

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 2

Respondent	Summary of comment	Response to comment	Action/Changes made
<p>Scottish Natural Heritage</p>	<p>General: Guidance is welcomed. It would be useful to use one or two of the masterplans currently under development to test the SPG.</p> <p>Introduction: Explain the difference between open and green spaces and the greenspace network.</p> <p>The implication of the first sentence in section 5 is that green spaces are more rural and open spaces are more urban which is misleading.</p> <p>Legislative and Policy Context: Note that under the Wildlife and Natural Environment (Scotland) Act 2011 all public bodies have a duty to report every 3 years on their compliance with their biodiversity duty.</p> <p>Open Space in Aberdeen: There should be a link to the open space audit so that developers can easily check its findings for the area they are considering.</p> <p>Pleased audit concluded that community demand for open space quantity could be addressed by the city's open space taking form of natural green space or green corridors, rather than highly formalised amenity space. This would also increase the benefits to local biodiversity in the area. Guidance on how this could be achieved by developers could be provided in this SPG.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges that improving the quality of existing open spaces may be of more benefit than purely provision of new open space. How does the Council propose to ensure these existing areas are improved as it will not be viable in all cases through diversion of funds from newer developments? What other mechanisms will the Council use to deal with these areas? Is there scope here for encouraging communities to take on this themselves?</p> <p>Green Space Network: 5.1 there should be a link to the green space network in the local plan.</p>	<p>Noted. Guidance has been tested with current applications.</p> <p>Reference to green spaces can be removed to reduce confusion.</p> <p>Agreed, see action.</p> <p>Noted. The biodiversity duty is highlighted in the SG and it is not necessary to add reference to reporting requirements on this.</p> <p>Links are provided in Section 13.</p> <p>SG on Natural Heritage is currently being developed, which will include information on how to support biodiversity in relation to development.</p> <p>The draft Open Space Strategy deals with this.</p> <p>Accepted.</p>	<p>Change first sentence of Introduction to "Access to good quality open spaces..."</p> <p>Change first sentence of Section 5 to "Connecting our urban and rural green spaces..."</p> <p>Hyperlink could be added to digital versions of SG.</p> <p>Add reference to Natural Heritage SG.</p> <p>Change first sentence of Section 5.1 to "Aberdeen's Green Space Network is identified in the Local</p>

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 2

	<p>5.1 – the bullet point for ‘cores’ mentions the need to protect and enhance this type of green space but there is no such reference for ‘links’ and ‘stepping stones’. This could be interpreted as meaning that these two latter types do not need to be protected and enhanced and we suggest that this section is amended to make it clear that all types of green space should be protected and enhanced.</p> <p>It should be made clear here or in Section 6, the role of development in strategic planning and delivery of properly functioning green space to ensure that connectivity and enhancements can be delivered.</p> <p>Open Space in New Developments: Useful to make it clearer that developers should consider how to contribute to connectivity of green space network and role of sustainable transport e.g multi-use links. SPG should explain that open space should be multi-functional where appropriate.</p> <p>6.1 Third sentence, suggest improving accessibility to open space or new play facilities or a contribution to maintenance could also be considered as alternative means for developers to contribute to open space provision.</p> <p>6.2 explain how minimum figure of 2.8 hectares of open space was derived.</p> <p>Figure 5 Indicative Quantity column – clarify that the figure of 100 refers to population, as other column refers to 1000 properties.</p> <p>6.3 Can be a conflict where brownfield is located in wards with least open space. If a brownfield site is in an area with a lack of open spaces, how will the council apply this to ensure that the most is made of opportunities to increase the open space provision? SPP states advice on this.</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>This and following point accepted.</p> <p>This is covered by the term ‘off-site contribution’ and expanded further in Section 12.3.</p> <p>The 2.8 hectare figure was carried over from the previous Open Space SG. Officers do not feel that an explanation of where this figure came from adds value to the document.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>It is accepted that this section should more clearly link with the standards outlined elsewhere in the SG.</p>	<p>Development Plan (Policy NE1) to protect, promote and enhance designated...”</p> <p>Remove second part of bullet point so it reads “Cores – large or key areas of existing green space.”</p> <p>In response to this and the following point, add paragraph between paras. 1 and 2 of Section 6: “Open space in new development should be strategically planned and contribute to enhancing the connectivity of the Green Space Network where possible.”</p> <p>Add “population” to each Indicative Quantity description.</p> <p>Alter third sentence of 6.3 to “Therefore where developers can satisfy the Council that there are exceptional</p>
--	---	--	--

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 2

	<p>6.4 Not clear why no minimum standards for non-residential development etc. Such areas can make a very important contribution.</p> <p>7 Suggest inclusion of the SUDS concept into the planning and design stage. PAN61 recommends. Objective 8 of Aberdeen Draft Open Space (Action to encourage SUDS) should be translated into SG on Open Space.</p> <p>12.3 2nd paragraph. Not clear what meant by ‘planning agreements will not be used to resolve...’</p> <p>Appendix D support checklist but who is it for and how should it be used. Could potentially be modified so applicants need to complete it and send it in with their planning application.</p>	<p>There were previously no minimum standards for non-residential development. This was not a major issue identified by the Open Space Audit. Standard requirements for open space in non-residential development is likely to raise issues over development viability.</p> <p>Accepted.</p> <p>This point is taken from the Government’s Planning Circular, ensuring developer contributions relate in scale and kind to the development.</p> <p>Need for reference to the appendix within the SG is accepted.</p>	<p>development costs associated with a site it may not always be appropriate to apply the same minimum standards for open space as those that apply to greenfield sites.” After the last sentence add “and Figures 2 and 7 will help to establish this.”</p> <p>Add “Well designed Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) can be valued, functional elements of open space” to Section 7’s box on Open Space Strategy.</p> <p>Add “See appendix D for a checklist of key design considerations” to the end of Section 7.</p>
<p>Play Forum</p>	<p>Very positive about the document's ethos and feel that it is a great step forward for play and community space in the City.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 2

	<p>Comments included in pages 17 and 18 of the supplementary guidance seem very positive and well researched.</p>		
<p>Aberdeen Greenspace Open Space SG</p>	<p>General Comments: Open Space SG are welcome as a positive step to improving open space provision in Aberdeen.</p> <p>Is 'greenspace' one or two words - think it should be one word.</p> <p>Specific Comments: Why is Open Space Important? Could be changed to Why Open Space is Important. A statement not a question!</p> <p>Second paragraph line 2 could substitute 'wellbeing' for 'health'</p> <p>Figure 1 Economic Growth – Prefer term visitors to tourists Producing Resources- could include growing spaces (allotments) producing food, fruit trees in greenspaces. Foraging in 'natural' areas brambles, fungi.</p> <p>Recreation and Leisure: 'low cost' recreation should be 'free' recreation.</p> <p>Legislative and Policy Context Give web link to Scottish Outdoor Access Code.</p> <p>SPP11 superceded by SPP, this should be reflected.</p> <p>Green Space Network First para, second last line should it be 'and' rather than 'or' 5.1 Rationale - Is there a dataset for the 3Rd Don Crossing?</p> <p>Page 8, 5.2. Line 5 'The rationale and opportunities...add 'for enhancement'...should be take...'</p> <p>Page 10 Second Para 'A minimum of 2.8 hectares of open space... Explain where this has come from.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Green Space Network and Urban Greenspace are used in the LDP. It would not be appropriate to alter these in the SG. Accepted.</p> <p>Accepted.</p> <p>Accepted. Last sentence refers to food growing facilities or opportunities. Accepted.</p> <p>Links are provided in Section 13.</p> <p>No reference to SPP11 found.</p> <p>Accepted. No – AWPR was included as it surrounds the city and therefore is a key consideration in planning the Green Space Network. Accepted.</p> <p>The 2.8 hectare figure was carried over from the previous Open Space SG. Officers do</p>	<p>Change title as requested.</p> <p>Change "health" to "wellbeing".</p> <p>Change "tourists" to "visitors"</p> <p>Change "low cost" to "free".</p> <p>Hyperlink could be added to digital versions of SG.</p> <p>Change "or" to "and".</p> <p>Add "for enhancement".</p>

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 2

	<p>Page 11 Figure 4 Local Open Space level of provision is 400 metres walking distance. Explain?</p> <p>7 Planning and Designing Open Space General Requirements: Box 11 Meadow has a specific meaning as a grassy field used for producing hay or for grazing domestic livestock. Use uncut or low maintenance grasslands?</p> <p>Last box Dog litter bins.. No mention of just litter bins?</p> <p>Page 15 - Paths and Access box 1: "Paths for recreation and active, sustainable travel should be provided..." add "<i>that are appropriate to the use, size and scale of the open space...</i>"</p> <p>Page 17 - Accessibility box "Developing Accessible Playspace: a Good Practice Guide and Inclusive Mobility" should be in bold</p> <p>Page 19 - 9.2 Quality Standards Box 'Enable contact with wildlife' change to 'Promote contact with nature.'</p> <p>Integrate boxes three and six to 'Include semi-natural habitats such as woodland, scrub, wetland and open water an native local species of wildlife such as birds, butterflies and wildflowers'</p> <p>Page 21 Maintenance and Management of Open Spaces Add 'The developer should produce a simple maintenance plan for the greenspace outlining the management regime required to ensure it is and</p>	<p>not feel that an explanation of where this figure adds value to the document.</p> <p>How the accessibility distance thresholds were established is explained in the Open Space Audit and briefly in section 4.</p> <p>Scientifically this may be correct, but the desire is for attractive, well-managed grass land.</p> <p>Litter bins add maintenance costs and non dog waste litter is more likely to be taken home.</p> <p>Accepted.</p> <p>Accepted.</p> <p>Accepted.</p> <p>Accepted.</p> <p>This is not appropriate as it will be dependent on the approach taken and is the subject of</p>	<p>Alter last sentence to "...more meadow or low maintenance (but managed) grassland areas..."</p> <p>Add box with "The location and expected type and level of use of paths should be taken into consideration in their design." Change format to bold.</p> <p>Alter wording to "Promote contact with nature".</p> <p>Integrate third and sixth boxes to "Include recognisable and where possible local, native species, and habitats such as wildflower meadow/grassland, woodland, scrub and open water."</p>
--	--	---	--

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 2

	<p>remains publicly usable greenspace’</p> <p>Appendix A As was noted by the Open Space Audit there is a lack of a large open space in the north of the city. Should the aspiration of designating and developing a large accessible open space in the north of the city be identified as an aspiration? East Woodcroft? Link back to Open Space Strategy?</p>	<p>planning conditions and agreements.</p> <p>This is covered to an extent by section 4, and the level and distribution of provision is to be considered as part of establishing the open space required by development.</p>	
<p>SEPA Open Space Supplementary Guidance</p>	<p>Welcome the draft Open Space Strategy and SG and on the whole consider the documents to be of a high standard and will provide a useful mechanism for the delivery of environmental improvements and benefits through open space.</p> <p>Welcome Figure 1; however feel that the supporting text could be further improved to highlight the opportunity provided by open space to provide informal flood storage areas.</p> <p>Request the opportunity for open spaces to contribute to environmental improvements to water quality; habitat; morphology and the restoration of riparian vegetation are also highlighted in Figure 1, which would contribute towards the achieving the Water Framework Directive objective of restoration of waterbodies to good ecological status. River Basin Management Planning (RBMP) is one of the main mechanisms identified for achieving the Directive objectives, and RBMP is a material planning consideration. The planning system has a key role in implementing these measures through the location and design of developments, new developments can also provide an opportunity to deal with historic impacts such as through the renaturalisation of watercourses or the removal of culverts, and such improvements can make a valuable contribution to open space in terms of amenity, flood management and habitat improvements.</p> <p>Would be happy to discuss producing more information such as on the location of alteration to river beds and banks with local authorities.</p> <p>Welcome the clear linkages with relevant LDP Policies.</p> <p>In Figure 5: Categories of Open Space With respect to Natural Greenspace and Green Corridors, under ‘description’ (column 2) ‘streambanks’ should be included after ‘riverbanks’.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Accepted. Reference to informal flood storage can be added to the sentence.</p> <p>Figure 1 is intended to provide a brief and concise overview of the key benefits of open space and Green Space Network (GSN). It is considered that the references to biodiversity, climate change mitigation and flooding cover these areas adequately. The GIS database that supports the GSN provides this more detailed information on specific measures and environmental improvements.</p> <p>Officers would be keen to make use of such information in further developing the GIS database.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Accepted.</p>	<p>“Well designed and well located green spaces <i>act as informal flood storage areas</i> and reduce pressure on drainage...”</p> <p>Add “streambanks” to the list of examples.</p>

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 2

	<p>Request that SG highlights opportunity for SUDS to provide multifunctional spaces which can contribute to a wider green network throughout the area whilst often contributing to a development's open space requirement through its aim to promote integration between the location and management of SUDS and the open space resource. This could perhaps be included in Figure 5 – Natural Greenspace and Green Corridors.</p> <p>Welcome reference in Section 7 – Planning and Designing Open Space to opportunity for existing features to be incorporated within open space. We highlight the potential for open space to make a valuable contribution to the delivery of Water Framework Directive objectives. The involvement of SEPA in an advisory capacity in Figure 6 is helpful.</p> <p>Section 10 – note that proposal that toilets are served by private drainage, we highlight that any detailed proposals would need to be considered in the context of SEPA's Policy and Supporting Statement on Provision of Wastewater Drainage in Settlements.</p> <p>We support the promotion of water efficiency measures.</p> <p>Would not encourage dedicated burning areas as a means of waste disposal where other waste facilities exist.</p> <p>Dedicated burning area may require registering of a Paragraph 30 exemption to Waste Management Licensing 1994 to be applied for at each location. We request you include the following link in Section 13 – Useful References with respect dedicated burning areas on allotments http://www.sepa.org.uk/waste/waste_regulation/application_forms/exempt_activities/paragraph_30.aspx in order to highlight the potential regulatory requirements.</p> <p>Welcome reference to design of parking and access on allotments being required to provide the best drainage solution. It would provide greater clarity to the user if it was clearly stated that this included the use of SUDS for disposal of surface water run off.</p>	<p>This reference is included in Appendix D – Checklist of Design Considerations.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Accepted.</p>	<p>Add reference to Appendix D to the end of Section 7.</p> <p>Remove reference to dedicated burning areas.</p> <p>Add “including SUDS where appropriate” to box titled Access.</p>
Nestrans	Welcome development of SG. Perhaps be relevant to specify rail stations as well as bus stops in table titled ‘Paths and Access’ on page 15 of guidance.	Noted.	Add “and rail stations”.
Adventure Aberdeen	Commends the work so far as fantastic. Canoes should be listed as a means of travel on green corridor routes.	Noted.	Add “watersports” to Figure 5 and to section 9.1.
Guss Glass	Credit to the authoring team.	Noted.	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 2

<p>Cults, Bielside and Milltimber Community Council.</p>	<p>Concerned by the exclusion of private gardens and farmland from the strategy and guidance. The matter of ownership is normally immaterial when studying 'land use', whether now or in the future so same principle should be followed for the open space strategy.</p> <p>There could be an additional open space type with a minimum size much larger than the largest of the open space types in the documents i.e. much larger than 5ha.</p> <p>The SG includes much detailed information and standards to guide the preparation of masterplans. However, it is incomplete as it excludes private gardens and farmland and the background of the numbers and ratios given is not disclosed. Would expect the rationale for the chosen numbers to be in the strategy document.</p>	<p>Farmland is not a form of open space, as defined by the Government's Planning Advice Note 65: Open Space. The SG is aimed more at public open space, hence the exclusion of private gardens. Ownership is not an issue in terms of the SG or Strategy, but public access is taken into consideration.</p> <p>There is no clear justification for this addition and it is not clear what would be gained.</p> <p>See above response regarding exclusion of farmland and private gardens. Ratios (taken to mean accessibility thresholds) are explained in the Open Space Audit section 3.1.</p>	
<p>Richard Bush RBCTP</p>	<p>The Supplementary Guidance cannot be given this status as it is not correct, justified or relevant. The Green Space Network cannot have been developed 'in parallel' with the Open Space Strategy and the Open Space Supplementary Guidance. The Green Space Network, as outlined in the Aberdeen Local Development Plan – Proposed Plan, was out for consultation until 17 January 2011. The Open Space Strategy and the Open Space Supplementary Guidance are out for consultation at present, therefore could not have informed the Green Space Network. The Open Space Strategy is required to feed into the Development Plan; due to the disparity between the dates of the Open Space Strategy, the Open Space Supplementary Guidance and the Aberdeen Local Development Plan – Proposed Plan this cannot be so.</p> <p>The Green Space Network in the Aberdeen Local Development Plan – Proposed Plan does not comply with Planning Advice Note 65 or with the scope of the Open Space Audit. The Aberdeen Local Development Plan – Proposed Plan includes farmland. PAN 65 and the Open Space Audit exclude farmland.</p>	<p>The Green Space Network, Open Space Strategy and Open Space SG have been developed in parallel. None of these have yet been adopted and although consultations on each may not have run concurrently due to limitations in resources and work programming, they do nevertheless relate to each other and support joint aims.</p> <p>Designation of a Green Space Network (GSN) as part of the LDP is not a requirement of planning policy although the aims of the GSN are supported by SPP and PAN65. The GSN</p>	

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 2

	<p>The 'other information' mentioned in paragraph 4 page 3 should be made explicit. The nature, source, relevance and influence of the 'other information' should be made the subject of further consultation so that this can be examined by stakeholder, including the general public.</p> <p>All references to – or suggestion of – an already existing (identified) Green Space Network should be deleted from the Draft Open Space Strategy and the Draft Open Space Supplementary Guidance. A new Green Space Network is required to be drawn up, which complies with Scottish Government Advice, and is truly derived from properly prepared and completed Open Space Strategy and Open Space Supplementary Guidance.</p> <p>The Green Space Network selected in the Aberdeen Local Development Plan – Proposed Plan should have been explained in the Aberdeen Local Development Plan – Proposed Plan and the Open Space Strategy and Open Space Supplementary Guidance cannot now be used to provide post facto justification.</p> <p>References to the materiality or otherwise of the Open Space Strategy and</p>	<p>offers opportunities for safeguarding and enhancing land to form part of a network of open space. This does not have to rely wholly on existing open space, as this would restrict any network of open space to existing managed public open spaces. Therefore there is no need for the GSN to consist purely of PAN65 defined open space-types. The Open Space Audit was required by planning policy, and is in line with PAN 65. As explained in the SG, it is one of several datasets used to develop the GSN.</p> <p>'Other information' refers to input from key partners such as SEPA, SNH and Aberdeen Greenspace, as well as a literature review of relevant strategies and plans. This is explained further in section 5 of the SG.</p> <p>See response above.</p> <p>Policy NE1 in the Proposed LDP does include an explanation of GSN but in line with the ethos of the modern planning system, greater detail is provided in SG.</p> <p>As per responses above, the</p>	
--	--	--	--

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 2

	<p>Open Space Supplementary Guidance in planning decisions should be strongly qualified or removed.</p> <p>There is limited cross referencing between the Open Space Strategy and the Open Space Supplementary Guidance. There is inappropriate overlap between the Open Space Strategy and the Open Space Supplementary Guidance on the subject of the value and importance of open space. The Open Space Strategy should set this out and the Open Space Supplementary Guidance should set out the standards, costs etc and how these are required to meet the strategy. There is a lack of focus and explicit purpose.</p> <p>The Open Space Supplementary Guidance is too long.</p> <p>The documents do not assess the future open space needs of the city rather than in the most general terms, therefore there is no clear justification for costs set out in Appendix 4 and 5 or Appendix C of the Open Space Supplementary Guidance.</p> <p>The reference in Figure 5 to the size and number of allotment plots being determined (partly) by the number of people within the allotment catchment area is inappropriate. Planning agreements should be related to the scale and kind of development involved.</p> <p>The maps in Appendix A are too small to be useful. An explanation of each map explaining its purpose would be helpful. The maps do not go into detail about the quality or availability of the subject of the maps, nor do they relate quality or quantity to demand.</p>	<p>materiality of the Open Space Strategy and SG is justified.</p> <p>The relevance of the Open Space Strategy is highlighted in the introduction of the SG, which then goes on to outline standards, costs etc. It is unclear where additional cross-referencing is necessary or how this would add value to the SG when there is a desire to be concise.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Between the Open Space Audit, Strategy and SG, current and future open space needs are considered. The costs set out in Appendix C were developed based on average current costs for existing open spaces.</p> <p>Figure 7 explains the process for identifying necessary provision, appropriate in scale and kind to the development. Figure 7 could be made more prominent in the document.</p> <p>Noted. The maps are due to become available as part of the Council's corporate web-based GIS to be launched this summer. It would not be appropriate to</p>	<p>Make reference to the use of Figure 7 in establishing required provision. Before 6.1 add "Figure 7 in Section 12 Applying the Policies explains the process for identifying necessary provision. This should be used as a step by step guide for identifying open space requirements."</p> <p>Provide hyperlink/reference to the Council's web-based GIS mapping.</p>
--	--	--	--

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 2

	<p>The Open Space Supplementary Guidance should be reworked, represented with a clear purpose and in a more concise form. Open space standards and developer contributions should be clearly justified.</p> <p>All reference to the existing Green Space Network should be deleted. A new Green Space Network should be derived from the final Open Space Strategy for inclusion in the next Local Development Plan.</p>	<p>map demand as this needs to take into consideration the nature and scale of development. General demand is identified in the Open Space Audit, and has for example led to the inclusion of requirements for more natural greenspace and green corridors.</p> <p>Officers consider the SG strikes the right balance of providing cross-references to the Strategy and other supporting information and justification with being as concise as possible.</p> <p>Officers do not agree that this is appropriate or necessary, see responses above.</p>	
<p>Stewart Milne</p>	<p>Stewart Milne welcomes the direction of the guidance with the focus being on the quality of open space provision rather than the quantity of open space. However whilst this is the aim of the draft Supplementary Guidance it would appear to contradict itself throughout by focusing on quantitative issues. This should be rectified prior to approval of the document as Supplementary Guidance.</p> <p>Pg 4 Section 2: Why is Open Space Important? Caution the reference to “Land & Property Values” in Figure 1. Reference to “views of natural landscapes” adding “up to 18% to property values” has not been substantiated. Believe the reference should be removed as the public may perceive “views” as being a material factor in the determination of planning applications.</p> <p>Section 6: Open Space in New Developments Firmly of the view that this section of the draft Supplementary Guidance needs to be clearer. At page 10, it is stated that there is a requirement for 2.8 ha of open space per 1000 people for residential developments. This is followed up by Figure 4 which identifies the hierarchy of open spaces but</p>	<p>The quantity of open space is referred to in the LDP Policy NE4, however a change to the wording has been suggested to the Reporter. See response to respondents comments under Section 6.</p> <p>Noted. This statistic was taken from research conducted in the USA.</p> <p>Noted. Officers agree that the relationship between the quantitative, qualitative and accessibility standards could be</p>	<p>Amend Land and Property Values box in Figure 1 to “Quality greenspace can increase property values”</p> <p>In Figure 7, top box, add “See Figure 2”, to the start of the second box (left) add “Locate the development site</p>

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 2

there does not seem to be any correlation between the requirement set and the hierarchy. We question whether when it is the quality of open space that is required rather than the quantity whether such a “standard” should be identified.

clarified. This can be aided by amending Figure 7. Also, a change to Policy NE4 is suggested in the Schedule 4 response to Reporters. This change to the Policy wording could be repeated in the SG in the interest of consistency. In clarifying the correlation between quality and quantity, it became apparent that the Green Flag award has been updated and the ‘good’ standard is no longer available online. Therefore a comparable standard based on our local criteria, as set by the Open Space Audit should be referred to in Figures 4 and 5.

on each of the Open Space Audit provision maps (Appendix A)” and remove reference to appendix at end of sentence. In the third level box, answer ‘no’ alter text to read “Does the amount of additional open space required (relative, in scale and kind to the development), meet the indicative quantity and site size standards contained in Figures 4 and 5”
In Figure 4 add “and achieving a score of at least 20 out of 25 in the Open Space Audit’s quality assessment” and in Figure 5 add “and Open Space Audit quality criteria” to each of the Quality Criteria boxes. Add Shedule 4 suggested change to Policy NE4 in the LDP to section 6.2 “The Council will require the provision of at least 2.8 hectares per 1000 people of meaningful and useful public open space in residential development. Where the Open Space Audit demonstrates that the minimum quantity and accessibility standards outlined in the Supplementary Guidance on Open Space are being met by existing provision, then raising the quality of that provision may be required

Figure 6: Flowchart guiding process for planning and designing open space

We query whether the flowchart meets the thrust of the Supplementary Guidance. The provision of open space will be inherent to good design and therefore should be no need to “agree necessary provision” of open space. The flow chart as it is currently written focuses on the quantity rather than quality of green spaces.

Section 11: Maintenance and Management of Open Spaces

Object strongly to the “preferred approach to management and maintenance” being for “the Council to adopt public open space”. This is not acceptable. There should be no hierarchy in place for options for the management and maintenance of open space. The cost of transferring land to the Council is prohibitive and householders do not have any level of control over the level of maintenance provided. Preference is for the maintenance of land to be

The ethos of the SG is to consider quality and accessibility as well as quantity, not instead of. It is acknowledged that this could be clarified, and such clarifications are proposed in response to other representations above, but it is felt that the flowchart is important in helping to ensure any open space requirements are relevant in scale and kind to the development, while taking into account the Open Space Audit.

As the respondee is aware, a review and separate consultation was undertaken into the various options and arrangements for open space maintenance. This identified

instead of, or as well as new provision.” Remove first sentence of third para of 6.2. After the first sentence of para 2 in 6.2 add “The public should have appropriate access to quality local, neighbourhood and major open space sites. These sites could consist of any of the open space types explained in Figure 5”. At the end of 6.2.1 add “This will take into account the level and quality of provision in the surrounding area, by taking into consideration the Open Space Audit provision maps and using Figure 7.”

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 2

	<p>transferred to a factoring company where the level of service can be controlled by the residents. Other local authorities, despite it being identified in their policies and s75 agreements as the preferred type of maintenance and management, are now reneging in the context of budget cuts. This provides uncertainty for everyone, not to mention significant legal issues and expense.</p> <p>Section 12.4: Calculating Required Provision Notwithstanding our comments in respect of the quantitative requirements for open space, we do not accept the figures in respect of average household occupancy rates. The GRO(S) Household Projections 2008 identify that the average dwelling occupancy in Aberdeen 1.96 falling to 1.72 in 2030. We therefore cannot accept the figures specified in Figure 8. These need to be reconsidered as a matter of urgency.</p> <p>Appendix C: Costs of offsite provision (developer contributions) and Maintenance Commuted Sums Whilst we note the requirement for such contributions, ACC have failed to justify the level of monies being sought. A full break down of the how the monies required has been arrived at is required before the Supplementary Guidance is approved.</p>	<p>various pros and cons with the different options but found that the best option was by commuted sum. The SG recognises however that this may not be the answer in every situation however, and allows an element of flexibility.</p> <p>The figure is based on the most recent information available and is more robust and likely to be more accurate than projections.</p> <p>The costs provided in Appendix C were identified using costs of current or recent relevant greenspace projects and maintenance. Officers do not feel a full breakdown of working is necessary for inclusion in the SG.</p>	
<p>RSPB Scotland</p>	<p>RSPB Scotland welcomes the development of this supplementary guidance and is satisfied that all relevant conservation and biodiversity issues have been included.</p> <p>Natural Greenspace and Green Corridors - Quality Standards The quality standards should include a sentence similar to that included in section 10.2, stating that ACC and other local and national conservation guidelines should be considered.</p> <p>Although the importance of isolated green spaces or “stepping stones” is acknowledged, the standards should state that greenspace should be connected to other green spaces wherever possible and practicable. The standards should also state that natural greenspace and green corridors</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Accepted.</p> <p>Protecting and enhancing biodiversity is referred to in various parts of this SG. A more appropriate location for</p>	<p>Add “Consider Aberdeen City Council and other local and national nature conservation guidelines.” to amended third box under 9.2. Alter second box in section 7 Planning and Designing Open Space to “Development should</p>

EPI/11/215 – Appendix 2

	<p>should, wherever possible, protect and enhance biodiversity.</p>	<p>addressing these points is section 7 Planning and Designing Open Spaces.</p>	<p>contribute positively to the Green Space Network, through provision of new open space, linked together where possible, and protection and enhancement of existing greenspace features and biodiversity.”</p>
<p>Kingswells Community Council</p>	<p>Draft Response to Open Space Audit 2010 : Public open space (“football field”) at Fairley Road, Kingswells situated next to the Old School. Respondent highlights the current condition and use of the above area of open space in Kingswells and is supportive of enhancements to the area, including through developer contributions. Highlights the importance of public access to the field. Respondent requests that the Open Space Audit 2010’s classification of the field as “Amenity – Business” be changed to “Amenity – Residential”. Respondent requests that the Open Space Audit 2010 recognises the Gillahill area for its landscape and recreation value. Respondent states that many Residential Amenity open spaces within Kingswells are an eyesore due to reductions in Council grass cutting and that more consultation with local people is required in relation to management of open spaces.</p>	<p>Noted. No changes to the Open Space Supplementary Guidance are sought.</p>	<p>None.</p>