

<b>Grandhome Development Framework</b>		
<b>1. SNH</b>		
<i>Summary of Representations</i>	<i>Officers Response</i>	<i>Action as a result of Representation</i>
Welcome the principles put forward in the Framework in relation to provision of greenspace, linked access routes and landscaping. Will provide further comments on detailed phase 1 application and Masterplan.	Noted	No action required. SNH will be consulted on detailed Masterplans and can feed into that process.
<b>2. Mr Paul Davis</b>		
<i>Summary of Representations</i>	<i>Officers Response</i>	<i>Action as a result of Representation</i>
<p><u>Part 2, Paragraph 5.5.1 Context</u> states: "The implementation of strategic infrastructure projects is <u>key</u> to the delivery of Grandhome. These include the AWPR, the Third Don Crossing, and the upgrade of key junctions including the Haudagain roundabout."</p> <p>The word 'key' implies that implementation of the three projects will unlock the capability to start Grandhome by enabling project start-up, and should therefore be completed before groundwork begins on Grandhome Phase 1. It is hoped that this is the intention.</p>	<p>The document states that a Transport Assessment is being carried to consider the potential impact of the new settlement. It is for the Transport Assessment to determine whether any development can be accommodated on the road network prior to the mentioned infrastructure being in place. The TA will also determined what infrastructure is required and when.</p> <p>Road schemes such as the AWPR, Third Don Crossing and the Haudagain junction improvement are all progressing, however, any proposals for a development, such as Grandhome, in advance of these schemes will</p>	No amendment required as a result of the representation.

	<p>be determined through this Transport Assessment and the appraisal process.</p> <p>Ultimately the precise level of infrastructure requirements and developer contributions for any development will be agreed with the Council, and other statutory agencies such as Transport Scotland, at the time that application is submitted.</p>	
<p><u>Part 3, Paragraph 7.1 Proposed Phasing of Development</u> states: "Delivery of the first phase is to proceed in tandem with major infrastructure upgrades, namely the AWPR and the 3rd Don Crossing."</p> <p>No mention here of the upgrading of the Haudagain roundabout, which is as equally important as the AWPR and Third Don Crossing. Are the prerequisites being watered down already? It is imperative that all three traffic-relieving upgrades are put in place prior to Phase 1 groundwork and, since Phase 2 is not due to start until 2018, there is sufficient time to complete at least the Third Don Crossing and Haudagain roundabout upgrade before the need to start Phase 1 groundwork.</p>	<p>The Haudagain roundabout upgrade can be added to 7.1 to ensure consistency throughout the document.</p> <p>It is for the Transport Assessment to determine whether any development can be accommodated on the road network prior to the mentioned infrastructure being in place. The TA will also determine what infrastructure is required and when.</p> <p>The TA will be available for comment as part of the Planning Permission in Principle once submitted.</p>	<p>Add: The Haudagain roundabout upgrade to 7.1.</p>
<p><b>3. Scottish Water</b></p>		

<i>Summary of Representations</i>	<i>Officers Response</i>	<i>Action as a result of Representation</i>
Satisfied with the comments relation to Water Supply, Wastewater and Surface Water Drainage. Further detail on requirements will be known once the developer has carried out the necessary Water and Wastewater Impact Assessments.	Noted	No amendment required as a result of this representation.
While Scottish Water is very much in support of water efficiency practices being used in developments, the have reservations regarding the intentions to include water meters in properties in Grandhome. Domestic metering is currently optional in Scotland and some households could actually be worse-off on a metered tariff than paying annual charges through Council Tax. This would be a very difficult element of the Development's water demand strategy to enforce.	Noted - the reference to water meters should be removed.	On page 80, paragraph 7.5.1 delete the words metering and from the paragraph. The paragraph should now read "Water demand is to be reduced through a demand management strategy to include low flow fittings, with grey....."
Scottish Water is currently conducting its own water efficiency pilot projects and research studies which we hope will help to develop policy, for both ourselves and the Scottish Government Building Standards Division, and will evolve to help inform future planning processes. I would be interested to hear more about how Grandhome intends to use grey-water recycling and rainwater harvesting.	Noted	This information will be passed onto the Grandhome Trust who we will encourage to speak to Scottish Water.
<b>4. Scottish Environment Protection Agency</b>		
<i>Summary of Representations</i>	<i>Officers Response</i>	<i>Action as a result of Representation</i>

<p>Please note that at this time we have <b>no additional comments</b> to make over and above those already made to date. In addition we have also provided direct advice with regards to drainage and flood risk to the applicant (our ref: PCS/123870 and PCS/123881).</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No amendment required as a result of this representation.</p> <p>SEPA will be consulted further on detailed masterplans as they emerge.</p>
--	--------------	--

**5. Bucksburn & Newhills Community Council**

<i>Summary of Representations</i>	<i>Officers Response</i>	<i>Action as a result of Representation</i>
<p>Welcome the fact that in the new development a large "green corridor" is being maintained adjacent to the River Don. This will be beneficial in alleviating the visual impact that this development will have from the south bank of the river and will also be of value to those who stay in the development itself.</p>	<p>Noted. It is important to ensure that the River Don and it's green corridor is maintained, protected and enhanced.</p>	<p>No amendment required as a result of the representation.</p>
<p>Pleased to see that the thinking behind the new development is that provision will be made for people working in the area in which they stay, we are of the opinion that this is purely aspirational and it is very unlikely that many people from within the site will actually be employed there. With the existing industrial developments, adjacent to the airport and the extensions likely to take place there, it is more than likely that the residents from this area will be travelling to the industrial units in Dyce or elsewhere</p>	<p>The aims of Grandhome are to provide a development where residents can access shops, schools, employments and community facilities easily.</p> <p>It has been designed to encourage and promote sustainable travel whether buses, cycling or walking. The links connect through the site and beyond including linking up with Core path networks and connecting the</p>	<p>No amendment required as a result of the representation.</p>

<p>away from Grandhome. We also feel that the idea that large numbers of people from this development would make use of public transport, as it exists at present, is just not tenable.</p>	<p>proposed ped/cycle bridge over the River Don.  Increased path connection and bus provision will be provided as the site develops.</p>	
<p>Main area of concern relates to the traffic from the new development. It is the community councils opinion that any development in the area of Grandhome is totally dependant on <b>all</b> of the following items being carried out in a similar timescale to the development itself:</p> <p><b>1) The Third Don Crossing.</b>  <b>2) The Aberdeen Western Peripheral Route.</b>  <b>3) Improvements to the Haudagan Roundabout.</b>  <b>4) The Provision of a Railway Station in Bucksburn.</b></p>	<p>The concern in relation to the impact on the traffic is noted. It is for the Transport Assessment to determine the level of development that can be accommodated on the road network at different stages and what infrastructure is required to release this land.</p> <p>It will determine whether any development can be accommodated on the road network prior to the mentioned infrastructure being in place.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment will also determine what other infrastructure improvements are required within the area of development including such as upgrades to Whitestripes Avenue etc.</p>	<p>No amendment required as a result of the representation.</p>
<p><b>6. Neil and Emma Robertson</b></p>		
<p><i>Summary of Representations</i></p>	<p><i>Officers Response</i></p>	<p><i>Action as a result of Representation</i></p>
<p>Raise serious concern about the addition of 1000s of houses in the Bridge of Don – Grandhome. Current school proposals in the area with the closure of Middleton Park and the merge with Glashieburn is a</p>	<p>The school estate review has considered the provision for Grandhome including the initial phases of development. The ultimate decision in relation to the primary and secondary school</p>	<p>No amendment required as a result of the representation.</p>

<p>big mistake. It is unclear where the extra children generated from Grandhome will go to school.</p> <p>To zone the children to Danestone would be insane, naturally they would be zoned between Middleton Park and Forehill Primaries but if Middleton Park was to close down then the children would have to cross a very busy 50mph road. The third don crossing would add to the traffic flow.</p> <p>As serious accident occurred on the Parkway a few weeks ago where a car crashed into the pedestrian crossing. If a child or person had been at the crossing it would have been disastrous. It would not be appropriate to let children cross this road make children cross this busy road to school.</p>	<p>catchments, zoning and the phasing and timing for the schools will be determined by the Education, Culture and Sport service. Any subsequent Masterplans and planning applications will reflect these decisions.</p> <p>The Development Framework does not make reference to specific schools. Reference is only given to using existing schools for early phases.</p> <p>The text within the Development Framework states:</p> <p>“Until the delivery of the first primary school in phase 2, children will utilise one or more of the surrounding schools. Similarly, existing secondary schools will be utilised until onsite provision is made.”</p>	
--	---	--

<b>7. Historic Scotland</b>		
<i>Summary of Representations</i>	<i>Officers Response</i>	<i>Action as a result of Representation</i>
<p>We support the provision of a development framework for this substantial development area, and welcome that the draft document includes consideration of heritage assets within the area, particularly at section 2.5.11. We have previously</p>	<p>Noted. It is important to maintain the setting of the hut circle. Additional text will be added to the relevant section to ensure that this is considered in detail as part of the EIA and the relevant Masterplan for that phase of</p>	<p>Amendment to page 20 on archaeology from stone circle to hut circle.</p> <p>Amendment on page 20 to</p>

<p>indicated (in our Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping response of 22 October 2012) that there is potential for adverse indirect impacts on the scheduled monument <i>Foucausie, hut circle 250m SSE of (SM 12452)</i>. In view of this, and given that the GDF has been produced in advance of any Environmental Statement, we recommend that the importance of protecting the setting of this scheduled monument should be included as a key point in this section. Simply for information, the Foucausie scheduled monument is a hut circle, rather than a stone circle as it is currently described on page 20 of the GDF.</p>	<p>development.</p>	<p>make reference to the need to ensure appropriate setting of the Foucausie, hut circle and ensure that phased masterplans can address and safely protect the Scheduled monument.</p>
--	---------------------	--

<p><b>8. Bridge of Don Community Council</b></p>		
<p><i>Summary of Representations</i></p>	<p><i>Officers Response</i></p>	<p><i>Action as a result of Representation</i></p>
<p>Bridge of Don (BoD) suffers from heavy congestion, this development will result in 7,000 new houses. BoD is a high employment area, where a minimum of one car is the normal. This development will add about 7,000 new vehicles onto the already strained infrastructure. Without the new Don crossing being constructed before development starts the roads of BoD will turn to grid lock for the new residents as well as those already living here, and those that commute through BoD.</p> <p><b>Request:</b> The third Don crossing is imperative if this</p>	<p>The concern in relation to the impact on the traffic is noted.</p> <p>It is for the Transport Assessment to determine whether any development can be accommodated on the road network prior to the mentioned infrastructure being in place. The TA will also determined what infrastructure is required and when.</p>	<p>No amendments required as a result of this representation.</p>

<p>development is to go ahead, as well as any other developments.</p>		
<p>Schooling – Although the plan does make reference to Schools, the first primary is part of Phase 2. As we have experienced many times before, development of community buildings, like schools, shops, etc. only commence once the phase is near completion. Currently the closest school is under threat of closure (Middleton park), and the School catchment area has the development going to Danestone School. This requires primary school children crossing, the still trunk road, A90 – Parkway. It is unknown if the AWPR will be constructed before phase 1, but crossing a trunk road to a school, when there is a school nearby is very short sighted.</p> <p><b>Request :</b> Middleton Park School should remain open as it will be required even for phase 1 of this development. Closure is very short sighted</p>	<p>The school estate review has considered the provision for Grandhome including the initial phases of development. The ultimate decision in relation to the primary and secondary school catchments, zoning and the phasing and timing for the schools will be determined by the Education, Culture and Sport service. Any subsequent Masterplans and planning applications will reflect these decisions.</p> <p>The Development Framework does not make reference to specific schools. Reference is only given to using existing schools for early phases.</p> <p>The text within the Development Framework states:</p> <p>“Until the delivery of the first primary school in phase 2, children will utilise one or more of the surrounding schools. Similarly, existing secondary schools will be utilised until onsite provision is made.”</p>	<p>No amendments required as a result of this representation.</p>
<p>Development to the South of the Parkway. During the process there were strong objections from BoDCC in regards to developments south of the</p>	<p>The Development Framework demonstrates the potential to improve pedestrian and cycle connections to the south via land owned by the</p>	<p>Amend the plans to clearly indicate which areas are allocated in the ALDP.</p>



<p>Parkway – A90 (Easter Persley). It is included in Phase 2. The A90 is, presently a trunk road, but even after the AWPR it will be a very busy road, and to include the south in the development could lead to heavy plant crossing a very busy road, causing disruption and increase in danger to motorists with muck etc on the road.</p> <p><b>Request:</b> Development south of the Parkway should be excluded at present from this proposal. In future it should be looked at as an individual proposal.</p>	<p>estate.</p> <p>For the purpose of the Framework it should be clear that this area is not part of the Local Development Plan allocation.</p>	
<p>Access to the Development from the Parkway – A90. Access will require more than the proposed slip way. A Roundabout would be the best access, however construction of a new roundabout at the proposed location would be very problematic until a new Don Crossing is built, the A90 is rerouted to the AWPR and speed measures are put in on alternative routes (Danestone).</p> <p><b>Request:</b> Access to the development be completely looked at from scratch due to the changes in the A90/AWPR.</p>	<p>The Transport Assessment will determine the most appropriate junction for the parkway to accommodate the traffic. The junction shown is indicative until such a time as the TA has been agreed.</p> <p>The indicative nature of the diagrams within the Framework Document is noted in the last paragraph of the first column of page 49 where it states: “The exact location, form and detailed layout of the junction required at each access will be determined through the TA process.”</p>	<p>Amend figure 5.12 on page 49 to read indicative junction arrangements. This makes it clear that the final junction layout will be determined through the TA process and the access strategy.</p>
<p><b>Request:</b> A proper timescale should be agreed for development of first new primary.</p>	<p>The exact timing for the first new primary school is unknown. This is dependent on the school estate review and scale and type of the first proposed properties. Further detail and</p>	<p>No amendment required as a result of the representation.</p>

	timings will be available when the detailed phased masterplans are developed.	
Also this consultation makes it clear the electricity pylons are not a worry, I understand that is no longer the case and a "green corridor" is to be included. As the pylons go through the site from the proposed junction with the Parkway at an angle through the whole development, I worry this consultation has no merit as the whole document does not include the pylons.	The pylons are located within the green corridor and are shown on the plan on page 8. The key should make it clear that this is what is shown.	Key on page 8 to include reference to the pylons.
<b>9. Mr Nicol and Miss Ross</b>		
<i>Summary of Representations</i>	<i>Officers Response</i>	<i>Action as a result of Representation</i>
<p>We are owners of one of the homes within the building that is not owned by Grandhome Trust. There are three homes within this old building which was formally a school and schoolhouse.</p> <p>It looks from the plans that there have been changes to the plans around the boundaries of our homes and appears that there is some green space being maintained there. After discussion with the council staff member it became apparent that there is no actual detail in the plans as they are currently, so couldn't be specific on actual proximities, elevations, type of housing, etc. However, on page 32 of the Development Framework, it does state that Phase 1 has undergone detailed design so it can be</p>	<p>The concern in relation to the proximity to the residential properties is noted. Careful consideration will be given to existing properties at the more detailed masterplan stages, including the integration between the existing house and the new development.</p> <p>Contact details will be passed onto Turnberry planning as requested to allow them to contact the owner.</p>	No amendment required as a result of the representation.

<p>submitted with the planning application.</p> <p>Our main concerns with regards to phase 1 is the elevation of the buildings directly in front of our home and timescales. As one of only three independent homeowners within the boundaries of this huge project, we would appreciate liaison on any areas of the Grandhome development.</p>		
<p>Timescales would actually be a subject we would like to have more information for the whole project if possible. We would really appreciate consultation/liaison regarding phase 1.</p>	<p>Noted further detail on timings will be available through the Masterplans.</p>	<p>No amendment required as a result of the representation, but update as appropriate through Masterplans.</p>
<p>Furthermore, we would hope for consultation with regards to the detailed plans of phase 4 too because, as you can imagine, both these phases of plans will radically change our surrounding living environment, and therefore impact on our day to day lives.</p>	<p>Again as above there will be a masterplan for phase 4 which will consider in more detail the layout, streetscape, landscaping etc.</p>	<p>No amendment required as a result of the representation.</p>
<p>We would continue to have concerns about the issue of volumes of traffic and the coordination of timelines with regards to the building of the phases and the completion of A.W.P.R, Third Don Crossing and the upgrade of Whitestripes Road.</p>	<p>The concern in relation to the impact on the traffic is noted.</p> <p>It is for the Transport Assessment to determine whether any development can be accommodated on the road network prior to the mentioned infrastructure being in place. The TA will also determined what infrastructure is required and when.</p>	<p>No amendment required as a result of the representation.</p>

<b>10. Tillydrone Community Council</b>		
<i>Summary of Representations</i>	<i>Officers Response</i>	<i>Action as a result of Representation</i>
<p>Impressed with the architectural design and layout of the development and consider it to provide a wonderful opportunity for citizens to live in a development that puts to the fore the well being of the residents by employing naturalistic and holistic principles as the basis of its design.</p> <p>We can only express positive comments for all the elements right down to the building fabric to be employed.</p> <p>It has inspired us to work for similar design principles being employed in the impending regeneration of our own neighbourhood.</p>	<p>Noted these comments are welcomed.</p>	<p>No amendment required as a result of the representation.</p>
<p>The framework has no strategy for travel out-with the settlement, relying completely on the private car. The current 19, 1 and 2 services are inadequate and do not run on time. The proposal that the development will utilise the third don crossing and the initial phases will be served by a variant of service 1 is not justified or sufficient.</p> <p>The access strategy is therefore to slot the development into the planned road infrastructure of a major outer circular road (the AWPR) complimented by main radial roads into the city centre (3rd Don Crossing). This unsustainable model will only</p>	<p>Discussions with bus operators have begun to ensure that the site is well serviced by public transport. Further information and detail on the access strategy will be provided within detailed Mastepans once more the design has evolved further.</p> <p>A detailed Travel Plan will be required as part of the planning application process once housing type and tenure has been confirmed. Travel Packs will also be sent out to residents.</p>	<p>Add in section 5.5 Access Strategy that-  “A residential Travel plan and travel packs will be developed and sent out to every resident.”</p>

<p>increase the north east dependency on the car thereby exacerbating existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>The vehicular increase will also add to the existing traffic congestion in the City and will also add to the carbon emissions which are contributing to the extreme weather events which are increasingly experiencing.</p>		
<p>It defies comprehension that the City Council cannot see the irony of a route being constructed across a river valley clearing hundreds of mature trees, many of which are protected species, disrupting wild life, visually blighting the area and devastating the health and wellbeing of a community of over 3000 people; all for the sake of servicing a 'Sustainable Development' based upon the ideals of the famous naturalist 'von Humboldt'</p> <p>The framework document states "The development of the site will also result in improved accessibility through related improvements to the road network serving the site, complemented by other strategic transport proposals such as the Third Don Crossing ..."</p> <p>This is completely illogical as the construction of a main radial route to the city centre contradicts principles 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the vision . (see page 3 of the Development Framework)</p>	<p>The principle of the Third Don Crossing is not part of this Development Framework or this consultation exercise.</p> <p>It is for the Transport Assessment to determine whether any development can be accommodated on the road network prior to the mentioned infrastructure being in place. The TA will also determine what infrastructure is required and when.</p>	<p>No amendment required as a result of the representation.</p>

<p>The representation highlighted the above principles of the framework and how they will be contradicted with the erection of the third don crossing. Full comments are appended in Appendix 2.</p>		
<p>It has been the practice of Tillydrone Community Council to provide alternative solutions when objecting or making criticisms to planning proposals. Our solution is for the development of Scotlands first Bus Rapid Transit (BRT ) system. (suggested route can be seen within the full representation in Appendix 2.)</p> <p>This solution has proven to be feasible affordable and timely to implement and the funding proposed for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Don Crossing would provide considerable contribution to the project.</p> <p>It would be worthwhile to investigate the successful systems in Curitiba, Boston, Moscow, Melbourne, Bogota, Pittsburgh, Seattle, Cleveland, New Jersey, Essen, or Johannesburg to name just a few. The viability and success of these projects have even prompted car centric Nestrans to introduce it into their Transport Strategy update.</p>	<p>The principle of the Third Don Crossing is not part of this Development Framework or this consultation exercise.</p> <p>It is for the Transport Assessment to determine whether any development can be accommodated on the road network prior to the mentioned infrastructure being in place. The TA will also determined what infrastructure is required and when.</p>	<p>No amendment required as a result of the representation.</p>
<p><b>11. Aberdeen Outdoor Access Forum</b></p>		
<p><i>Summary of Representations</i></p>	<p><i>Officers Response</i></p>	<p><i>Action as a result of</i></p>

		<i>Representation</i>
Access legislation is contained within the <i>Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003</i> . The term “footpath” is not used in the legislation as this term ignores other legitimate users of a path network.	It is noted that a few of the reference to footpaths within the document need to be amended to read paths in order to comply with the Reform (Scotland) Act 2003.	Amend all ‘footpaths’ to read ‘paths’.
<p>The Grandhome Framework recognises the local Core Path Network within both the Danestone and Middleton Park areas of the Bridge of Don, as well as the wider Network available in the neighbouring section of the River Don corridor.</p> <p>The developers have also identified a link with Aspirational Path (AP) 6 in the area of the Mugiemoos (Davidson Mill) regeneration site on the opposite bank of the River Don. This aspirational route is planned to cross the river, to the Grandhome bank, via a new-build bridge. Further, AP 6 is a piece of the jigsaw that will allow a through path network to follow the River Don from Dyce to the Brig o’ Balgownie.</p>	<p>The text associated with the bridge connection to the Davidson’s Mill site on page 9 of the Development Framework states:</p> <p>“A future connection will be created in respect of the pedestrian and cycle bridge at Davidson’s Mill with others potentially being created elsewhere within the Don corridor.”</p> <p>The text associated with the plan key also reflects this.</p>	No amendment required as a result of the representation.
At present, Whitestripes Road appears to have a poor provision for non-motorised activity, especial in its more “rural” sections. This road will be a key route to service the proposed Grandhome Development as it runs along the northern edge of the main part of the Development, and also a north eastern outlier. A multi-use pavement, or segregated routes, on both sides of Whitestripes Road would link into CP 26.	<p>Whitestripes Road will be considered as part of the Transport Assessment being carried out for the site. Consideration will be given to pedestrian and cyclist movement as part of this process.</p> <p>Whitestripes Road and Avenue upgrades have been indicated for delivery in phase 1 shown on page 83 of the Development Framework.</p>	No amendment required as a result of the representation.

<p>The present shared path along The Parkway is not signed and is of poor quality requiring improvement. Upgraded links along both Whitestripes Avenue and Whitestripes Road would both join into The Parkway. Similarly, upgrade of the existing crossing points at Whitestripes Avenue / The Parkway and the Balgownie Road / The Parkway junctions will be required. At least one other crossing over The Parkway, between Laurel Drive and Whitestripes Avenue will be required. A major Tesco superstore is situated on Laurel Drive and would likely be popular with residents in the new development.</p>	<p>These concerns and issues will be assessed and addressed via the Transport Assessment process.</p> <p>There will be the requirement for upgrades to roads, junctions and the addition of crossing points but their location and timings will be determined through the Transport Assessment.</p>	<p>No amendment required as a result of the representation.</p>
<p>Though employment and retail opportunities and schools are planned for Grandhome, links to other examples outside the area e.g. Aberdeen Science and Technology Park and Oldmachar Academy need to be improved.</p>	<p>Noted links outwith the site will be further developed through the phased masterplans.</p>	<p>No amendment required as a result of the representation.</p>
<p>The predominantly rural minor road from The Parkway / Laurel Drive roundabout at Persley to Foulcausey / Foulcausey Brae on the landward section of Whitestripes Road is on a popular itinerary with cyclists. It is presumed that there will be access to the Development at, or near to, this point. Provision for cyclists and other non-motorised users would be necessary. This route would give direct access to the proposed bridge at the Mugiemoor regeneration site and to the Core Path network</p>	<p>These concerns and issues will all be assessed and addressed via the Transport Assessment process.</p> <p>There will be the requirement for upgrades to roads, junctions and the addition of crossing points but their location and timings will be determined through the Transport Assessment.</p>	<p>No amendment required as a result of the representation.</p>



downstream of Persley Bridge.		
To the north of the Grandhome Development there are no Core Paths present in the City, or in Aberdeenshire. As a result, no new links whether formal or informal have been envisaged.	There is scope to provide connections to the north as shown on page 66 of the Framework. Detailed connectivity and access will be fully assessed as part of the detailed Masterplan for phase 5. The layout and path network does not prevent connections to the north in the future if required/desired.	No amendment required as a result of the representation.
The Development Framework has identified other paths outside the periphery of the Grandhome site. An example includes the small network of paths signed by Aberdeen Countryside Project. These paths are in the area of the former “stock car circuit” behind Persley Quarry (scrap yard). A link has been recognised from this small network to Clerkhill Wood via Cothill through the Grandhome Development site. Hopefully, improvements could be initiated at the Persley end.	The proposal will have a well connected path network through the site. The detailed paths will be shown in the phased Masterplans and planning applications. The infrastructure requirements within the Local Development Plan ensure the provision of connections through the site linking to strategic routes outwith the site.	No amendment required as a result of the representation.
Monument Wood and the “Manganese Quarry” though recognised as an important woodland and wetland respectively appear to miss out on a formal path provision from outside the Development. Within the Development woods, there appears to be proposals for a regular grid pattern of paths. This may not be in keeping with such an environment and may promote the formation of desire lines in the woodlands.	The detail of paths and connections will be determined through the Masterplan process. Further consideration will be given to the footpath network and the appropriateness of proposed routes.	No amendment required as a result of the representation.
The new community, consisting of subsets of	One of the main aspirations of the Grandhome	No amendment required as

<p>separate “villages”, will have provided a range of facilities such as schools, a library, medical centre and shops. The idea is for an attractive network of safe routes for movement within and between the separate “villages” and to the wider area outside the Grandhome Development. Using <i>Designing Streets</i> as a template, there is an attempt to give these subset communities a local distinctiveness and a sense of place. It is hoped that having compact areas that are both walkable and attractive for cyclists will encourage social activity.</p>	<p>Development Framework is to ensure a sustainable and walkable neighbourhood with well connected streets and a strong sense of place. Social activity is a fundamental part of this.</p>	<p>a result of the representation.</p>
<p>One illustration is of Coopers’ and Wrights’ Place, a row of 19<sup>th</sup> Century houses which are part of the University of Aberdeen campus. Students, and others, pass in front of these. It would be interesting to ascertain the views of the residents on the stream of walkers passing their properties.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No amendment required as a result of the representation.</p>
<p>In the Bucksburn suburb of Aberdeen, Newhills Primary School (slated for a new build) is at the centre of the Newhills housing development. The development is bounded by the peripheral Newhills Avenue and has a grid of paths criss-crossing the area internally. At regular intervals, the local Community Council receive complaints from some of the residents about youths congregating on the path grid outside homes.</p>	<p>It is essential to have a path network connecting the different areas and community uses. There needs to be safe routes to schools allowing the children to walk or cycle.</p> <p>All paths and spaces will be overlooked providing natural surveillance.</p> <p>There will also be social and recreational nodes provided within the green space networks ensuring variety and areas to stop and congregate. Page 59 of the Development</p>	<p>No amendment required as a result of the representation.</p>

	Framework goes into more details about this.	
Green links are proposed within the development. Examples include a green link going from the River Don to Clerkhill Wood via Hall's Quarry and Monument Wood. The core wetland of the Manganese Pond / Quarry is recognised and is at the heart of an east-west green corridor that includes a series of sports pitches. However, on studying the various green corridor maps within the Development Framework, there was apperception that the corridors varied in size from map to map. It is hoped they do not shrink in the final draft.	<p>The detailed green links and open space provision will be looked at in more detail as part of the Masterplans for each phase of development.</p> <p>Careful consideration will be given to these links and it will be essential to ensure that they have a function and are of an appropriate scale.</p>	No amendment required as a result of the representation.
Though lying outside the Grandhome Development this (riparian) green corridor along the River Don has been recognised as part of a natural link with areas of a more rural character upstream. Hopefully, it will remain as such.	Noted - it is the aims of the Local Development Plan and the River Don Development Framework to ensure the River Don corridor is protected.	No amendment required as a result of the representation.
<b>12. Mrs Laing</b>		
<i>Summary of Representations</i>	<i>Officers Response</i>	<i>Action as a result of Representation</i>
Traffic concerns - Bridge of Don traffic is diabolical at the moment regardless of the time of day. I appreciate there are plans to build the western peripheral route and 3rd don crossing however by then introducing 7000 new homes we will be back where we first began with our traffic issues.	It is for the Transport Assessment to determine whether any development can be accommodated on the road network prior to the mentioned infrastructure being in place. The TA will also determined what infrastructure is required and when.	No amendment required as a result of the representation.

<p>Zoning of children from Grandhome to Danestone. It is crazy, dangerous and entirely unreasonable to expect primary school children to cross a main trunk road when walking to and from school every day. There have been several accidents on this road over the last few months mainly around the crossing areas. School children should not be faced with this challenge or risk.</p>	<p>The school estate review has considered the provision for Grandhome including the initial phases of development. The ultimate decision in relation to the primary and secondary school catchments, zoning and the phasing and timing for the schools will be determined by the Education, Culture and Sport service. Any subsequent Masterplans and planning applications will reflect these decisions.</p> <p>The Development Framework does not make reference to specific schools. Reference is only given to using existing schools for early phases.</p> <p>The text within the Development Framework states:</p> <p>“Until the delivery of the first primary school in phase 2, children will utilise one or more of the surrounding schools. Similarly, existing secondary schools will be utilised until onsite provision is made.”</p>	<p>No amendment required as a result of the representation.</p>
<p><b>13. Mr Mitchell</b></p>		
<p><i>Summary of Representations</i></p>	<p><i>Officers Response</i></p>	<p><i>Action as a result of Representation</i></p>
<p>Encouraged to see the bridge link over the River</p>	<p>Noted. It should be made clear that the</p>	<p>No amendment required as</p>

Don, and that there are potential for further links. There would also be benefit in another link beside Grandhome House to allow access to Dyce and Stoneywood.	proposed bridge is pedestrian/cycle only and not for vehicular transport.	a result of the representation.
Note reference to a proposed vehicular bridge (Vol 3, App 2 Comments) which could also provide this link, however no further details were given, could this or a stand-alone pedestrian link be considered for future revisions of the plan.	A pedestrian/cycle bridge is proposed at Farburn. This is specifically a non-vehicular bridge crossing the Don.	Amend Appendix 2 on page 86 accordingly.
In relation to the bridge links there are certain locations where linkage to existing paths does not appear to be present, this would be appreciated in future revisions.	Noted. A well connected path network is essential.	No amendment required as a result of the representation.
Whitestripes Road appears to be a main route through the development and on completion of the AWRP and the 3 <sup>rd</sup> Don crossing it will be under increasing vehicular pressures. Access for residents and pupils from all parts of the development should be of primary concern. Development of pedestrian/cycle provision would be beneficial early so that they can be considered and their impact assessed rather than at a latter stage when potentially opportunities for their inclusion may be considered either too expensive or disruptive to the existing infrastructure.	The Transport Assessment will determine the level of upgrade that is required on Whitestripes Road. This will include junctions, pavements, crossings etc.  Page 83 of the Framework indicates this will be within phase 1.	No amendment required as a result of the representation.
The existing minor link between the Parkway and Whitestripes Rd should be subject to the same pedestrian and cycle provision.	The Transport Assessment will determine the level of upgrade that is required.	No amendment required as a result of the representation.
Good quality cycle linkages needs to be provided to	Improvements to the Parkway footway is	No amendment required as

access the shared path along the Parkway. The existing shared use path needs improvements.	identified within the Council's Infrastructure requirements for the site.	a result of the representation.
Detailed design should consider at least one new toucan crossing between Laurel Dr and Whitestripes Ave junctions and the upgrade of the existing crossing points at the Whitestripes Ave/Parkway junction and the Balgownie Rd/Parkway junction.	It is for the Transport Assessment to determine the number of crossings, location and phasing.	No amendment required as a result of the representation.
<b>14. NESTRANS</b>		
<i>Summary of Representations</i>	<i>Officers Response</i>	<i>Action as a result of Representation</i>
Welcome the publication of this development framework and in particular the emphasis it places on the creation of a sustainable mixed community designed to prioritise the movement of pedestrians and cyclists.	The comments are welcomed.	No amendment required as a result of the representation.
As well as walking and cycling, bus service provision makes up a key part of the access strategy and key to ensuring sustainable travel both within and to/from the site. It is welcomed that potential bus routes have been considered at this early stage and options identified for phased implementation. In order to positively influence the travel patterns of residents and those working within the site, these travel options need to be present from a very early stage of development, recognising that it will take time for demand to increase.	Further consideration will be given to the bus routes as part of the detailed Masterplans to ensure there is coverage of the entire site.  It is agreed that the bus provision will have to be in place from the outset. A detailed Travel Plan will be required as part of the planning application process.	No amendment required as a result of the representation.
Welcome the inclusion of a parking strategy for the	Noted. The information will be forwarded onto	No amendment required as

development and this should be developed in line with the principles and objectives set out in the North East's Regional Parking Strategy which can be found on the Nestrans website.	Turnberry Planning.	a result of the representation.
We have no objection to the principles set out in the development framework and welcome the recognition of the requirements of the Strategic Transport Fund under the Access Strategy. As identified in the framework, contributions to the STF will be required in line with the policy set out in the supplementary planning guidance "Delivering Identified Projects through a Strategic Transport Fund.	Noted. The Development Framework makes explicit reference to the requirement of the Strategic Transport Fund on page 46.	No amendment required as a result of the representation.
<b>15. Transport Scotland</b>		
<i>Summary of Representations</i>	<i>Officers Response</i>	<i>Action as a result of Representation</i>
Refer to previous comments from Transport Scotland.	Noted	No amendment required as a result of the representation.
<b>16. Mr Paterson - Chairperson Education or Bust?</b>		
<i>Summary of Representations</i>	<i>Officers Response</i>	<i>Action as a result of Representation</i>
As a group representing parents from Glashieburn and Middleton Park primaries we are extremely concerned with the potential rezoning of the initial phases(s) of the Grandhome development from	The school estate review has considered the provision for Grandhome including the initial phases of development. The ultimate decision in relation to the primary and secondary school	No amendment required as a result of the representation.

<p>Middleton Park to Danestone Primary. This has been suggested as part of the Council's review of the nursery and school estate. This action seems to purposefully put children in danger by forcing them to cross a 50mph trunk road (A90) in order to get to primary school.</p> <p>A better and safer alternative would be to utilise the area's other 3 great primaries (Middleton Park, Glashieburn and Forehill) for the Grandhome children. These all have the obvious advantage of being on the same side of the Parkway as the potential development. While we realise the Parkway might eventually be declassified this might not be for many years. Please find attached a picture of the only current A90 crossing across in the vicinity taken only a few weeks ago!</p> <p>We are seriously worried about children been killed or injured going to primary school if this change is allowed to happen.</p>	<p>catchments, zoning and the phasing and timing for the schools will be determined by the Education, Culture and Sport service. Any subsequent Masterplans and planning applications will reflect these decisions.</p> <p>The Development Framework does not make reference to specific schools. Reference is only given to using existing schools for early phases.</p> <p>The text within the Development Framework states:</p> <p>“Until the delivery of the first primary school in phase 2, children will utilise one or more of the surrounding schools. Similarly, existing secondary schools will be utilised until onsite provision is made.”</p>	
<p><b>17. Dr Ewan Paterson - resident</b></p>		
<p><i>Summary of Representations</i></p>	<p><i>Officers Response</i></p>	<p><i>Action as a result of Representation</i></p>
<p>Purposefully putting children in danger by forcing them to cross a 50mph trunk road (A90) in order to get to primary school (Danestone) rather than use the 3 great primaries in the area (Middleton Park,</p>	<p>The school estate review has considered the provision for Grandhome including the initial phases of development. The ultimate decision in relation to the primary and secondary school</p>	<p>No amendment required as a result of the representation.</p>



<p>Glashieburn and Forehill) where this wouldn't be necessary is totally unacceptable.</p>	<p>catchments, zoning and the phasing and timing for the schools will be determined by the Education, Culture and Sport service. Any subsequent Masterplans and planning applications will reflect these decisions.</p> <p>The Development Framework does not make reference to specific schools. Reference is only given to using existing schools for early phases.</p> <p>The text within the Development Framework states:</p> <p>“Until the delivery of the first primary school in phase 2, children will utilise one or more of the surrounding schools. Similarly, existing secondary schools will be utilised until onsite provision is made.”</p>	
<p>The road infrastructure in Bridge of Don is horrendous and anybody who has tried to get in or out in the hours surround rush hour will attest to that comment. The WPR and 3rd Don crossing will bring the situation to HOW IT SHOULD BE not give an excuse to build many more thousands of houses and take things back to probably worse than they are just now.</p>	<p>The principle of development on this site has been established by the Local Development Plan.</p> <p>It is for the Transport Assessment to determine whether any development can be accommodated on the road network prior to the mentioned infrastructure being in place. The TA will also determined what infrastructure is required and when.</p>	<p>No amendment required as a result of the representation.</p>

<p>There is currently NO additional capacity for any more traffic. If this development which will be a disaster for Bridge of Don is to go ahead there should be absolutely no new houses before 3rd Don crossing / WPR</p>	<p>The principle of development on this site has been established by the Local Development Plan.</p> <p>It is for the Transport Assessment to determine whether any development can be accommodated on the road network prior to the mentioned infrastructure being in place. The TA will also determined what infrastructure is required and when.</p>	<p>No amendment required as a result of the representation.</p>
<p><b>18. Sue Thomson - Resident</b></p>		
<p><i>Summary of Representations</i></p>	<p><i>Officers Response</i></p>	<p><i>Action as a result of Representation</i></p>
<p>Increase in traffic - Strong concerns this development will start without the key new infrastructure in place putting unbearable pressure on the current road system in Bridge of Don and also increasing the risk to pedestrians walking near the development</p>	<p>It is for the Transport Assessment to determine whether any development can be accommodated on the road network prior to the mentioned infrastructure being in place. The TA will also determined what infrastructure is required and when.</p> <p>There will likely be the requirement for upgrades to roads, junctions and paths as a result of the development, this will be determined through the Transport Assessment process.</p>	<p>No amendment required as a result of the representation.</p>

<p>Education - Asking children to cross the Parkway, a 50mph road, to go to Danestone School while the new schools are built is unacceptable and putting their lives at risk.</p> <p>Concerns that the children living in the new estate will get shiny new schools with all the associated benefits the current schools and children in Bridge of Don will miss out. This development should not go ahead until a future proof plan for all the schools - new and old - in Bridge of Don has been developed and agreed.</p>	<p>The school estate review has considered the provision for Grandhome including the initial phases of development. The ultimate decision in relation to the primary and secondary school catchments, zoning and the phasing and timing for the schools will be determined by the Education, Culture and Sport service. Any subsequent Masterplans and planning applications will reflect these decisions.</p> <p>The Development Framework does not make reference to specific schools. Reference is only given to using existing schools for early phases.</p> <p>The text within the Development Framework states:</p> <p>“Until the delivery of the first primary school in phase 2, children will utilise one or more of the surrounding schools. Similarly, existing secondary schools will be utilised until onsite provision is made.”</p>	<p>No amendment required as a result of the representation.</p>
<p>There is no mention of churches that I can see in this document. Has provision been made for churches in this development? Are you expecting the current churches in Bridge of Don to meet the needs.</p>	<p>The development Framework makes reference to Religious buildings.</p> <p>P44 states – “additional sites have been identified to allow the community to bring forward specific buildings in support of its</p>	<p>No amendment required as a result of the representation.</p>

	needs, including religious buildings.”	
	P45 shows potential site for a religious building.	
<b>19. Forestry Commission</b>		
<i>Summary of Representations</i>	<i>Officers Response</i>	<i>Action as a result of Representation</i>
<p>There are a number of woodland blocks both throughout the development site and on its boundaries. A number of these are designated as Ancient Semi-Natural Woodlands and are an extremely valuable part of the landscape. The key concern in managing the development around them will be to ensure the following principles are adhered to:</p> <p>These woodlands should be protected. This should be through active management and by buffering them by increasing their size by creating similar woodland habitat around them.</p> <p>The woodlands should be connected to each other allowing species (flora and fauna) to freely move, this will help to maintain and enhance healthy populations.</p>	It is agreed that the management of the woodlands are key within the site.	<p>Add a note within the landscape strategy</p> <p>“ A tree survey and a woodland management plan will be required to be submitted as part of the detailed planning applications for each phase of development”</p>
Looking at the actual plan there appears to be a couple of pinch points which would limit woodland	Careful consideration must be given to the green spaces to ensure habitat connectivity	Amendment required

<p>habitat connectivity as follows:</p> <p>South from Monument Wood NJ 908 109 to Ancient Semi Natural Woodland on the southern border at NJ 906 105 above Lower Persley Farm.</p> <p>East from Monument Wood NJ 907 111 where there is a school, roundabout and the density of development increases, creates a significant barrier to species movement particularly as this corridor would be the most direct link to the riverside, this would be a major movement route. Opening up this link should be made a priority when reviewing the current plan.</p>	<p>and allow movement through the site. It is noted that largely there is good connectivity through the site. The concern about pinch points is very valid and further consideration needs to be given to these areas to ensure that there are no barriers.</p> <p>Habitat connectivity is very important and as stated in the representation especially when the density of development is higher and the area busier with people and vehicles.</p>	<p>Add a paragraph onto page 63 which states:</p> <p>“Phased Masterplans must ensure connectivity of habitats within and through the whole site. Justification and evidence will be provided to ensure that this is the case.”</p>
<p>Suggest caution at the use the term 'less valuable trees' as even woodland in poor condition is easier for woodland species to move through than an open farmland or urban landscape. Some of these areas also have a grant scheme legacy as discussed below, any removal or replacement of this habitat should be done with the use of a competent forester or ecologist and in consultation with the relevant statutory authorities.</p>	<p>This is agreed the term less valuable is not appropriate as they could be improved.</p>	<p>Amend the last paragraph on page 18 to read</p> <p>“A few specimens and areas are of a poorer quality and may benefit from being replaced or having enhancement woodland management practices carried out”.</p>
<p>The woodlands within the scheme have been grant aided under Woodland Grant Schemes 1, 2 and 3 with contract dates between 1991 and 2005, whilst these contracts have closed there is still a liability to</p>	<p>The Development Framework aims to retain as much of the existing tree cover as possible and the phased masterplans will provide more detail in relation to the existing woodlands and</p>	<p>Add a section at the end of the last paragraph on page 18 in relation to woodland removal:</p>

<p>ensure they remain as woodlands. I note that the written narrative of the plan states that there is a presumption against woodland removal however please be aware of the grant scheme conditions and also the following statement concerning the control of woodland removal in Scotland:</p> <p>The Scottish Government has a long-term plan to expand the woodland cover in Scotland and there is a general presumption against the permanent loss of woodland. To help manage the permanent loss of woodland through economic development, the Scottish Government has produced a policy on the Control of Woodland Removal (2009). The policy requires compensatory planting, to mitigate permanent woodland loss through economic development. Compensatory planting of at least the same area lost to development should be made a condition any planning approval.</p>	<p>additional planting areas.</p>	<p>“The policy requires compensatory planting, to mitigate permanent woodland loss through economic development. Compensatory planting of at least the same area lost to development should be made a condition any planning approval.”</p>
<p><b>Internal comments</b></p>		
<p>Development Framework also referenced that 'some initial development could be accommodated on the transport network' rather than saying that 'initial development can be accommodated'.</p>	<p>Noted this wording is more appropriate due to the requirement for the Transport Assessment to address this issue.</p>	<p>Amend all references to reflect this change.</p> <p>This should include p46 1<sup>st</sup> column last paragraphs amend to read “....the potential traffic impact of the</p>

		new settlement, and what development could be accommodated on the existing road network.”
3D images and sketches of the site should be marked as indicative.	Agreed	Amend the relevant figures to read Indicative.
		A few further minor textual changes are proposed.