

<b>Appendix 1</b>			
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Officers Response</b>	<b>Action/Amendments</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Scottish Natural Heritage</b>		
1.1	Do not wish to make comment as the application of the relevant Local Development Plan policies should safeguard the natural heritage interests.	Comment is noted.	No action or amendment required.
<b>2.</b>	<b>Forestry Commission</b>		
2.1	Forestry Commission Scotland welcomes the sensitive proposals outlined in relation to the Ancient Woodland including the development buffer around the woodland and the newly proposed connected hedgerows. Recommend planting with locally relevant native species.	Comment is noted.	No action or amendment required.
<b>3.</b>	<b>Mr Neil Taylor</b>		
3.1	The plans for the site are acceptable within the site context.	Comment noted.	No action or amendment required.
3.2	Main concern is overdevelopment of the A944 corridor if Phase 4, Phase 5 and a new Stadium are approved on the opposite side of the AWPR. Houses in the near area will suddenly be in the middle of a transport/business/stadium development that is most definitely not rural as when purchased.	The Prime Four development and the extension covered by this Development Framework are as allocated in the Proposed Local Development Plan 2015 for specialist employment use. Any proposal for a stadium requires separate consultation.	No action or amendment required.
<b>4.</b>	<b>SEPA</b>		
4.1	The application site is completely outwith the medium likelihood (0.5% annual probability or 1 in 200 year) flood extent on the SEPA flood map. There does not appear to be any watercourses on the site and SEPA have no	Comment is noted.	No action or amendment required.

<b>Appendix 1</b>			
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Officers Response</b>	<b>Action/Amendments</b>
	records of any past flooding at the site. Therefore no assessment of flood risk is required for the site.		
4.2	We request that confirmation is provided that the SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) proposals have been designed in accordance with the CIRIA SuDS manual C753. <a href="http://www.susdrain.org/resources/SuDS_Manual.html">www.susdrain.org/resources/SuDS_Manual.html</a>	Comment is noted - amend Development Framework accordingly.	Add text to page 48 to state "All SuDS proposals will be designed in accordance with CIRIA SuDS manual C753"
4.3	We note that Phase 1 contains a SuDS pond and we request that it is clarified why these cannot be provided in Phase 2.	Comment noted.	Update page 48 to include reference to a SuDS basin in the southern part of the site.
4.4	We note that peat was found on site in the development of Phase 1. We request that a statement is provided on the actions that will be taken for peat management, including its re-use, if peat is identified in Phase 2.	Comment noted, Add text that confirms if peat is identified what actions will be undertaken by the developer in accordance with SEPA's Developments on Peatland Guidance	Add text to page 19 to confirm what actions will be taken should peat be found within OP63.
<b>5.</b>	<b>Historic Environment Scotland</b>		
5.1	Welcome the consideration given to the historic environment. The development framework considers that the proposals are unlikely to affect the setting of the consumption dyke as the ancient woodland between the two sites is to be retained. Content to agree and therefore have no further comments.	Comment is noted.	No action or amendment required.
<b>6.</b>	<b>North of Scotland Quaker Trust</b>		
6.1	Appreciate that the plans take seriously the preservation of the burial ground and show respect for its religious and historical	Comments are noted, it is important to ensure that the Quaker Burial Ground is respected.	No action or amendment required.

<b>Appendix 1</b>			
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Officers Response</b>	<b>Action/Amendments</b>
	significance. Not opposed in principle, but have a number of concerns over how the development may impact on the sanctity and security of the burial ground.		
6.2	<p><b>20 m Buffer Zone</b> Clarification sought of what will be included within the buffer zone. We would also question whether it is wide enough in order to protect the sanctity and ambiance of the burial ground, particularly if nearby buildings are tall.</p> <p>We appreciate that the buffer zone would not be a neat rectangle, and suggest 30 m might be more appropriate at some points, with a minimum of 20 m.</p>	The buffer zone should not be regular in shape, it should be more natural in form. Text to be added to explain that a 20m buffer is the minimum land required. It is assumed that the planting will be natural as shown in fig 47 but access and location of any planting etc should be carried out in discussion with the Quaker Trust.	<p>Add text to page 31 confirming that 20 metre buffer is the minimum.</p> <p>Add text to confirm the nature of the buffer zone including form and content.</p>
	Concerns that the developer states it may be necessary to remove and replace some parts of the boundary wall of the burial ground. This would also involve removing some of the trees growing around the burial ground.	<p>The text refers to walls that join the burial ground wall and the plot dykes, it does not refer to the walls of the burial ground itself. Clarification should be provided on this topic within the document.</p> <p>Maintenance requirements should be discussed between the developer and the North of Scotland Quaker Trust.</p>	Page 31, text should be added to make it clear that the walls of the burial ground will remain.
6.3	<p><b>Future Maintenance and Insurance</b> We are currently responsible for the periodic maintenance and upkeep of the trees and surrounding walls of the site. We are concerned potentially increased pedestrian traffic around and onto the site will increase the requirement for such maintenance.</p>	Maintenance and insurance is not a planning consideration and any discussion and/or agreement on this matter should be made with the developer directly.	No action or amendment required.

<b>Appendix 1</b>			
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Officers Response</b>	<b>Action/Amendments</b>
	We would be grateful if you could make it clear to the developer and future managers for the Business Park that the costs of such an increased maintenance and possible insurance burden will be borne by them.		
6.4	<b>Interpretive Information and Seating</b> It is suggested that a 'display board' and seating will be erected adjacent to the burial ground. As custodians of the site, we request to be involved in the design and content.	Comment noted: offer of assistance in this matter will be forwarded onto the developer.	Forward offer of assistance for content of the display board to the developer.
6.5	<b>Options for a road around the site</b> Some concerns about the possible roads around the burial ground. Options are shown to the north or south. The road to the south may be preferable if it is sunken as it would result in the site being more open. A road around the north side may be more intrusive unless it is located further back from the burial ground and with more screening.	Further assessments will be required in relation to the location of any road. The two options were put forward for consideration and to ensure that the burial ground was appropriately protected from the potential impact of a road.  Roads both side of the burial ground must be avoided in order to protect the site.	No action or amendment required.
6.6	<b>Link Road through to A944 (p38)</b> This would almost certainly increase the level of traffic flows past the burial ground and would be of some concern. If another access onto the A944 is to be permitted or welcomed, what is its likely impact to be?	Careful consideration will need to be given to any link road in proximity to the Friends Burial Ground. Should the new access onto the A944 be deemed appropriate (subject to detailed Transport Assessment) connections through to the wider Prime 4 site would be essential to provide public transport and cycle connectivity.  Detailed Transport Assessment will determine the requirement for any additional	Pass comments to the developers.

<b>Appendix 1</b>			
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Officers Response</b>	<b>Action/Amendments</b>
		access, make up and location of any proposed new access onto the A944 and subsequently through the site. Comments will be passed onto the agents for their information.	
6.7	<p><b>Western Hub with Eatery and access to the Burial Ground</b></p> <p>There is the possibility that food would be taken out from an outlet close by and taken into the burial ground. Whilst we are not against members of the public having access to the burial ground, there is a very real danger that there would be litter left, the place used in a noisy way inappropriate to such a site, or otherwise not treated with respect. We would therefore be very concerned and unhappy with any proposal to include a fast food take away in the proximity of the burial ground.</p> <p>More generally, in terms of access to the Burial Ground would we have a say on whether we want to encourage people to go to the burial ground?</p>	<p>Comments noted. The proximity of the hub should be carefully considered so as not to adversely affect the burial ground which by its nature is peaceful.</p> <p>The buffer zone around the burial ground and its design should also be carefully considered, in particular the potential inclusion of seating or any improved access to the burial ground.</p> <p>Discussions should take place between the Trust and the Developer to determine the most appropriate arrangement for access.</p>	<p>Add text to page 34 stating landscape strategy will be required as part of any masterplan or detailed applications for the site. Careful consideration should be given to the area around the burial ground given its sensitivity.</p>
6.8	<p><b>Proposal for larger and taller buildings around the burial ground in order to create a visual marker or statement (p42)</b></p> <p>Concerned about the likelihood that such building would dominate and overshadow the burial ground. We suggest that the massing of the buildings should be carefully considered for their impact on the burial ground and that they</p>	<p>Additional analysis will be required for the buildings and in particular siting, scale and massing. This does not only related to the burial ground but the views into and out with the site.</p>	<p>Add text to 6.6 buildings, in relation to the requirement for further analysis.</p>

<b>Appendix 1</b>			
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Officers Response</b>	<b>Action/Amendments</b>
	should be stepped and set back within their sites, and the buffer zone increased in width. We trust that the formal buffer zone does not come up abruptly with a building.		
6.9	<b>Status of the Masterplan document</b> We are pleased to note that there will be further opportunity to make comments on more detailed proposals.	Comment noted.	No action or amendment required.
<b>7.</b>	<b>Aberdeen Cycle Forum</b>		
7.1	Currently, there are some excellent examples of good cycle infrastructure at Prime Four, however, there are other examples of infrastructure that is dangerous and potentially deadly. We have been very vocal about the need for these links from the beginning of the development.	It is unclear where the dangerous infrastructure is within the Prime Four development. Detail of this should be provided to ensure this is resolved. All ped/cycle links within the OP63 site will be carefully assessed to ensure there are no road safety issues.	No action or amendment required.
7.2	We petitioned formally regarding the narrow sub-standard section of path to the west of the main development entrance on the A944 to the city council. The council's response was that perhaps mitigation could be achieved at the next stage of development which is where we are now. The OP63 site puts forward this section as part of its cycle links. The Westhill cycle path usage will only increase with the steady uptake of buildings as highlighted in the document.	As part of any Transport Assessment, cycling infrastructure will have to be considered and fully assessed. P49 of the Framework should include the assessment of the A944 shared footway as being a key element of a Transport Assessment. The requirement for a financial contribution to the route may be identified.	Add text to P49 Accessibility to confirm the requirement to consider the A944 shared footway in any future Transport Assessment.
7.3	The OP63 internal links seem adequate but await further detail. It is indicated on the plans that the access to the site is along the A944	Detailed cycle connections will be determined through the Transport Assessment process. The cycle routes	No action or amendment required.

<b>Appendix 1</b>			
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Officers Response</b>	<b>Action/Amendments</b>
	and that there is potentially a path through the site too. Clarification would be required to ensure there is an alternative route for users continuing their journey and not stopping at Prime Four.	would connect into the A944 shared footway as well as onto the C89 Kingswells bypass. Though not a separate cycle lane, this north south connection is still available. It is also expected that the C89 Road will become quieter as a result of the AWPR opening.	
7.4	Welcome the necessity for cycle infrastructure at Prime Four has already been identified and that it is intended to link with existing infrastructure.	Comment noted.	No action or amendment required.
7.5	Section 3.2 If new portions of Prime Four are to connect to everything mentioned in the document, upgrading the WCP or rerouting will be necessary to address the ongoing problems.	Comment noted. Any necessary Transport Assessment will consider road impacts as well as any required upgrades to cycle infrastructure.	No action or amendment required.
<b>8.</b>	<b>Transport Scotland</b>		
8.1	<b>Phasing</b> - The Framework indicates that the new allocation of land at Phase 4 (OP63 in the LDP) will be the next phase to be brought forward. The Framework also indicates that Phase 5 (OP40 allocation, renamed OP29 in the LDP) will be the final phase to be developed. However, we are aware of discussions regarding the creation of a new access from the A944 to serve Phase 5 which would appear to add some uncertainty around the intended order of phasing. The Framework does not set out the rationale for a new access from the A944. These discussions would therefore appear to be	The Development Framework identifies the <b>potential</b> for an additional access onto the A944 nothing more. Further Transport Assessments would be required prior to any agreement being reached on such a proposal.  The opportunity to have an additional access onto the A944 could provide a bus connection through the site to connect with the wider Prime Four development.	Add text to make it explicit that any additional access onto the A944 will incorporate wider connections through the site to provide a connected bus route.

<b>Appendix 1</b>			
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Officers Response</b>	<b>Action/Amendments</b>
	going against the principles of the Framework and risk disregarding appropriate appraisal and planning process.		
8.2	<b>Potential Impacts</b> - Irrespective of the issues associated with the location and form of any new access on the A944, Transport Scotland's primary consideration will be the impacts which further development in the area would have on the operation of the strategic transport network, specifically at the AWPR/A944 Kingswells junction.	Any new access will require a detailed Transport Assessments to be carried out with the operation of the key strategic network being a vital consideration.	No action or amendment required.
8.3	Transport Scotland consider that a cumulative assessment which considers both Phase 4 and Phase 5 is required to inform consideration of further development on the site. This assessment should determine the potential impacts on the trunk road network and consider deliverable mitigation measures where appropriate.	The cumulative impact and impact on the trunk road network of the phases will have to be considered through the relevant Transport Assessment.	No action or amendment required.
8.4	<b>Internal Connectivity</b> - The Framework appears to illustrate contrasting internal access arrangements. See full comment in Appendix 2 for details.	<p>Any new connection onto the A944 would be required to connect through to the wider site and must not be stand alone. Text should be added to the document to confirm this.</p> <p>The plans should also be consistent and show this additional proposed connection including fig 5 and fig 9.</p> <p>There are a number of inaccuracies within the plans that need to be resolved.</p>	<p>Add text to 6.5 to confirm that any new connection will be subject to a detailed TA and would have to connect through to the wider site.</p> <p>Ensure that all plans are consistent and do not contradict each other.</p>

<b>Appendix 1</b>			
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Officers Response</b>	<b>Action/Amendments</b>
<b>9.</b>	<b>Kingswells Community Council</b>		
9.1	<p>This response is written before the Local Development Plan (LDP) has been approved and whilst the OP63 site is under review by the Reporter. As such the response is written with the following assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> the Reporter approves the OP63 site for development in the LDP,</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> the Reporter does not ask for any changes to the wording of the LDP.</li> </ul> <p>If any of the above assumptions prove to be invalid then KCC reserves the right to make additional comments.</p>	<p>Comments are noted. The recommendation to this report states that the document would be Local Planning Advice until the adoption of the Local Development Plan. If the site was not deemed suitable by the reporter the Development Framework will no longer be Interim Planning Advice and will not be taken forward as Supplementary Guidance.</p>	<p>No action or amendment required.</p>
9.2	<p>Site OP63 is not suitable for this type of development and a more suitable site should be found elsewhere. The need for this expansion is questionable given the recent request to change the use of the original phase 4 (now phase 5) from office to retain, food and drink and other uses.</p>	<p>Site OP63 has been identified in the Proposed Aberdeen Local Development Plan as an opportunity site for employment land. The site abuts an existing specialist employment site, in the Prime Four Business Park. The existing site has been exceptionally successful since its opening, bringing a significant positive economic impact to Aberdeen through the office accommodation, hotel and other uses. The developable land has been built out and demand for plots is continuing, therefore expansion of the site capitalises on the existing success.</p> <p>A POAN can be submitted at any time and</p>	<p>No action or amendment required.</p>

<b>Appendix 1</b>			
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Officers Response</b>	<b>Action/Amendments</b>
		for any use. Any planning application on this site will be determined against the relevant land allocation, planning policies and approved Development Framework for the site.	
9.3	The timing of this document before the approval of the LDP and during the review by the reporter is a manipulation of the planning system. This view is further justified by the recent change of use request highlighted above.	<p>The developer and their agents have been advised that producing the Prime Four Expansion Development Framework document for OP63 prior to the completion of the Reporters' Report and prior to adoption of the Plan by Aberdeen City Council, is entirely at their own risk. The Prime Four Expansion Development Framework will only be adopted as supplementary guidance if the Reports' include OP63 as an opportunity site. Frameworks can be submitted to the Council at any point in the lifespan on the Plan, also it is not uncommon for planning applications to be submitted on land not allocated for development.</p> <p>Should the Reporters' dismiss the Prime Four Expansion in their examination, the developers could still apply for planning permission. Under this circumstance the application would be a departure from the Plan and the site's recent status would not prejudice the planning process.</p> <p>The existing allocation original phase 4/now</p>	No action or amendment required.

<b>Appendix 1</b>			
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Officers Response</b>	<b>Action/Amendments</b>
		phase 5 within the 2012 Aberdeen Local Development Plan is an opportunity site for business land, and in the 2015 Proposed Plan it is allocated as Specialist Employment Land. In areas identified as Specialist Employment Areas, Policy B2 outlines only Class 4 (Business) uses shall be permitted. Applications submitted to the site will be assessed against this policy.	
9.4	The original phase 4 area is low lying and more suitable for tall buildings than the hilltop development proposed for OP63.	Careful consideration will be required with the design of the buildings in the site. Both sites are allocated for development in the Proposed Local Development Plan and were deemed appropriate for Specialist Employment.	No action or amendment required.
9.5	<b>Communication and engagement - section 4.1</b> The document suggests that there has been a lack of community engagement. KCC has been fully engaged through the lifecycle of the Prime Four Development and have chosen to identify issues that make a real difference to the community. The lack of comment should not be taken as lack of interest. The comments made should be given more credence as minor comments have been removed.	Section 4.1 considers the main points that were put forward as part of the engagement process and what events took place.  It confirms that the Kingswells Community Council provided comments and it also confirms that the Community Council attended the event.	No action or amendment required.
9.6	<b>Protection of heritage and features</b> The development of the AWPR does not allow for the landscape setting of the area to be destroyed. The AWPR will ultimately merge into the landscape and have lesser impact.	Further assessment is required within the Development Framework in terms of a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). A full LVIA is required as part of the EIA process for the site so any work carried	Carry out a further assessment and update the Development Framework accordingly.

<b>Appendix 1</b>			
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Officers Response</b>	<b>Action/Amendments</b>
	<p>The proposal for significant buildings and skyline development will change the landscape forever. The original agreement with the community to minimise the visual impact of the development should be respected.</p>	<p>out now will be able to inform the future assessment. We do not expect a full LVIA as part of the Development Framework however a further assessment of the site and its surroundings is required.</p> <p>The assessment should consider the potential landscape and visual impacts of the development. This should include assessing the character of the site and its surroundings, the sensitivity of the landscape to development of this type, and its capacity to accommodate the development. The visual assessment will include views from within and outwith the site. The spatial scope of the assessment should be influenced by the extent of visibility of the proposed development, the characteristics of the surrounding landscape, and how it is used and experienced by people. Reference should be made to relevant techniques within Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, and the <u>Scottish Government's Design Manual PAN 44 Fitting New Housing Development into the Landscape</u>. The outcome of the assessment should influence the final Framework document, including the landscape strategy, along with the scale, height and massing of proposed buildings. Once the assessment is carried out it may</p>	

<b>Appendix 1</b>			
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Officers Response</b>	<b>Action/Amendments</b>
		be necessary to update further text and diagrams within the Framework to reflect these outcomes.	
9.7	<p><b>Impact on the Landscape</b> As above. KCC do not think that the 1<sup>st</sup> phase of development has been located sensitively. The existing development is highly visible even though it was promised that it would not be seen from anywhere. Development on this site should not be allowed above tops of existing trees.</p>	See 9.6 above	See 9.6 above.
9.8	Any reference to prominent development should be removed from the Framework.	The word prominent is only used once in the document on p44 where it confirms that the plateau is the most prominent location so would be a logical location for a statement building. By their nature business premises are larger buildings, the development will not be fully screened but careful consideration must be given to how best to integrate it into the wider landscape.	Add text to p44 to confirm high quality design and careful consideration of the scale and massing of any building(s) on the plateau is required.
9.9	<p><b>5.1 The site</b> Timings for walking to Kingswells are optimistic and are likely measured from the Kingswells boundary. A further 15 minutes should be added to travel from the village centre.</p>	Noted, the developer should revisit the timings to ensure they are accurate.	Development Framework should be updated as appropriate.
9.10	<p><b>5.5 Surrounding Context</b> Woodland to north and east can only offer screening if the buildings do not breach the tops of the trees.</p>	Noted: See 9.6	See 9.6

<b>Appendix 1</b>			
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Officers Response</b>	<b>Action/Amendments</b>
9.11	<p><b>5.6 Ecology</b> Concern about the encirclement of the West Hatton LNCS. Increased shading by the high buildings and increase in light pollution will have an adverse impact on the biodiversity in the woods. The woodland needs to be managed sensitively in order to sustain and broaden its biodiversity.</p>	Comments noted.	No action or amendment required.
9.12	Access paths through the woodland should not be part of any plans.	The access paths through the woodland have been removed from the plans.	No action or amendment required.
9.13	<p><b>5.7 Heritage and archaeology</b> KCC do not accept that the proposed development “will not affect the setting of the consumption dyke in any way.” The only way to ensure the setting is not effected is to extend the no build zone that extends 120m both sides of the consumption dyke. Within this zone there should be no development above the tree tops. The level of trees vary and no development above the tree tops should be interpreted literally and no part should be visible from the north and east of the development. The best views of the consumption dyke have been screened by feature landscaping (mounds) and will be further concealed in the future by the new tree planting.  Some redesign of the eastern boundary of the northern park is required to reinstate the once magnificent views of the consumption dyke.</p>	<p>Comments from Historic Environment confirm that they do not think that this development would have any impact on the Consumption Dyke.</p> <p>“We note that the development framework considers that the proposed works within the OP63 site are unlikely to affect the setting of the consumption dyke as the ancient woodland between the two sites is to be retained. We are content to agree with this conclusion and therefore have no further comments to offer.”</p> <p>The eastern boundary as referred to in the comments is not within the site that this Development Framework covers.</p>	No action or amendment required.

<b>Appendix 1</b>			
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Officers Response</b>	<b>Action/Amendments</b>
	This could be done by reopening the views from the C89 travelling north.		
9.14	<p><b>5.11 Landscape</b> Every effort needs to be made to minimise the impact of the development on the local area. The development of the AWPR does not give future developments the right to destroy the local landscape.</p>	See 9.6 above	See 9.6 above
9.15	<p><b>6.2 Key objectives</b> Concern that if the landscape strategy is continued from phases 1-3 the identity of Kingswells will be lost forever. The strategy seems to make the business park buildings as prominent as possible, which is good for a business park but no the setting of the village.</p> <p>Drum promised that the buildings would be screened by the existing trees. The impact of the landscape is much greater than agreed with the community and this needs to be redressed.</p> <p>The reality of phase 1-3 is that the tree cover was removed along the A944, and the tallest buildings were built on the highest points of the site.</p>	<p>By their nature these buildings are larger and cannot be fully screened. Phases 1-3 are set into the landscape and have built mounds and the trees provide backdrop to those in the foreground.</p> <p>Driving along the A944 to the east, Kingswells is not visible until past the business park. Kingswells and the Prime 4 development are not both visible from the C89 road, given the strategic planting along this road adjacent to Kingswells. It is unclear how the development will impact on the setting of the village.</p> <p>A more detailed landscape scheme will be required for the development to include planting etc.</p>	No action or amendment required.
9.16	We ask that the height and layout of the buildings closest to the ancient woodland address the concerns outlined above. Any landmark buildings should be viewed from the	Careful consideration will have to be given to the scale and massing of the buildings and in particular those adjacent to the ancient woodland.	See 9.6 above

<b>Appendix 1</b>			
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Officers Response</b>	<b>Action/Amendments</b>
	west / AWPR. Phase 4 (now called Phase 5) has the lowest contours and is most suitable for the tallest buildings. Tree cover must screen the site.	See 9.6 above	
9.17	The architectural beauty of the buildings can best be appreciated from <i>within</i> the development site. The whole site will be a landmark, and there is no need for any especially tall buildings to highlight the development when viewed from a car travelling at 70mph.	By the nature of the use of the site the buildings will be visible but detailed assessments and a landscape strategy will help to integrate the development into the landscape.	No action or amendment required.
9.18	<b>6.3 Response to the Historic Environment</b>  The consumption dyke should be included in this section. Mitigation should include height restrictions to ensure plant rooms are below the tree tops, and buildings are well set back to reduce light penetration through the trees.	Comments from Historic Environment confirm that they do not think that this development would have any impact on the Consumption Dyke.  “We note that the development framework considers that the proposed works within the OP63 site are unlikely to affect the setting of the consumption dyke as the ancient woodland between the two sites is to be retained. We are content to agree with this conclusion and therefore have no further comments to offer.”	No action or amendment required.
9.19	The height of trees is not quoted consistently in the document. 15-20m is quoted and so to is 20-25m. In reality the height of trees varies across the site, and the actual heights should be used when designing specific buildings.	Noted, text should be made clear that the height of the trees varies across the site from 15-25 metres.  The accurate height of the trees must be used when designing the specific buildings and determining a detailed layout.	Add text to Page 33 to confirm that the accurate tree heights will be used to determine the scale and massing of the buildings as well as the final layout.

<b>Appendix 1</b>			
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Officers Response</b>	<b>Action/Amendments</b>
9.20	<p><b>Friends Burial Ground</b></p> <p>KCC would like the following modification:            “Any building within close proximity to the 20m buffer zone will require to take cognisance of its setting through the use of sensitive design and materials.”</p> <p>should be changed to:</p> <p>“Any building within close proximity to the 20m buffer zone will require to take cognisance of its setting through material selection and the use of sensitive design including building height and by increasing the effect of the buffer zone using car park layout.”</p>	<p>Partly agreed, text should be amended.</p> <p>The carparking location and design will need to be carefully considered in particular the location; adjacent to the burial ground may not be the most appropriate.</p>	<p>“Any building within close proximity to the 20m buffer zone will require to take cognisance of its setting through material selection and the use of sensitive design including building height and massing”</p>
9.21	<p>KCC would favour a road layout that passed in low profile to the north of the Friends Burial Ground, but reserve the right to comment on this at the application stage.</p>	<p>The document is a Development Framework where it is entirely appropriate to show options for elements such as roads. The most appropriate location for the road around the burial ground will have to be carefully assessed to ensure the least impact on the Burial ground.</p>	<p>No action or amendment required.</p>
	<p>This is not the correct location for any hub building.</p>	<p>Agreed: The hub should be relocated further to the west, away from the Friends Burial Ground. The hub area should be relocated to the east, adjacent to the entrance from earlier phases.</p> <p>Fig 58 shows a cluster of buildings to the east of the burial ground, the hub area</p>	<p>Alter fig 53 and any other associated figures accordingly.</p>

<b>Appendix 1</b>			
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Officers Response</b>	<b>Action/Amendments</b>
		should be relocated around here.	
9.22	<p><b>Ancient Woodland</b></p> <p>Concern that the 10m buffer is insufficient. The design should include a 10m buffer to the carpark to avoid creating dark spots which cast shadows on the woodland.</p> <p>The buffer zone between any buildings should be at least the height of the trees. Setting similar to fig 51 would be welcomed.</p>	<p>10 metres is an absolute minimum standoff distance from the trees. There are areas proposed where this will be greater such as in fig 47.</p> <p>Further assessments will be required to determine the distances as part of the application process but it is expected that this will not be a solid line but more informal in nature.</p>	Add text to 33 to state that that it is highly likely that the standoff distances from the ancient woodland will be greater than 10m.
9.23	<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p>The content of this section is largely satisfactory, particularly in relation to dyke preservation/creation, native planting and design of the SUDS area.</p>	Comments noted	No action or amendment required.
9.24	The long-term viability of the “birch grove” planting needs to be checked. Any felling/pruning of existing trees should be kept to an absolute minimum.	A tree management plan will be required as part of any planning application. Text should be added accordingly.	Add text to the landscape section which states “A tree management plan will be required as part of any planning application adjacent to the ancient woodland”.
9.25	<p><b>6.5 Connectivity</b></p> <p>However, KCC would like views from the AWPR and A944 and any other affected location to be included in this Framework document.</p>	See 9.6 above	See 9.6 above

<b>Appendix 1</b>			
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Officers Response</b>	<b>Action/Amendments</b>
9.26	<p><b>Parking</b></p> <p>The wording could be changed from: Where topography allows, decked structures should be investigated to minimise the surface area of parking, if these can be provided without prejudicing the key principles above (fig. 58). to: Where topography allows, decked structures incorporating landscaped screening should be investigated to minimise the surface area of parking, if these can be provided without prejudicing the key principles above (fig. 58).</p>	<p>Agreed text should be amended accordingly.</p>	<p>Amend last para on page 40 to state “Where topography allows, decked structures incorporating landscaped screening should be investigated to minimise the surface area of parking, if these can be provided without prejudicing the key principles above”</p>
9.27	<p><b>6.6 Buildings</b></p> <p>KCC would like clarification on what the intention is for the area to the west and south of the Friends’ Burial Ground. Fig 61 suggests the area will be used for 3-4 storey stepped buildings whereas Figs 39, 58 and 60 do not show any buildings.</p>	<p>Fig 39, 58 and 60 are correct. The setting of the burial ground was deemed to be principally to the south west.</p> <p>Fig 61 should be updated accordingly.</p>	<p>Update Fig 61 to respect the setting of the Friends Burial Ground by removing reference to 3-4 storey stepped buildings in this area.</p>
9.28	<p>KCC is concerned about the impact the prominent building in the Hub will have on the setting of the Friends’ Burial Ground. The location of the Hub on Fig 54 and 56 is different to Fig 53 on P41 (assumed to be Fig 59)</p>	<p>As mentioned above the hub should be moved further east away from the burial ground.</p>	<p>Update the relevant figs to relocate the hub to the east adjacent to the cluster of four buildings.</p>
9.29	<p>KCC requests that a comprehensive set of sketches of the development from different viewpoints outside the development are</p>	<p>See 9.6 above</p>	<p>See 9.6 above</p>

<b>Appendix 1</b>			
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Officers Response</b>	<b>Action/Amendments</b>
	prepared. This would be required before any comment on the heights of buildings could be made. We would also like some indication of how the intended heights of buildings on the OP63 site relate to the buildings in Phase 3.		
9.30	KCC does not accept that there is a need for a focal point. Fig 54 demonstrates that the whole of the western boundary is visible from the AWPR and the whole of the southern boundary is visible from the A944. Effort is required to ensure the buildings fit into the rural landscape.	Agreed that the buildings should be integrated into the landscape. The use of focal points is appropriate as it can end streets and provide termination to views. Focal point does not mean high or dominating it means it is a key building within this site.	No action or amendment required.
9.31	KCC would like the additional information outlined above to be provided separately to allow KCC an opportunity to make comment. The above concerns made by KCC on behalf of the community must be incorporated in the text of a revised version of the Framework. The revised document should be an agreement by Drum Group, the community and ACC on the form of a suitable development for the site. Further work is required prior to approval by ACC. It is more important to get it right, and agreed than to rush the approval of this version of the Framework for OP63 through the planning system.	The proposed changes in this appendix will be included in the Draft Development Framework prior to it going back out to consultation as part of the adoption process for the Local Development Plan. This will afford another opportunity to comment on the document.	No action or amendment required.
<b>10.</b>	<b>Waste and Recycling Service</b>		
10.1	Bin stores will be required for each property; this is a commercial development and therefore will receive business waste	Noted: The information on bin storage and collection along with legal requirements information will be forwarded onto the	Forward comments onto design team.

<b>Appendix 1</b>			
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Officers Response</b>	<b>Action/Amendments</b>
	collection. Commercial waste bins cannot be stored on the street any day of the week as per Council Policy 2009 (Obstructions-Commercial Waste Bins).	design team.	
10.2	The Waste (Scotland) 2012 requires that all businesses from 1st January 2014 are required to separate paper, cardboard, glass, plastic and metals for recycling. Some businesses will additionally be required to separate their food waste (where food waste >5kg per week).	Noted: a paragraph should be added to the Development Framework to highlight that the relevant provision and facilities will be provided onsite in the appropriate location.	Add para to 6.10 to highlight that the relevant facilities will be provided onsite in the appropriate location.
10.3	General tips for site and hopefully the chosen waste collection contractor will detail this but for access, the following is needed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ An area of hard standing at storage and collections point(s)</li> <li>○ Dropped kerb at proposed bin collection point</li> <li>○ Yellow lines in front of bin collection point</li> <li>○ Bin storage areas to ideally be provided with a gulley and wash down facility for the interest of hygiene.</li> </ul>	Noted: a paragraph should be added to the Development Framework to highlight that the relevant provision and facilities will be provided onsite in the appropriate location.	Add para to 6.10 to highlight that the relevant facilities will be provided onsite in the appropriate location.
<b>11.</b>	<b>Environmental Policy</b>		
11.1	Whilst it is agreed that well designed SUDS basins and drainage swales can provide additional wildlife habitats the construction of such features must remain out with the root protection areas of existing trees.	Text should be added to confirm that SUDS basins will be outwith the root protection zone of existing trees.	Page 48, Para 3 add text to confirm that SUDS basins will be outwith the root protection zone of existing trees.
11.2	Accept that the stand-off distance is quoted as	10 metres is an absolute minimum standoff	Add text to 33 to state that

<b>Appendix 1</b>			
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Officers Response</b>	<b>Action/Amendments</b>
	<p>a 'minimum' it should be noted by the developer that a greater distance is likely to be required to ensure long-term retention. It is essential that factors relating to the future pressures for removal post development are considered.</p>	<p>distance from the trees. There are areas proposed where this will be greater such as in fig 47.</p> <p>Further assessments will be required to determine the distances as part of the application process but it is expected that this will not be a solid line but more informal in nature.</p>	<p>that it is highly likely that the standoff distances from the ancient woodland will be greater than 10m.</p>
11.3	<p>Given the scale, location and type of development, there needs to be an explicit commitment in the framework to a landscape and visual analysis of the site and surroundings to inform the layout and design of the proposal.</p> <p>Section 5.12 is very limited and would need a fuller assessment. It also needs to acknowledge that the design of the development will need to ensure that any cumulative effects with the AWPR are considered.</p> <p>Consideration also needs to be given to how the development sits in relation to the skyline. The approach to building heights a needs to be informed by a landscape visual assessment.</p> <p>The statement on page 44 - that' the highest part of the site could be one of the most visually prominent when viewed from the south</p>	<p>See 9.6 above</p>	<p>see 9.6 above</p>

<b>Appendix 1</b>			
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Officers Response</b>	<b>Action/Amendments</b>
	making it the most logical position for statement buildings' is also of concern.		
11.4	<p>Stand-off distances need to be defined by the tree heights as well as root systems. Whilst it is OK to suggest indicative buffer widths it is important that the document clarifies that 10m would be the absolute minimum and it is expected to be greater than this to achieve biodiversity and tree protection objectives, and that this will be informed by a detailed assessment of the woodland and its constituent trees.</p> <p>While it is good that additional tree belts are proposed the priority should be to provide sufficient space for the existing woodland.</p>	<p>A detailed tree survey should inform the siting and design of the buildings.</p> <p>10 m buffer is the minimum and distances are likely to increase from this.</p> <p>From a visual point of view the additional tree belts are welcomed and the extent should be determined through a landscape plan.</p>	Add text to 33 to state that that it is highly likely that the standoff distances from the ancient woodland will be greater than 10m.
11.5	P33 Third para – several typos/grammar errors, and should not refer to Fig 47 as SUDS pond no longer shown here.	Noted spelling and grammar errors should be checked and plans need to be checked for consistency.	No action or amendment required.
11.6	Figures 58, 60, 65 and 66 do not allow for the indicative buffer zones for the woodland shown earlier in the document.	Comments noted the figures should be adjusted accordingly.	Update figures 58, 60, 65 and 66 to include the woodland buffer identified on fig 47.
11.7	Figure 68 – the SuDS basin is shown too close to the ancient woodland .	The SuDs basin should be moved slightly further away from the woodland in fig 68	Fig 68 - Relocate the SuDs basin slightly further away from the Ancient woodland.
11.8	No mention of solar panels or any renewables, this is a shortcoming.	The image of the solar panels is misleading and should be removed if no solar panels are being proposed.	Text in relation to the provision of renewables should be provided on

<b>Appendix 1</b>			
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Officers Response</b>	<b>Action/Amendments</b>
			page 51.  Delete fig 71 if solar panels are not to be provided
<b>12.</b>	<b>Local Development Plan</b>		
12.1	Inaccuracies in some dates, i.e SDP was approved 2014 not 2013.	Agreed	Update Framework accordingly.
12.2	A number of typos are present.	Breakdown of typos available to forward onto developer, document should be carefully read and typos amended accordingly.	Update Framework accordingly.
12.3	Section 6.13, Cumulative Transport Infrastructure, makes reference to the Strategic Transport Fund. A legal challenge was lodged at the Court of Session (Inner House) by the Elswick Development Company Ltd and Goodgrun Ltd, against the adoption by the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Planning Authority (SDPA) of Supplementary Guidance: Strategic Transport Fund (STF). The Inner House issued its decision on 29 April 2016 which allowed the appeal. The SDPA has sought leave to appeal and awaits the outcome of this process.	Agreed	Update para 6.13 Cumulative Transport Infrastructure to read:  “Proposals shall comply with Local Development Plan Policy and any other relevant guidance/policy. The impact of the development on the strategic transport network will need to be assessed as applications for planning permission for this site proceed. Applicants must work with the Council as the Roads and Transport Authority to assess and demonstrate

<b>Appendix 1</b>			
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Officers Response</b>	<b>Action/Amendments</b>
			how any such impact on the strategic network will be addressed and mitigated.”