

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

Supplementary Guidance	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officers Response	Amendments made as a result of Representation	Action
<b>Existing Masterplans/Planning Briefs/Development Frameworks</b>					
Bon Accord Baths Planning Brief	No representations received	N/A	This Planning Brief was approved by Council in October 2009 and covers the Bon Accord Bath site, which was declared surplus to Council requirements in 2008. This document cannot be adopted as SG to the ALDP as there is no definitive link between this document and the ALDP. Under the Town and Country Planning (Development Planning) (Scotland) Regulations 2008 SG may only deal with the provision of further information or detail in respect of the policies or proposals set out in	N/A	Keep as Local Planning Advice

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

			that Plan and only deal with those matters which are expressly identified in a statement contained in the plan. It is therefore recommended that this document is not sent to the Scottish Government for ratification as SG to the ALDP, but instead remains as a Local Planning Advice document.		
Cove Charrette Report and Masterplan	Wim Gonweleew	Object to any development of housing in the Loirston Green area next to Earnshugh road. If anything site should be used for recreation.	The Charrette 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 proposed link may be achieved between these areas and the existing developed area which uses Loirston Green. Loirston Green is not	No amendments required.	Send to Scottish Govt for ratification

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

			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.		
Cove Charrette Report and Masterplan	SEPA	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 Charrette 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	The comments raised would be more suitably addressed through the planning application process. The Cove Charrette 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	No amendments required.	Send to Scottish Govt for ratification

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p>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 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>bodies and the proximity to the landfill site.</p>		
Cove Charette Report and Masterplan	Graham John Mackie	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	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	No amendments required.	Send to Scottish Govt for ratification

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p>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>document states 'natural features are protected and celebrated, where possible, by crafting unique spaces around them. The consumption dyke is one example of 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</p>		
--	--	---	--	--	--

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

			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 masterplan but it is still possible that minor difference could occur between the masterplan and planning application.		
Dyce Drive Planning Brief	Graeme Stewart	Regarding Section 18.1: 'reinstatement of the footbridge across Dyce Drive.' This would present further security issues, Escape routes for burglars, etc. Greenburn Cottage residents et al, would require to be involved in design process from earliest possible stage.	This Brief was written prior to the adoption of both the Aberdeen Local Plan 2008 and the Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2012. This Brief covers part of the site now zoned as OP32: Dyce Drive in the ALDP, but does not show the full extent of surrounding development and allocations and does	No amendments currently required.	Keep as Local Planning Advice

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

			<p>not represent the up to date boundary of OP33:A96 Park and Rides site. This Brief requires to be updated to bring it in line with the current land zonings and allocations. It is therefore recommended that this document is not sent to the Scottish Government for ratification as SG to the ALDP, but instead remains as a Local Planning Advice document until such time as it is revisited and updated. The need to update this document would not affect any current Planning Applications.</p> <p>The Planning Brief suggests that, given the existence of a Right of Way through part of the site, it will</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

			<p>be appropriate to investigate ways to improve and enhance this link. This may include the reinstatement of the footbridge across Dyce Drive, but further study will be necessary to determine the best means of integrating the route with the proposed development. The exact nature of any enhancements to the route should take into account the desirability of creating a safe and secure route.</p>		
<p>Dyce Drive Planning Brief</p>	<p>Graeme Stewart</p>	<p>Regarding Section 16.1: 'The internal distributor roads (excluding the new spine road, which will provide access to the Airport Terminal) should discourage through traffic, excepting public transport.' Would this be redirected through Rowett North,</p>	<p>This Brief was written prior to the adoption of both the Aberdeen Local Plan 2008 and the Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2012. This Brief covers part of the site now zoned as OP32: Dyce Drive in the ALDP, but does not</p>	<p>No amendments currently required.</p>	<p>Keep as Local Planning Advice</p>



Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p>Greenburn Cottage and other residential dwellings? Greenburn Cottage residents et al, would require to be involved in design process from earliest possible stage. Agree with density figures.</p>	<p>show the full extent of surrounding development and allocations and does not represent the up to date boundary of OP33:A96 Park and Rides site. This Brief requires to be updated to bring it in line with the current land zonings and allocations. It is therefore recommended that this document is not sent to the Scottish Government for ratification as SG to the ALDP, but instead remains as a Local Planning Advice document until such time as it is revisited and updated.</p> <p>Discouraging through traffic on internal distributor roads is good practice to avoid creating 'rat-runs' and</p>		
--	--	---	---	--	--

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

			<p>minimise traffic levels on local roads. It is not intended that any major traffic would be redirected through the Rowett North (OP28).</p>		
<p>Dyce Drive Planning Brief</p>	<p>Graeme Stewart</p>	<p>Road traffic congestion would be better eased through a choice of alternative routes/exit points, rather than an upgraded single route.</p>	<p>This Brief was written prior to the adoption of both the Aberdeen Local Plan 2008 and the Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2012. This Brief covers part of the site now zoned as OP32: Dyce Drive in the ALDP, but does not show the full extent of surrounding development and allocations and does not represent the up to date boundary of OP33:A96 Park and Rides site. This Brief requires to be updated to bring it in line with</p>	<p>No amendments currently required.</p>	<p>Keep as Local Planning Advice</p>

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

			<p>the current land zonings and allocations. It is therefore recommended that this document is not sent to the Scottish Government for ratification as SG to the ALDP, but instead remains as a Local Planning Advice document until such time as it is revisited and updated.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that no single transport measure will be sufficient to address congestion in the area. The proposed spine road between the A96 and the airport terminal is one of a number of measures, including delivery of the A96 Park and Ride facility, the Aberdeen western Peripheral Route and improved public</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

			transport facilities, which represent an integrated package intended to collaboratively relieve traffic congestion.		
Dyce Drive Planning Brief	Miller Developments	Welcome the decision of Aberdeen City Council to carry over the provisions of the approved Dyce Drive Planning Brief (2004) into the new LDP. However, there is concern of the wording of Policy BI2 in the new plan, which states that within areas designated as 'Specialist Employment Areas', only Class 4 Business uses shall be permitted. This is a significant departure from the approved Planning Brief, which allocates our Dyce Drive site for a (Class 4) Business Park with associated Class 5 & 6 uses. Companies want to	This Brief was written prior to the adoption of both the Aberdeen Local Plan 2008 and the Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2012. This Brief covers part of the site now zoned as OP32: Dyce Drive in the ALDP, but does not show the full extent of surrounding development and allocations and does not represent the up to date boundary of OP33:A96 Park and Rides site. This Brief requires to be updated to bring it in line with	No amendments currently required.	Keep as Local Planning Advice

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p>integrate their office functions with covered storage and yard areas. This is normally the case even with headquarter functions and is evidenced in the requirements of companies who have looked at the Dyce Drive area in recent years. To remove the 'and ancillary Class 5 &amp; 6 uses' presents a serious threat to the viability of the proposed Business Park and we would strongly request that the LDP reinstates the original Planning Brief wording. We are fully supportive of the Council's aspirations for this area which, with the new Dyce Drive Link Road, will form an important and visible gateway between the airport, the AWPR and the City but this aspiration should still be achievable through policies which seek, for example, to locate the more attractive office</p>	<p>the current land zonings and allocations. It is therefore recommended that this document is not sent to the Scottish Government for ratification as SG to the ALDP, but instead remains as a Local Planning Advice document until such time as it is revisited and updated.</p> <p>The Brief indicates that development will generally be restricted to those falling within class 4 of the use classes order, but that other uses (such as classes 5 and 6, for example) would be permitted where 'they are necessary and maintain the required high quality environment'. The 'specialist employment'</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		functions along the Link Road corridor, with any associated facilities facing internally into the park.	designation expresses a similar sentiment, albeit in different terms, with an emphasis on class 4 uses, but an acknowledgement that ancillary facilities may be permitted where it can be demonstrated that they would enhance the attraction and sustainability of the area for business investment.		
Foresterhill Development Framework	SEPA	No detailed comments to make on the document and note that much of the work is underway, but would highlight the issues set out in Appendix 1 (of SEPA's representation) as being useful for any proposals coming forward as part of stage 2 of the project.	Comments noted.	No amendments required.	Send to Scottish Govt for ratification
Fire Station Site, North Anderson Drive Planning Brief	Mastrick, Sheddocksley and Summerhill Community Council	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 &	Should the Fire Service decide to do something different with the site then we would agree that the Brief may need to be	No amendments required.	Send to Scottish Govt for ratification

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p>Rescue Service decide to relocate its headquarters at any future date.</p> <p>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 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>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 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>		
Greenferns Development Framework and Masterplan	SEPA	The Bucks Burn runs along northern boundary of OP45 and is at moderate status because of alterations to	The existing Greenferns Masterplan which was approved by Aberdeen City	No amendments required.	Send to Scottish Govt for ratification

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p>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 waterbodies.</p>	<p>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 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</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--



Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

			<p>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 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>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

<p>Kingswells Development Framework</p>	<p>SEPA</p>	<p>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>This paragraph was added into the document prior to the latest round of consultation.</p>	<p>No amendments required.</p>	<p>Send to Scottish Govt for ratification</p>
---	-------------	---	--	--------------------------------	---

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

Kingswells Development Framework	SEPA	Welcome the recognition of the North Burn of Rubislaw as an important feature for the site and welcome the proposals to retain and enhance the Burn in the vicinity of the site. We note from Section 5.21 of the document that foul drainage will be directed to the public sewer and surface waters will be disposed of via SUDS.	Comments noted.	No amendments required.	Send to Scottish Govt for ratification
Kingswells Development Framework	Kingswells Community Council	<p>Page 3 <b>1.1</b> Site “A”. This site has now been fully developed by Barratts with 33 houses. It is now completed (Newton).</p> <p>Site “D” and “E”. This site is no longer an opportunity site (OP41) as it is in the midst of being developed with 72 houses by Stewart Milne Group (West One).</p> <p>Site “B” is in the midst of a master planning process for 120 houses (Huxterstone).</p> <p>Site “C” (The Fairley Road</p>	The Development Framework was written in 2008 to help inform the preparation of future Masterplans for the various sites in Kingswells by setting out the broad principles that need to be considered within the Mastepans. These subsequent Masterplans provide more detailed information to guide and shape development. It is not felt to be necessary to	<p>Remove reference to a mobile library service on page 3.</p> <p>The reference to a youth facility on page 6 will be removed and the sentence will be amended to read, “<i>The old primary school is now being used by</i></p>	Send to Scottish Govt for ratification

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p>Old School playing field) should not be designated as Residential H1 in the Aberdeen Local Development Plan. KCC have instigated a land search which is inconclusive and complicated and the field may well have three landowners and partly be 'in trust'. Developer Contribution has been agreed for the field from planning gain from site "D" and "E". The field is to be flattened and drained for community recreational and sporting use. This site should now be re-designated to protect this valuable community asset.</p> <p><b>Page 3 1.2</b> The mobile library service has now been discontinued throughout the city, and therefore, Kingswells.</p> <p><b>Page 6 5.4</b> <i>"The old primary school is currently used as a youth</i></p>	<p>update the Development Framework to reflect evolving site status as the Masterplans incorporate the principles set out within the Framework. It is important to keep all of the opportunity sites (whether they are now developed or not) to show the original scope of the Development Framework.</p> <p>The H1 Residential zoning of Site C is appropriate and reflects the sites position within an existing residential area. Policy H1 allows for the development of appropriate complimentary uses such as community recreational and sporting as long as the proposal complies with</p>	<p><i>Adventure Aberdeen."</i></p> <p>References to bus routes will be updated in accordance with the First Bus review.</p>	
--	--	--	---	---	--

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p><i>facility.” This building was taken over and renovated by ACC’s “Adventure Aberdeen” in 2009. The youth group was then made “homeless” and disbanded.</i></p> <p><b>Page 7 5.14</b>  <i>“New buildings should be designed to have a designed relationship with existing buildings. They should not turn their backs or leave blank facades to those on Old Skene Road and Fairley Road and should be designed to relate to a street, with clear definition between public and private space”</i>          KCC would like to point out that on the north of Site B, (Huxterstone) the established houses along the Lang Stracht have their backs to the road. Any houses planned for Site B should follow this precedent. New houses would be inclusive to the site only by facing an inner</p>	<p>other policies in the Local Development Plan.</p> <p>The reference to mobile library service will be removed.</p> <p>The reference to a youth facility will be amended to read, <i>“The old primary school is now being used by Adventure Aberdeen.”</i></p> <p>It is important that dwellings front onto streets to provide active frontages. Active frontages promote a safer and livelier place that benefits the whole community.</p> <p>References to bus routes will be updated in accordance with the First Bus review.</p> <p>Core Path 31 is</p>		
--	--	---	--	--	--

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p>road within the development rather than segregated by facing outwards to the Land Stracht.</p> <p>Page 11 <b>6.5</b>          Kingswells is currently served by the number 14 bus service only and not as stated 14/14A. (The number 14 is to be replaced by the number 11 in September 2012.) The number 14 bus service is a half hourly service during the day and hourly in the evenings - not as stated <i>“operates at a frequency of once every 15 minutes Monday to Saturday during the daytime, with the 14A supplementing the Park and Ride service during peak times giving 8 buses per hour.”</i> There is no longer a 40 A bus service from the Park and Ride. There is no longer a 902 weekend night bus service.</p> <p>Page 10 <b>6.2</b></p>	<p>designated as a Core Path in Aberdeen City Council’s Core Path Plan (2009) and it is therefore appropriate for it to be referenced in the Development Framework.</p>		
--	--	---	---	--	--

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		Core Path 31 has no pavement at east side of the north end of Fairley Road to access village centre and bus stop.			
Murcar Development Framework	Montagu Evans LLP on behalf of Buccleuch Property	<p>Previous references to the Science and Energy Park should be updated to Aberdeen Energy Park.</p> <p>We are keen to ensure that the landscaping to be provided is appropriate for the development and that a landscape masterplan is agreed and fair to all parties. The balance of landscape masterplanning should not be left to the end to be provided by the final development.</p> <p>In 5.3 there is reference to the Reporters recommendations, following the Local Plan Inquiry, for “extensive landscaping</p>	<p>This Brief was written prior to the adoption of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2012. This Brief covers OP4: Findlay Farm, Murcar, OP3: Berryhill, Murcar and part of OP2: Murcar, but does not show the full extent of surrounding development and allocations. This Brief requires to be updated to bring it in line with the current land zonings and allocations. It is therefore recommended that this document is not</p>	No amendments currently required.	Keep as Local Planning Advice

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p>within the northern boundary of OP94 Berryhill” although apart from areas associated with the access road, this has not been reflected in the indicative Framework Plan. It has not been accommodated within the landscape masterplan relative to Application Ref. 121031 either. The referenced Parkland Buffer to the west appears to be accommodated in the framework plan.</p> <p>Other issues to be accommodated include the buffer to the golf course and retention of existing planting and natural features. The indicative plan should aim to provide a more coherent landscape structure in order to assist in ensuring a coherent landscape masterplan across the whole site.</p> <p>Support the requirement for habitat surveys to be</p>	<p>sent to the Scottish Government for ratification as SG to the ALDP, but instead remains as a Local Planning Advice document until such time as it is revisited and updated.</p> <p>The issues raised through this representation will be taken into consideration during any redrafting/updating work that takes place on the Development Framework in the future.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--



Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p>consistent across the whole framework site, given the intention is to create a green network.</p> <p>We agree that the framework site should be developed in accordance with the principles of sustainability. It will be important to appreciate how this may affect the deliverability, cost plan and construction phasing across the site.</p> <p>Buccleuch Property are currently working up a masterplan for their future expansion land, which will include a phasing plan, in accordance with previous conditions relative to their land. The phasing of the various sites will also be an important planning consideration. The interconnectivity of road, pedestrian and cycle access, landscaping and services will all require to be</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p>carefully phased and agreement reached between the respective land owners and Aberdeen City Council.</p> <p>A green travel strategy should be developed for the masterplan site. Clarification is sought on the requirements to extend bus services and the provision of a bus gate link. How will this impact on the Berryhill Farm and Finlay Farm lands?</p> <p>We note that the main vehicular access to the site would be from the Murcar Roundabout. It is envisaged that there will be through access between the Murcar and Parkway Roundabouts, limited to public transport only. The previous approval to extend the Science and Energy Park was approved on that basis.</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p>Buccleuch Property are currently working up a masterplan for their future expansion land, to the north of the existing Energy Park. We wish to reserve our position on connectivity between the Berryhill Farm land and Finlay Farm land until such times as further discussions have taken place and agreement reached on an appropriate link between the two sites. The location of the link road will need to be agreed in order to interconnect the two masterplans seamlessly. The connecting road between Finlay Farm and Berryhill Farm lands, as identified within Figure 3, is therefore for indicative purposes only.</p> <p>Potential linkages across the framework area should be developed and travel corridors agreed.</p> <p>The framework document</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p>should be updated in order to consider how the de-trunking of the A90 will affect the development. Will an additional access point be promoted to serve the central area of Cloverhill Farm? Clarification is sought on how this may impact / inform the strategies developed for travel links, environmental and landscaping aspects for the framework site.</p> <p>Park and Ride proposals should be updated and clarified for the masterplan site. It will be important to understand the impacts arising from a Park and Ride facility being developed on the site, including walking distances</p> <p>It will be important to ensure consistency between the Council's Core Paths Plan and the proposed footpaths and cycle routes within the Murcar area. It should be possible to provide the</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p>aspirational path connections contained within the Core Paths Plan across the Framework site.</p> <p>The provision of strategic utility upgrades should be taken into account with the routes and service provision calculated for the whole of the masterplan site and enabled in such a way as to avoid unnecessary cost.</p> <p>Drainage from the wider development may require to pass through the Finlay Farm site. We would not wish to sterilise parts of the site due to drainage wayleaves or cordon sanitaire requirements for third parties.</p> <p>Buccleuch Property and Scottish Enterprise will seek to ensure a fair and consistent approach to any planning restrictions to be applied across the framework site. Whilst</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p>research and development uses will continue to make an important contribution to the future development of the Aberdeen Energy Park and associated expansion land to the north, it will be essential to ensure that restrictions on use are reasonable and do not obstruct or hinder future investment opportunities</p>			
<p>Murcar Development Framework</p>	<p>Paul and Williamsons on behalf of Stewart Milne Homes</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The SG should be updated</p>	<p>This Brief was written prior to the adoption of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2012. This Brief covers OP4: Findlay Farm, Murcar, OP3: Berryhill, Murcar and part of OP2: Murcar, but does not show the full extent of surrounding development and allocations. This Brief requires to be updated to bring it in line with the current land zonings and allocations. It is</p>	<p>No amendments currently required.</p>	<p>Keep as Local Planning Advice</p>

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p>to incorporate and reflect the other allocations in the Plan.</p>	<p>therefore recommended that this document is not sent to the Scottish Government for ratification as SG to the ALDP, but instead remains as a Local Planning Advice document until such time as it is revisited and updated.</p> <p>The issues raised through this representation will be taken into consideration during any redrafting/updating work that takes place on the Development Framework in the future.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

<p>Pinewood Hazledene Planning Brief</p>	<p>GVA Grimley Ltd on behalf of Dobbies Garden Centres LLP</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>No amendments required.</p>	<p>Send to Scottish Govt for ratification</p>
<p><b>New Masterplans/Planning Briefs/Development Frameworks</b></p>					



Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

<p>Aberdeen Harbour Development Framework</p>	<p>SEPA</p>	<p>We have already provided comments during the preparation of the Framework and we are pleased to note that many of the suggestions made previously by SEPA have been incorporated into the document. There is still scope for the natural environment (particularly the water environment) to be further emphasised, for example by highlighting that the River Dee may be protected not just as a Special Area of Conservation but also in order to meet the requirements of the EC Water Framework Directive to ensure that all waterbodies reach good ecological status by a set deadline, and by highlighting the pressures and impacts that are influencing the status of the mouth of the River Dee (including the harbour area).</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>	<p>No amendments required.</p>	<p>Send to Scottish Govt for ratification</p>
---	-------------	---	-----------------------	--------------------------------	---

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

<p>Kingswells Development Framework and Phase One Masterplan (OP40)</p>	<p>SEPA</p>	<p>Pleased to note that Cults Burn has been identified as an important feature for the site and welcome the proposals to retain and enhance the Burn in the vicinity of the site through the creation of an open space buffer strip extending along the burn corridor. We welcome the recognition of the need for a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) to be undertaken, this should inform the design and layout of the site. Note from Section 5 of the document that foul drainage will be directed to the public sewer and surface waters will be subject to 2 levels of treatment for roads and a single level for roof run off, and that an indication that ponds/basins will be incorporated into the drainage strategy within areas of open space. This is in principle acceptable to SEPA as it would provide the required 2 levels of</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>	<p>No amendments required.</p>	<p>Send to Scottish Govt for ratification</p>
---	-------------	--	-----------------------	--------------------------------	---

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		SUDS treatment for this type of development. We have already provided advice on a pre-application enquiry (Council Ref P120340, SEPA Ref PCS/119104) for part of this site.			
Kingswells Prime Four Business Park (Phase Two and Three)	Kingswells Community Council	<p><b>Summary Document:</b> It is noted that there is a 90m band of GSN including an open setting to the Consumption Dyke, and a 120m no build zone. Kingswells Community is concerned about the appearance of the development when viewed from the north. The community was given assurances that the development would be screened and would have minimal visual impact. It would appear that the 90m open setting limits the screening that was promised. If this is the case then the 120m no build zone should be extended to ensure that promises made</p>	<p><b>Summary Document:</b> During the Examination into the Aberdeen Local Development Plan the Reporter stated, “To the north, this development would be contained within the line of the large consumption dyke. It is a scheduled monument and both it and its immediate setting should be safeguarded. This can be secured through the green space network designation which runs along either side of it. The extent of the green space network shown on the proposals map</p>	<p>Remove ‘where possible’ from sentence at Part 4B. Design Principles and sentence at Part 4.B.1.3 Context.</p> <p>References to bus routes will be updated in accordance with the First Bus review.</p>	Send to Scottish Govt for ratification

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p>to the community can be fulfilled.          The significant deviation from the Framework is not acceptable to the community. The masterplan should not be approved until community issues are addressed.</p> <p><b>Design Principles:</b>          KCC request the following text change in section Part 4B. Design Principles.  <b>Buildings must, where possible, be set within the landscape and be sympathetic to the rural setting and the West Hatton Woodland.</b>          KCC is concerned that the phrase 'where possible' allows the developer too much leeway. There is no argument into what is possible. This is purely subjective.</p>	<p>is indicative, and its precise extent will be confirmed through the subsequent master planning process.” Historic Scotland have intimated that they do not want landscaping right up to the consumption dyke and this is reflected in the phase 2 and 3 masterplan.</p> <p><b>Design Principles:</b>          We agree that the phrase 'where possible' should be removed from the text at Part 4B. Design Principles.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p><b>Part 4B. Indicative Masterplan</b>  KCC would be opposed to the use of H shaped buildings on the northern boundary of the development as it contravenes the principle <b>“Buildings must be broken down where possible into smaller blocks, and gables orientated North / South.”</b>  The grouping of buildings in ‘Clusters’ in the Framework document is much more acceptable to the community than the use in the Masterplan where the use makes it impossible to soften the visual impact from the north. The density of building on the northern boundary is too high and must be reduced to provide an acceptable solution for this sensitive area.  The masterplan should be changed accordingly, and should make a detailed 3D model showing</p>	<p><b>Part 4B. Indicative Masterplan</b>  The building layout shown in the masterplan is more detailed that the ‘Clusters’ shown in the Development Framework and shows the relationships between buildings. Detailed 3D models and landscape and visual impact assessments, including long distance views from the north will be provided as part of the Planning Application process.</p>		
--	--	---	---	--	--

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p>the visual impact a requirement of any planning application for development in this area.</p> <p><b>Existing Features:</b> KCC is concerned that despite the agreement that Phase 1 would maintain <b>tree belts</b> the Planning Authority allowed the mass destruction of existing tree belt along the A944 and has approved a boulevard devoid of trees. KCC is extremely concerned that the planning system can permit the wholesale destruction of 80 trees in a sensitive area when the Framework clearly opposes such an action. Trees removed by the construction process need to be replaced nearby. This also should retrospectively apply to Phase 1.</p> <p><b>Phasing:</b> KCC is concerned with the proposed phasing strategy.</p>	<p><b>Existing Features:</b> The formation of the vehicular access to the business park off the A944 dual carriageway resulted in the loss of a number of trees along the road frontage. The Development Framework acknowledges that some tree removal would be required to form the main access into the site. This loss of trees was clearly set out in the planning application report (111653) that was approved at Committee on 22nd March 2012. The loss of trees will be mitigated through the planting of new trees across the site.</p> <p><b>Phasing:</b> Aberdeen City Council has no control over the</p>		
--	--	---	---	--	--

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p><b>“There will be no definitive sequence to these phases. Phase Three could well be developed earlier than Phase Two. Furthermore the sequence of development within Phase Two will be determined by operator demand”</b></p> <p>The provision of Phase Two – the hub is important as it provides facilities all Phases rely upon. Delaying the development of this would not be seen in a good light. KCC request that this section is re-worded to ensure that Phase Two is developed in conjunction with other phases. Furthermore</p> <p><b>“The Phasing Strategy allows for this, and does not require individual Phases to be completed prior to development commencing on another Phase. Throughout the development of the site, opportunities must be</b></p>	<p>market conditions within the development industry. We would expect Phase 2 to be developed alongside or before Phase 3 but we do not have powers to insist upon it. The whole site is allocated for development within the Aberdeen Local Development Plan up to the period ending 2023. The phasing shown in the masterplan is indicative, however, we have no reason at this moment in time to expect other than what is suggested.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p><b>appropriately managed to ensure they are not prejudicial to overall growth.”</b>          KCC accept that Phase 3 can start before Phase 2 is complete, but they would be concerned if Phase 4 started before Phase 3 was substantially complete. Cherry picking prime locations should be avoided, and good design should ensure that all ‘sites’ are developed to their best advantage.          Development hard up to the ancient woodland is not acceptable, and GSN buffers should be included in this sensitive area.</p> <p><b>Detailed Masterplan: “A key consideration will be to ensure the development is not isolated from the existing community of Kingswells.”</b>          The concept of isolation</p>	<p><b>Detailed Masterplan:</b>          Sustainable communities rely on ensuring that there are linkages between existing settlements and new developments. We</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--



Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p>should not be interpreted as 'integration'. KCC agree that:  <b>“Instead, the proposals should offer a sustainable development solution, incorporating into the Park a number of key local facilities which are currently lacking.”</b>          The development must be sustainable on its own and should not rely on Kingswells to provide facilities for the development where the use would be detrimental to existing users, and provision of on-site facilities would be sustainable.</p> <p><b>4.B.1.3 Context:          “Both Phases Two and Three, where possible, respect this principle. Within ‘the Hub’ area of Phase Two the aim should be to encourage lively spaces at pedestrian level and a mixture of activities</b></p>	<p>would expect the two to be mutually supportive.</p> <p><b>4.B.1.3 Context:</b>          We agree that the phrase ‘where possible’ should be removed from the text at Part 4.B.1.3 Context.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p><b>and uses which will encourage the Hub to be used and useable outwith the operating hours of the Business Park”</b>          The use of the phrase ‘where possible’ leaves the developer too much leeway and should be removed – this is a general comment throughout the document.</p> <p><b>4.B.1.5 Spaces:</b>          The concept of grouping buildings in closely spaced clumps goes against the principle of lessening the visual impact of the buildings by building gable on North / South orientations. See also Part 4B. Indicative Masterplan.</p> <p><b>Green Space Network:</b>          KCC is extremely concerned about the U-turn that has taken place since they discussed the main issues with the development and agreement on</p>	<p><b>4.B.1.5 Spaces:</b>          This issue has already been addressed through the response to part 4.B Indicative Masterplan comments.</p> <p><b>Green Space Network:</b>          This issue has already been addressed through the response to the Summary Document and Part</p>		
--	--	---	---	--	--

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p>acceptable mitigating strategies was reached. The community requirement that the development should have minimal visual impact when viewed from the north has been removed from the masterplan. The rural setting will be totally lost if buildings are not screened from view. The setting of the consumption dyke will be compromised if buildings overlook the dyke – even from a distance of 120-200m.</p> <p>Community issues need to be addressed and the masterplan needs to identify a strategy for screening buildings from view from the north.</p> <p>The Masterplan should include a requirement that a detailed 3D model showing the visual impact of development in this area is provided with planning application.</p>	<p>4.B Indicative Masterplan comments.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--	--

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p><b>Building Heights:</b>  <b>“Buildings within the northern extent of the Northern Zone will be restricted to two storeys, whereas the southern extent of this Zone may accommodate slightly taller buildings. With the exception of the Landmark Buildings within the Hub, buildings in the Central Zone will generally be three storey. Where topography allows, additional top floors of buildings could be treated as ‘penthouses’ which could be achieved by recessed walls and lightweight materials. As a general principle all buildings must demonstrate that they are sympathetic to setting and relate to the scale of surrounding landscape features.”</b></p> <p>KCC request that all building including the “Landmark Buildings”</p>	<p><b>Building Heights:</b>  The masterplan already states that as a general rule all buildings must demonstrate that they are sympathetic to setting and relate to the scale of surrounding landscape features. This is clearly stated in the ‘Building Heights’ section.  KCC’s statement suggesting that the current wording of the masterplan gives the developer a “freehand” to do anything is contradictory. The very fact that the masterplan states where landmark buildings should be located provides clarity on the siting of such buildings.  The request for a detailed 3D model has</p>		
--	--	---	--	--	--

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p>should be sympathetic to setting and relate to the scale of surrounding landscape features.</p> <p><b>“The hub has already been identified as a suitable location for ‘landmark buildings’. In this regard a zone has been identified within the Hub where buildings of some prominence could be located. These feature buildings will act as focal points for the development.”</b> The developer has obviously some ideas about this and these have not been shared with the community. KCC object to the above wording as it gives the developer a freehand to do anything.</p> <p>The masterplan needs to offer the community some safeguards over what is developed. The Masterplan should include a requirement that a detailed 3D model showing the</p>	<p>already been addressed through the response to Part 4.B Indicative Masterplan comments.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--	--

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p>visual impact of development in this area is provided with planning application.</p> <p><b>The ‘feature zone’:</b> KCC has concerns about the impact prominent buildings in the feature zone will have on the adjacent homes. The area is higher than the homes and distance is required to avoid imposing on the nearby homes. The buildings can be prominent from within the development, but should not be prominent on the landscape. If this is not possible then the Hub could be moved to a more suitable location within the development where more prominent buildings can be accommodated.</p> <p>The significant change between the Framework and the Masterplan is not acceptable to the community and further</p>	<p><b>The ‘feature zone’:</b> We agree that buildings should be integrated within the landscape, particularly when viewed from outwith the site. We would not recommend the location of the Hub being moved as it’s current position is at the end of the boulevard entrance, this is the most logical position to provide a focal point between the business park and Kingswells. As stated in the response to the Building Heights comments, the masterplan already states that as a general rule all buildings must demonstrate that they</p>		
--	--	---	--	--	--

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p>consultation is required before the Masterplan can be agreed.</p> <p><b>Access:</b>  <b>“It recognised that a second access into the Prime Four site will require to be considered as the development progresses. This access could be taken from the east (as indicated adjacent), or from the south or west which would be investigated via a separate masterplanning exercise for Phase Four. A Transport Assessment will be undertaken, and will be assessed by Aberdeen City Council as Roads Authority via subsequent planning applications.”</b></p> <p>KCC can see the advantage of having an access to the Hub from the Home Farm track as shown, but would have serious concerns if</p>	<p>are sympathetic to setting and relate to the scale of surrounding landscape features.</p> <p>The masterplan has rightfully developed and evolved as planning decisions have been made and as development has taken place. The community has been appropriately consulted at all of these stages.</p> <p><b>Access:</b>          As already stated in the masterplan text under the ‘Access’ section, the second access would be considered as the development progresses and would be fully investigated through a separate Masterplanning exercise and Transport Assessment.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p>this access could be used by the wider development. Access to Phase 3 and 4 should be from the A944 or to the west. The masterplan should identify that additional access could be provided and will be subject to a separate masterplanning exercise and Transport Assessment when necessary. The current wording suggests that the Home Farm access has been subject to a masterplan and has some level of acceptance – this has not been discussed with the community.</p> <p><b>4B.3.4 Public Transport Connections:</b> The masterplan take no account of the recent changes to the Park and Ride bus service which no longer connects Kingswells to Aberdeen as the service is terminated at ARI. The need to change bus is a major disincentive to using</p>	<p><b>4B.3.4 Public Transport Connections:</b> We agree that it would be appropriate to update the masteplan to reflect the recent changes in bus services which have been implemented by First Bus. We will be</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--



Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p>the P&amp;R service.</p> <p><b>4.B.1.6 Landscape Treatments:</b> The list of tree types should include some evergreen types. It is also noted that birch trees at Dobbies have not worked well with many leafless trees.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> The proposed Masterplan represents a significant deviation from the Framework document. The community has not been involved in agreeing the deviations and their views have been substantially removed from the proposed Masterplan. This is unacceptable, and the Masterplan should not be approved until it addresses community concerns expressed throughout this document whether they are highlighted or not.</p>	<p>looking for opportunities to ensure that there is a direct service to/from Kingswells Park and Ride to the City Centre. This may only be achievable once all development is in place in order to achieve critical mass.</p> <p><b>4.B.1.6 Landscape Treatments:</b> The example species list contained within the masterplan makes reference to ‘Scots Pine’ which is an evergreen tree.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> As previously stated in the response to the Feature Zone comments, the masterplan has rightfully developed and evolved as planning decisions have been made and</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

			<p>as development has taken place. The community has been appropriately consulted at all of these stages. This round of consultation which we are currently responding to is another example of consultation. The views of all respondents are taken into account, responded to and influence the final judgments that the Council must make.</p>		
General Comments	Transport Scotland	<p>Phasing should take into account delivery timescales of infrastructure including the Aberdeen Western Peripheral Route (AWPR) and other critical infrastructure such as the Third Don Crossing.</p> <p>A significant amount of development has been consented recently and a number of pre-application</p>	<p>It is agreed that phasing should take delivery timescales of infrastructure into account and this should be reflected in all documentation as it is developed or updated.</p> <p>The appropriate level of analysis demonstrating the likely impacts on the</p>	No amendments required.	N/A

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p>discussions are ongoing. This development will further impact on an already significantly constrained trunk road network. This issue has been discussed at length at a number of meetings between Transport Scotland and the Council in the last few months. Going forward an analytical approach is needed to determine what level of development can be accommodated in advance of the AWPR, and other critical transport infrastructure, before the current trunk road network performance becomes unacceptable. Given the pressures are not limited to the trunk road, consideration of the performance of the local road network will also be important. The outcome of this exercise should be reflected in the planning briefs, development frameworks and</p>	<p>agreed extent of the local road which is impacted must be provided in each document, as agreed through discussion with Transport Scotland and Aberdeen City Council, with reference and commitment to the appropriate Strategic Transport Fund (STF) contribution where there is a need to mitigate cumulative impact on the regionally strategic road network.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p>masterplans. We would welcome an early meeting on this matter.</p> <p>The detail contained within some of the documents is out of date and some have been superseded by planning consents or subsequent transport studies. It is appreciated that these documents will become dated relatively quickly, however for sites with consents, they should be updated to reflect the transportation requirements within the conditions. For example Dyce Drive, Stoneywood, Davidson’s Mill, Murcar (part thereof) and Robert Gordon University have all been consented.</p> <p>Reference to the Structure Plan Supplementary Guidance on the Strategic Transport Fund (STF) is welcomed. However, a review should</p>	<p>The action plan should be updated regularly and where documentation is revisited, or the next level of detail is required eg via planning applications arising from Masterplans, then the most up to date position should be reflected.</p> <p>All documentation is required to reflect the STF policy. Where an exemption or reduction is requested for consideration a</p>		
--	--	---	---	--	--

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p>be undertaken to ensure that the STF is listed as a requirement in all Supplementary Guidance documents where the STF is to be applied. This is of particular importance given these documents are to be statutory. It is critical that the STF is applied transparently and consistently. The concern is that should the Guidance not be applied and contributions are waived on a case by case basis, this risks the emergence of a funding gap. This in turn has consequences for delivery of the identified infrastructure contained within the STF, including those relating to the trunk road. Should this situation arise Transport Scotland will need to revisit the approach to addressing the transportation impacts of development. Where full STF contributions are not</p>	<p>process is now in place, which includes Transport Scotland, to collectively agree or otherwise where exemption or reduction is appropriate. Also, the policy identifies processes for reporting development progress and the application of this policy and the outcomes.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

		<p>sought, Transport Scotland may take the view that it would be more appropriate to seek no net detriment mitigation to the trunk road for new allocations that are to be promoted in advance of the AWPR. It is likely that the transport requirements for the allocations would change and would need to be reflected in the Planning Briefs, Development Frameworks and Masterplans.</p>			
General Comments	Sport Scotland	<p>Include the following 'catch all' comments:</p> <p>The Pitches Strategy and Leisure Asset review that is currently being undertaken should be referenced.</p> <p>The requirements of the SPP (specifically paragraph 156) in relation to the loss of outdoor sports areas should be referenced.</p>	<p>It would not be appropriate to make reference in the Masterplan documents to the Pitches Strategy and Leisure Asset review as this has not yet been completed.</p> <p>The requirements of Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) are clearly stated and it is not necessary for this National Policy to be repeated in Local</p>	No amendments required.	N/A

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations

			Policy documents.		
--	--	--	-------------------	--	--