

**EPI/13/259: Persley Den (Woodside) Masterplan OP135: Public Consultation Results
Summary, Officer Response and Actions**

Historic Scotland

<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<i>Officers Response</i>	<i>Action as a result of Representation</i>
None of our statutory interests will be affected by the proposals for the area in question. Welcome the preparation of the brief and confirm we have no further comments.	Comments noted.	No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.
Advise you also seek comments from your Council's Conservation and Archaeology Services who will also be able to advise on the potential for significant impacts on the historic environment and of potential impacts and mitigation for any sites of regional and local importance.	Comments noted. Conservation colleagues have been involved in the preparation of the Masterplan and detailed advice will be sought from the Council's archaeology department during planning application stages. However, at the Masterplan stage there are no historical sites which will be affected by the development.	No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.

Scottish Water

<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<i>Officers Response</i>	<i>Action as a result of Representation</i>
Scottish Water previously commented on the Draft Persley Den (Woodside) OP135 Masterplan [during an earlier stakeholder consultation] and we have no additional comments to make in regards to the foul and surface water drainage for the development.	Comments noted.	Clarify corresponding text in Section 12 of the Masterplan. Advise developer and design team to

<p>We would always encourage early engagement between the developer and our Customer Connections Team, to discuss available strategic and network capacity, as well as proposed SUDS design if the system is to be vested with Scottish Water.</p> <p>In relation to Section 12 - Infrastructure and Developer Contributions, I would like to clarify that developers are not required to contribute to upgrades at our Water or Wastewater Treatment Works (Part 4 Assets). They will however be required to lay any water mains, sewers, pumping stations or other Part 3 Assets essential to supporting their development and maintaining our existing customers' level of service. The developer will be eligible for a Reasonable Cost Contribution from Scottish Water towards these costs.</p>		<p>engage with Scottish Water at an early stage in the detailed design stages.</p>
<p>Local Resident 1</p>		
<p><i>Summary of Representation</i></p>	<p><i>Officers Response</i></p>	<p><i>Action as a result of Representation</i></p>
<p>The area is an important wildlife corridor, where there are roe deer, foxes, otters, tawny owls, dippers amongst many others.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The value of the area for wildlife is understood and expressed through the designations of the River Don and Kittybrewster-Inverness Railways Line Local Nature Reserves, the Green Space Network and Green Belt.</p>	<p>No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.</p>

	<p>An ecological survey has informed the production of the Masterplan and the document recognises the importance of the wildlife designations and considerations for the site. The Masterplan aims to work with the site landscape, topography and ecological assets whilst accommodating the proposed new development. It proposes four key opportunities in this respect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve wildlife corridors • Implementation of an ecology management programme • Increase biodiversity • Improve River Don water quality <p>A full Ecological Survey will be submitted as part of any planning application for the OP 135 site, which will include any necessary protected species surveys.</p>	<p>Advise design team / developer that detailed tree and ecological surveys (included protected species surveys) will be required as part of any future planning application.</p>
<p>Whilst the outline sounds very good, it is squeezing more housing into an important recreational and wild area that brings space into the city and allows wild creature a space to stay.</p>	<p>The Persley Den (Woodside) site is allocated as Opportunity site OP135 in the Aberdeen Local Development Plan. The development proposed is maintained within the limits of both the OP135 site boundary and the boundaries of the Green Space Network and Green Belt boundaries. As a result the green space network is maintained. Detailed ecological and tree surveys will be completed and submitted as part of any future planning application which will inform the detailed layout on site, including exact sizes of proposed open spaces and green corridors in addition to the retained Green Space Network and Green Belt.</p>	<p>No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.</p>
<p>The woodland helps with flood control of the</p>	<p>Comments noted and the benefit woodland has to control</p>	<p>No amendment</p>

<p>river Don as well; the loss of trees would worsen that situation.</p>	<p>flood water is understood and the Masterplan states that the development should work with the existing topography and any opportunities for the Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems should be optimised.</p> <p>The Masterplan understands the site has a strong, well established landscape setting. The existing tree belts, woodland and river will be celebrated, improved and strengthened where possible and existing tree lined roads will be upgraded sensitively to minimise any potential damage the established trees.</p> <p>The Masterplan proposes a number of key objective with regard to the importance of trees and woodland:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved maintenance and care of trees • Strengthen existing historic tree belts • Supplementary planting • Removal and management of diseased and dangerous trees • Improve wildlife corridors • Provide an established, attractive setting for new development <p>A detailed landscape strategy, including details of species choice and maintenance, will be submitted as part of any future planning application for the site. In addition, a detailed assessment of trees with regard to proximity to new housing, separation distance and excavation impacts will form part of any future planning application for the site.</p>	<p>proposed as a result of the representation.</p> <p>Advise design team / developer that detailed tree and ecological surveys (included protected species surveys) will be required as part of any future planning application.</p>
--	---	--

Scottish Natural Heritage		
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<i>Officers Response</i>	<i>Action as a result of Representation</i>
No comments to make in in this case.	Noted.	No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.
Council Sport and Physical Activity Team		
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<i>Officers Response</i>	<i>Action as a result of Representation</i>
1. We have concerns regarding the loss of pitches. We acknowledge that there is an intention to upgrade pitches however our concern is that the overall number of pitches will be reduced significantly.	The Persley Den (Woodside) site is allocated as Opportunity site OP135 in the Aberdeen Local Development Plan. The masterplanning process has included an assessment of the existing pitch provision on the site, which has included consultation with Sport Scotland. This assessment has resulted in a package of upgrading / replacement and financial contributions which has been agreed in principle with Sport Scotland. In addition to the proposed upgrading of the two pitches on the site, an off site financial contribution will be agreed and controlled through a legal agreement as part of any future formal planning application. Such an application will require a Sports Pitch Assessment to provide specific details of pitch provision, upgrading works, management and off-site contributions. As a result of this approach, the development of OP135 would result in no net loss of sports pitches, which is in line with Scottish Planning Policy and the Aberdeen Local	No amendment proposed as a result of the representation. Advise design team / developer of the requirement for Sports Pitch Assessment as part of any planning application.

	Development Plan.	
2. Please advise who will provide the revenue budgets to manage and maintain this pitch area.	It is not within the remit of the Masterplan to determine or detail specific arrangements or level of funding for the management of the new sports pitch provision. Any planning application will include a Sports Pitch Assessment to provide specific details of pitch provision, upgrading works, management and off-site contributions and any necessary contributions will be managed through a legal agreement.	No amendment proposed as a result of the representation. Advise design team / developer of the requirement for Sports Pitch Assessment as part of any planning application.
3. Following a discussion with users of the Woodside Sports Complex on 18.11.13 we know that there is not capacity to accommodate additional teams from these pitches on this site and some of the users are already having to use municipal pitches in the city for matches and they are having to consider putting portacabins on site. Please advise how you intend to accommodate the additional users given that the developer intends to demolish the pavilion but not replace.	The Masterplan states that upgrading works will be completed as part of the new pitch strategy for the site, and at present these upgrades are proposed for the Woodside Sports Complex. Any planning application will include a Sports Pitch Assessment to provide specific details of pitch provision, upgrading works and management.	No amendment proposed as a result of the representation. Advise design team / developer of the requirement for Sports Pitch Assessment as part of any planning application.
4. Within this consultation document it refers	The 'Woodside Sports Village' concept is referred to in section	No amendment

<p>to the woodside sports village. We would not classify 1 x 11 aside pitch and 1 x 7 aside pitch with no changing as a sports village.</p>	<p>1.2 of the Masterplan. This development concept was promoted at an earlier stage in the masterplanning process. The masterplan vision still includes sports pitches and facilities to the north and east of the site. However, since the earlier 'sports village' development concept and as a result of specialist input, technical analysis and detailed site design stages – this vision has been amended to reflect the current Masterplan proposals.</p>	<p>proposed as a result of the representation.</p>
<p>5. Parking is already an issue at the Woodside Sports Complex site and if the proposal is that users of the pitches at Persley Den use the changing accommodation at Woodside Sports Complex the assumption is that they will also park in this area. How will the parking issue be addressed for the current users of this facility?</p>	<p>The Mastepplan states that upgrading works will be completed as part of the new pitch strategy for the site, and at present these upgrades are proposed for the Woodside Sports Complex. Any planning application will include a Sports Pitch Assessment to provide specific details of pitch provision, upgrading works and management. Management of the site should consider car parking as an issue and it is agreed that this requires to be considered in this assessment along with a detailed Transport Assessment.</p>	<p>Sports Pitch Assessment and Transport Assessment required as part of any future planning application.</p> <p>Advise developer / design team that such assessments should take account of car parking issues and management options.</p>
<p>Transport Scotland</p>		
<p><i>Summary of Representation</i></p>	<p><i>Officers Response</i></p>	<p><i>Action as a result of Representation</i></p>

<p>We refer to the consultation request issued to Transport Scotland, which has been passed to JMP (as their term consultants) to comment.</p> <p>Transport Scotland's primary consideration will be the potential impact these proposals will have on the safe and efficient operation of the A90 (T) trunk road. It is noted that the masterplan proposes that this development will be accessed from a new junction on the A90 Muggiemoss Road. This is to incorporate relocated access to Hutcheon Low Drive and Persley Bridge Nursing Home and is likely to be signalised.</p> <p>The masterplan notes correctly that the details of this junction will require to be confirmed through the TA process. In that regard we would advise that Transport Scotland (and your roads colleagues) have already commenced discussions with the developers and their consultants regarding the scope of the necessary TA. These discussions have highlighted the need to demonstrate an appropriate form of access from the A90 that does not adversely affect operating conditions.</p> <p>The programme for development on page</p>	<p>Comments noted. Discussions have begun with Council road officers and the developers to discuss both the content of a forthcoming detailed Transport Assessment and detailed junction/road design issues.</p>	<p>No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.</p> <p>Comments to be passed on to design team / developer and Council Roads Project Officers.</p>
--	--	--

<p>63 indicates house building commencing from 2016. By this time it is anticipated that the 3rd Don Crossing would be complete, which is likely to provide more favourable conditions to accommodate new/modified junctions along the A90 (T). Thereafter the AWPR is anticipated to provide further relief. Allowance for these infrastructure projects will therefore require to be included as part of any phasing strategy within the TA.</p> <p>We trust these comments are of assistance and look forward to continued discussion on the delivery of these development proposals.</p>		
Aberdeen Outdoor Access Forum		
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<i>Officers Response</i>	<i>Action as a result of Representation</i>
<p>Page 7 of document states "...public exhibitions in the Citizen newspaper..." Is the Citizen widely available in Aberdeen area?</p>	<p>The Citizen is a free newspaper, available throughout Aberdeen in paper format or online and is frequently used to advertise planning issues, consultations and associated notices. As part of the early consultation on the masterplan, the design team sent invitations to 400 local residents and businesses to advertise the early consultation events and launched a corresponding website. As part of the most recent 4 week statutory public consultation (ran by the Council) the following means of advertisement were carried out and this is considered an appropriate level to ensure the consultation</p>	<p>No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.</p>

	<p>and proposals have been adequately publicised.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publication of document on Aberdeen City Council Website 'Current Consultations' and 'Masterplanning' web pages. • Hard copy of document available for viewing at Marischal College between 9am and 5pm Monday to Friday. • Hard copy of the document and consultation poster made available at Woodside Library and Woodside Customer Access Point & Community Centre. • Press Release from Aberdeen City Council issued on 18 November 2013 entitled "Consultation on Persley Den (Woodside) Masterplan" which was picked up by local media such as the Evening Express and Original 106 Radio. • Information giving details of the consultation and how to submit comments provided by relevant Planning Officer via radio interview with Original 106 Radio on 18 November 2013. • Information giving details of the consultation published in the Aberdeen Local Development Plan Newsletter. • Letters sent to Bucksburn & Newhills, Northfield, Bridge of Don, and Tillydrone community councils. 	
<p>Mention of Suburban railway service (page 14) mentions "...five stations...existed between Aberdeen Joint Central Station and...Dyce Station". There were historically more than five stations. [details of stations</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>Amend corresponding text on page 14 to accurately reflect railway history as</p>

<p>provided]. The site of the former Persley Station is close to the present access road leading to Hutcheon Low.</p>		<p>per representation.</p>
<p>The Core Path network in the area has been recognised as has other routes to access green space for recreations purposes.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.</p>
<p>The linear connectivity along the Don is to the east with Core Path (CP) 7 joining CP 6 at Jacob's Ladder / Grandhome Bridge. CP 7 comes to a dead end near to the Mugiemoos end of Persely Bridge and will have no western link with Aspirational Route (AP) 6, which is proposed for the Danestone bank of the Don at this location. A safe route for cyclists and pedestrians would be appreciated at this point to link Persley Den with AP6 and the Tesco supermarket at Danestone on the other side of the Persley Bridge.</p>	<p>Core Path 7 currently meets up with Mugiemoos Road roundabout where the existing path network provides connections north towards the Tesco across Persley Bridge. By connecting into the existing path network the principle of the connection is established in the Masterplan. Any new core path route or connection could only be established as part of a core path plan review.</p>	<p>No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.</p>
<p>The link to the Woodside Sports Complex and an improved NCN 1 is appreciated, but is this route presently used by parent driving young football and rugby players to matches and training?</p>	<p>Comments noted. The principle of an improved connection along this route is detailed in the Masterplan. However, the detail of the form, usage and management of this route is to be determined in the Transport Assessment. The Transport Assessment will also take account of parking issues/pressure within the site.</p>	<p>No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.</p>

<p>Unfortunately the development generally appears isolated from the wider CP network.</p>	<p>The route of Core Path 7 runs through the OP135 site to the north of the site, along the River Don corridor. Connection from the development site to the core path network is shown in the Masterplan and therefore the site is considered to have good connectivity into the core path network.</p>	<p>No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.</p>
<p>Links to routes outside the development may be problematic, especially with safer access to schools along busy routes such as Great Northern Road, junctions at Don Street and St Machar Drive.</p>	<p>Potential routes to schools have been outlined in the Masterplan, however it is noted that some of these routes in their present form may not be suitable.</p> <p>Section 6.7 on page 47 of the Masterplan refers to the requirement for safe routes to schools will be considered in detail as part of any planning application and associated Transport Assessment for the site, including whether any mitigation and/or improvements are necessary to such routes.</p>	<p>No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.</p> <p>Advise design team / developer of requirement to consider Safe Routes to Schools as part of Transport Assessment and planning application.</p>
<p>A key point will be the traffic situation in the surrounding roads along with other proposed developments (Grandhome, Mugiemoos, Newhills Expansion, ABZ & D2 business parks along with smaller flatted developments in the surrounding area). Concerns regarding the ability of the AWPR</p>	<p>The Masterplan document states that a Transport Assessment will be carried out as part of any planning application to consider the potential impact of the new development. It is for the Transport Assessment to determine whether development can be accommodated on the road network and to determine the type and level of infrastructure required.</p>	<p>No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.</p>

<p>to divert traffic and new developments will still carry an excessive traffic flow, even after the AWPR has opened. New developments will generate different traffic flows and internal routes and these journeys may be achieved without a need to access the AWPR.</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 Woodside, in advance of these schemes will 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 planning application stage.</p>	
<p>Figure 75 (page 46) details cycling routes and facilities and local junctions/routes which require care on approach by both cyclists and pedestrians. The dual use of the pavement along Great Northern Road / Auchmill Road is recognised on Figure 75. There is an unprotected crossing over Mugiemoos Road at the Haudagain Roundabout for cyclists and pedestrians.</p>	<p>Comment noted, however it does relate to an existing crossing. It is the subject of the Transport Assessment as part of a planning application to consider and assess whether any mitigation measures are required to the surrounding road network, including any junction or crossing improvements.</p>	<p>No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.</p>
<p>A popular bus stop on Great Northern Road, close to roundabout, sees First Bus Services 17 / 17A / 18. Here is a promoted cycle route sharing an area with a wide cross-section of the public, which includes those with mobility problems.</p>	<p>Comments noted, however it does relate to user-conflict along an existing promoted cycle route. It is not within the remit of this Masterplan document to revise this route or define users; however the Transport Assessment will consider what improvements are necessary to the surrounding network in order to accommodate the new development.</p>	<p>No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.</p>

<p>Traffic on the A90 (T) may be eased by the construction of the Third Don Crossing.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.</p>
<p>Page 32, Figure 59 and Page 48-50 Figures 78-82 reference a designing streets approach which will hopefully lead to slower safer driving throughout the estate. However, concerns have been raised that the surfaces used may not be suitable for all users, for example guide dogs, partially sighted or wheelchair / mobility scooter users and young cyclists.</p>	<p>Comments and concerns noted. The Masterplan does indeed state its desire to approach the development of the Persley Den site through a 'Designing Streets' approach. However, at this stage the detailed design of road and street surfaces has not been defined. All surfaces will be determined through any planning application process and will be the subject of a separate Roads Construction Consent application whereby such issues will be considered in detail.</p>	<p>No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.</p> <p>Advise Council Roads Officers of the concerns raised with regard to accessibility concerns for all users.</p>
<p>Local Resident 2</p>		
<p><i>Summary of Representation</i></p>	<p><i>Officers Response</i></p>	<p><i>Action as a result of Representation</i></p>
<p>Having looked through the Persley Den masterplan that is linked on your website, I am wondering if the most recent plans for distribution of houses is included. The masterplan shows houses in the field in front of Woodside Care home which I had understood were now not being proposed.</p>	<p>Page 34 (Figure 61) of the Masterplan document which was available for public comment as part of the consultation, shows the housing layout which is proposed.</p> <p>'Masterplanning' web page http://www.aberdeencity.gov.uk/masterplanning</p>	<p>No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.</p>

<p>The housing layout as published in the Evening Express on Tuesday 19 November 2013 as well as the Persley Den website shows a different layout including a number of houses in the field to the north of the main development located between Woodside Care Home and Persley Castle. As an side, if it is the case, it is not helpful to canvas comments on something that is no longer being proposed.</p>	<p>'Current Consultations' web page http://www.aberdeencity.gov.uk/consultations</p> <p>A Press Release was issued from the Council on 18 November 2013 containing information of how to access the document available for public consultation which included the above links to the Masterplan document.</p> <p>Earlier forms of the Persley Den (Woodside) Masterplan did I include some housing development located in the green area between Persley Castle Care Home and Woodside Care Home, however, this was removed as this section of housing was in the Green Belt. This section of housing was removed prior to Reporting to Committee on 12 November 2013 and the finalised and correct version of the Masterplan was available for public comment at the above links.</p> <p>It appears the design team may not have had time in this interim period to update their website which was used for the earlier consultation events. It is also unfortunate that the Evening Express appear to have used an out-of-date incorrect image when they publicised the consultation.</p>	
<p>The Aberdeen Local Development plan 2012 Proposals map shows the field at the north of the development to be Green Space or Green Space Network (see Figures 1 and 2 below). Assuming that the current plan is the one printed in the Evening Express and not the master plan, I would like to question</p>	<p>Comment noted and agreed. As per the response above with regard to the incorrect image in the Evening Express, the area of housing which was proposed in earlier forms of the Masterplan in the green area between Persley Castle Care Home and Woodside Care Home was requested to be removed. This removal was requested as this section of housing was proposed in the Green Belt and would have been</p>	<p>No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.</p>

<p>why residential housing would be permitted in this area. My concerns are on two levels:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Regarding the Persley Den development, once houses are built on one area of Green Space/ Green Space Network, the precedent for building on other areas of Green Space/Green Space Network is set and there is no reason to imagine that over time, this field will disappear under housing. 2. On a city-wide note: it seems odd to have taken much time, effort, cost and consideration to designate areas for certain use to then disregard these when developers demand. 	<p>contrary to Policy NE1 and NE2 of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2012.</p>	
<p>I would also like to note that the Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2012 allows for the building of 300 homes (see figure 3 below). It seems that the developers are proposing to build 33% more houses than the plan provides for. One of the great charms of this area is that it is an oasis of natural greenspace. It would be sad to lose any more of the greenspace which attracts people to this area in the first place solely to meet developers demands.</p> <p>While, in principle, I support this project; I would like to see it done respecting the land use designations and quantity of houses laid</p>	<p>The Masterplan does propose an overall increase in the number of housing units, from the OP135 allocated 300, up to 400 units. This proposed increase was detailed in the corresponding Committee Report (EPI/13/207, Item No. 7.8) at the Enterprise, Strategic Planning and Infrastructure's meeting on 12 November 2013. Planning officers are confident that a design solution can be found to provide for 400 housing units on the site and it should be noted that all of the proposed housing will be located within the constraints as defined by the OP135, Green Belt and Green Space Network boundary designations.</p>	

out in the Aberdeen Local Plan 2012.		
Sport Scotland		
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<i>Officers Response</i>	<i>Action as a result of Representation</i>
Thanks for the opportunity to provide comment on Draft 2b (November 2013) of the masterplan. As advised in previous correspondence, we have met with GSS Developments, Aberdeen Lads Clubs and the agent for GSS Developments.	Comments noted.	No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.
<p>The masterplan site contains a number of pitches and is part of a larger playing field area, which includes the Woodside Sports Complex. A significant portion of this playing field area would be removed, and the additional pitches to the north of the site, as envisaged by the Local Development Plan, will not be delivered.</p> <p>National planning policy (paragraph 156 of the SPP), reinforced by Local Development Plan policy (NE3 – Urban Green Space) requires, where there is no evidence of an excess of pitches in an area, that the loss of pitches require to be ‘replaced by a new playing field of comparable or greater benefit</p>	<p>Comments noted and agreed.</p> <p>As part of the masterplanning process to date, the design team / developer have completed an assessment of the existing sports provision on the site (Section 4.9 of the Masterplan). This assessment has resulted in a ‘package’ of upgrading / replacements of pitches and financial contributions.</p> <p>Although it is accepted that the upgrading of 2 pitches would not compensate for the loss of pitch areas on the site, the Masterplan does commit to a financial contribution being made to compensate for the loss of pitches. As a result, and on the assumption that further details are obtained at the planning application stage which shows that replacement capacity has been provided, the development proposals will</p>	<p>No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.</p> <p>Advise design team / developer of the requirement for a detailed Sports Pitch Assessment as part of any planning application. This must include details of upgrading works, maintenance,</p>

<p>for sport and in a location which is convenient for its users, or by the upgrading of an existing playing field to provide a better quality facility either within the same site or at another location which is convenient for its users and which maintains or improves the overall playing capacity in the area' (para 156).</p> <p>We note that the masterplan states that 2 existing pitches will be upgraded but no details of this have been provided as yet. The upgrading of these 2 pitches would not compensate for the loss of pitch areas on the site. The masterplan also states that a financial contribution will be made to compensate for the loss of pitches on the site, again no details of this have been provided as yet.</p> <p>While no details are provided, we welcome the masterplan's commitment to meet the national planning policy requirement, through upgrading or the provision of new pitches in the area. We would suggest that the detail of upgrades at the existing pitches on site and the off site compensation provisions be developed as soon as possible in order that these are known prior to the submission of a planning application.</p>	<p>comply with planning policy.</p> <p>Specific details of the proposed pitch upgrades and management will form part of a detailed Sports Pitch Assessment which will be submitted alongside any future planning application for the site, preferably at the pre-application stage. This will be developed and assessed through continued consultation with Sport Scotland. Exact details of financial contributions will be subject to a legal agreement as part of any future planning application process.</p>	<p>management, changing facilitates and measures to compensate for the loss of pitch provision on the site.</p>
---	---	---

<p>We enquire how the 2 remaining pitches at the site will be managed, there is existing changing accommodation which will be removed, can these pitches be serviced from Woodside Sports Complex?</p>	<p>Comment noted. Specific details of the proposed pitch upgrades and management will form part of a detailed Sports Pitch Assessment which will be submitted alongside any future planning application for the site, preferably at the pre-application stage.</p>	<p>Advise design team / developer of the requirement for a detailed Sports Pitch Assessment as part of any future planning application. This must include details of upgrading works, maintenance, management, changing facilitates and measures to compensate for the loss of pitch provision on the site.</p>
<p>As noted in responses to previous drafts, our view is that the importance of this playing field area has been downplayed in the masterplan.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.</p>
<p>We note the masterplan shows a SUDs area to the south of the pitches that will remain and we seek confirmation of how this will be managed and constructed in relation to the adjacent pitches.</p>	<p>Confirmation sought from design team / developer.</p>	<p>Confirmation required from the design team / developer and Section 8 of</p>

		Masterplan amended to reflect new information.
We look forward to working with the applicants and Council to find a solution that ensures the pitch loss meets the requirements of national planning policy.	Comments noted and welcomed.	No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.
Forestry Commission Scotland		
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<i>Officers Response</i>	<i>Action as a result of Representation</i>
<p>The development proposes maintaining the existing trees and woodland and creating new woodland across the development site, this is to be welcomed.</p> <p>However, the Concept Character Map (fig. 58, p32) indicates woodland creation on the steeper slopes along the southern boundary of the development site, linking and enhancing existing woodland; but this woodland planting is not replicated across subsequent concept maps including the landscape plan (fig. 66, p38). Furthermore the existing woodland at the south-western boundary, along Muggiemoss Road is not depicted in most concept maps.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Masterplan proposes to improve, maintain and enhance existing woodland, policy planting and tree belts which are in line with the Scottish Government's Policy for the presumption in favour of protecting Scotland's woodland resource.</p> <p>A detailed landscape strategy, including details of species choice and maintenance will be submitted as part of any future planning application.</p> <p>However, it is accepted that the proposals for strategic woodland retention, enhancement and new planting could benefit from clarification within the Masterplan document.</p>	<p>Amend relevant sections of the Masterplan (section 6.4) to clarify the proposals in terms of woodland retention, enhancement and new planting.</p> <p>Advise design team / developers of requirement to provide details of proposed tree felling and any new</p>

<p>The Scottish Government's Policy on the Control of Woodland Removal stipulates a strong presumption in favour of protecting Scotland's woodland resources, but also provides recommendations and methodology for managing appropriate woodland removal (www.forestry.gov.uk/woodlandremoval).</p> <p>This plan should be developed in-line with the guidance provided by the Policy. The detailed proposals should indicate all proposed tree felling and any new planting areas.</p> <p>Woodland removal should only be considered on the condition that a clear, concise and time-limited transition plan is in place to mitigate any loss through the development.</p>		<p>planting areas in the Tree Survey (including a time-limited transition plan) to be submitted as part of any future planning application.</p>
<p>Tillydrone Community Council</p>		
<p><i>Summary of Representation</i></p>	<p><i>Officers Response</i></p>	<p><i>Action as a result of Representation</i></p>
<p>The proposals are not firm enough on matters of Access to meet the Masterplan objective, "Create attractive routes and</p>	<p>The Masterplan site offers good connectivity to the Core Path network and is directly associated with National Cycle Route 1 which offers connections along a promoted route to key</p>	<p>Further detail of how the development will</p>

<p>enhance existing routes to promote sustainable transport".</p> <p>The development proposals do little to convince any discerning reader that the new residents will use sustainable means of travel.</p> <p>Statements such as "There is an ambition to provide a pathway...", and "There is a long-term aspiration to develop a Donside cycle way..." are simply not good enough.</p> <p>Well maintained walking and cycle paths need to be constructed prior to or at the same time as the Persley Den development, and these routes, to encourage uptake of active travel.</p>	<p>destinations in the City. As noted, the Masterplan aims to create attractive routes and enhance existing routes to promote sustainable transport.</p> <p>Section 12 of the Masterplan highlights the requirement for a residential travel plan leaflet to be developed as part of the development to highlight options available to residents.</p> <p>However, further detail of how the development will promote/provide sustainable travel will be requested to supplement Section 6.7 of the Masterplan document.</p> <p>Reference to the requirement for any necessary upgrades to Core Path 7 must be added to Section 6.7 of the Masterplan, with details such as path dimensions and surface material to be confirmed as part of future planning application process.</p> <p>Section 6.7 should be amended to show additional points of access to the site from Core Path 7.</p>	<p>promote/provide sustainable travel added to Section 6.7 of the Masterplan.</p> <p>Amend Section 6.7 (page 43 & 47) to illustrate additional access points to Core Path 7 and to include reference to the following: "Core Path 7 will require upgrading, with details such as path dimensions and surface material to be confirmed as part of future planning application process."</p>
<p>Masterplan relies on the existing low valued public transport provision.</p> <p>Greater expenditure must be allocated to providing an efficient public transport system.</p>	<p>The Masterplan acknowledges there are difficulties with public transport provision to the site, bus operator's unwillingness to divert services and that this situation may change in the future alongside other nearby development proposals.</p> <p>Initial discussions with both bus operators and Council Roads Development Control Officers have taken place at the</p>	<p>Further work and assessment required to clearly illustrate adequate public transport provision for the proposed</p>

	<p>masterplanning stage, however it is accepted that the Masterplan document does not offer clarity with regard to how the development will be in accordance with Scottish Planning Policy, PAN 75 and the Council’s Transport and Accessibility Supplementary Guidance – to provide an adequate level of public transport provision. Further work and assessment of the proposed public transport provision will be required within the Masterplan.</p> <p>The corresponding ‘Public Transport Connections’ section of the Masterplan document (pages 43-45) must therefore be updated accordingly and show a clear commitment to providing adequate public transport provision to serve the development in accordance with local and National planning policy.</p> <p>This must be reflected in the Masterplan document, prior to it being submitted to Scottish Ministers for consideration as Supplementary Guidance. Once adequate public transport provisions have been agreed, further details will be confirmed through the Transportation Assessment and planning application stages.</p>	<p>development. The masterplan must be updated accordingly as per ‘Officer Response’ comments and with agreement from Council’s Planning Authority, prior to the Masterplan being sent to Scottish Ministers for consideration as Supplementary Guidance.</p>
<p>Health concerns with regard to the health of future residents, especially school children, due to air quality and residing in a river valley within metres of a congested major road were the pollutants from tailed back traffic will accumulate.</p>	<p>The requirement for all development to promote active and sustainable travel is instilled in National ‘Designing Streets’ Policy, the Aberdeen Local Development Plan Policy D3 and the Council’s Transport and Accessibility Supplementary Guidance, which all planning applications will be assessed against.</p>	<p>No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.</p> <p>Advise design team / developer of the</p>

<p>Aberdeen City Council should take these health and wellbeing issues seriously and brings sustainable travel to the forefront of planning decisions.</p>	<p>Concerns regarding air quality are noted; however these issues would be dealt with through the planning application process. Section 4.13 of the Masterplan highlights the requirement to undertake an air quality assessment to determine the impact of the development on the existing Air Quality Management Area due to the increased traffic volume. The assessment would need to take account of any other committed developments in the area.</p> <p>The Council's Environmental Health department have been consulted at the draft Masterplan stage and for this site they have requested a detailed modelling assessment in consultation with their team. This should be dealt with as part of the planning application process, not via condition, so that any issues can be adequately addressed.</p>	<p>requirement to undertake an Air Quality Management Assessment as par to the planning application process.</p>
<p>The Local Development Plan is flawed in the respect that the planned growth of Aberdeen is unsustainably reliant upon motorised transport as being the dominant means of travel.</p> <p>We find it galling that a major reason given for the approval of the 3rd Don Crossing was to alleviate congestion at the Haudagain 'pinch point', but before the bridge construction works have begun we are presented with development plans likely to introduce an additional 600 car journeys onto the roads adjacent to the junction,</p>	<p>The Masterplan document states that a Transport Assessment will be carried out as part of any planning application to consider the potential impact of the new development. It is for the Transport Assessment to determine whether development can be accommodated on the road network and to determine the type and level of infrastructure required.</p> <p>Road schemes to alleviate congestion throughout the city such as the AWPR, Third Don Crossing and the Haudagain junction improvement are all progressing, however, any proposals for a specific development, such as Woodside, in advance of these schemes will be determined through this Transport Assessment and the appraisal process.</p>	<p>Add reference to Page 46 that "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</p>

<p>surely exacerbating current tailbacks.</p> <p>Concerned our community will be directly affected by further increases in road traffic associated with an expanding city devoid of an effective public transport system and active travel network.</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 planning application stage.</p>	<p>what infrastructure is required and when”.</p>
<p>Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA)</p>		
<p><i>Summary of Representation</i></p>	<p><i>Officers Response</i></p>	<p><i>Action as a result of Representation</i></p>
<p>We welcome this opportunity to comment on the Masterplan, Draft 2b, for Persley Den (hereby just referred to as the “Plan”). As you will be aware we have previously provided written advice on the draft masterplan for this area in our correspondence of 27 September 2013 made a number of recommendations and comments. We are pleased to note that our recommendations have been incorporated into this draft of the Plan and have summarised these below for your information.</p>	<p>Comments noted and welcomed. A previous consultation response from SEPA was communicated to the design team / developer and a number of amendments to the masterplan have already been undertaken as a result.</p>	<p>No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.</p>
<p>We can confirm receipt of the Draft Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) by way of your e-mail of 26 November 2013. We have</p>	<p>A copy of the Finalised Flood Risk Assessment has been sent to SEPA for further consultation. The Masterplan will not be progressed to Scottish Ministers for consideration as</p>	<p>Request approval of Finalised Flood Risk Assessment</p>

<p>reviewed the draft FRA however Appendix A and B have not been completed and this information is needed to assess the flood risk at the site. As such we have no further advice or comments on flood risk at this stage to add to our comments on flood risk in section 1 of our correspondence of 27 September 2013. We look forward to receiving a copy of the full FRA for our further advice.</p>	<p>Supplementary Guidance until SEPA have confirmed they are satisfied with the findings of the Flood Risk Assessment. Feedback on this issue will be available prior to Committee and a verbal briefing update given at Committee.</p>	<p>prior to progressing the Masterplan to Scottish Ministers for adoption as Supplementary Guidance.</p>
<p><u>Protection of the water environment</u> We are pleased to note that the recommended wording to investigate opportunities on site to redevelop water features has been added to page 20 of the Plan.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.</p>
<p><u>Construction environmental management and pollution prevention</u> We are pleased to note that the recommended reference, to the requirement for pollution prevention and environmental management to be addressed by the applicant during the construction phase, has been added under a sub heading: Pollution Control within Section 12 of the Plan.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.</p>
<p><u>Space for waste management provision</u></p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>No amendment</p>

<p><u>within the site layout and Site waste management plan (SWMP)</u> We are pleased to note that the recommendations to reference waste management and the requirement for a site waste management plan within the Plan have been added under a sub heading: Waste Management within Section 12 of the Plan.</p>		<p>proposed as a result of the representation.</p>
<p><u>Regulatory and best practice advice for the applicant</u> We are pleased to note that the recommended reference to planning permission being separate from environmental licensing has been added under a sub heading: Environmental Licensing within Section 12 of the Plan. As such we have no further comments on the Plan at this time but would be pleased to provide further advice as this proposal progresses to the detailed planning stage.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.</p>
<p>Additional Internal Council Officer Comments</p>		
<p>Archaeology Department</p>		
<p><i>Summary of Representation</i></p>	<p><i>Officers Response</i></p>	<p><i>Action as a result of Representation</i></p>
<p>I note that Historic Scotland suggested</p>	<p>Consultation was sought with the Council's Archaeology</p>	<p>No amendment</p>

<p>consulting the local authority archaeologist (i.e. me). I may be wrong, but I don't think the authors of the Masterplan did that.</p>	<p>department during this session of public consultation on the Persley Den (Woodside) Masterplan. Consultation opportunities will also be available at any subsequent planning application stage for major developments.</p>	<p>proposed as a result of the representation.</p>
<p>I think there should have been a cultural heritage section to sit alongside the quite lengthy information about ecology. I think I agree that there are no known archaeological sites actually within the development area as they are not indicated on the Sites and Monuments Record, other relevant sources, or from my knowledge of the area's history/archaeology, but the document needs to demonstrate that the process has been gone through by the authors of the report.</p>	<p>Comments noted and agreed. An additional section to be requested for inclusion in the Masterplan document (potentially within Section 4.2 'Site History') to outline the approach taken to explore the archaeological and heritage assets to the site and its immediate surroundings.</p>	<p>Request additional section added to the Masterplan document to outline the approach taken to explore the archaeological and heritage assets to the site and its immediate surroundings.</p>
<p>There should also be a statement to the effect that there may be as yet unidentified archaeological and historic sites within the development area and how such potential will be dealt with through the planning process.</p>	<p>Noted and agreed.</p>	<p>Request additional section is added to the Masterplan document to reference that there may be as yet unidentified archaeological and historic sites within the development area, and to outline</p>

		<p>how these will be dealt with through the planning application process.</p>
<p>The development is very close to some immensely significant features of the industrial landscape of Aberdeen. Having, with colleagues led a large number of public guided walks along that bank of the Don, I'm very keen to have the remains properly surveyed in an historic building recording exercise before they crumble further. That could be professionally led but could also be a 'community' exercise. Is there an opportunity to fund such a programme through this sort of development.</p>	<p>Comments noted and it is agreed that this would be an advantageous project which would benefit from community involvement. The specification and funding of such a survey is unfortunately beyond the remit of this Masterplan document, however it is requested that a relevant 'masterplan opportunity' be added to the Masterplan whereby the opportunity to explore this idea alongside other recreational and landscape improvements can be considered as the development moves forward to the planning application process. Such an opportunity should be referenced in an appropriate section, for example 6.4 'Landscape' or in relation to enhancements/upgrading of Core Path 7.</p>	<p>Advise design team / developer of suggested opportunity.</p> <p>Request additional 'masterplan opportunity' added to relevant sections within the Masterplan document to reference the opportunity to survey the heritage assets and industrial remains along this section of bank at the River Don as a historic building recording exercise as a community resource and to ensure that the</p>

		proposed development has a positive impact on local cultural identity.
Aberdeen City Council Roads Development Control		
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<i>Officers Response</i>	<i>Action as a result of Representation</i>
Core Path 7 should be upgraded within the confines of the site, to an adoptable standard if it is identified as forming part of the pedestrian access infrastructure. The core path must be lit, of a suitable surface material, drained and generally 3m in width therefore suitable for pedestrians and cyclists. Figures 61 & 77 contradicts Figures 54-57 in terms of the pedestrian accessibility to Core Path 7. Multiple points of access to the site from Core Path 7 should be provided.	<p>Noted. Reference to the requirement for any necessary upgrades to Core Path 7 must be added to Section 6.7 of the Masterplan, with details such as path dimensions and surface material to be confirmed as part of any future planning application process.</p> <p>Section 6.7 should be amended to show additional points of access to the site from Core Path 7.</p>	Amend Section 6.7 (page 43 & 47) to illustrate additional access points to Core Path 7 and to include reference to the following: "Core Path 7 will require upgrading, with details such as path dimensions and surface material to be confirmed as part of future planning application process."
The National Cycle Route provision through the site must be maintained and the	Reference that NCR 1 will be improved, surfacing and lighting to create a more attractive and safe route is included in	Add reference to Section 6.7 (page

<p>infrastructure upgraded. There are a variety of means by which this can be delivered, the detail of which will be ascertained through the Transport Assessment process. However this should be a route segregated from vehicular traffic and be to an adoptable standard, which will include drainage and lighting.</p>	<p>Section 6.7 of the Masterplan.</p> <p>Reference must be added to this section that this route should be segregated from vehicular traffic and designed to an adoptable standard. The detail and means of delivering NCR1 upgrades will be ascertained through the Transport Assessment process.</p>	<p>47) stating that this route should be segregated from vehicular traffic and designed to an adoptable standard. The detail and means of delivering such upgrades will be ascertained through the Transport Assessment process.</p>
<p>Figure 30 should be altered so that the 400m distance from the bus stops identified makes use of actual and proposed walking routes, and is not based on radii.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>Amend Figure 30 accordingly to show actual and proposed walking routes with reference to 400m walking route distances as per Scottish Planning Policy.</p>
<p>Table on page 16 should identify which routes are accessible from which bus stops, and whether these are within a 400m walk</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>Amend table on page 16 and Figure 73 accordingly to</p>

<p>distance of all properties.</p>		<p>show which bus stops are within a 400m walk distance of all properties.</p>
<p>States the most attractive public transport facilities will be those on Great Northern Road (nearest and most frequent city centre bound services). Masterplan states that these bus stops are 800m from the site; however it is unclear from where this is measured.</p>	<p>Noted and agreed. Clarification is sought from the design team / developer where the 800m is measured from and this information included within Section 6.7 (page 45) of the Masterplan document.</p>	<p>Amend Section 6.7 (page 45) of the Masterplan document to include clarification where the 800m is measured.</p>
<p>Paragraph 168 of Scottish Planning Policy stipulates that planning permission should not be granted for development sites that are outwith a 400m walk distance of public transport services. The majority of this site would be outwith meaningful public transport access. This is a primary concern and must be adequately addressed at the masterplan stage.</p> <p>It will therefore be a likely requirement that a city centre bound service penetrate the site to the extent that all housing units are within 400m.</p> <p>If a bus route cannot be provided through the development, then the developers</p>	<p>The Masterplan acknowledges there are difficulties with public transport provision to the site, bus operator's unwillingness to divert services and that this situation may change in the future alongside other nearby development proposals.</p> <p>Initial discussions with both bus operators and Council Roads Development Control Officers have taken place at the masterplanning stage, however it is accepted that the Masterplan document does not offer clarity with regard to how the development will be in accordance with Scottish Planning Policy, PAN 75 and the Council's Transport and Accessibility Supplementary Guidance – to provide an adequate level of public transport provision. Further work and assessment of the proposed public transport provision will be required within the Masterplan.</p>	<p>Further work and assessment required to clearly illustrate adequate public transport provision for the proposed development. The masterplan must be updated accordingly as per 'Officer Response' comments and with agreement from Council's Planning Authority prior to</p>

<p>should consider providing a pedestrian and cycle bridge from the development across the railway to the A96, to establish the extent to which this improves public transport accessibility. In addition a pedestrian/ cycle bridge across the River Don to connect with Laurel Drive and the First Aberdeen service 1 should be provided. These should be shown in Figure 77. An alternative would be the provision of a subsidised bus service through the site for a substantial number of years.</p>	<p>A number of potential mitigation and/or compensatory options should be explored to ensuring adequate public transport provision, for example enhanced pedestrian access, dedicated routes, pedestrian/cycle bridges etc. Any such options may have other constraints and/or environmental considerations which will require assessment. The corresponding 'Public Transport Connections' section of the Masterplan document (pages 43-45) must therefore be updated accordingly and show a clear commitment to providing adequate public transport provision to serve the development in accordance with local and National planning policy.</p> <p>This must be reflected in the Masterplan document, prior to it being submitted to Scottish Ministers for consideration as Supplementary Guidance. Once adequate public transport provisions have been agreed, further details will be confirmed through the Transportation Assessment and planning application stages.</p>	<p>the Masterplan being sent to Scottish Ministers for consideration as Supplementary Guidance.</p> <p>Delete "reasonably" from last paragraph on page 45.</p>
<p>The current proposals of a singular access point would not meet with the Council's standards. It is understood that an enhanced access from Mugiemoor Road will be provided, however further details should be provided having been discussed with this section. All options will need to be considered. Consideration will need to be given to either upgrading, restricting or preventing vehicular access from Don</p>	<p>The 'Road Connections' section on page 46 details some of the access arrangements, however the text should also refer to which options are being explored to meet the Council's standards. For example, is an enhanced access being considered? What is the proposed form and access usage proposed for vehicular access to the east towards Don Terrace?</p> <p>However, it is understood that that full details of access arrangements and junction design will be determined through</p>	<p>Amend text on page 46 which makes reference to which options are being explored to meet the Council's standards.</p>

Terrace etc. as appropriate.	the Transport Assessment process.	
A Drainage Impact Assessment will be required at the appropriate stage of the development in order to ensure that infrastructure which will be adopted will not flood in the required timescales and conditions.	Section 8 makes reference to the requirement for a Water Impact Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment to form part of any subsequent planning application for the OP135 site.	No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.
Any new or altered utilities should not be located under the carriageway of new roads, but rather in service strips, which will be adopted, adjacent to the roads.	Noted.	No amendment proposed as a result of the representation. Advise design team / developer regarding location of utilities.
<p>Further information should be provided in the masterplan as to exactly what each street type in the hierarchy will consist of.</p> <p>Access for private houses vehicular parking should not be taken from the High Street or those streets at the top of the street hierarchy.</p> <p>On street parking throughout the development should be at an absolute</p>	<p>Noted. Section 6.8 of the Masterplan does indicate a series of design principles for the proposed street hierarchy, however precise details of street surfaces, dimensions and design will be submitted as part of future planning and Roads Construction Consent applications.</p> <p>Insert the following text to Section 6.8 of the Masterplan:</p> <p>“On street parking throughout the development will be kept to a minimum and discouraged through design.</p>	<p>Insert text accordingly to Section 6.8 of the Masterplan: “On street parking throughout the development will be kept to a minimum and discouraged through design.</p>

<p>minimum, and discouraged through design. If does occur, clearly designated areas must be provided.</p> <p>On all residential streets, all individual residential car parking should be located to the rear of properties, and accessed along lanes. This is in accordance with the requirements of Designing Streets, leaving the street to the front of properties as an enhanced multi-modal environment.</p> <p>There appears to be a central 'square' area within the middle of the development, adjacent to the High Street. This is identified as a primary street in the hierarchy. However, it is likely that this area will have larger numbers of pedestrian movements accessing communal facilities and areas. This central square area should therefore be largely pedestrianized, with adequate car and cycle parking in designated areas in order to prevent on street parking.</p>	<p>On all residential streets, all individual residential car parking should be located to the rear of properties and accessed along streets in accordance with Designing Streets.</p> <p>The central square area will be largely pedestrianised with adequate and designated car and cycle parking.</p> <p>Details of road surfaces, dimensions and parking arrangement will be assessed and considered through the subsequent planning and Roads Construction Consent applications.”</p>	<p>On all residential streets, all individual residential car parking should be located to the rear of properties and accessed along streets in accordance with Designing Streets.</p> <p>The central square area will be largely pedestrianised with adequate and designated car and cycle parking.</p> <p>Details of road surfaces, dimensions and parking arrangement will be assessed and considered through the subsequent planning and Roads Construction Consent</p>
--	--	---

<p>A number of crossroads within the masterplan layout. While permitted in accordance with Designing Streets they can only be permitted where traffic flows are very low, e.g. shared surface areas. Crossroads in the masterplan must be removed from all other streets.</p>	<p>Noted and agreed. The crossroads which are in the Masterplan document (with specific reference to the two 'civic squares') will require much further detail to be submitted in order to assess their suitability in accordance with Designing Streets and Roads Development Control Officers. Such information will be submitted and assessed as part of any future planning and Roads Construction Consent (RCC) applications.</p>	<p>applications.”</p> <p>No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.</p> <p>Advise design team / developer of the concerns regarding crossroads and that potential redesign of some junctions and further details will be required as part of planning and RCC applications.</p>
<p>There are two squares identified which appear as large areas of hardscaped street material. If left as shown, substantial traffic management and parking restrictions will be required. It would therefore be advantageous if these could be designed to be pedestrian only areas, with traffic routes provided and identified parking areas for cycles and cars included.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Further detail on surface treatment, designation, use and movement routes of the two Civic Spaces identified will be submitted as part of the planning and Road Construction Consent application processes, including details of cycle/car parking arrangements and traffic management.</p>	<p>Add following sentence to section 6.8 under heading 'Civic Space – Village Square':</p> <p>“Further detail on surface treatment, use and movement routes of the two Civic Spaces identified will be submitted as part of</p>

		the planning and Road Construction Consent application processes, including details of cycle/car parking arrangements and traffic management for these areas.”
Foot and cycle paths connecting Hutcheon Low Parade with the development must be to an adoptable standard and must link with existing adopted infrastructure and that proposed as part of the development.	Agreed.	Add following sentence to Section 6.7 (page 47) of the Masterplan document: “Path connections to Hutcheon Low will be designed to an adoptable standard. Details of path design will be submitted as part of the planning and Road Construction Consent application processes.”
The development access road should have	Noted.	Add following

<p>a shared use foot and cycleway on one side of the carriageway, and a footway on the other. Account should also be taken of links to infrastructure within the development and NCN Route 1.</p>	<p>Add the following sentence to Section 6.7 of the Masterplan:</p> <p>“The development access road will be designed to have a shared use foot and cycleway on one side and a footway on the other”.</p> <p>Links to NCR 1 are illustrated in Figure 77 of the Masterplan and the street network of the development is envisaged to be permeable to all forms on non-motorised movement to ensure connectivity within the development.</p>	<p>sentence to Section 6.7 (page 47) of the Masterplan document:</p> <p>“The development access road will be designed to have a shared use foot and cycleway on one side and a footway on the other”.</p>
<p>The Masterplan states that facilities on Great Northern Road are available within 1km walk and Woodside Primary School is within 1600m. No information is given in respect to secondary school provision which should be included at this stage. Information should include which school children will attend and that it is within an acceptable walk distance using acceptable infrastructure.</p>	<p>Noted and agreed. Information and clarification to be sought from design team / developer.</p>	<p>Text addition to Section 6.7 (page 43) of Masterplan to provide details of walking routes and distances to schools, including secondary school provision, and indication of which schools pupils will attend.</p>
<p>While the road connections section acknowledges that the access will allow for the future scheme of Haudagain</p>	<p>Noted and agreed. The Masterplan must reference that the development will allow for the Council’s preferred scheme for improvements and will allow for <u>full</u> access to be provided for</p>	<p>Amendments to page 46, paragraph 3.</p>

<p>improvements and the dualling of Mugiemoos Road. The masterplan should emphasise that the development will allow for the Council's preferred scheme, outline of which has been provided to the developers transport consultants. The third paragraph in the Road Connections section states that 'satisfactory' access for all parties for the upgrading of Mugiemoos Road will be provided. The word 'satisfactory' should be replaced with 'full'.</p>	<p>all parties in relation to Mugiemoos Road being upgraded.</p>	<p>Change word "satisfactory" to "full". Reference added that the development will allow for the Council's preferred scheme for improvements and will allow full access to be provided for all parties involved in relation to Mugiemoos Road being upgraded.</p>
<p>Figure 77 identifies a pedestrian route towards Don Terrace that at present has no pedestrian infrastructure. At present there is no continuous pedestrian infrastructure on this route, and as such if this is to be presented as a pedestrian access route, adequate provision will need to be put in place and it should be acknowledged that this will be upgraded to an adoptable standard.</p>	<p>Noted. Insert following text to Section 6.7 of the Masterplan (page 47): "Any proposed pedestrian route to Don Terrace (to the east) will require to be upgraded to an adoptable standard".</p>	<p>Add following text to Section 6.7 (page 47) of the Masterplan: "Any proposed pedestrian route to Don Terrace (to the east) will require to be upgraded to an adoptable standard".</p>

<p>The diagrams throughout the masterplan should show consistency in terms of the links to Hutcheon Low, and at present they do not, for example Figure 77 shows infrastructure not shown in Figure 61.</p>	<p>Agreed. Seek clarification from design team/developer to clearly illustrate pedestrian infrastructure on all Figures throughout Masterplan including Figure 61.</p>	<p>Amendments sought to clearly illustrate proposed pedestrian infrastructure on all figures throughout the Masterplan document.</p>
<p>In Figure 55 the village square is identified as a primary street, however in section 6.8 it has its own designation. This should be clarified.</p>	<p>Noted. Clarification sought regarding the designation, functions and proposed movement hierarchy for the main civic square. However, it is understood that the detailed design of the civic squares will be assessed and considered through the subsequent planning and Roads Construction Consent applications.</p>	<p>Clarification sought and information included into Section 6.8 (page 49) of the Masterplan document regarding the designation, function and proposed movement hierarchy for the main civic square.</p>
<p>The hierarchy in Figure 55 does not accord with that in section 6.8. This should be clarified and consistent throughout document.</p>	<p>The diagrams in Figure 55 regarding the street hierarchy are conceptual and therefore may not illustrate the final proposed street hierarchy arrangement.</p>	<p>No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.</p>
<p>Figure 81 shows a courtyard which is</p>	<p>Figure 81 is conceptual in nature however the concerns have</p>	<p>No amendment</p>

<p>dominated by car parking. This does not accord with the policies of designing streets.</p>	<p>been noted and the request is made that further details will be required as part of subsequent planning and Roads Construction Consent (RCC) applications, in accordance with Designing Streets and the Council's Roads Development Control Officers.</p>	<p>proposed as a result of the representation.</p> <p>Advise design team / developer of concerns raised and that further details will be required as part of the RCC and planning application processes.</p>
<p>Section 7.2/7.3/7.4 At all times the Councils car parking standards will require to be adhered to in terms of off street parking. It will not be acceptable to provide parking for flatted, housing or other parts of the development on street.</p>	<p>Comments noted and concerns will be communicated to design team / developer for consideration alongside detailed parking strategy and design in subsequent planning, Roads Construction Consent (RCC) application(s) and Transport Assessment processes.</p>	<p>No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.</p> <p>Advise design team / developer of concerns raised and that further details regarding parking standards will be required as part of the Transport Assessment, RCC and planning</p>

		application processes.
Section 12 – Note that the developer will provide a contribution towards the upgrade of Mugiemoos Road. Further road infrastructure improvements may be required, depending on the outcome of the Transport Assessment.	Comment noted and agreed. Text insert to ‘Roads / Access’ section of table in Section 12 (page 64) of the Masterplan requested to read as follows: “Further road infrastructure improvements may be required depending on the results and assessment process of the Transport Assessment.”	Text insert to ‘Roads / Access’ section of table in Section 12 (page 64) of the Masterplan requested to read as follows: “Further road infrastructure improvements may be required depending on the results and assessment process of the Transport Assessment.”
A full residential Travel Plan will be required, of which a Residential Travel Pack will form part.	Section 12 of the Masterplan highlights the requirement for a residential travel plan leaflet to be developed as part of the development to highlight options available to residents.	No amendment proposed as a result of the representation.
Additional Internal Council Officer Comments		
Transportation and Strategy		

<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<i>Officers Response</i>	<i>Action as a result of Representation</i>
<p>NCN – Can routes just be referred to as cycle routes.</p> <p>Anderson Drive is a proposed cycle route and not actually there.</p>	Noted.	<p>Remove words 'Aberdeen City Council' from page 10, 3rd text column.</p> <p>Add reference that Anderson Drive route is a proposed route.</p>
Page 14 – Figure 21 is not the Core Paths Plan.	Noted.	Amend Figure 21 (page 14) description to remove reference to Core Path 7.
Page 32/35/38/39/42/43 – Mugiemoos not Muggiemoos.	Noted.	Amend misspelling of 'Mugiemoos' throughout the Masterplan.