

ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

COMMITTEE	Communities, Housing & Infrastructure
DATE	27 October 2015
DIRECTOR	Pete Leonard
TITLE OF REPORT	DRAFT ROWETT NORTH MASTERPLAN: CONSULTATION FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS (Proposed site of new AECC and other uses)
REPORT NUMBER	CHI/15/191
CHECKLIST COMPLETED	Yes

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To inform members of the results of the 6-week public consultation period following Committee approval on the 19 May 2015 to consult on the content of the Draft Rowett North Masterplan; and
- 1.2 To seek approval for the revisions made by the Director of Communities, Housing and Infrastructure as a result of the consultation findings; and
- 1.3 To approve the Masterplan as Interim Planning Advice to the emerging Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2015 to inform the redevelopment of the site.
- 1.4 *A record of the public and statutory responses received within the time limit form the appendices to this report.*
- 1.5 *The Draft Masterplan can be viewed by accessing the following link: www.aberdeencity.gov.uk/masterplanning. A hard copy of the Draft Masterplan is available in the Members' Library (Town House) and within the Planning and Sustainable Development Service at Ground Floor North, Marischal College.*

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 It is recommended that Committee:
 - (a) Notes the consultation findings;
 - (b) Approves the revisions made by the Director of Communities, Housing and Infrastructure based upon the findings of the consultation;

- (c) Approves the revised Draft as the Masterplan to be Interim Planning Advice for redevelopment of the site.

3 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1 The Council is indirectly funding the production of the Draft Masterplan and subsequent planning applications as the project finances are met within the approved Strategic Infrastructure Projects (SIP) programme.

4 OTHER IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 In order to attract and retain skills, talent and business in the North East early public sector investment and policy impetus in quality placemaking infrastructure for tourism, cultural and leisure facilities etc. is needed. The development of a new exhibition and conference centre is an integral part of an ambitious programme of investment being planned for the city through the Aberdeen City Region Deal, the Council's City Centre Masterplan and its Strategic Infrastructure Plan.
- 4.2 Upon Council approval the Masterplan becomes Interim Planning Advice to the Aberdeen Local Development Plan until such time as it is submitted to Scottish Ministers for adoption as Supplementary Guidance to the emerging Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2015. The Interim Planning Advice status of the Masterplan provides a material consideration in determining planning applications for the site.
- 4.3 The revisions made to the consultation Draft Masterplan, as a result of the consultation findings, should provide greater clarity, certainty and confidence to guide the planning applications for the site.

5 BACKGROUND & MAIN ISSUES

5.1 Process and Site Requirements

- 5.2 The site is currently owned by Aberdeen University and the project is part of the Council's wider Strategic Infrastructure Projects (SIP) programme to relocate the new Aberdeen Exhibition and Conference Centre from the current Bridge of Don site.
- 5.3 Through the approved SIP programme the Council has an agreement with Henry Boot Ltd. (developer) for the development of the site and therefore has a financial interest.
- 5.4 The Draft Masterplan aims to establish design-led planning guidance to inform a business and leisure led mixed-use development with the new Aberdeen Exhibition and Conference Centre building as the centrepiece of the site. The new AECC, in addition to the other uses planned for the site, will:
- Provide a fourfold increase to the existing available exhibition space
 - Double the seated entertainment arena to 10,000

- Forecast to secure an additional 31,000 business tourists to the North East and Scotland
 - Forecast to result in an additional £11m of visitor spend per annum (£113m by 2025)
 - Forecast to deliver £63m net additional GVA and over 350 full-time equivalent jobs by year 10 of operation
- 5.5 Committee Report CHI.15/231 'Draft AECC Site Development Framework: Consultation Findings' is also presented to this Committee for approval for public consultation on the Draft Development Framework to guide the redevelopment of the current AECC site.
- 5.6 **Consultation Procedure**
- 5.7 Following Communities, Housing and Infrastructure Committee approval on the 19 May 2015 the Draft Masterplan was hosted on the Council's website notifying that comments by interested parties were to be received within a six week period. Hard copies and electronic copies were forwarded to the Bucksburn & Dyce and the Newhills & Stoneywood Community Councils and hard copies and posters lodged with the Aberdeen Central Library and the Bucksburn Community Library. Electronic copies were also forwarded to all Community Councils in Aberdeen because of the scale and importance of the project to the city and region.
- 5.8 The public consultation was timed to coincide with the final Design Review Panel with Architecture+Design Scotland (A+DS), the national agency for design matters in the built environment.
- 5.9 Appendix 2 lists the invited consultees, statutory consultees and interested parties who responded within the consultation period. Two responses were received outwith the consultation period.
- 5.10 In addition the local press have publicised articles throughout the consultation period which has generated interest in the Draft Masterplan.
- 5.11 Henry Boot Ltd submitted an application for Planning Permission in Principle (PPIP) for the site on the 28 May 2015. The statutory consultation period for the PPIP, at the time when the public consultation on the Draft Masterplan was live, resulted in some confusion as to what interested parties were being consulted upon. For example both the Bucksburn & Dyce and Newhills & Stoneywood Community Councils did not specifically respond to the invitation to comment on the Draft Masterplan. However, the results of the statutory consultation on the PPIP have been appended to this report because the content of the PPIP follows the content of the Draft Masterplan.
- 5.12 Throughout the preparation of the Draft Masterplan, and its evolving design and capacity needs, Henry Boot Ltd conducted extensive community consultation events, the conclusions of which are within Appendix 3 of the Draft Masterplan.

5.13 Consultation Responses

- 5.14 Of the 18 organisations formally invited to respond, in addition to all the Community Councils in Aberdeen, 10 responses were received. Three expressed an opinion that Strathcona House be retained and both Community Councils and the Archaeologist for the city and shire objected to the proposed loss of Strathcona House. In addition the response from Historic Scotland state that they would not consider the House for inclusion in their listing as it is subject to planning matters. However, Historic Scotland sought to forward their findings suggesting that the House was likely worthy of being listed as Category 'C'. Similarly Architecture+Design Scotland state '*Strathcona House is a building of substance and quality and its presence was a key generator for the form of the original masterplan and the AECC building and without it the masterplan concept appears to have less meaning*' and went on to state that '*if the building is to be removed it is imperative that something of a commensurate quality and amenity take its place*'. It is outwith the remit of Scottish Water, SEPA & SNH to express an opinion on Strathcona House and the Architectural Heritage Society provided an unclear response.
- 5.15 Of those non-statutory organisations and interested parties who responded to the public consultation three organisations and one interested party wrote in support of the Draft Masterplan. In contrast the 20th Century Society, four private individuals, sixty nine respondents to the PPIP and a petition comprising 591 names, addresses and comments was forwarded to the Leader of the Administration objecting to the proposed loss of Strathcona House.
- 5.16 No objection was received to the principle of the redevelopment of the site for the new AECC and other complementary uses.
- 5.17 Architecture+Design Scotland's report on their Design Review Panel findings focuses on the design quality of the Draft Masterplan and concludes that significant revisions to design elements are required in order to augment their current rating of '3 – *With potential*', out of a possible range of 1-4, in order that the project be more aligned to a '2'- '*Well considered and supported*'.
- 5.18 All consultees' responses and observations made are referenced within the Appendices to support this report.
- 5.19 **Conclusion on Areas of Interest**
- 5.20 **1) Retention of Strathcona House**
- 5.21 The most common objection to the content of the Draft Masterplan is the proposal to demolish Strathcona House.
- 5.22 In their 'Assessment Against Listing Criteria' Historic Scotland, in response to a request by a member of the public to consider listing Strathcona House, visited the property on the 28 May 2015. In view of

the preparation of the Draft Masterplan and the application for Planning Permission in Principle being submitted for the site on 28 May 2015, Historic Scotland have chosen not to add Strathcona House to their record of listed buildings because listing during a live planning application is contrary to their protocol. (See Appendix 5).

- 5.23 In their 'Category of Listing' section Historic Scotland state that Strathcona House is considered to be of local importance and it may meet the criteria for listing at the category C. It should be noted however, that the listing by Historic Scotland of any building within their categories of A, B or C does not preclude demolition but any demolition must be demonstrated as justified on the basis of a robust Scottish Historic Environment Policy (SHEP) test.
- 5.24 The Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historic Monuments of Scotland (RCAHMS) have made a photographic record of the building which is to be publicly available.
- 5.25 At the outset of the project Strathcona House was to be retained and incorporated within the redevelopment of the site, however, the physical requirements of the AECC have evolved and now crystallised. Appendix E of the draft masterplan illustrates the developer's conclusion that, taking into account the operational requirements considered necessary for the AECC, are not compatible with the retention of Strathcona House.
- 5.26 Whilst the support expressed for the retention of Strathcona House is recognised, it is concluded that this is outweighed by the material planning circumstances relating to the delivery of the wider scheme of development.
- 5.27 **2) Design Quality**
- 5.28 As part of the evolution of design detail for the site the Draft Masterplan has been reviewed in a number of design forums by Architecture and Design Scotland (A+DS) as the design and the design teams have both evolved over the last two years. As the national organisation for aesthetic matters in the built environment A+DS support the principle and ambition for the proposal. Following the final design review on the 11 June 2015, however, A+DS conclude, in considerable detail, that the Draft Masterplan represents a project that is rated within their category '3' – '*with potential*' and should be subject to development to address the issues of 'further advice' to be able to attain a category '2' – '*well considered and supported*' ... '*otherwise there is potential for the outcome of the project to be at risk* (category 4 - unsupported)' in implementation and delivery. (See Appendix 6).
- 5.29 Each section of the 'Further Advice' received from A+DS has been used to influence the architectural and landscaping revisions necessary in order that the Draft Masterplan firmly anchors the high place-making design quality intention.

- 5.30 There are also a number of technical observations by statutory consultees, usually addressed a more detailed level in the development process, now incorporated into the Draft Masterplan in order that planning applications for the site follow policy and best practice guidance.

6 IMPACT

- 6.1 **Improving Customer Experience** - The Council's approval of the Draft Masterplan for public consultation was a key stage in the development process to support the delivery of high quality place-making for the new AECC and complementary employment uses. The revisions made, as a result of the consultation, have in the main been inclusive and reflect the opinion of interested parties in Aberdeen. The new AECC must be a transformational project of outstanding potential to the city as a local, national and global events destination, the impact on the city image, the cultural offering and further business opportunities of Aberdeen are significant.
- 6.2 **Improving Staff Experience** – The detailed processes involved in the creation of the masterplan for the redevelopment of this important and complex site provides greater clarity, certainty and consistency in assessing the qualities of planning applications for each phase of development because the detailed planning requirements are known.
- 6.3 **Improving our Use of Resources** – The masterplan achieves a redevelopment plan and site layout that connect with surrounding multi-modal transportation network in order to provide more opportunity for walking and cycling through the site enabling established and emerging communities to have greater choice and access to employment opportunities, greenspace and recreational amenities as well as better connectivity to new transportation networks.
- 6.4 **Corporate** - The Masterplanning process follows key priorities of the Council's **Single Outcome Agreement**, the **Community Plan**, the **5 Year Business Plan**, and the Aberdeen City Council Administration's **Vision for Aberdeen: 2012-17** because the Masterplanning process:
- a) Aims to directly influence the quality of redevelopment for local and global business and leisure uses with distinctive high quality place-making architecture and landscaping supporting Aberdeen to remain as one of the most competitive and attractive places to do business in the UK.
 - b) Strategic public sector-led investments are critical to delivering the city's socio-economic objectives, build Aberdeen's global reputation and strengthen the appeal Europe's oil & gas capital as a place to work, live and visit. The new AECC is a crucial element of Aberdeen and Scotland's infrastructure to energy related business, tourism and the provision of high quality amenities within an area planned for significant residential development, as well as expansion associated with proximity to the airport;

- c) Involves encouraging the citizens of Aberdeen to actively participate in design and development matters through public consultation and engagement events the findings of which should shape the content of the finalised masterplan;
- d) Front-loads high-level detail of this Strategic Infrastructure Project with key place-making parameters that are of sufficient quality to guide redevelopment proposals, thereby increasing the efficiency of planning decision making and supporting the Planning and Sustainable Development Service Plan.

6.5 **Public** - This Report has been reviewed for Equality and Human Rights Impact Assessment (EHRIA) and it is considered that revision to the Draft Masterplan as a result of public consultation findings does not negatively impact on Equality and Human Rights matters.

7 MANAGEMENT OF RISK

7.1 The process of public consultation has resulted in a body of interested party opinion which has informed the revisions to the Draft Masterplan. It is important that consultation findings are balanced and reflected in the Draft Masterplan prior to Council endorsement and adoption of the finalised Masterplan, at a later date, as Interim Planning Advice to the Aberdeen Local Development Plan.

7.2 As an example of the economic impacts expected - energy sector conferences such as Offshore Europe (OE) alone have an estimated economic impact of £54m gross value added (GVA) to the Scottish economy as well as providing an international focus to the city. In the absence of the redevelopment of the Rowett North site there is a risk that Aberdeen is unable to compete for events such as OE and to respond to growing demand for industry conferences, undermining the international reputation of Aberdeen and Scotland. With the new AECC it is anticipated that Aberdeen will enter the top five world energy cities for conferences and events.

7.3 The existence of an approved Masterplan should significantly contribute to efficiencies in agent time to prepare planning applications and further supporting statements as well as officer time in determining future planning applications.

8 BACKGROUND PAPERS

8.1 Draft AECC site, Bridge of Don Development Framework: Consultation Findings CHI/15/231

8.2 Draft Rowett North Masterplan (New AECC) CHI/14/056

8.3 New Aberdeen Exhibition and Conference Centre (AECC) CHI/14/045

8.4 Redevelopment of the AECC Site, Draft Bridge of Don Development Framework CHI/14/55

- 8.5 Proposed Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2016 CHI/14/001
- 8.6 Aberdeen Local Development Plan – Main Issues Report EPI/13/182
- 8.7 Aberdeen Masterplanning Process 2008 (article 22, Planning Committee Minute, 6/11/08)
- 8.8 Aberdeen Masterplanning Process: Update Report EPI/12/231 (agenda item 1.1, article 4)

9 REPORT AUTHOR DETAILS

Pete Leonard

Director of Communities, Housing & Infrastructure

 01224 (52) 3899

 pleonard@aberdeencity.gov.uk

10 APPENDICES

Appendix 1 - Revisions to the Draft Masterplan

Appendix 2 - List of Consultees

Appendix 3 - List of Interested Party Responses

Appendix 4 - Consultation Responses and Observations

Appendix 5 – Historic Scotland – ‘Assessment Against Listing Criteria’

Appendix 6 - Architecture + Design Scotland

Appendix 7 – Draft Rowett North Masterplan- **available at**
<http://www.aberdeencity.gov.uk/masterplanning>

Appendix 1 - Revisions to the Draft Masterplan

1) Improvements to the site layout, architectural and landscape design:

Consultation response: 3) Architecture+Design Scotland

- *Original concept – Ripples in the Landscape – to be developed through the masterplan to determine the nature of routes, spaces and built forms. The ‘Ripples’ are applied in small scale landscape treatments and deconstructed into angular buildings.*

Response – the original design concept will be worked through in detail as the building design evolves.

- *Aspects of quality on the site, such as Strathcona House, have been crowded out, and at the time of reviewing little of quality or amenity is proposed to replace them.*

Response – the detail of the landscape plan has been brought forward at this stage in the development process to demonstrate the level of design integrity proposed for the site. The area occupied by Strathcona House has been revised to celebrate the junction between the hotel and the arena building and not to be given over to being part of the service area.

- *Wider connectivity in terms of roads and public transport and to progress development of visual axes off the site to ensure that the facility has sufficient presence and is well connected.*

Response – the amenities and connectedness of the redeveloped site to its wider environs will be apparent and its presence undeniable.

- *While there are sinuous qualities present in the proposed landscape treatment this is not the case in the built forms and there is fundamental uncertainty as to whether the buildings are intended to be set on - or be part of - the landscape, and to what the extent the two are reinforcing one another.*

Response – The main AECC arena and gallery space will be designed as part of the landscape and the office and other uses will be designed as buildings that sit on the landscape to differentiate them.

- *The level of proposed cut and fill needs to be optimised relative to the existing site topography, particularly in relation to the Business Gateway Zone where issues of concern remain. Although the primary access to the offices is from the south, a more level access*

from the north would be advantageous and help create a more active frontage to the boulevard.

Response – The level of cut and fill will be optimised to reflect topography where possible. The primary avenue is designed for transport access where stopping is not permitted. The office complex to the immediate south can be accessed by pedestrian routes from the avenue but is serviced and accessed from within the office complex area.

- *The landscape exemplars shown by the Team suggest that the rippled landforms would be occupied as habitable spaces, however the current landscape proposals show these acting as buffers alongside and penetrated by routes.*

Response – The landscape strategy has been developed in considerable detail at a stage earlier in the development process than would otherwise be anticipated. The landscape strategy comprises a hierarchy of spaces and planting within a detailed design framework that observes the original design rationale.

- *The proposed incorporation of amenity/recreational space within the masterplan would be beneficial to the neighbouring communities provided it feels accessible and encourages use. However, further work on creating quality of connections is needed to ensure that initial experiences into the site are inviting.*

Response – The requirement for the underpass and path connecting the site to the Newhills area has been strengthened within the masterplan, and all other pedestrian, cycle routes etc. have been augmented through the site with compliant structured routes.

- *A more dynamic design device should be developed at this point to bring all of these things together, to celebrate and contribute to a greater sense of arrival and departure from the site.*

Response – The entrances to the site have been carefully considered for opportunity for strong visual impressions, the area between the hotel complex and the main AECC arena has been subject to fundamental review so that this transition space is not wholly given over to service vehicles.

- *There is currently a missed opportunity in making a usable landscape space at the southeast entrance where the existing building currently sits. There could be potential to create a south-facing amphitheatre or break out space to occupy the proposed landforms rather than simply penetrate them with routes. The Panel recommend this be developed further.*

Response – As above.

- *The crossing of the burn is important in forming a sense of arrival into the site. The proposed culverting of the burn is demeaning and the Panel recommend that a bridge crossing would create a much more positive experience at this point.*

Response – the design team have expressed concern at the cost and value of creating an actual bridge in this location. A structure with parapet sides that resembles and bridge will be constructed from stone down-takings from the existing buildings on the site.

- *Currently the AECC building presents its back to the space and the associated service area creates an unsatisfactory relationship with the entrance into the site. Further work is necessary to minimise the impact of the loading area to provide more usable space for the landscape at the rear of the hotel/AECC and an improved entrance into the site.*

Response – The service area has been redesigned to take cognisance that the arena building must be designed in the round and that precedent should not be taken from standard service areas which generally have reduced quality material finishes and design ambition.

- *Ongoing discussions with the Council and adjacent communities, including the landowners of the proposed Newhills settlement, are encouraged to help shape the detailed development of the proposed open spaces, coordinated vistas and to ensure quality connections are made between the AECC site and the wider area.*

Response – The planning approvals process will ensure correlation between the landscape plan for the AECC and the wider development of Rowett South for mainstream housing and other uses.

- *Any scope to move or amend the form of the Energy Centre strip along the southern edge of the AECC building to improve views through from the A96, and particularly the underpass from Newhills, should be taken.*

Response – The energy centre will be a discrete building whose slender chimney will only be visible from the A96 and whose roof will be designed with soft landscaping as part of the planting plan.

- *Having set up key axes it is important to consider the termination of new vistas being created, so that they are consequently followed through and meaningfully concluded. The route into the site from the east along the Main Boulevard feels unsatisfactory and ends abruptly in the subterranean building obstructing views into the site. The traffic diagram appears to conflict with the landscape plan,*

whereby taxis and buses are required to cut across the applied grain of the site to drop off at the AECC.

Response – The key axes have been scrutinised to achieve vistas and termination points on buildings and the graphics revised to illustrate there are no conflicts with the design layers proposed.

- *It would be beneficial to improve the alignment of the access road from the Main Boulevard, so that it follows a more natural route towards the AECC building and strengthens the entrance experience into the site.*

Response – For reasons of maximising the internal floor area of the subterranean gallery space for a larger range of exhibitions the axes remains, however the corner of the gallery space has been reviewed as an architecturally more interesting corner for visual interest.

- *It will take time for the proposed landscaping to mature. In assessing the detail of the landscape design it would be helpful to give an impression of what the views might look like at an early stage in the development of the landscape, as well as in the fullness of time.*

Response – The landscaping will include different ages and heights of specimen tree planting as well and under-planting and it is anticipated that the visual and recreational impact of the landscape plan will be appreciated from the outset and improve as it matures.

- *As a fulcrum point at the centre of the site, the Panel suggest that there could be scope to treat the design in the piazza differently – as a more restful space or eddy into which the flowing landscape forms converge – rather than necessarily continuing the stratification of the landscape into the space.*

Response – The design of the plaza will incorporate a mix of uses and characteristics that respond to the likely needs of the adjacent hotels as well as informal out-door space for the AECC arena with the ability to host a range of uses both informal and formal. The plaza will be serviced with water and electricity to make its future use attractive.

- *A key concern raised in previous workshops still remains that the raised inaccessible landscape atop the subterranean hall in the central area effectively ‘sterilises’ the public realm. Subsequent development has not lessened these concerns and further information provided only increases concerns about the nature of its perimeter.*

Response – The sides of the subterranean gallery are well detailed and attention paid to the soft landscaping planting specification for the roof in order that it brings the landscape and movement of the topography into the heart of the project. The accessibility of the roof is under review due to weight loadings and design implications should people be encouraged to want to climb onto it.

- *Introduction of commercial activity along its edges if viable, and/or careful articulation of the facades, to help animate the public frontages, in particular towards the central square and linear business park*

Response – There is sufficient opportunity for commercial uses to be formed in the foyer of the AECC arena as well as ‘pop-up’ locations within the plaza to serve events.

2) Retention of the ‘Burn Parkland’ & adherence to water extraction policies in the forthcoming Aberdeen Local Development Plan, and that the landscaped buffer areas between the Green Burn and the buildings are at least 6m wide.

Consultation response: 5) SNH Grampian & 7) SEPA

3) Water usage and discharge needs to be accurately reflected in the Draft Masterplan as scope of proposals change.

Consultation response: 6) Scottish Water

4) Flood Risk Assessment to correlate with SEPA’s observations to the PPIP and that further modelling is carried out to demonstrate that the Green Burn, without embankments, is carried out to demonstrate the buildings are out with the floodplain, and that off-site flooding is not increased. That the embankments proposed as not to act as flood defences.

If the Green Burn is to be bridged per findings of A+DS then the design team contact the local operations team at SEPA to discuss further the level of Controlled Activity Regulations necessary.

Consultation response 7) SEPA

5) Within section 3.2.4 of the Draft Masterplan rewording to state ‘Where buildings of a historic nature are to be demolished or significantly altered on site, an appropriate level of Standing Building Survey will be completed in advance of works in order to preserve a historic record of them.’

Consultation Response: 8) Aberdeen City & Shire Archaeological Service

6) The Draft Masterplan clearly states the area and connectivity for the provision of a railway halt to the north east part of the site.

Consultation Response: 3) Architecture+Design Scotland & 15 Knight Frank Land Agents

Appendix 2 – List of Consultees

	Invited Consultees (Statutory, Institutions & Constituted Groups)	Response
1	Dyce & Stoneywood Community Council	yes (PIIP)
2	Bucksburn & Newhills Community Council	yes (PIIP)
3	Architecture + Design Scotland	yes
4	Historic Scotland (Strategic Heritage Management)	yes
5	SNH Grampian	yes
6	Scottish Water	yes
7	SEPA	yes
8	Aberdeen City and Shire Archaeological Service	Yes
9	Aberdeen & Grampian Chamber of Commerce	Yes
10	Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland (NE)	Yes
	Scottish Enterprise Grampian	no
	NHS Grampian	no
	Aberdeen City & Shire Developer Obligations Team	no
	Aberdeen Cycle Forum	no
	Energetica	no
	Aberdeen Civic Society	no
	Aberdeen Chapter of Architects	no
	All Community Councils of Aberdeen outwith site boundary	no

Appendix 3 - List of Interested Party Responses

	Interested Party Response	
11	Historic Scotland (Listing & Designed Landscapes Team)	yes
12	University of Aberdeen (Director of Estates)	yes
13	Bon Accord Land Group (Mr C Campbell)	yes
14	20th Century Society	yes
15	Knight Frank (Mr G Purves)	yes
16	Mr K Mackenzie	yes
17	Mr D McPherson	yes
18	Mr B Gardner	yes
19	Mr A Clubb	yes
20	Mr AJ Richardson	yes
21	Chairman of Aberdeen City & Shire Hotels Association (Mr I Watson)	yes
22	Petition (591 signatories)	yes
23	Objections received from the application for Planning Permission in Principle for the site	Yes (PPIP)

Appendix 4 - Consultation Responses and Observations

1	<p style="text-align: center;">Dyce & Stoneywood Community Council Response (by email)</p> <p>Summary:</p> <p>The Dyce & Stoneywood Community Council strongly object to the proposal to demolish Strathcona House because of its sandstone construction in relation to Aberdeen’s built heritage, the quality of the interior and the historical association of its benefactors. The Community Council expresses surprise and disappointment that the developer has changed their mind on the retention of Strathcona House.</p> <p>Observations: The Community Council see Strathcona House as a valued asset to the site and have expressed their wish to have it retained. The Community Council raise no objection to the broader principle of the proposals.</p>	
2	<p style="text-align: center;">Bucksburn & Newhills Community Council (by email)</p> <p>Summary:</p> <p>The Bucksburn & Newhills Community Council held a public meeting on the 21 May 2015 and state in clear terms they wish Strathcona House to be retained in its entirety for its architectural features and because of its social/historical worth. The Community Council raise no further objection to the draft masterplan and hope that Strathcona House can be incorporated into the new conference facility.</p> <p>Observations: The Community Council see Strathcona House as a valued asset to the site and have expressed their wish to have it retained. The Community Council raise no objection to the broader principle of the proposals and express that Strathcona House be incorporated into the proposed development.</p>	
3	<p style="text-align: center;">Architecture + Design Scotland</p> <p>Summary:(quote) See Appendix 5</p> <p>Observations: See Appendix 5</p>	
4	<p style="text-align: center;">Historic Scotland (Strategic Heritage Management) (by email)</p> <p>Summary:(full quote)</p> <p><i>Thank you for your consultation on the Rowett North Masterplan. I would refer you to our EIA response of 25 June 2015 which states that as there are no designations within our statutory remit within or in the immediate vicinity of the site we have no specific comments to offer on the masterplan. Our response included an assessment of Strathcona House to help inform Aberdeen City Council’s consideration of the application and draft masterplan.</i></p> <p>Observations:</p> <p>Historic Scotland's detailed comments on the call, by a member of the public, to list Strathcona House are discussed, undernoted.</p>	

5	<p style="text-align: center;">SNH Grampian</p> <p>Summary: (full quote) <i>Thank you for your email consulting SNH on the draft masterplan for the new AECC at Rowett North.</i></p> <p><i>We welcome the green corridors and linking provision for active travel and informal recreation within the proposal. In particular, we are pleased to note provision of the "Burn Parkland" will take place during the initial phase of the development. We further advise that the extent of this open space should be protected and retained during consideration of any changes to the surrounding road network in response to the forthcoming traffic assessment.</i></p> <p><i>The masterplan includes a sustainability statement which covers water efficiency amongst other measures. As you are aware, most of Aberdeen's water comes from the River Dee SAC. In order to reduce water abstraction rates, we advise that targets for water efficiency within the masterplan adhere to the policies and standards within the emerging local development plan. Given the international importance and sensitivity of the River Dee we advise that the more stringent targets within the LDP are appropriate for this proposal.</i></p> <p>Observations: SNH broadly welcome the proposals, and in particular signal the importance of protecting the area around the proposed unculverted burn against land-grab for road widening, as well as recommending that the water extraction rates are the same as those agreed in the Aberdeen Local Development Plan.</p>	
6	<p style="text-align: center;">Scottish Water (By email letter attachment)</p> <p>Summary: (Full quote) <i>I write with reference to your email dated 22nd May 2015, requesting comments in relation to the Draft Rowett North Masterplan. Thank you for giving Scottish Water the opportunity to review this document and provide feedback.</i></p> <p><i>A Pre Development Enquiry (PDE) was submitted to Scottish Water in September last year, which comprised the exhibition centre and one hotel. The Masterplan reflects a much bigger development than we have previously received details for, therefore, we would encourage the developer to reflect on these changes.</i></p> <p><i>It is important that Scottish Water is kept informed of the latest plans for this substantial site. This will ensure that we are asking the developer to deliver the appropriate level of infrastructure, if required, and will help to avoid delays further down the line.</i></p> <p><i>We look forward to our continued involvement in the development of the Rowett North Masterplan area. Should you require additional support or guidance from Scottish Water, we would be happy to assist.</i></p> <p>Observations: The scale of the proposal has grown since the original brief and the estimated figures for water usage must be revised to reflect this. Revision to the Draft Masterplan will be sought.</p>	

Summary: (quote)

*We note from the Plan that “The purpose of this Masterplan is to guide the future redevelopment of this site.” We have therefore made a number of **recommendations and comments** below to assist in providing clarity on the type of information required to avoid unnecessary delay and/or objection from SEPA as the proposal progresses through planning. Please note the advice below.*

1.1 Section 3.2.6 makes reference to a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) being undertaken. We have recently provided comments, on 25 June 2015, on the FRA and proposed Green Burn realignment under planning application P150826 (our reference PCS/140566) and this response should be read in conjunction with those comments as many of them are applicable here.

1.3 Section 2.2.2 (Ground Conditions) has identified that there is a shallow groundwater table at the site. The masterplan states that this will be taken into account in any piling design and operation. We highlight that post construction groundwater flooding can also potentially be mitigated through appropriate drainage measures, and by site design such as raising finished floor levels and using water resistant materials. You may wish to consult with your Flood Prevention colleagues who may be able to provide more detailed advice on these matters.

1.5 It is stated that a Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken and the development will have no negative impacts of flooding. We have reviewed the FRA undertaken by Arup (May 2015) and note that although the modelling work carried out on the re-aligned burn is predicted to reduce flooding in the area, there are still some issues that would need clarifying in order to determine the developable area on site and ensure flood risk offsite is not increased. Please refer our response of 25 June 2015.

1.6 From the information provided in Section 5.4 (Burn Parkland) it appears that there will be suitable green space adjacent to the burn, primarily to create new habitats, but we highlight that buffer zones also have flood risk benefits by reducing run off into watercourses and promoting connectivity between the river and its floodplain. We recommend a minimum 6m buffer is maintained between watercourses on site and areas of development.

1.7 We note that from Section 5.4.2 that the use of earth mounding is proposed to minimise removal of material off site. Part of the modelling work carried out in the FRA showed that some of the flooding from the re-aligned burn could be contained by earth embankments. We requested in our previous response of 25 June 2015 that further modelling work showing the new Green Burn without the embankments is carried out to ensure that the development could be situated out with the ‘natural’ functional floodplain, and to ensure offsite flood risk is not increased. We would be unlikely to have an issue with landscaping and embankments within the development, providing they are out with the functional floodplain and are not being relied on to act as flood defences.

3.2 Reference is made in Section 5.4.4 to “Bridges over the new burn at key points along route to provide an accessible public resource”. We would take this opportunity to highlight that depending on when these are installed in relation to the realignment of the burn, if these are minor bridges with no construction on the bed or banks of the burn then these can be installed under General Binding Rule 6 of The Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2011(as amended) (CAR). If there will be construction on the bed or banks of a watercourse/burn then we recommend the developer contact the local Operations team to discuss further the level of CAR authorisation required.

5.1 Land contamination issues should be sought from the local authority contaminated land specialists because the local authority is the lead authority on these matters under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 except for matters relating to radioactively contaminated land or special sites. However, as highlighted in our comments of 25 June 2015, on planning application P150826 (our reference PCS/140566), there are two disposal sites possibly containing radioactive waste within the boundary of this planning application. As such we note and welcome within Section 6.2.1 that “any other contaminated areas will also be addressed accordingly”.

8.1 We welcome the proposals for district heating that will feed the whole Masterplan area with spur connections for future expansion offsite.

8.2 The Energy Centre combined cooling, heat and power plant (CCHP) may require authorisation from SEPA. If the applicant requires further advice on this aspect of the proposal they are advised to contact the local Operations team.

Observations:

SEPA are generally welcoming of the proposals and have made recommendations on measures that must be taken to redress the possibility of their objections at a later date for the redevelopment of the site. SEPA's recommendations will be reflected in revision to the Draft Masterplan. The full response is appended to this report.

8 Aberdeen City and Shire Archaeological Service (Mr B Mann by email)

Summary: (quote)

Thank you for the invitation to comment on the above draft Masterplan. Having reviewed the document as it currently exists, I can make the following comments regarding archaeology and the historic environment.

1) I welcome the stated intention that the Masterplan aims to deliver “buildings and spaces of high design quality with a focus on environmental credentials.” (Section 2.1 para 4), with characteristics of a “...unique sense of place and identity.” (Section 2.1 bullet point 1). The key vision also states the intention to “develop the site using the principles of environmental sustainability which will set an example for the future development within the region and beyond.” (Section 2.2 para 2). This intent however is at odds with the proposal to demolish all existing buildings on the site given both national and local policy direction that re-use should be sought whenever possible.

2) While the document states that “none of the buildings are listed by Historic Scotland for social or architectural merit” (Section 3.1.4 ‘Character’), this should in no way underestimate the importance, both architecturally and socially, of the structures in regional terms. This applies in particular to Strathcona House.

3) I note and welcome Section 3.2.4 ‘Heritage & Archaeology’ which recognises the requirement for an archaeological evaluation. In addition to this mitigation a sentence should be added noting that “Where buildings of a historic nature are to be demolished or significantly altered on site, an appropriate level of Standing Building Survey will be completed in advance of works in order to preserve a historic record of them.”

4) Appendix E – The section sets out the justification for the demolition of Strathcona House based on service loading requirements and current lack of an identified re-use. Given the examples of service delivery areas included within the Masterplan, as well as known examples within the NE, these are visually unsympathetic elements within the overall design. Therefore, even if no use could be identified for the House itself, it would serve as an extremely able means of masking the service delivery entrances and associated traffic from the principle view of the site from the A96 while retaining an iconic building in the region.

5) Furthermore, the diagrams within Appendix E demonstrate that the current land shortfall between the current designed swept path and that needed for the full extent of the loading bay requirement (Diagram 1 and 2) is 27.5m. As such the following diagrams (starting with Diagram 3) showing the entire design being moved 75m north, and greater distances thereafter, is unnecessary. A revised design involving the retention of Strathcona House with a less drastic movement of the main AECC building would be most welcome, as retention of this significant building should be considered a priority within the overall design.

Observations:

The Archaeologist states that the proposal to demolish all the buildings on the site is contrary to local and national planning policy were the presumption should always be for retention and re-use, and that whilst un-listed Strathcona House has regional architectural and social significance and that he believes a 'less drastic' redesign of the site layout is possible in order to retain Strathcona House. The recommendation in point 3 will be made within the Draft Masterplan.

9	<p>Aberdeen & Grampian Chamber of Commerce (Mr J Bream, Research & Policy Director)</p>
	<p>Summary: (Full quote)</p> <p><i>Aberdeen & Grampian Chamber of Commerce writes in reference to the above consultation, regarding the proposed new Aberdeen Exhibition and Conference Centre (AECC). Henry Boot Developments Ltd is a Chamber member and we write to support this development which will be built at Rowett North, Bucksburn, to replace the current facility at the Bridge of Don.</i></p> <p><i>The Chamber has been consistently impressed with the content of the plans and the ambitious nature of the proposed development. We fully support investments in infrastructure which contribute to promoting Aberdeen’s profile as a world-class energy hub and a desirable destination for tourism. It is our belief that the new AECC will further these aims by providing the city with a modern and versatile venue for large-scale concerts and major exhibition events like Offshore Europe.</i></p>

	<p><i>The Aberdeen City Council's Local Development Plan identifies the new AECC as an important project for the area which, due to its proximity to Aberdeen Airport and allocations of land for employment, will be an improved setting for the city's main events venue. Furthermore, the proposed development at Bucksburn will address many issues faced by the current AECC, such as insufficient public transport access and a lack of space and flexibility.</i></p> <p><i>The Chamber encourages planning officers and the Local Authority to support the new AECC, as it constitutes an important step forward in achieving Aberdeen's plans for the future.</i></p>	
	<p>Observations:</p> <p>The Aberdeen & Grampian Chamber of Commerce are 'impressed with the content of the plans' and fully support the Draft Masterplan to secure the quality of development needed to secure major exhibition events in Aberdeen.</p>	
10	<p>Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland (Letter attachment by email)</p> <p>Summary:(full quote)</p> <p>As a heritage organisation, The Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland is supportive of any initiatives prepared to retain historic buildings in use in an appropriate and complementary manner.</p> <p>In this case, we note that various options have been explored for retention of Strathcona House, the detached traditionally-constructed property, as part of the wider masterplan, together with its association with such the noted figure of Lord Strathcona should be recognised as the proposals are developed.</p> <p>We would welcome the opportunity to review the further proposals for this property in due course.</p> <p>Observations:</p> <p>The response doesn't seem to reflect an understanding that the Draft Masterplan proposes the demolition of Strathcona House. The letter then mentions welcoming the opportunity to review further proposals though in fact this is the only proposal for Strathcona House in the Draft Masterplan.</p>	
11	<p>Historic Scotland (Listing & Designed Landscapes Team)</p> <p>Summary:</p> <p>Summary: Historic Scotland, in view of the Planning Permission in Principle Application being submitted for the site on 28 May 2015, have chosen not to add Strathcona House to their record of listed buildings because listing during a live planning application is contrary to their protocol. However, Historic Scotland has chosen to forward their assessment of Strathcona House to Aberdeen City Council to inform the Council's consideration of the draft masterplan and planning application for the site. Historic Scotland also state that if the planning situation changes they may consider the case again for listing Strathcona House.</p> <p>In their 'Assessment Against Listing Criteria' Appendix 1 Historic Scotland state that Strathcona House was designed by Arthur G Ingham, chief engineer and surveyor to the Department of Agriculture for Scotland and funded with a donation of £10,000 from Lord Strathcona, furnishing were supplied by John L Archibald & Sons, and in 1937 stain glass windows to designs by Dr William Kelly were installed.</p>	

	<p>Historic Scotland state that Strathcona House is likely to be a relatively rare example of a purpose built hall of residence for its period, as many students in the 19th and early 20th century will have lived at home or in private lodgings, however, is not early for a purpose built hall of residence but is distinguished because of the quality of its design which references a historicists collegiate style with good sandstone detailing and a good interior decorative scheme, and noting that the building remains largely unaltered since the east wing was added in 1950.</p> <p>In their 'Category of Listing' section Historic Scotland consider that the interest of Strathcona House is considered to be of local importance and it may meet the criteria for listing at category C.</p> <p>Historic Scotland has requested that the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monument of Scotland (RCAHMS) make a photographic record of the building so that a record of it can be made public.</p>	
	<p>Observations:</p> <p>Historic Scotland have presented an anomaly by refusing to list Strathcona House because such an action would be contrary to their protocol because Strathcona House is subject to a live planning matters (both public consultation on the draft and the live application for Planning Permission in Principle). However, Historic Scotland have shared their findings with Aberdeen City Council and go so far as to suggest that Strathcona House may be worthy of listing at a later date and that it may achieve a Category C Listing. It is significant to note that Historic Scotland consider the building worthy of their further consideration at a later date, but due to the quality of its architecture and the quality of the craftsmanship as well as social and historical significance, however, have requested that RCAHMS make a record of the building presumably in the event of demolition. Historic Scotland has however provided no clear and certain basis for the retention of Strathcona House. Should Council be minded to make recommendation that Strathcona House can be demolished as part of the masterplan for the site then the Masterplan must include the Scottish Historic Environment Policy test (SHEP) to illustrate that factors outweigh retention of Strathcona House. It must also be noted that any works to Category C listed buildings are under jurisdiction of the Local Authority for determination, however, this does not take into consideration the strength of public feeling illustrated about the demolition of Strathcona House.</p>	
12	<p>University of Aberdeen, Director of Estates (By email & letter attachment)</p> <p>Summary: (Full quote)</p> <p><i>I am writing in support of the Draft Rowett North Masterplan.</i></p> <p><i>The proposals present an opportunity for Aberdeen to create a Conference Centre that strengthens Aberdeen's international profile with the best facilities within a distinctive new building and a landscape setting that will set a high quality redevelopment agenda for the site. The site is ideally located to accommodate a development of this type and scale.</i></p>	

	<p><i>The draft masterplan considers the general and architectural requirements of the site and identifies a number of constraints including the conflict between Strathcona House and the new conference centre. Although the loss of Strathcona House is unfortunate, this is not a building of significant importance and its removal is a compromise worth taking in order to ensure that the operational efficiency of the new AECC is not compromised. It is also important to consider the economic implications of a new facility of this sort and I think it is fair to say that the benefits to both the University and Aberdeen in general will be significant.</i></p> <p><i>I therefore urge you to approve the masterplan and encourage the proposal which will be of huge benefit to the City and Region.</i></p>	
	<p>Observations: The University of Aberdeen currently own the site. The Director of Estates is fully supportive of the draft masterplan to deliver what will be an important economic facility within Aberdeen, and that the demolition of Strathcona House is a compromise worth taking.</p>	
13	<p align="center">Bon Accord Land Promotion (Mr C Campbell) (By email)</p> <p>Summary: (Full quote) <i>To whom it may concern,</i></p> <p><i>I write in support of the draft Masterplan for development of a new AECC and complimentary uses at site OP28, Rowett North, Bucksburn.</i></p> <p><i>The high-quality design for a world-class facility set in landscaped parkland is much needed to strengthen Aberdeen’s profile as a global centre for the Oil and Gas industry.</i></p> <p><i>The range of facilities proposed will not only be an asset to the AECC and its wide range of potential users but also to the surrounding community, both existing and planned, in this key expansion area for the City.</i></p> <p><i>Whilst it is appreciated that Strathcona House holds considerable sentimental value to members of the local community, it has not been considered of sufficient architectural merit to be listed and it is clear that it would clash both architecturally and operationally with the new AECC.</i></p> <p><i>In summary, I am in favour of the proposed development and would urge the Local Authority to support this much needed investment in the City of Aberdeen.</i></p> <p>Observations:</p> <p>Bon Accord Land Promotion is fully supportive of the Draft Masterplan and the range of uses it proposes. However, the assertion that Strathcona House would present an architectural 'clash' with a new AECC is yet to be proven. However, the Draft Masterplan seeks to demonstrate the need to remove Strathcona House for servicing requirements to the site layout.</p>	

14	The 20th Century Society (by letter)	
	<p>Summary: (quote)</p> <p><i>The Twentieth Century Society has been made aware of the above application proposing the demolition of Strathcona House. The Society objects to this application, which we believe causes significant harm to an undesignated Heritage Asset. The Society is disappointed that the applicant has altered the Master Plan which contemplated the retention of this important building, which would be listed were it not under threat and therefore outside Historic Scotland's policy to add to the heritage list at this time....The Society would therefore urge Aberdeen City Council to resist the proposals by refusing this application. The Society is hugely disappointed that the applicant is contemplating the loss of this historic and unusually intact building having formerly incorporated it into their proposals. The applicants should be prevailed upon to reassess their treatment of this heritage asset by reverting to the original Master Plan which retained the building. Historic Scotland has indicated that Strathcona House is an undesignated heritage asset of sufficient heritage merit to be listed as Category C. As a result this building should be considered in planning terms as a heritage asset and should be retained and incorporated into the plans for the site.</i></p>	
	<p>Observations:</p> <p>Noted. The Society's opinion is for the retention and re-use of Strathcona House</p>	

	Knight Frank, Land Agents (Mr G Purves)	
15	<p>Summary: (quote)</p> <p><i>I wish to comment on the draft masterplan for the new exhibition centre at the Rowett.</i></p> <p><i>I believe the masterplan should only be approved if there will be a new railway station on or adjacent to the site which has a firm commitment from Aberdeen City Council and Network Rail in terms of its delivery and will provide connections to the airport and the city centre.</i></p>	
	<p>Observations:</p> <p>The approved Masterplan must inform all future redevelopment of the site. Whilst the Draft Masterplan consciously shows there is space for a railway halt to the north east of the site a revision to the Draft Masterplan should be made to make explicit that the opportunity exists for a railway halt. The consultation has been forwarded to the Head of Economic Development.</p>	

16	<p style="text-align: center;">Mr K Mackenzie (by letter & emails)</p> <p>Summary: Mr MacKenzie wishes to see the prospect of a new AECC etc. as a stimulus for the possibility of AFC relocating to Rowett South with the physical proximity and, at the very least, the current underpass link being mutually beneficial to both.</p> <p>Observations: Mr Mackenzie's emails were forwarded to Aberdeen City Council's Director of Communities, Housing and Infrastructure, appropriate Heads of Service, and the planning officer for the Rowett South site should they wish to facilitate the idea of adjacent and complementary locations. Mr MacKenzie's supports the Draft Masterplan and his wishes do not detract from it because it which proposes a variety of linkages for connectivity to the wider area.</p>	
17	<p style="text-align: center;">Mr D McPherson (by email)</p> <p>Summary: (quote) <i>I Donald K. McPherson object to the demolition of the Strathcona house. This building is of great architectural importance to Aberdeen with its red sandstone sourced from Elgin. It also has great links with Lord Strathcona past rector of University of Aberdeen who damaged a large sum of money to fund the building.</i></p> <p>Observations: <i>Mr McPherson wishes to see Strathcona House retained for its architectural importance to Aberdeen.</i></p>	
18	<p style="text-align: center;">Mr B Gardner (by email)</p> <p>Summary: (quote) <i>I am shocked to hear that the historic and cultural feature of Strathcona House is being considered for demolition because of a secondary evolution of the AECC project at Bucksburn.</i> <i>With its links to Canada and to Lord Boyd-Orr, it seems a tragic act of municipal vandalism to even think of destroying this building. It is also extremely insensitive to the current citizens who reside in Bucksburn.</i> <i>I trust that an alternative plan can be found to preserve the old with the new, which must be a priority for those who believe in historic continuity. If it is not all about money and barbarism, please save this house.</i></p> <p>Observations: Mr Gardner would like to see Strathcona House preserved for 'historic continuity' with the new AECC.</p>	

19	Mr A Clubb (by email)	
	<p>Summary: (Full quote)</p> <p><i>I am concerned that there is a consideration to demolish Strathcona House in order to build the new Exhibition Centre, I question whether this should be allowed by the conditions of ownership, also the hair brained scheme to move the existing operations at The Rowett Research Facility to an already overcrowded site at Foresterhill.</i></p> <p><i>Please give serious consideration to both of these points and not dismiss them to take an irreversible decision which will have a long term impact on services at ARI</i></p>	
	<p>Observations:</p> <p><i>Mr Clubb wishes to see Strathcona House retained. The other matters raised are out with the scope of this consultation.</i></p>	

20	Mr AJ Richardson (by email)	
	<p>Summary: (Full quote)</p> <p><i>With respect to the new Bucksburn Masterplan & PPP Application I would like to strongly object to the proposed demolition of Strathcona House. This is an essential part of Aberdeen's heritage. I have worked here at the World class Rowett Research Institute for over 40 years and I would be extremely sorry to see such a beautiful building destroyed as part of the new AECC plan. Is it not possible to retain this building within the proposed complex and thereby secure an important part of Aberdeen's heritage and history?</i></p>	
	<p>Observations:</p> <p><i>Mr Richardson wishes to see Strathcona House retained and incorporated within the proposed development of the site.</i></p>	

21	Mr Ian Watson, Chairman of Aberdeen City & Shire Hotels Association (by email)	
	<p>Summary: (Quote)</p> <p><i>As chairman of the Aberdeen City and Shire Hotels Association, I write on behalf of the 44 full, and 10 associate, association members to confirm our support of the planning application being proposed for the building of the new AECC on the proposed site at Bucksburn.</i></p> <p><i>We believe that the introduction of the new exhibition centre will bring great commercial opportunities to the region, and allow the city and surrounding areas to become more than just the "Oil Capital of Europe" by introducing so many more people to the region through increased conference business and much larger leisure events thereby enhancing visitor experience.</i></p> <p><i>At present there is no doubt that we fall behind both Glasgow and Edinburgh in Scotland and most major cities in England in providing a venue/reason for visitors to come to our fair city. However, we have an opportunity now to take this forward and put us in the forefront of so many more markets to which we are not available just now.</i></p> <p><i>Please do allow the business community in the city to help in making Aberdeen a major force internationally by agreeing the application for a new and brighter future.</i></p>	
	<p>Observations:</p>	

	The Hotels Association fully supports the Draft Masterplan.	
--	---	--

22	<p align="center">Social Media Generated Petition (forwarded to Leader of Administration)</p> <p>Summary: A petition with 591 signatories who do not wish to see Strathcona House demolished have been lodged as a response to the public consultation.</p>	
	<p>Observations: Noted. There is a significant body of public opinion who wish to see Strathcona House retained.</p>	

23	<p align="center">Letters of Objection to the Application for Planning Permission in Principle</p> <p>Summary: 69 letters of representation have been made to the Application for Planning Permission in Principle for the redevelopment of the site. The letters chiefly object to the loss of Strathcona House.</p>	
	<p>Observations: It is considered that 69 objections is a significant factor in evaluating strength of public opinion on the proposed demolition of Strathcona House.</p>	

**Appendix 5 – Historic Scotland – Assessment Against Listing Criteria
(Findings Copied in Full)**

**Appendix 6 – Architecture + Design Scotland
(Findings in Full)**

**Appendix 7 – Draft Rowett North Masterplan (AECC)
(In Full)**