recommend that you provide an indication of the balance of provision between affordable rented and intermediate tenures within the supplementary guidance or, alternatively, within your LHS.</p>	<p>indicates that there is considerable potential for intermediate housing, under current housing market conditions. The ability to afford intermediate housing is not the same as demand for such products, and this proportion is based on current assumptions about the future housing market. Guidance contained within the Affordable Housing Supplementary Guidance is included to outline the potential contribution of intermediate housing, but no specific requirements are included in policy. The Supplementary Guidance recognised that it is important not to constrain development through the implementation of the Affordable Housing Policy</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
		<p>and providing no housing at all will not improve the situation either, as recognised by paragraph 3.46 of the Proposed Plan. Policy H5 sets the target for delivering affordable housing and it refers to Supplementary Guidance on Affordable Housing to provide more detail on the implementation of the policy. Supplementary Guidance promotes the approach recommended by Planning Advice Note 2/2010 and allows flexibility in the type of provision, and identifies a process of negotiation and the consideration of any exceptional servicing costs for the development. The impact of the requirement on the viability of the</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
		development will be considered in these negotiations. The starting point for negotiations will be a 25% requirement, and it will only be in circumstances where the viability of development is affected that this contribution may be reduced.	
	<p><b>1442 (Homes for Scotland).</b> Policy H5 states that ‘housing developments of five units or more are required to contribute no less than 25% of the total number of units as affordable housing’. Members recognise that there is a requirement for the provision of affordable housing within the Aberdeen Market Area, however they request a greater flexibility to be built into the policy to take account of all financial aspects of delivering development sites. Members of GHBC are concerned that the SG does not expand on the options open to developers, in the event of no HAG funding being available. Para 3.8 states that subsidy is not guaranteed, but only advises early discussion with the Council in this instance.</p>	The Supplementary Guidance can only provide further detail to policy contained in the Local Development Plan, and through the policy cannot be amended by this Supplementary Guidance. The Local Development Plan is going through an examination process in which this issue will be discussed. If there are any changes the Supplementary Guidance	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p><b>PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS</b>                      The policy should be amended to read: ‘Housing developments of five units or more are required to contribute towards the 25% target of affordable housing units. The planning authority will take into consideration all other issues which may affect the viability of a site when determining the type and size of contribution.’                      Para 3.8 should be expanded, along the following lines:                      ‘As an alternative to providing serviced land where funding is not available to an RSL the developer may, with the agreement of the Council as Planning Authority, provide complete units without a subsidy, either transferring these to an appropriate RSL, or the Council, to manage, or selling them at low cost entry level values. The number of completed units will be the financial equivalent to the provision of the serviced land for affordable housing.’</p> <p><b>JUSTIFICATION</b>                      SPP states that: ‘Policies on affordable housing provision should be realistic and take into account considerations such as development viability and the availability of funding.’ (para 87)                      PAN2/2010 re-enforces this in para 17 ‘It is considered good practice for policies in</p>	<p>will be amended to reflect these changes.                      Paragraph 3.8 has been expanded to provide further information on the options available if funding for social rented housing is not available.</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p>development plans to: 'have regard to financial obligations linked to particular developments, including any expectation that developers will contribute to infrastructure and supporting development such as schools and roads. Land values vary across Scotland, and the capacity of developments to bear a range of costs will also vary.'</p> <p>The LDP states that 'the level of annual need is 30% of the total housing requirement for Aberdeen'. However it also goes on to say 'To ensure the viability of development, the requirement has been set at 25% for all areas of the City'. The recognition that viabilities of sites are affected by the provision of affordable housing is welcomed by the members of Homes for Scotland, however this policy wording does not go far enough, and should be amended as suggested.</p> <p>Given the uncertainty surrounding public funding availability for HAG, flexibility will be key over the coming months as more imaginative forms of delivery are explored by developers and RSLs. We believe that Scottish Government should also be pushed to provide clear guidance to local authorities, RSLs and private developers on acceptable alternative methods for delivery of</p>		

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p>affordable homes in the event that public sector funding is reduced so significantly as to be effectively withdrawn.</p>		
	<p><b>41 (Grampian Housing Association).</b> I have to bring to your attention a fundamental and potentially misleading error in paragraph 2.3.2 (second bullet point) "Shared Equity". The remaining stake held in the house (other than that purchased by the applicant) is not purchased by a RSL using Scottish Government grant as stated. In fact, the remaining stake is held by the Scottish Ministers. The RSL only acts as a facilitator and agent for the grant and has no direct interest in the title of the property. The RSL does not gain from any increase in equity value when the house is sold. Please provide me with assurance that this error will be corrected in the final version.</p>	<p>We would accept the suggested change to clarify the process for shared equity housing. The supplementary guidance document will be amended accordingly.</p>	
	<p><b>1464 (Stewart Milne Homes).</b> Policies on affordable housing should be realistic and take into account considerations such as development viability and the availability of funding. Where an identified affordable housing requirement is applied against a site which as a consequence would render the site financially unviable, then this requirement should be removed or reduced accordingly. PAN 2/2010 also supports this position.</p>	<p>The Supplementary Guidance makes allowance for site viability and there is a section titled Instances When Contributions May be Reduced. Alternative models of affordable housing and the</p>	



EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p>Affordable housing does not constitute essential infrastructure without which development cannot proceed, this is likely to be one of the first elements which would require to be re-evaluated in light of a change in circumstance. The Supplementary Guidance supports this approach.</p> <p>The Council also need to take into account of developers providing smaller, higher density housing into the mix on sites which may not necessarily be 'affordable' in the truest sense i.e. by definition as set out in the affordable housing SG. If provision can be made on site for a low cost product that can be termed as falling within an affordable bracket, providing a product of the first time buyer and or lower income households, this should also be taken into account.</p> <p>Housing developments of 5 or more are expected to contribute to the target of 15% of the total number of units as affordable housing. This will be assessed on a site by site basis taking into account all aspects of development viability.</p>	<p>question of their acceptability will need to be judged on a case-by-case basis as each circumstance will be different. The guidance does make provision for alternative models of affordable housing at Paragraph 2.3 bullet point 3.</p> <p>The Supplementary Guidance can only provide further detail to policy contained in the Local Development Plan, and through the policy cannot be amended by this Supplementary Guidance. The Local Development Plan is going through an examination process in which this issue will be discussed. If there are any changes the Supplementary Guidance</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p><b>1561 (Bancon Developments Ltd).</b> Bancon object to the above supplementary guidance (SG) on the grounds that it is inappropriately specific on the requirement for 25% of all developments of more than 5 units to be affordable housing. Bancon therefore submit that the SG be reviewed to allow greater site specific flexibility, so as not to compromise the deliverability of the Local Development Plan through undermining project viability.</p>	<p>will be amended to reflect these changes.</p> <p>The Supplementary Guidance recognised that it is important not to constrain development through the implementation of the Affordable Housing Policy and providing no housing at all will not improve the situation either, as recognised by paragraph 3.46 of the Proposed Plan. Policy H5 sets the target for delivering affordable housing and it refers to Supplementary Guidance on Affordable Housing to provide more detail on the implementation of the policy. Supplementary Guidance promotes the approach recommended by Planning Advice Note 2/2010 and allows</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
		<p>flexibility in the type of provision, and identifies a process of negotiation and the consideration of any exceptional servicing costs for the development. The impact of the requirement on the viability of the development will be considered in these negotiations. The starting point for negotiations will be a 25% requirement, and it will only be in circumstances where the viability of development is affected that this contribution may be reduced.</p>	
	<p><b>1189 (Emac on behalf of Scotia Homes).</b> The identification of ‘other options’ (paragraph 2.3), which would allow for new models of affordable housing delivery, together with the principle of integrated development is supported (paragraph 2.9).</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p><b>728 (Knight Frank LLP on behalf of Stewart Milne Group Ltd).</b> Our clients Stewart Milne Group Limited, Manse (Aberdeen) Limited, Westhouse Estates Limited and Manse (Aberdeen Project Management) Limited requests that changes are made to the Supplementary Guidance on Affordable Housing. In particular we would wish to see the Supplementary Guidance on Affordable Housing: SG 5.1 amended by the addition of the following text in the Introduction as a new Paragraph 1.3.</p> <p>“1.3 The affordable housing requirement for sites identified in the adopted 2008 Aberdeen Local Plan for residential development (Figure 8a), sites safeguarded for residential development (Figure 8b), brownfield housing sites (Figure 10) and housing sites identified as proposals and opportunities (Appendix 5) will continue to be assessed against Policy 42 Affordable Housing. The adoption of the new Local Development Plan and Policy H5 Affordable Housing will not take precedence over any agreements for sites that are already in place between applicants and the Planning Authority.</p> <p>In order to provide linkages to the Local Development Plan section on 'Meeting Housing and Community Needs' our client has asked that the</p>	<p>The 25% requirement contained in Policy H5 will apply to all housing developments of five units or more, which includes existing allocations and brownfield sites. However, if there are constraints on-site, or the requirement affects the viability of development it will be addressed through the individual planning application, the policy approach is flexible in order to deal with these situations as discussed in the previous paragraph. A blanket approach to retain a 10% requirement for all existing sites and brownfield allocations would not take into account any future land deals, or changes in market conditions that</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	above text is also added to the end of Paragraph 3.46 in the sub section on Affordable Housing.	may allow delivery of greater than 10%. Applying a 10% target for some developments is not supported by the plan and is not appropriate.	
5.2 Children's Nurseries and Sports Facilities	<b>1244 (Sport Scotland).</b> Combining these 2 issues in 1 SG is illogical as there is no connection between the two. The SG guidance in relation to sports facilities is confusing as it deals with redevelopment of these (which is covered already by policy NE3 within the LDP itself and the development of new sports facilities. It is considered that this is an unduly negative policy and is not required. Delete this SG in relation to sports facilities. The SPP requirements in relation to the policy presumption against the redevelopment of playing fields can be covered by an appropriately revised Policy NE3 and the assessment of new sports proposals can be considered in relation to other policies in the LDP, principally policy CF2.	Although the two subjects appear unrelated, both are concerned with protecting the local environment and residential amenity. Because of this we would wish to retain the Supplementary Guidance as it is. We do not agree that the SG in relation to sports facilities should be deleted. Policy CF2 does not adequately cover the specific issues raised by new sports facilities and their potential impact on local areas and residential amenity. We would therefore wish to retain it.	No other amendments.

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
5.3 Gypsy and Traveller Sites	<p><b>1579 (Kingswells Community Council).</b> KCC agrees in principle that adequate authorised sites need to be provided for Gypsies and Travellers within Aberdeen.</p> <p>When deciding on where to locate these sites, it is crucial to consider the local ‘settled community’ in the areas chosen as well.</p> <p>The provision of future Park and Ride sites should include the provision of secure sites with height restriction barriers to prevent illegal encampments. It is important to note that, although a halting site is available within the city boundary (at Clinterty), the Gypsies and Travellers seem to prefer to roam between unauthorised encampments as witnessed repeatedly in past years. This suggests that providing further halting sites within the city will not necessarily resolve the issue of unauthorised encampments. ACC should consider making any new halting sites free of charge for users. This would hopefully encourage greater use of these sites rather than further unauthorised encampments. When making such decisions, we must also consider the expenses faced by ACC when clearing unauthorised sites after they have been used.</p> <p>The document Supplementary guidance topic:</p>	<p>The sites for Gypsies and Travellers within larger development areas will have to be identified through the masterplanning process and will be subject to a planning application. At the masterplanning stage community consultation will be undertaken and at the planning application stage a period for further notification will be provided.</p> <p>This guidance is concerned with the provision of sites for Gypsies and Travellers and not the design of Park and Ride sites.</p> <p>There would be no planning requirement to charge rent or otherwise and this would be an issue for the ongoing</p>	No other amendments.

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p>Gypsy and traveller sites 2010/5.3 has a number of contradictory statements:</p> <p>*Point 1.4 (page 3) states that ‘following a review by Aberdeen City Council, Aberdeenshire Council and the Moray Council, undertaken by Craigforth Research, the research found that provision in Aberdeen was adequate but recommended providing one alternative permanent site in Aberdeen for 6 to 8 pitches, 1 to 2 halting sites between Aberdeen and Aberdeenshire and provision for development of private sites’.</p> <p>However, Policy H7 (page 4) mentions 5 sites (Grandholme, Newhills expansion, Countesswells, Greenferns and Loirston) as ‘required to make contributions towards the provisions of sites for Gypsies and Travellers’. The ‘contribution’ is quoted as meaning a small site for 6 pitches with a net area of approximately 0.5 ha.</p> <p>*Further ambiguity is caused by the subsequent statement in the policy (H7 page 4) that ‘for Grandholme, Newhills expansion and Loirston, the provision must be provided on site’. It is not clear here what the provision at the other 2 sites at Countesswells and Greenferns is therefore expected to be.</p> <p>KCC does not agree with the provision of sites for</p>	<p>management of the site.</p> <p>The requirement for Countesswells and Greenferns is more flexible and the provision may be on-site in the form of a gypsy and traveller halting site or a financial contribution towards the provision of a Gypsy and Traveller site.</p> <p>The Policy in the Proposed Plan is under examination and this Supplementary Guidance can only provide further detail on this policy.</p> <p>These sites have been selected because of their scale and the fact that the provision of a small site of 0.5ha for Gypsies and Travellers will only have a minimal impact on housing mix, developer contributions, community</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p>Gypsies and Travellers being taken from the allocation for affordable housing. An allocation of 0.5 hectares of land for the provision of 6 caravans would accommodate more than 15 homes at a density of 30 homes per hectare. In reality, affordable housing is likely to be at a higher density than this.</p> <p>In addition, the cost of affordable housing would come from developer contributions. A site with a Gypsy/Traveller camp on it would be impacted in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*It is unlikely to have an adequate mix of housing types as it would have a smaller proportion of affordable housing.</li> <li>*The funding available for community facilities and infrastructure will be less as the developer is providing land and creating the halting sites, but has no income from the housing that would otherwise be built on that land.</li> <li>*In addition to the 0.5 hectares of land provided for the halting site, it is likely that there would need to be a buffer between the settled community and the halting site. There would also be a lower 'profit' margin for houses in the adjacent part of the development. This will have further financial implications for the developer and consequential</li> </ul>	<p>facilities, development value and infrastructure. The site size is to include screening, and of more importance is the location of the site in minimising any potential impact on the residential amenity. The aim of the policy is to provide Gypsy and Traveller sites that have some level of separation to the settled community, but are still within close proximity to the services and facilities that are required by both the settled community and Gypsies and Travellers. The policies covering affordable housing and Gypsy Traveller sites are both aimed at providing accommodation to all sectors of society that are unable to currently access</p>	



EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p>impact on the facilities that will be available to the community from developer contributions. It is well known that neither the travelling community nor the settled community wish to live next to each other. The policy is fundamentally flawed if it tries to force the communities together. Some of the land proposed for the halting sites is owned by ACC, so they are effectively the developer on these sites. This policy would be effectively relieving ACC of its responsibility to the travelling community and people who wish 'affordable' housing. Developers from other sites would pay for this provision through their contributions. The settled communities from these other sites also 'pay' in kind by living in communities with fewer facilities than they would otherwise have.</p>	<p>the housing market or meet their own need. There is no trade off between each it is simply the aim of these policies to provide accommodation to those people that have an identified housing need. The provision of halting sites seeks to reduce the incidence of unauthorised encampments and it is the Council's consideration that this has wider community benefits.</p>	
	<p><b>214 (Graeme Stewart).</b> Gypsies and Travellers should be aware of Planning Aid for Scotland.</p>	<p>The Supplementary Guidance provides contact details for Planning Aid for Scotland.</p>	
<p>6.1 Hierarchy of Centres</p>	<p><b>1153 (RDPC Ltd).</b> In the adopted Aberdeen City Local Plan 2008, the site at the former Woodend Hospital Annex (OP38) is identified for superstore development, and to be designated - together with the existing shops at Rousay Drive - as a District Centre following development of the superstore.</p>	<p>The capacity study carried out as part of the 2004 Aberdeen and Aberdeenshire Retail Study revealed a degree of overprovision of</p>	<p>No other amendments</p>

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p>The reasoning behind this allocation is clearly explained in the Inquiry Reporter's recommendations of August 2007 (attached) and in the proposed modifications to the Local Plan which were issued in November 2007 (attached). The reasoning remains entirely relevant to current circumstances.</p>	<p>convenience floorspace in the south west Aberdeen area but a shortfall in north west Aberdeen. Given that the overprovision in south west Aberdeen is due to the concentration of superstores at Bridge of Dee, which are not conveniently located for much of west and north west Aberdeen, it is considered that there remains a need for a modern superstore to serve the western districts of the City. This must be well located to serve the main concentrations of population and served by frequent public transport. The extant Local Plan which was adopted in June 2008 identified a site at Lang Stracht - Rousay</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
		<p>Drive as suitable for a modern supermarket. However, another site located at the Former Summerhill Academy has come available with developer interest. Development on either of these sites may meet the need identified above. Planning permission has been granted for a retail development on part of the OP38 Woodend Hospital Annex, Lang Stracht site in 1996. In 2001 Tesco bought the site, and in March 2008 an application was lodged for detailed planning permission. However, it wasn't until 25 November 2010 that full planning permission was granted. This permission will last three years from the date</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
		<p>of approval (25/11/13). In the 2008 Aberdeen Local Plan, the site was allocated for a superstore opportunity reflecting the Reporter's conclusions into this Issue 239. The Reporter also stated that when the superstore was complete and brought into use, an additional entry should be made under District Centres at Land Stracht/ Rousay Drive. At the time of preparing the Proposed Plan, full planning permission had not yet been granted on the site and to date the development of the supermarket is not underway. Therefore we rezoned the site as Policy H1 - Residential Areas. Under this zoning a superstore would still be</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
		<p>an acceptable use for this site, so long as any negative impacts on surrounding residential properties are mitigated. The site will not be designated as a District Centre as the superstore is not complete and brought into use. As local development plans are reviewed on a five year basis if development is completed then consideration will be given to redesignate this site as a District Centre. Also, if development is completed, the site could be listed as a District Centre in Supplementary Guidance 6.1 - Hierarchy of Centres after a review of the Supplementary Guidance.</p>	
	<p><b>1438 (GVA Grimley).</b> Support the content of this</p>	<p>We note and welcome this</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	SG in particular the network of shopping centres and that the city centre is the preferred location for retail and other city centre uses.	comment.	
7.2 Bats and Development Guidance 2010	No representations received.	N/A	No other amendments.
7.3 Buffer Strips	We welcome the inclusion of the Supplementary Guidance on buffer strips in the Local Development Plan and consider that the finalised document of is a high standard and represents very good practice. We are pleased to note the comments we made on the draft document have been incorporated into the finalised version.	We note and welcome this comment.	No other amendments.
7.4 Drainage Impact Assessments	<p><b>141 (Scottish Water).</b> This document has been written pre-Scottish Water so all mention of NoSWA should be removed. The NoSWA document referred to for obtaining information on connecting to the public sewer should be replaced with the Scottish Water "Guide to Obtaining New Water and Waste Water Services", which can be found at <a href="http://www.scottishwater.co.uk">www.scottishwater.co.uk</a>.</p> <p>A Cordon Sanitaire is no longer part of planning policy; however it is recommended that a "buffer zone" specific to a particular works, which takes into account the impact of the odour, noise and vibrations of the Waste Water Asset, be</p>	We accept that this Supplementary Guidance needs updating. However, the procedures for doing this will differ from the other SG's which relate to the Aberdeen Local Development Plan because it was prepared by the Flood Advisory Group. This involved Aberdeen City and Aberdeenshire Councils,	No other amendments.

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p>established. It is therefore recommended that both Scottish Water and the local authority environmental health department be consulted on any proposed odour-sensitive development within this buffer zone.</p> <p>Scottish Water supports the principles of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) and encourages the incorporation of such schemes. Scottish Water would also ask developers to refer to Sewers for Scotland 2 when devising any drainage proposals should the developer wish to have their Surface Water system considered for adoption. The SUDS manual (2007) should also be referred to. Should an updated version of this document be produced, Scottish Water would welcome the opportunity to be involved in its content.</p>	<p>Scottish Water and SEPA. We feel that the document should not be amended unilaterally but should be updated by the same body. This will ensure a consistent approach over both council areas. We will investigate how to go about this as we understand that the Flood Advisory Group has not met for some time. In the meantime we will continue to use the guidance as much of it remains valid and useful for development management purposes.</p>	
	<p><b>408 (Scottish Environmental Protection Agency).</b> We welcome the inclusion of Supplementary Guidance on Drainage Impact Assessments (DIAs). The DIA Guidance was developed by SEPA, Aberdeen City and Aberdeenshire Councils in 2002 and at the time was widely recognised as good practice in terms of</p>	<p>We accept that this Supplementary Guidance needs updating. However, the procedures for doing this will differ from the other SG's which relate to the Aberdeen Local</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p>the implementation and delivery of SUDS through development management. While the broad principles of the document are still very much supported by us, the document itself is now quite outdated.</p> <p>Specifically the guidance does not take into account the recent changes to planning legislation, associated regulations, updates to Planning Policy and Guidance and changes to environmental and infrastructure legislation and regulations. Ideally the Supplementary Guidance should be revised to take account of such changes. However alternatively we recommend that the accuracy and relevance of the document could be improved by including an addendum which directs the reader to the following:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-National Planning Policy Guidance NPPG 7 and NPPG 14 have been superseded by Scottish Planning Policy. The SPP states, 'local development plans should incorporate the legal requirement for SUDS, promote a coordinated approach to SUDS between new developments and set out expectations in relation to the long term maintenance of SUDS' (Paragraph 209).</li> <li>-The Control of Pollution Act 1974 (as amended) has been replaced by The Water Environment</li> </ul>	<p>Development Plan because it was prepared by the Flood Advisory Group. This involved Aberdeen City and Aberdeenshire Councils, Scottish Water and SEPA. We feel that the document should not be amended unilaterally but should be updated by the same body. This will ensure a consistent approach over both council areas. We will investigate how to go about this as we understand that the Flood Advisory Group has not met for some time. In the meantime we will continue to use the guidance as much of it remains valid and useful for development management purposes.</p>	



EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p>(Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2005 (as amended) (CAR). (CAR includes a requirement that the discharge must minimise the risk of pollution of the water environment. It also makes SUDS a legal requirement for new development, with the exception of runoff from a single dwelling and direct discharges to coastal waters. Whilst the Regulations make SUDS a requirement, the location, design and type of SUDS are largely controlled through planning.)</p> <p>-Standards for adoption of SUDS by Scottish Water are set out in the Sewers for Scotland Manual Second Edition (2007).</p> <p>-Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems: Design Manual for Scotland and Northern Ireland (CIRIA C521) has been replaced by The SUDS Manual (CIRIA C 697).</p> <p>-SUDS for Roads Manual (SCOTS 2010).</p>		
7.5 Trees and Woodlands	No representations received.	N/A	No other amendments made.

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
8.2 Waste Management	<p><b>1288 (SITA UK).</b> We support the provision of this document but would suggest the principles within it need to be integrated further into the Development Plan document and into Supplementary Guidance document 2010/3.2: The Aberdeen Masterplanning Process. Waste and recycling facilities need to be considered at the design stage of all developments if Scotland's Zero Waste Plan is to be successful. We have two comments on the text of this document. Firstly on page 2, houses with gardens are referred to as having two wheeled bins - presumably this should be three? The text goes on to say the recyclables bin would be taken to the Materials Recycling Facility in Altens - this should be taken out as currently it goes to the Sclattie Quarry site and we are not aware of an existing facility in Altens.</p> <p>Integrate consideration of waste management and recycling issues further into the Development Plan document and into Supplementary Guidance document 2010/3.2: The Aberdeen Masterplanning Process. On page 2, list houses with gardens as having 3no. wheeled bins and remove reference to where the dry recyclables will go.</p>	<p>In respect of the comment on the number of wheeled bins required for houses with gardens, we can confirm that it should be 3. The first sentence under the section 'Houses with Gardens' (which refers to 2 bins) should be amended to refer to 3 bins to put right a drafting error. It is correct that there is not an existing Materials Recycling Facility in Altens. However a site for one has been identified at OP70 in the Proposed Local Development Plan. We will amend the text to clarify our position. Under the sections 'Houses with gardens' and 'Houses without gardens', replace reference to the Materials Recycling Facility in Altens with the</p>	<p>No other amendments made.</p>

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
		<p>following;                      “This is currently taken to Sclattie Quarry for transfer. However, in future it will be taken to a new Material Recycling Facility in Altens to be separated for recycling. We would agree that waste management needs to be considered at the Masterplan stage. However, the Waste Management Supplementary Guidance carries equal weight to, and needs to be considered alongside the Aberdeen Masterplanning Process. There is not need to repeat these requirements in the latter Supplementary Guidance.</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p><b>408 (Scottish Environmental Protection Agency).</b> SEPA strongly supports the preparation of clear Supplementary Planning guidance relating to managing waste in new developments, which will help new development support the achievement of the Zero Waste Plan objectives and the target of achieving 70% recycling by 2025.</p> <p>We welcome the approach to provide guidance but request clarification if the guidance is to apply to all new developments, including residential and commercial, industrial and retail developments. The Supplementary Guidance states that Policy R6 states that all new development will be required to incorporate adequate provision for waste disposal and recycling facilities.</p> <p>We request this be amended to read (SEPA’s emboldenment) “all new development will be required to incorporate adequate provision for waste management and recycling facilities”; as the term disposal has a very specific definition under the terms of the European Waste Framework Directive and would in fact include landfill and burning operations, which is clearly not what you intend in that part of the Supplementary Guidance. (Please find attached link to Annex IIA of the Directive which lists all disposal operations <a href="http://www.wastexchange.co.uk/documenti/europea_norm/wfd_dr__859830.pdf">http://www.wastexchange.co.uk/documenti/europea_norm/wfd_dr__859830.pdf</a>)</p> <p>We support the guidance given to incorporating sustainable management of waste into the design of new developments – in particular guidance relating to where bins and recycling receptacles should be incorporated into the overall design of the</p>	<p>SEPA’s comments on clarifying the wording of Policy R6 Waste Management Requirements for New Development are reasonable. This is dealt with under Issue 130 of the Local Development Plan Examination. Here we indicated that the Reporters may wish to consider the merits of SEPA’s suggested amendment to Policy R6. In respect of the comment on the number of wheeled bins required for houses with gardens, we can confirm that it should be 3. See above amendment made in response to SITA’s representation. We would agree that Site Waste Management Plans can be a useful tool in reducing waste generated by new development. However, we are reluctant to impose the requirement for them on all developments - rather they should be used for</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p><b>67 (Diarmid MacAlister Hall).</b> Improved environmental performance is essential to reduce the volumes going to landfill - fully agree! Recycling is therefore important as is identifying an appropriate site for this quasi-industrial activity. In addition the location has to be able to accept a considerable increase in traffic volumes. The Grove nursery area is a poor choice for a recycling centre situated as it is adjacent to Hazlehead Park and urban development. A Recycling Centre is best located in an industrial Estate type of area where there will be minimal disturbance to local people and residents.</p>	<p>Alternative sites to Grove Nursery were examined in the site selection process. Employment land would make a good location but there is a lack of available sites to the west of Aberdeen. The lack of sites located in employment land has to be balanced against the need to provide a network of conveniently located facilities which will encourage their use and increase recycling. The issue of locating a recycling facility at Grove Nursery was dealt with under Issue 34 of the Local Development Plan Examination.</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
<b>Existing Masterplans/Planning Briefs not for adoption as Interim Planning Guidance</b>			
9.1 Balgownie Centre	No representations received.	N/A	No other amendments at this stage. Following the publication of the Reporters' Report into the Examination of the Local Development Plan we will review this document and update in accordance with the Reporters' recommendations.
9.2 Bon Accord Quarter Masterplan	<b>1438 (GVA Grimley).</b> Welcome and support the inclusion of the Masterplan as Supplementary Guidance.	Comment noted and welcomed.	No other amendments at this stage. Following the publication of the Reporters' Report into the

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
			Examination of the Local Development Plan we will review this document and update in accordance with the Reporters recommendations.
9.3 Broadford Works	No representations received.	N/A	No other amendments at this stage. Following the publication of the Reporters' Report into the Examination of the Local Development Plan we will review this document and update in accordance with the Reporters recommendations.
9.4 Cattofield	No representations received.	N/A	No other

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
Depot			amendments at this stage. Following the publication of the Reporters' Report into the Examination of the Local Development Plan we will review this document and update in accordance with the Reporters recommendations..
9.5 Greenferns Masterplan	<b>408 (Scottish Environmental Protection Agency).</b> The Bucks Burn runs along northern boundary of OP45 and is at moderate status because of alterations to beds and banks and diffuse pollution. It is noted that SG 9.5 Masterplan for Greenferns makes no clear reference to water features. It is requested that the Masterplan be amended to take account of the existing water features within the site and the pressures which apply to these features, and to direct developers to look for opportunities to protect and improve the	The existing Greenferns Masterplan which was approved by Aberdeen City Council in January 2010 covers only site OP39 Greenferns (residential opportunity to provide 120 homes). Site OP45 Greenferns which SEPA refer to in their representation is covered	No other amendments at this stage. Following the publication of the Reporters' Report into the Examination of the Local Development Plan we will review this



EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	waterbodies.	by the Greenferns Development Framework, which was also approved by Aberdeen City Council in January 2010. The Development Framework sets out a baseline or 2-dimensional spatial framework, for the way in which OP39 and OP45 should be developed. The Development Framework makes specific reference to the Bucks Burn as an existing feature that should be retained (page 53) and states that "Throughout the process of developing a framework for Greenferns it has been the aim to provide the highest quality place to live, supported by the highest environmental aspirations. In the context of this, one of the main	document and update in accordance with the Reporters recommendations.

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
		<p>elements has been to enhance and protect the Bucks Burn corridor, utilising its potential as an environmental route, supporting enhanced ecological and habitat activity, while bringing it literally to the doorstep of the inhabitants of Greenferns" (page 80). Any future Masterplan that is developed for OP45 Greenferns will comply with this Development Framework and will take account of existing water features.</p>	
<p>9.6 Cove Charrette</p>	<p><b>714 (Wim Gouweleeuw).</b> Object to any development of housing in the Loirston Green area next to earnshugh road. If anything site should be used for recreation.</p>	<p>The Charette covers two distinctive areas in Cove, one close to Loirston Loch and the other close to the railway line. There is a conceptual drawing on page 7 of the document highlighting how a</p>	<p>No other amendments at this stage. Following the publication of the Reporters' Report into the Examination of the</p>

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
		<p>proposed link may be achieved between these areas and the existing developed area which uses Loirston Green. Loirston Green is not an area for development within the Charette document and is zoned as urban green space and green space network within the Aberdeen Local Development Plan.</p>	<p>Local Development Plan we will review this document and update in accordance with the Reporters recommendations.</p>
	<p><b>458 (Graham John Mackie).</b> I am sad to see the plans for the vast number of houses which are to be built directly across from my house. This will obliterate the beautiful views from my windows, block daylight, increase noise traffic and pollution. I would be willing to support the masterplan if the following concerns were upheld: dykes, hedgerows, trees retained. Reasonable open space between roads and first row of hedges. For privacy new houses built end on to road and when developers are given the go ahead there will be no last minute changes to the masterplan.</p>	<p>The Charette Process and the ethos of the modern planning system propose to increase the design quality of new developments. Page 32 of the Charette document states 'natural features are protected and celebrated, where possible, by crafting unique spaces around them. The consumption dyke is one example of</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
		<p>this'. Other features of the area which add to the character are likely to be retained and enhanced. Open space requirements are also stated in policy within the local development plan. Issues regarding loss of day light, traffic noise and pollution would be examined in a planning application however as the objective is to create sustainable communities it is expected that the increase in traffic movement and therefore pollution would not increase significantly. A planning application still has to be submitted for development even if there is a masterplan for the site. It is expected that the planning application would have regard to the</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
		masterplan but it is still possible that minor difference could occur between the masterplan and planning application.	
	<p><b>408 (Scottish Environmental Protection Agency).</b> This area is in proximity to Loriston Loch and the East Tullos Burn (although both are outwith the boundary of the Charrette). The East Tullos Burn is in a very poor condition due to pressures from heavy modifications, diffuse and point source pollution. The Charrette provides little context in terms of the water environment within the boundary of the sites and in the surrounding area. It is requested that the Charette document be amended to take account of the existing water features within and around the site and the pressures which apply to these features, and to direct developers to look for opportunities to protect and improve the waterbodies.</p> <p>Part of the area covered by the Cove Charrette lies in close proximity to a licensed landfill site which is known to be actively producing gas, although the document highlights that a waste management licence is still in place, we request that the implications of this be clarified. We recommend that</p>	<p>The comments raised would be more suitably addressed through the development management process. The Cove Charette discussed two areas within Cove. Part A sits close to Loiston Loch and Part B close to the railway line. At present part A is subject to three planning applications which cover the site. SEPA have been consulted on these planning applications and have outlined in their response a number of conditions that would be required to satisfy issues concerning water bodies</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p>the Charrette document be amended to clarify that a Waste Management Licence is still in place over part of the site and any development must be preceded by suitable remediation and gas risk assessments.</p>	<p>and the proximity to the landfill site.</p>	
<p>9.7 Dyce Drive Planning Brief</p>	<p><b>408 (Scottish Environment Protection Agency).</b> See also Table 5.4 in comments on Proposed Plan. The Green Burn flows through the site and other minor watercourses within the site have been modified. While the Supplementary Guidance broadly highlights the need to protect watercourses from pollution during construction, we request that it be expanded to take account of the existing water features within and around the site and the pressures which apply to these features, and to direct developers to look for opportunities to protect and improve the water environment.</p>	<p>We agree that the Dyce Drive Planning Brief could be strengthened by adding in a reference to the importance of water features within and around the site, the pressures which apply to these features and by directing developers to look for opportunities to protect and improve the water environment. The most</p>	<p>No other amendments at this stage. Following the publication of the Reporters' Report into the Examination of the Local Development Plan we will review this document and update in</p>

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
		<p>appropriate time to make this amendment would be following the publication of the Reporters' Report into the Examination of the Local Development Plan. At this stage we will review this document and update in accordance with the Reporters recommendations and add in the reference suggested by SEPA.</p>	<p>accordance with the Reporters recommendations</p>
<p>9.8 Fire Station North Anderson Drive</p>	<p><b>543 (Mastrick, Sheddocksley and Summerhill Community Council).</b> We recognise the recent construction of a new Fire Station on this site but have concerns regarding the future of the rest of this site, should Grampian Fire &amp; Rescue Service decide to relocate its headquarters at any future date. We would welcome a review of this Planning Brief. The existence of a new Fire Station on site was not envisaged when the original brief was drawn up and the suitability of housing co-located on this site would need to be carefully considered in light of this. In addition, the proposed site layout would</p>	<p>Should the Fire Service decide to do something different with the site then we would agree that the Brief may need to be revisited. However, we are not aware of any plans the Fire Service have for this site since their decision to remain there. To amend the Brief we would need to know for instance, if the Fire Service wished to</p>	<p>No other amendments at this stage. Following the publication of the Reporters' Report into the Examination of the Local Development Plan we will review this document and update in</p>

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
	<p>require to be updated with regard to proximity of buildings and changed access arrangements.</p> <p>We would welcome having appropriate input into the process on behalf of the wider community and in addition to those who live in close proximity to the site.</p>	<p>remain on part of the site or not. In the absence of any particular development pressure we would not wish to revisit the Brief at this time. If however, the Brief is revisited in future then consultation with the wider community would be required.</p>	<p>accordance with the Reporters recommendations.</p>
9.9 Forresterhill	No representations received.	N/A	<p>No other amendments at this stage. Following the publication of the Reporters' Report into the Examination of the Local Development Plan we will review this document and update in accordance with the Reporters</p>



EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
			recommendations.
9.10 Greenferns Development Framework	No representations received.	N/A	No other amendments at this stage. Following the publication of the Reporters' Report into the Examination of the Local Development Plan we will review this document and update in accordance with the Reporters recommendations.
9.11 Hillhead Campus	No representations received.	N/A	No other amendments at this stage. Following the publication of the Reporters' Report into the Examination of the Local

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
			Development Plan we will review this document and update in accordance with the Reporters recommendations.
9.12 Kingswells Development Framework	<p><b>408 (Scottish Environmental Protection Agency).</b> The Den Burn, which is in close proximity to the site, is at poor ecological potential site due to sewage pollution and watercourse modifications. Kingswells developments may also impact on Bucks Burn which are at moderate ecological status because of culverting and diffuse pollution. While the Supplementary Guidance does highlight the need for development proposals to not cause detriment to water quality or ecology in general terms, we request that it be expanded to take account of the existing water features within and around the site and the pressures which apply to these features, and to direct developers to look for opportunities to protect and improve the water environment.</p>	<p>We agree that the Kingswells Development Framework could be strengthened by expanding the current reference to water quality to include reference to the importance of water features within and around the site, the pressures which apply to these features and by directing developers to look for opportunities to protect and improve the water environment. The most appropriate time to make this amendment would be following the publication of</p>	<p>No other amendments at this stage. Following the publication of the Reporters' Report into the Examination of the Local Development Plan we will review this document and update in accordance with the Reporters recommendations.</p>

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
		<p>the Reporters' Report into the Examination of the Local Development Plan. At this stage we will review this document and update in accordance with the Reporters recommendations and add in the reference suggested by SEPA.</p>	
<p>9.13 Mugiemoos Mills</p>	<p><b>408 (Scottish Environmental Protection Agency).</b> The Bucks Burn is at moderate ecological status because of changes to beds and banks (culverting) and diffuse pollution. The site also lies close to the River Don (Dyce to tidal limit) which is at moderate ecological status because of alterations to beds and banks (mill structures), diffuse pollution and sewage pollution. While the Supplementary Guidance does state that the Bucks Burn shall be opened up and enhanced through planting (paragraph 65) which we support, we request that this be expanded to take account of the existing water features within and around the site and the pressures which apply to these features, and to direct developers to look for opportunities to protect and improve the water environment.</p>	<p>This Planning Brief has been superseded by the Former Davidson's Mill Development Framework which was adopted as Supplementary Guidance to the Aberdeen Local Plan 2008 and Interim Supplementary Guidance to the Aberdeen Local Development Plan (pending adoption) on 24th May 2011. The Former Davidson's Mill Development Framework does take account of</p>	<p>No other amendments as this document has been superseded.</p>

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
		<p>existing water features within and around the site and states that "The Bucks Burn is an important landscape feature which should be used as a positive asset within the Development Framework, helping create character, enhance ecological value, assist in sustainable site drainage and provide a recreational resource" (page 18).</p>	
<p>9.14 Murcar</p>	<p><b>1572 (Paul &amp; Williamsons).</b> The SG does not take into account any other allocated sites in the area. The SG should contain a requirement for the preparation of a joint Development Framework in conjunction with OP25 and Site Ref 2/02 Mundurno should be included. SG should be the most up to date guidance and reflect the allocations in the LDP in due course. A development framework would help deliver better phased development. The SG should be updated to incorporate and reflect the other allocations in the Plan.</p>	<p>A substantial amount of work has already been undertaken on the design of the new future residential development at Dubford (OP25) and the Development Framework for the existing land allocation at Murcar was completed in 2008. Therefore to prepare a joint Development</p>	<p>No other amendments at this stage. Following the publication of the Reporters' Report into the Examination of the Local Development Plan we will review this document and</p>

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
		<p>Framework for the housing allocation at Dubford and the employment land to the east of the A90 would disregard the work already undertaken and completed on the separate Development Frameworks and would be counter productive. It is recognised that the SG for Murcar could be updated to incorporate the additional employment land allocation in the Proposed Plan, however the original SG was developed by an external source who at this current time have not been instructed to do any further planning work at Berryhill. This may change in the future should the land be</p>	<p>update in accordance with the Reporters recommendations.</p>

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
		acquired by the same developer as the current area covered by the Development Framework. It is recognised that it will be necessary to link the land already zoned at Berryhill in the current adopted Local Plan with the additional development land identified at Murcar.	
9.15 Oakbank	No representations received.	N/A	No other amendments at this stage. Following the publication of the Reporters' Report into the Examination of the Local Development Plan we will review this document and update in accordance with

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
			the Reporters recommendations.
9.16 Pinewood Hazledene	<b>383 (GVA Grimley Ltd on behalf of Dobbies Garden Centres plc).</b> This SG should continue to recognise all available opportunities to link the two areas (Hazledene/ Pinewood and Former Dobbies Garden Centre) for pedestrians and cyclists. This would be advantageous to the future development of both areas.	Given that the sites at Pinewood and Hazledene both now have planning permission, we do not intend to revisit the existing planning brief. Therefore the linkages mentioned in the brief remain unchanged.	No other amendments at this stage. Following the publication of the Reporters' Report into the Examination of the Local Development Plan we will review this document and update in accordance with the Reporters recommendations.
9.18 The Robert Gordon University Garthdee Masterplan	No representations received.	N/A	No other amendments at this stage. Following the publication of the Reporters' Report into the Examination of the

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 1

Supplementary Guidance	Representation Received	Officer Response	Other minor amendments made not as a result of representations
			Local Development Plan we will review this document and update in accordance with the Reporters recommendations.
9.19 Urquhart Road	No representations received.	N/A	No other amendments at this stage. Following the publication of the Reporters' Report into the Examination of the Local Development Plan we will review this document and update in accordance with the Reporters recommendations.