

Appendix 2: Summary of Representations Received to SG Policy Consultation 2015, and Officer Responses

Report Number – CHI/16/158
Council – 14th December 2016

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
Retail and Commercial	Hierarchy of Centres	34(1) John Handley Associates obo Standards Life Assurance Ltd	Welcome the Proposed Plan's identification of Denmore Road as an important retail centre (zoned as Commercial Centre in Proposed Plan). However, it has the potential to become a new centrally-located 'District Centre' for the new housing development at Bridge of Don/Grandhome and Dubford. It is a well-established and well-used retail development, and benefits from an open Class 1 retail consent. The Aberdeen City and Shire Retail Study 2013 also identified the Denmore Road area as a key retail opportunity, being an area which already has a significant concentration of retail activity.	The request for Denmore Road to be identified as a 'District Centre', rather than a 'Commercial Centre', was considered as part of the examination on the Local Development Plan. See Issue 21 Policy NC4, NC5, NC6, NC7, NC8 & NC9: Supporting Retail Centres. No modification was recommended by the Reporter and therefore no change has been made to the Supplementary Guidance.
Retail and Commercial	Hierarchy of Centres	34(4) John Handley Associates obo Standards Life Assurance Ltd	Welcome the Proposed Plan's identification of the Boulevard Retail Park as an important retail centre (zoned as Commercial Centre in Proposed Plan). However, it should be zoned as a 'District Centre', in recognition of its established role in the existing retail hierarchy. It is a highly accessible, well-located retail centre which contains a wide range of shopping and leisure uses. It is accessible from the city centre, and is in close proximity to the Queens Links Leisure Park and Aberdeen Beach leisure, hotel and recreation facilities. Zoning it as a District Centre would be consistent with the advice in Scottish Planning Policy, which recognises the need for district centres to be a focus for a mix of uses including retail, leisure, entertainment, recreation, cultural and community facilities. The Boulevard Retail	The request for Boulevard Retail Park to be identified as a 'District Centre', rather than a 'Commercial Centre', was considered as part of the examination on the Local Development Plan. See Issue 21 Policy NC4, NC5, NC6, NC7, NC8 & NC9: Supporting Retail Centres. No modification was recommended by the Reporter and therefore no change has been made to the Supplementary Guidance..

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
			<p>Park clearly demonstrates these attributes and provides the range and quality of shopping, wider economic and social activity in both the day and the evening, and integration with residential areas which are considered by SPP to be the key elements of successful town centres.</p>	
Retail and Commercial	Hierarchy of Centres	88(1) Montagu Evans obo Zurich Assurance Limited	<p>Welcome the identification of Kittybrewster Retail Park as a Commercial Centre in the Proposed Plan and note that it forms the role of a commercial centre; part of a wider network of centres across the plan area.</p> <p>Figure 1: Retail Hierarchy and Sequential Approach states that the policy approach to new development within commercial centres will be to "support large bulky goods and comparison only". It continues that general principles for the sequential approach relate to such centres being 'appropriate for large bulky comparison if city centre/town centre sites are not available - i.e subject to sequential test.'</p> <p>The approach in the Proposed Plan is inconsistent with SPP. Commercial centres play an important role in the retail hierarchy where a range of investment and development opportunity may be appropriate.</p> <p>Respondent quotes SPP paragraph 24 and 27 in relation to sustainable economic growth. Respondent quotes paragraph 68 and 69 relating to sequential town centre first approach when planning for uses which generate significant footfall and the flexible and realistic approach to be taken in applying the sequential approach.</p> <p>SPP does not preclude uses which generate significant footfall within commercial centres, but that development plans should adopt a sequential town centre first approach. Preference within SPP is to develop allocated sites over isolated out-of-centre sites. This is partially reflected by policy NC4 of the Proposed Plan but the</p>	<p>The issues raised were considered as part of the examination on the Local Development Plan. See Issue 21 Policy NC4, NC5, NC6, NC7, NC8 & NC9: Supporting Retail Centres. Modifications to Policy NC4, NC5 and NC6 were recommended by the Reporter and subsequent consequential amendments have been proposed to SG: Hierarchy of Centres.</p> <p>In line with Scottish Planning Policy (SPP), the Local Development Plan and associated SG have adopted a sequential town centre first approach when planning for uses which generate significant footfall. Locations for uses which generate significant footfall will be considered through a hierarchy of centres as set out in the local development plan and associated SG. With reference to SPP paragraph 63 which states "Where necessary to protect the role of town centres, plans should specify the function of commercial centres, for example where retail activity may be restricted to the sale of bulky goods". Both the SG: Hierarchy of Centre and Policy NC4 state that bulky goods should only be located in commercial centres if the sequential test demonstrates that a suitable site is unavailable in the first, second or third tiers of the hierarchy.</p> <p>To acknowledge that floorspace could be developed outwith the town centre could threaten the town centre first approach advocated. This is why a sequential test must be carried out to assess any development proposals</p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
			<p>Supplementary Guidance appears to contradict this.</p> <p>As a 'commercial centre' in the context of SPP, there is support for investment and improvement where such investment will not undermine town centres.</p> <p>The policy should:</p> <p>Support investment in Commercial Centres and acknowledge the significant potential benefits this could bring to the wider retail hierarchy including in relation to employment opportunities, investment, retention of expenditure and town centre prospects.</p> <p>Acknowledge that floorspace could be developed outwith the town centre also where its operational or location requirement ordinarily requires; and</p> <p>Support proposals for retail and / or commercial leisure developments in such identified Commercial Centre where their function complements that of other centres within the network of centres such as Kittybrewster Retail Park, having particular care not to undermine town centres. Figure 1 should be updated to accord with SPP. The policy should also include reference to their being an appropriate location for leisure related development where there are no sites available, either suitable or available, within the town centre or edge of centre sites (in accordance with the sequential approach).</p>	<p>outwith the town centre.</p> <p>As per Figure 1; leisure related developments are listed as being suitable in city centre, town centre, and district centre and neighbourhood centre locations. Any proposal submitted for leisure related developments in a commercial centre would be assessed using Policies NC4, NC5 and NC6 and the sequential approach identified in SG: Hierarchy of Centres.</p>
Retail and Commercial	Hierarchy of Centres	88(2) Montagu Evans obo Zurich Assurance Limited	<p>Welcome the identification of Kittybrewster Retail Park as a Commercial Centre in the Proposed Plan and note that it forms the role of a commercial centre; part of a wider network of centres across the plan area.</p> <p>Figure 2 is unnecessarily confusing in seeking to preclude forms of development that otherwise may be demonstrated to be supportable</p>	<p>The issues raised were considered as part of the examination on the Local Development Plan. See Issue 21 Policy NC4, NC5, NC6, NC7, NC8 & NC9: Supporting Retail Centres. Modifications to Policy NC4, NC5 and NC6 were recommended by the Reporter and subsequent consequential amendments have been proposed to SG: Hierarchy of Centres.</p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
			<p>in the context of SPP including where there is an operational or locational requirement.</p> <p>The approach in the Proposed Plan is inconsistent with SPP. Commercial centres play an important role in the retail hierarchy where a range of investment and development opportunity may be appropriate.</p> <p>Respondent quotes SPP paragraph 24 and 27 in relation to sustainable economic growth. Respondent quotes paragraph 68 and 69 relating to sequential town centre first approach when planning for uses which generate significant footfall and the flexible and realistic approach to be taken in applying the sequential approach.</p> <p>SPP does not preclude uses which generate significant footfall within commercial centres, but that development plans should adopt a sequential town centre first approach. Preference within SPP is to develop allocated sites over isolated out-of-centre sites. As a 'commercial centre' in the context of SPP, there is support for investment and improvement where such investment does not undermine town centres.</p> <p>The Local Development Plan should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to identify Kittybrewster as a Commercial Centre, in the context of SPP; ▪ Support investment in Commercial Centres and acknowledge the significant potential benefits this could bring to the wider retail hierarchy including in relation to employment opportunities, investment, retention of expenditure and town centre prospects. ▪ Acknowledge that floorspace could be developed outwith the town centre also where its operational or location requirement ordinarily requires; and 	<p>In line with SPP, the Local Development Plan and associated SG have adopted a sequential town centre first approach when planning for uses which generate significant footfall. Locations for uses which generate significant footfall will be considered through a hierarchy of centres as set out in the local development plan and associated SG. Figure 2 does not seek to preclude forms of development – the numbers represent the preferred order in the sequential approach as is explained in the notes section of the SG.</p> <p>To acknowledge that floorspace could be developed outwith the town centre could threaten the town centre first approach advocated by the local development plan, and in line with SPP. This is why a sequential test must be carried out to assess any development proposals outwith the town centre.</p> <p>Any proposal for retail development in commercial centres would be assessed as per the policy provision in the local development plan and sequential approach outlined in supplementary guidance.</p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acknowledge that retail development of less than 1,000 sqm could be appropriate and justifiable in commercial centres. 	
Retail and Commercial	Hierarchy of Centres	101(3) Turnberry obo The Grandhome Trust	<p>Phase 2 of Grandhome will serve as a Town Centre for the development as well as the wider Bridge of Don area.</p> <p>Grandhome Trust object to the omission of Grandhome as a Tier 2 Town Centre within the Supplementary Guidance.</p>	<p>The issues raised were considered as part of the examination on the Local Development Plan. See Issue 21 Policy NC4, NC5, NC6, NC7, NC8 & NC9: Supporting Retail Centres.</p> <p>As per the response to Issue 21; the designation of the site as a town, district or neighbourhood centre will be agreed, and identified in the Local Development Plan, once it has been built, and is in operation.</p>
Retail and Commercial	Hierarchy of Centres	120 (11) Scott Hobbs obo Scottish Enterprise	<p>There will be no need for the sequential assessment for office and business developments if they are to be located in in B1, B2, B3, B4 sites and this should be made explicit.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.1.2 add text Within the hierarchy, the City centre is identified as being the preferred location for retail, commercial, leisure and other significant footfall generating developments servicing a city wide or regional market, other than business uses locating on allocated B1, B2, B3, B4 and OP land.</p>	<p>The issues raised were considered as part of the examination on the Local Development Plan. See Issues 20: Policy NC1, NC2 & NC3: City Centre and West End Retail and 21: Policy NC4, NC5, NC6, NC7, NC8 & NC9: Supporting Retail Centres. An amendment to Policy NC1 was recommended by the Reporter. A consequential amendment has been proposed in SG: Hierarchy of Centres.</p> <p>As per the response to Issues 20 and 21; an employment proposal on land zoned for employment use would not be subject to sequential assessment. An opportunity site or zoning establishes the type of use acceptable on the site/area, with Appendix 2 providing further information pertaining to usages acceptable on the OP sites. Principle of business use is established in areas zoned as B1, B2, B3 or B4.</p>
Retail and Commercial	Hierarchy of Centres	139(6) CBRE obo John Lewis	This SG intends for commercial centres to be the focus for retail developments compromising of large bulky comparison goods where city centre sites are not available. We accept the allocation of these	<p>Support for the SG is welcomed.</p> <p>The issues raised were considered as part of the</p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
			<p>sites within the retail hierarchy if there are clear parameters set for new retail and leisure developments in these locations.</p> <p>The SG is not robust enough to protect the vision for a healthy city centre. Any guidance or policy which relates to commercial centres should ensure that development in these locations supports, and is complementary to the role of the city/town centres.</p> <p>This SG should be strengthened to ensure that any proposal in these commercial centres still has to demonstrate that it will not have significant adverse impact on other city/town centres, or future strategies for enhancing the vitality and viability of the city centre, by providing an impact assessment. We also suggest including criteria that requires the proposal to address a qualitative or quantitative deficiency within the catchment area and a restriction on the type of goods that can be sold in these locations.</p>	<p>examination on the Local Development Plan. See Issue 21 Policy NC4, NC5, NC6, NC7, NC8 & NC9: Supporting Retail Centres. Modifications to Policy NC4, NC5 and NC6 were recommended by the Reporter and subsequent consequential amendments have been proposed to SG: Hierarchy of Centres.</p> <p>As stated in Issue 21: Policy NC4 states “In all cases, proposals shall not detract significantly from the vitality or viability of any centre listed in the Supplementary Guidance, and shall accord with all other policies in the Plan....”</p> <p>The Local Development Plan, associated supplementary guidance and other planning advice are intended to form a suite of documents to be used in the assessment of development proposals. Read together, a robust policy framework is in place to assess development proposals and their impact on the city centre. SG: Hierarchy of centres supports policies NC1, NC2, NC4, NC5 and NC6 by providing guidance on how developments will be expected to assess and demonstrate their compliance with policy. It provides guidance on the retail hierarchy, sequential approach thresholds and designated centres.</p> <p>Further advice is provided through Technical Advice Note 6: Retail Impact Assessments. Where applicable, retail impact assessments (or impact assessments for smaller proposals) can be used to assess the significance of impact on the current and future vitality and viability of the surrounding centres.</p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
Retail and Commercial	Hierarchy of centres	158(8) Savills obo Hammersons	Support the SG. Request table at figure 1 be modified. In the 'Centre Type' column City Centre should be City Centre and City Centre Retail Core are the two boundaries vary slightly. This approach should be repeated in the Centre Location column.	It is agreed that clarity can be provided in expanding the centre type for city centre to be City Centre and City Centre Retail Core in line with the town centre first principle. Similarly repeated in the centre location column. An amendment is proposed to similarly clarify Figure 2.
Retail and Commercial	Harmony of Uses	124(15) SEPA	The Proposed Plan states (Page 20) Criteria: Six Qualities of Successful Placemaking Safe and Pleasant • avoids unacceptable impacts on adjoining uses, including noise, smell, vibration, dust, air quality, invasion of privacy and overshadowing. Request text is added to make reference to the requirement of when a development proposal will be regulated by SEPA for consultation to ensure consentability under SEPAs regulatory requirements and confirmation of potential impacts which will be regulated. SEPAs regulation generally covers impacts during operation but not during construction. Reference should also be made to consultation with SEPA when a proposed development may be impacted by an existing process regulated by SEPA.	A sentence will be added to the SG to ensure developers/owners are aware some operations aspects, such as waste management and flooding will be regulated by SEPA, and to ensure developers/owners are made aware a proposed development may be impacted by an existing process regulated by SEPA.
Retail and Commercial	Harmony of uses	136 (21) Aberdeen Civic Society	There is a section on Residential Developments in the City Centre which mentions the challenges of allowing residential development to occur in the centre, but it should also provide some encouragement. Wording should therefore be included saying something like 'despite the fact that there are challenges accommodating residential development in a thriving city centre, where there are a mix of uses, it is to be encouraged as a way of ensuring vitality of the centre, particularly in buildings that otherwise would not have a use above ground floor level.'	Agree. The suggested wording has been added. Reference has been made to below ground also.
Retail and Commercial	Union Street Frontages	140(3) Savills obo Tiger Aberdeen	Section 5.2.2 It is unclear whether a proposal leading to the minimum threshold being breached would be refused outright, or, in the event that it does breach, consideration would be given to the merits of the	As it the case of every application submitted, it will be judged on its own merit, using a number of material considerations. There is a focus on ensuring retail use is retained within the city centre and in particular within the

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
			<p>proposal. This should be clarified. Suggest that policy goes too far in preventing the clustering of non-retail uses in the City Core and instead each proposal should be considered on its own merits.</p> <p>The SG states there will be greater degree of flexibility for change of use from Class 1(retail) to Class 3 (food and drink) but it is not stated how this flexibility would be applied.</p>	<p>city centre retail core, which encompasses Union Street. The City Centre, as outlined at the start of the supplementary guidance, 'now hosts a mix of uses all appropriate for a thriving city centre. Proposals to enhance the vitality and viability of Union Street will be supported'. This thereby ensures a town centre first approach is supported, as is outlined in Scottish Planning Policy.</p> <p>With regard to the clustering of non-retail uses – the guidance is specific in that it noted, this will be discouraged where it is likely to have a significant adverse effect on retail use of existing groups if retail units or on amenity.</p> <p>The guidance does not state outright that clustering of non-retail uses will be refused, it notes there are specific considerations which need to be addressed.</p> <p>With regard to the flexibility from change of use from Class 1 to Class 3 again each application will be judged on its own merit, with a town centre first approach principle. As outlined in the supplementary guidance, 'Proposals to enhance vitality and viability of Union Street will be supported.'</p>
Resources	Wind Turbine Developments	38(4) John Handley Associates obo Shell UK Limited	The Further Information section of the SG should make reference to the United Kingdom Onshore Pipeline Operator's Association (UKOPA) Guidelines.	This reference has been included.
Resources	Wind Turbine Developments	42(2)NATS Safeguarding Office	NATS information pack for wind turbines applicants document could be referenced	This reference has been included.

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
Resources	Wind Turbine Developments	76(8) Scottish Water	<p>We would request that any proposals or applications for wind farms or fuel storage are submitted to Scottish Water for review, to identify whether there are Drinking Water Protection Areas present which would require protection through mitigation actions. Wind farms can have other potential impacts on our operations. For example, our below ground assets such as water and sewer mains can be affected by heavy construction traffic and may require protection. Some of our radio telemetry signals can be interfered with by wind turbine blades, depending on the location of the turbines.</p> <p>We would request that the document advises all proposals and applications be sent to Scottish Water for review so that we can assess for any impact on the following:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drinking water quality and quantity Below-ground assets Radio telemetry interference 	This will be considered by the case officer depending on the scale of the development.
Resources	Wind Turbine Developments	164(17) Scottish Government	<p>The running order of Maps in Section 9.29 appears to be incorrect, as it does not reflect the earlier reference on page 25 of the SG under the title 'Onshore Wind Spatial Framework'. The second paragraph under the heading "Onshore Wind Spatial Framework" on page 25 should be amended from "Map 1 in Section 9 shows...." to read "Map 2 in Section 9 shows...".</p> <p>The supporting text for Map 5 in Section 9.29 on page 36 could be clearer in describing that there are no Group 3 areas. Request the inclusion of some additional text under the heading 'Map 5' to clearly explain how the entire Aberdeen City area is impacted by constraints. For example, it would be helpful to know how the community separation areas have been defined and how the Council have arrived at this outcome.</p>	These sections have been amended to reflect the comments provided.
Resources	Wind Turbine Developments	164(18) Scottish Government	<p>Within the section 'Onshore Wind Spatial Framework' on page 25 of Supplementary Guidance, Topic Area 9 – Energy and Resources the terms "community buffer zones" and "areas of search are used". In</p>	The terminology has been amended.

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
			<p>the context of developing spatial frameworks for wind farms, as defined in SPP (2014) these terms are no longer used. It is appropriate to maintain consistency of language between National policy (SPP), Local Development Plans and guidance documents to prevent any confusion. We therefore recommend the revision of these terms to comply with SPP.</p> <p>Within the section 'Onshore Wind Spatial Framework' on page 25 of Supplementary Guidance, Topic Area 9 - Energy and Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Replace the term "Community Buffer Zones" with "community separation areas". - Replace the term "areas of search" with "areas with potential for wind farm development (Group 3)". 	
Resources	Wind Turbines for New Developments	54(24) SNH	<p>Page 80 - Reference to SNH guidance at the end on assessing the impact of small scale wind energy proposals should be to Version 2 (2014) available on our website via http://www.snh.gov.uk/planning-and-development/renewable-energy/onshore-wind/general-advice-and-information</p> <p>Page 81-82 - Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. - A better reference to SNH guidance (given that 'Assessing the impact of small scale wind energy proposals on the natural heritage' has already been referred to) would be to 'Siting and Design of small scale wind turbines between 15m and 50m in height' (2012) available on our website via http://www.snh.gov.uk/planning-and-development/renewable-energy/onshore-wind/landscape-impacts-guidance/</p> <p>Page 90-95 - Maps - In due course we suggest a map should be added of carbon-rich soil, deep peat and priority peatland habitat in terms of the Group 2 area in SPP. The recent consultation document and draft map can be seen on our website</p>	The references noted have been included, as has a carbon rich soil map. The comment in relation to Map 4 is noted however this is outside the Councils administrative area.

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
			http://www.snh.gov.uk/planning-and-development/advice-for-planners-and-developers/soils-and-development/cpp/ Map 4 – European sites in Aberdeenshire omits the part of Cairngorms Massif SPA that is within Aberdeenshire.	
Resources	Resources for New Developments	54(2) SNH	<p>This should require Gold sustainability level for domestic buildings and BREEAM level 5 standard for non-domestic buildings from the date of the adoption of the plan.</p> <p>The water standards proposed as not as high as those proposed in the Proposed Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan. As both LDPs area affected by the same constraint in terms of water resource we suggest developments in both LDPs should be subject to the same water efficiency standards. This will create a more joined up approach</p>	This has been amended to align with the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan.
Resources	Resources for New Developments	76(4) Scottish Water	Support the commitment to reducing the pressures on water infrastructure and the amount of water abstracted from the River Dee	Support noted.
Resources	Resources for New Developments	85(11) Ryden obo Stewart Milne Homes	<p>A "fabric first" approach should be adopted ahead of the requirement to install low and zero carbon generating technologies.</p> <p>The Sullivan Panel specifically noted that concerns can arise from requirements and prescription on low carbon equipment within the Scottish Planning System. The Panel also acknowledged that delivery of zero carbon objectives through an entirely onsite strategy is not currently a realistic approach for mainstream housing production, due to issues of cost and practicality of building to such a standard on many sites.</p> <p>Improving water efficiency are technical measures best addressed through Building Regulations rather than through a land use Planning Policy document</p>	<p>While “fabric first” approaches are supported, Section 3F of the Climate Change Act requires Local Development Plans to “avoid a specified and rising proportion of the projected greenhouse gas emissions from their use.....through the installation and operation of low and zero-carbon generating technologies”.</p> <p>Section 4.17 of the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan requires “Local development plans (and supplementary guidance) will encourage water efficiency and water saving measures in all relevant developments”</p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
Resources	Resources for New Developments	164(15) Scottish Gov	<p>Section 9.2.8 of Topic Area 9 'Decommissioning' omits any suggestion of a decommissioning or restoration guarantee. This section should be amended to reflect SPP.</p> <p>Para 169 pf SPP includes a list of DM considerations for energy infrastructure developments. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need for conditions relating to the decommissioning of developments, including ancillary infrastructure, and site restoration; - Need for robust planning obligation to ensure that operators achieve site restoration. <p>Heads of Planning Scotland recent submission to Economy, Energy and Tourism Committee, Security of Supply Inquiry highlights the possible future requirement to cover decommissioning guarantees to ensure site restoration. See - www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/CurrentCommittees/89359.aspx</p> <p>It is recommended that an additional sentence is included at the end of Section 9.2.8 'Decommissioning' to read as follows: "The need for conditions relating to the decommissioning of developments, including ancillary infrastructure and site restoration, will be considered. In addition robust planning obligations to ensure operators achieve site restoration will also be considered.</p>	This section has been amended to reflect the suggested comments.
Resources	Resources for New Developments	164(16) Scottish Gov	<p>The text under the heading 'Borrow Pits' in Section 9.2.3 of Supplementary Guidance Topic Area 9 - Resources does not properly reflect paragraph 243 of Scottish Planning Policy (SPP). This section should be amended to reflect paragraph 243 of SPP which states: "Borrow pits should only be permitted if there are significant environmental or economic benefits compared to obtaining material from local quarries; they are time-limited; tied to a particular project and appropriate reclamation measures are in place".</p>	This section has been amended to reflect the suggested comments.

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
			An additional sentence should be added to the end of this section to read as follows: "Borrow pits will only be permitted if there are significant environmental or economic benefits compared to obtaining material from local quarries; they are time-limited; tied to a particular project and appropriate reclamation measures are in place"	
Natural Environment	Natural Heritage	54(10) SNH	Accordingly, the text in the second paragraph under the heading of 8.1.4 Protected Species on page 5 of the Supplementary Guidance should be amended to read applies to a particular species. For protected species, licenses will only be granted if tests are met. SNH's website provides...	In line with the recommendation to amend the wording to Policy NE8 we note the comment, regarding the Supplementary Guidance, and will change the wording to "protected species".
Natural Environment	Natural Heritage	54(18) SNH	Page 6 To highlight that development within Aberdeen has the potential to affect protected areas outwith Aberdeen. Amend wording: Table 1 notes the various site designations found within the City of Aberdeen. Please note that development within Aberdeen has the potential to affect protected area outside Aberdeen. For example, bottlenose dolphins from the Moray Firth SAC and grey seals from the Isle of May SAC and the Berwickshire & North Northumberland SAC.	The comment is noted and the text has been amended accordingly.
Natural Environment	Natural Heritage	54(19) SNh	Table 2 Protected Species - refers to section 2.6 for further guidance, but this does not exist. 8.1.7 Bats and Licensing refers to paragraph 2.2 for more information on the three tests, but again this does not exist. Delete or amend text to provide an accurate reference to guidance on Bats.	The incorrect paragraph referencing is noted and the numbering has been amended.
Natural Environment	Natural Heritage	54(20) SNH	8.1.6 Construction Environmental Management Plans. We welcome the requirement for CEMPs and draw your attention to	There is currently reference to the appointment of an Ecological Clerk of Works on sensitive sites within the Trees and Woodland Supplementary Guidance. This

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
			<p>guidance prepared by The Highland Council http://www.highland.gov.uk/downloads/file/2644/construction_environmental_management_process_for_large_scale_projects. ECOWs are an effective way of ensuring CEMPs are followed.</p> <p>Suggest that for larger developments on more sensitive sites, the Council should require an Ecological Clerk of Works would be appointed.</p>	<p>alongside the explanation of when a Construction Environmental Management Plan may be required, within the Natural Heritage SG, is felt to adequately address how developments will avoid, minimise and mitigate environmental impact during the construction phase of development.</p>
Natural Environment	Natural Heritage	54(21) SNH	<p>8.1.10 Habitats Regulations Appraisal</p> <p>To ensure sites outside the area are not overlooked. Under 'Natura Sites', as well as reference to River Dee SAC, we suggest you add "Other Natura sites may be affected by development within the jurisdiction of the Council, eg Moray Firth SAC, Isle of May SAC and the Berwickshire & North Northumberland SAC".</p>	<p>This section of the SG has been amended to prevent the repetition of information provided by SNH and instead the link to the information is provided. The comment is noted but as it refers to a section of text that has been removed no amendments will be made.</p>
Natural Environment	Natural Heritage	124(17) SEPA	<p>Requested the following policy changes: NE8 - allow development on peatland and carbon rich soils with the agreement of the planning authority in consultation with SEPA. NE8 - amended to afford specific protection groundwater dependent terrestrial ecosystems NE6 - amended to prevent all unnecessary engineering works affecting the water environment.</p> <p>Request that text is incorporated into the SG to explain and support this position. Suggested text change, see rep.</p>	<p>The issues raised have been considered as part of the examination into the Local Development Plan. See: Issue 32: Policy NE5 Trees and Woodland & Policy NE8 Natural Heritage; and Issue 33: Policy NE7 Coastal Planning & Policy NE6 Flooding, Drainage and Water Quality.</p> <p>There is currently reference to Peatland within the Resources Supplementary Guidance and it is felt to adequately address the issue.</p> <p>In regard to Ecosystems additional text has been added to the introductory section of the SG and so as not to repeat SEPA guidance a link has been provided.</p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
Natural Environment	Flooding Drainage and Water Quality	54(22) SNH	Paragraph 8.3.6 refers to the multiple benefits of SuDS. It would be helpful to cross reference this to the Supplementary Guidance on landscaping.	The comment is noted and cross references have been added to the SG.
Natural Environment	Flooding and Drainage	76(7) Scottish Water	<p>Sewers for Scotland has now been superseded by Sewers for Scotland 3rd Edition. In relation to SUDS, work to confirm the technical specification requirements for swales and filter trenches is on-going. These will take the form of additional clauses to be added into Sewers for Scotland 3rd Edition.</p> <p>We understand that one of the biggest challenges is to ensure SUDS are appropriately maintained before Scottish Water is in a position to vest. We have begun to implement "early vesting" of new assets, which will result in Scottish Water vesting SUDS as soon as they are operational rather than when the development has been completed. This will give the developers confidence that their asset will be vested and will give our customer comfort that they are appropriately maintained and operated.</p>	To ensure the most up to date reference is included within the Supplementary Guidance the text has been amended to refer to 'Sewers for Scotland 3'.
Natural Environment	Flooding, Drainage and Water	124(18) SEPA	<p>Request that reference is made to the requirement for access to maintenance to waterbodies in order that regular maintenance can be carried out as part of flood risk management work and also that reference is made to the flood risk benefits of buffer strips as they promote connectivity.</p> <p>Reference should be made to clarify that excessive engineering and culverting of all waterbodies including watercourses is unacceptable, including for land gain. This includes the diversion of watercourses around development sites unless it results in improvements to a previously modified or canalised watercourse.</p>	<p>It is agreed that reference should be made regarding access to maintain waterbodies. Text to this effect will be added. The benefits of buffer strips are already addressed within the Natural Heritage SG, but for clarity cross references will be added.</p> <p>Policy NE6 Flooding, Drainage and Water Quality currently states that "there is a presumption against excessive engineering and culverting of watercourses....." As the SG is an extension to the Local Development Plan policy it does not need to repeat the content contained within the Policy, therefore no amendments are proposed to the SG.</p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
Natural Environment	Trees and Woodland	54(23) SNH	<p>The Scottish Government's Control of Woodland Removal Policy, sets out the role that compensatory planting can make to mitigating woodland removal and the situations where compensatory planting may be appropriate. Indeed the role of compensatory planting in addressing impacts of woodland removed is one of the policy's 'Guiding Principles'.</p> <p>A section should be added to require compliance with the Scottish Government's Control of Woodland Removal Policy (see para 218 of SPP). The need for compensatory planting should in particular be set out.</p> <p>It would also be helpful to include a cross-reference to the Supplementary Guidance on the Natural Environment (with regard to protected species in particular).</p>	<p>Reference to the Scottish Government's Control of Woodland Removal Policy will be added to the SG.</p> <p>The issue regarding compensatory planting is being considered as part of the examination into the Local Development Plan, see Issue 32: Policy NE5 Trees and Woodland & Policy NE8 Natural Heritage.</p>
Natural Environment	Trees and Woodland	126(2) Forestry Commission Scotland	<p>Supplementary Guidance does not adequately cover forest and woodland habitats.</p> <p>Consider revising the Trees and Woodland Strategy (2006) and publish it as SG. If not possible, considerable revisions to the current SG to address management of woodland areas within the City.</p>	<p>Currently, there is the 'Forest and Woodland Strategy for Aberdeenshire and Aberdeen City' but it is acknowledged that it is overdue for review. Our environmental policy team are currently considering how best to take this forward, the options being a stand-alone strategy or integration into a wider climate adaptation strategy. The work is on-going however it will undoubtedly include revised planting and re-stocking policies and be adopted as a Council strategy.</p>
Modifications to Existing Buildings and Curtilages	Conversion of Buildings in the Countryside	54(17) SNH	<p>Section 3.3.3</p> <p>As well as referring to bats, it would be useful to refer to birds because species such as swallows and barn owls frequently nest in farm buildings. All birds are given some protection whilst breeding and some species, such as barn owl, have additional protection. Our website provides information on this and what actions can constitute an offence: http://www.snh.gov.uk/protecting-scotlands-nature/protected-species/which-and-how/birds/. For bats and licensing, it would also be useful to cross reference to the</p>	<p>We agree with the suggested amended wording and have updated the document to reflect. Additional reference has also been made to the Natural Heritage Supplementary Guidance.</p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
			<p>Supplementary Guidance on the Natural Environment. To ensure natural heritage interests and laws are considered.</p> <p>Amend the wording to read Farm buildings, and any associated drystone dykes and surrounding trees may be home to protected species such as bats and birds</p>	
Modifications to Existing Buildings and Curtilages	Curtilage Splits and Redevelopments	136(20) Aberdeen Civic Society	<p>There is an increasing desire in the city for existing buildings in streets to be demolished and rebuilt. There should be a policy that covers this as it is likely to become more prevalent. Buildings that undergo the type of re-development should respect the environment in which they are placed, in terms of scale and massing, proportions and materials.</p> <p>We support a SPG that addresses the issue of the re-development of existing properties within any area. In general we would like to see developments that involve the demolition of existing buildings and the re-building of new ones to be carefully considered in the context of their surroundings. The policy covers this to some extent, but it needs to ensure that there is not an over development of a single house in a group, and that any redeveloped property is sympathetic in terms of scale, design, height and materials. We do acknowledge that there may be occasions when this needs to be reviewed (for example the retrofit of a neighbourhood centre in a specific location to which this can be supported) but in general the priority in cases such as these has to be that the character of the existing neighbourhood is retained.</p>	<p>The consultation comment focuses on the redevelopment aspect of the SG. The demolition of buildings which are not listed, or outwith conservation areas is subject to permitted development rights under Class 70 of the General Permitted Development Order 1992. A number of conditions are outlined with Class 70 which need to be adhered to. Proposals which involve the demolition of more than 0.5 hectares are required to carry out EIA procedures. To write a policy as suggested, Aberdeen City Council would be required to submit to, and have approved by the Scottish Ministers an Article 4 Direction on the whole of Aberdeen for the removal of Class 70. This would not sit comfortably with the modern planning ethos which proposes a system which is fit for purpose and efficient. There is also no justification/reason outlined in the consultation comment as to why demolition and rebuilt will become more prevalent. Policy D1: Quality Placemaking by Design already outlines development needs to respond to the site context and be designed with due consideration to siting, scale, massing, colour, orientation, details, footprint, proportions and materials, and for it be well planned with high quality design, materials and craftsmanship.</p> <p>The SG already outlines criteria new development must adhere to. These criteria include: respecting scale, massing, density and the established pattern of</p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
				<p>development. This includes ensuring over-development does not occur. Further to this, Policy D1: Quality Placemaking by Design and, if relevant, Policy H1: Residential Areas, give guidance on design criteria required in all new developments and ensuring over-development does not occur. The guidance within the SG and design policy does indicate development must respond to, respect and reflect local distinctiveness.</p>
<p>Planning Obligations, Affordable and Specialist Housing Provision</p>	<p>Affordable Housing</p>	<p>63(4) Ryden obo University of Aberdeen</p>	<p>Object to the failure to identify student and key worked accommodation within the definition of affordable housing. There is an expanding student and staff population at both universities, and an increase in house prices and flat rents - housing is unaffordable for the majority of students and key workers, thereby not attracting staff and students to the city.</p> <p>By allowing affordable housing contributions arising from surplus land sold by the University of Aberdeen to be retained either for the provision of on-site or off-site new or refurbished students and key worker accommodation. Aberdeen City Council have recently shown willingness to accept the retention of affordable housing units by the University for provision as key worker accommodation at the cala homes development at Balgownie Farm.</p>	<p>Student Accommodation and Key Worker Accommodation have both been identified within the revised Supplementary Guidance. In the case of Key Worker Accommodation a definition including income thresholds has also been included.</p> <p>The specific case identified within the submission, that of Aberdeen University acting as a Register Social Landlord, was considered under 2.3.3 Other Options, of the current Supplementary Guidance. This category allowed the council to accept alternative methods of delivery for Affordable Housing. While this option will remain, in the case of Aberdeen University the new Key Worker Accommodation category would now deal with the issue.</p>
<p>Planning Obligations, Affordable and Specialist Housing Provision</p>	<p>Affordable Housing</p>	<p>85(9) Ryden obo Stewart Milne Homes</p>	<p>The sequential approach to provision is not acceptable and off-site provision should be as acceptable as onsite provision. The key is the delivery of affordable housing in areas of need and all methods of delivery must be recognised and considered when faced with funding constraints. Commuted sums can play an important role in the delivery of affordable housing potentially acting as a catalyst for delivery on specific sites. Accordingly, there should be a wider acceptance of the benefit of commuted sums.</p> <p>Objection is also taken to the method of calculation of commuted</p>	<p>The sequential approach is the approach taken in the current supplementary guidance and is the preferred approach of the Council, it is therefore being carried forward to the new Supplementary Guidance. This does not however prevent the Council from accepting options from further down the list should they be deemed more suitable.</p> <p>Off-site provision has been included and will be accepted in certain circumstances as set out within the guidance. In</p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
			<p>sums and the prospect of that sum being reviewed on an annual basis. The Guidance provides no indication of how the sums were derived or how each market area is defined. Such an approach removes any certainty from the Planning Process and is entirely un-acceptable. Many land deals can take over a year to conclude and the potential for costs to increase with such regularity is unacceptable and fails to provide the development industry and landowners with any degree of certainty.</p> <p>SG should be amended to omit the sequential approach to provision and permit a more flexible approach to the provision of affordable housing in terms of on-site and off-site provision and the range of tenures acceptable. There should be greater scope to address the provision of affordable housing through commuted sums, but the calculation of those commuted sums must be transparent and should not be determined by sub-market areas. Any review of those sums should be through the Local Development Plan review process and not on an annual basis.</p> <p>Planning Advice Note 2/2010 promotes four additional or alternative means of delivering affordable housing, which could be considered by Planning Authorities. These include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allocating new sites in Local Development Plans specifically for affordable housing. 2. Identifying plots for self-build dwellings. 3. Using Compulsory Purchase powers to support the delivery of a new supply and regeneration. 4. Making appropriate surplus Local Authority land or buildings available for affordable housing. <p>The SG makes reference to sub-market areas. This is not acceptable and a flexible approach should be taken to the location of off-site provision throughout the city. Aberdeen City, along with its</p>	<p>relation to commuted payments these are only of value to the Council where sites are available to use the funds collected. At present securing affordable housing units is of more benefit than collecting additional funding.</p> <p>The process of calculating the commuted sums and determining the market areas was an open process involving the development industry. All the calculations and methodology were provided and the work was undertaken by the District Valuer as set out in PAN 2/2010 Affordable Housing. The proposal to review these on an annual basis has however been removed and this will only be done at the time of the review of the plan every five years.</p> <p>In relation to the alternative means of delivering Affordable Housing suggested from PAN 2/2010 all of these options are currently being used by the Council. As no additional sites have been allocated within the plan no new Specific Affordable Housing sites have been included.</p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
			<p>immediate hinterland lying within Aberdeenshire, comprise a single housing market area and it is not appropriate to divide this into sub-market areas.</p>	
<p>Planning Obligations, Affordable and Specialist Housing Provision</p>	<p>Affordable Housing</p>	<p>90(4) Ryden obo Dandara</p>	<p>It should be more flexible in terms of on-site and off-site provision and the range of tenures acceptable. There should be greater scope to address the provision of affordable housing through commuted sums, but the calculation must be transparent and should not be determined by sub-market areas. Any review should be through the LDP process and not on an annual basis. Any review of commuted sums and benchmark prices should be undertaken in consultation with the development industry.</p> <p>Surplus Local Authority land or buildings should be identified for affordable housing as advocated by PAN 2/2010.</p> <p>It is not appropriate to divide the housing market area into sub market areas. If these are to be adopted then the SDP should identify the housing requirement for those areas. There is a danger that the approach advocated could distort the housing market.</p> <p>The scale of commuted sums set out in Table 1 is unacceptable. There is not indication of how the sums were derived.</p>	<p>Increased flexibility has been introduced into the guidance with the inclusion of options such as Off-site delivery and key worker accommodation.</p> <p>The sequential approach is the approach taken in the current supplementary guidance and is the preferred approach of the Council, it is therefore being carried forward to the new Supplementary Guidance.</p> <p>In relation to commuted payments these are only of value to the Council where sites are available to use the funds collected. At present time additional funding is not required.</p> <p>The process of calculating the commuted sums and determining the market areas was an open process involving the development industry including Stewart Milne Homes. All the calculations and methodology was provided and the work was undertaken by the District Valuer as set out in PAN 2/2010 Affordable Housing. The proposal to review these on an annual basis has however been removed and this will only be done at the time of the review of the plan every five years.</p>
<p>Planning Obligations, Affordable and Specialist Housing Provision</p>	<p>Affordable Housing</p>	<p>132(3) BurnessPaull</p>	<p>There should be more detail on what will be taken into account in considering the percentage requirement. Market conditions and funding will also be relevant.</p> <p>Para 6.2.2 advises that intermediate housing will have a significant role to play in meeting housing need, yet social rented housing is the preference. This is contrary to the mix of tenures required by the SDP and means that the Council planning officers would have to be</p>	<p>The level of Affordable Housing has been set in Aberdeen at 25% since 2008, as such the overwhelming majority of sites within the plan were purchased in full knowledge of the level of Affordable Housing required in Aberdeen. Where the viability of a development is questioned this will be considered on a development by development basis.</p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
			<p>persuaded that other tenures are appropriate. The preference for social rented housing should be deleted.</p> <p>In reference to "instances when contributions may be reduced" it is not clear what is considered to be "unviable" in terms of developer profit and how this applies to a landowner.</p> <p>Paras 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 suggests flexibility on the method of provision but the subsequent sections on developments of fewer than 20 units or 20 units and over is more prescriptive and removes the ability to come forward with a mix of provision. In relation to on site/ off site provision there is no reference to taking into account the views of RSLs who could indicate that the site is not suitable for them. The SG should implement the flexible approach to the provision of affordable housing which the Plan claims to support.</p> <p>It should be clear that the value relates to its end use of affordable housing and is not to be transferred at nil value. It is also noted that RSLs may be entitled to dispose of social housing/land which has been provided. If this is at full market value the landowner/developer should be entitled to a clawback of part of the uplift in value on the sale.</p> <p>The conditions for off-site provision will not work in practice and may impact the delivery of a 5 year effective supply of housing land. It cannot be a pre-condition of delivery on the main site that all land for affordable housing must be transferred to the Council or an RSL first. There are similar concerns about preventing units being constructed on the primary site where the developer is also providing units off site. This may result in a hiatus in development. The timing of off site provision should be agreed on a site by site basis.</p> <p>The conditions require the alternative site to be located in the same submarket area but there is no definition of "submarket area". This</p>	<p>In relation to the preference shown in the guidance for social rent all forms of tenure will be considered, however many forms such as LCHO and Mid-Market Rent can still be outside the reach of people in need of Affordable Housing.</p> <p>Increased flexibility has been introduced into the guidance with the inclusion of options such as Off-site delivery and key worker accommodation. This does not however alter the Councils obligations under SPP to provide sustainable mixed communities. While the Council will be flexible in examining alternative means of delivery, and has included additional approaches within the guidance, the Council still has an obligation to maximise the provision of affordable housing for those in need.</p> <p>It is clear in the guidance that off-site provision will only be accepted where it is discussed in advance with the council. As such the applicant has the opportunity to put forward all the proposed reasons for off-site delivery including the views of RSL's, which as partners in the process, will always be considered.</p> <p>The Council recognise that any uplift in value due to a future sale of land/housing at market value should be recoupable by the landowner/developer however this is a matter for the contract between the landowner/developer and RSL.</p> <p>To date developers have taken a rather haphazard approach to proposals for off-site delivery, most of which have been proposed very late in the delivery process. This has been very challenging and time consuming for</p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
			<p>reference should be deleted.</p> <p>It should be clear that the amount of units provided off site is equivalent to the percentage requirement on the primary site. In recent discussions the council has added the total number of units on the primary site to the number of off site units then applied a 25% requirement, inflating the off site provision.</p> <p>The SG proposes to introduce new levels for commuted sums in lieu of on site affordable housing. It is not clear how these sums reflect PAN 2/2010 which suggests that the value equivalent to the cost of providing serviced affordable housing land should be determined by a valuer and the commuted sum should be a negotiation between the developer and the local authority. However, in Table 1 the commuted sums will be fixed for 3 submarket areas and differ for flats and houses. There is no detail provided on arriving at these numbers. The proposed amounts listed as commuted sums should be deleted. Either the amount should revert to £25,000 or there should be no stated value and the amount will be worked out on a case by case basis.</p> <p>If the submarket areas are retained the Council must use the commuted sum in the submarket area which the primary site is located.</p> <p>Table 2 has no information as to how the figures for the sale of Low Cost Home Ownership have been calculated. The prices apply across the City but commuted sums differ depending on the submarket area. If the price of Low Cost Home Ownership is based on affordability thresholds and is fixed then it needs to be recognised that not all sites will be suitable at these prices.</p> <p>The SG does not consider student accommodation as affordable housing but acknowledges it as a specific need in the City. The lack of student accommodation places pressure on the private rented sector</p>	<p>officers to deal with and would be completely unacceptable going forward for both officers and elected members. As such only where a developer comes forward with a well-considered proposal which is of greater benefit to the residents of Aberdeen, than delivering the affordable housing units on the primary site, will such a proposal be considered.</p> <p>The issue of the number of affordable housing units to be delivered in off-site scenarios seems to have presented some arithmetical difficulties to the development industry. The 25% requirement applies to the overall number of units to be delivered for that development. In cases where the affordable housing is relocated to another site and additional units are provided on the primary site the 25% requirement will also apply to those additional units, ie the 25% applies to the total number of units to be delivered.</p> <p>The process of calculating the commuted sums and determining the market areas was an open process involving the development industry including. All the calculations and methodology was provided to the development industry and the work was undertaken by the District Valuer as set out in PAN 2/2010 Affordable Housing. The proposal to review these on an annual basis has however been removed and this will only be done at the time of the review of the plan every five years.</p> <p>The process of calculating the Low Cost Home Ownership Values was also an open process involving the development industry. All the calculations and methodology was provided to the development industry.</p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
			<p>by increasing rental prices and making it unaffordable for more people. It has a direct impact on affordable housing and should be considered as meeting a site's affordable housing contribution.</p> <p>The SG should set out relevant criteria for key worker accommodation and confirm that it will be considered as provision of affordable housing.</p>	<p>Student Accommodation has been identified within the SG as being exempt from the requirement to provide affordable housing.</p>
<p>Planning Obligations, Affordable and Specialist Housing Provision</p>	<p>Affordable Housing</p>	<p>183(27) Bancon</p>	<p>The Council has recently revised this Guidance and, against all advice from the housing industry (including RSLs) is seeking levels of commuted sum payments which are unviable and which will, in the terms of paragraph 3.82 of the Plan, "jeopardise the delivery of housing".</p> <p>The Council should revert to the previous approach on commuted sums of a commuted sum based on transaction evidence in the market. A figure of £25,000 is currently used, and this represents the value which both developers and RSLs find practical and viable.</p>	<p>The revised commuted sums are based on an assessment of the housing market by the District Valuer service, and that information was made available to the development industry.</p> <p>The Supplementary Guidance includes an option to challenge the level of Commuted Sum where there is disagreement.</p>
<p>Planning Obligations, Affordable and Specialist Housing Provision</p>	<p>Planning Obligations</p>	<p>164(14) Scottish Gov</p>	<p>Under the heading 'Securing of Contributions' on page 5 of the Supplementary Guidance, paragraph 3 states: "The applicant will be required to cover the costs of preparing and registering the Planning Obligation and will be responsible for their own legal costs".</p> <p>Note that a charge cannot be made unless the power to charge is given by express words or by necessary implication. The Fees Regulations provide for planning fees and charges but do not enable charges of this nature to be made. Under the heading 'Securing of Contributions' on page 5 of the Supplementary Guidance, we recommend that paragraph 3 is removed. This currently states: "The applicant will be required to cover the costs of preparing and registering the Planning Obligation and will be responsible for their own legal costs".</p>	<p>The Planning Review being undertaken by The Scottish Government is looking at this matter. Recommendations put forward by the panel were published on 31 May 2016 and Scottish Ministers published their response in July 2016. A commitment was made to deliver a White Paper, which will include proposals for legislative change, by the end of 2016.</p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
<p>Planning Obligations, Affordable and Specialist Housing Provision</p>	<p>Planning Obligations</p>	<p>85(6) Ryden obo Stewart Milne Homes</p>	<p>Fail to mention or have proper regard to Scottish Government Circular 3/2012: Planning Applications & Good Neighbour Agreements. Similarly, it makes no reference to the tests set out in that Circular, all of which must be met before Planning Obligations can be sought.</p> <p>The Supplementary Guidance should also be amended to outline the tests which must be satisfied before Planning Obligations can legitimately be sought.</p> <p>Standard practice is for the monies to be held for a period of 5 years and the 7 year period now proposed is entirely unacceptable. So too is the proposal to charge 9% of the interest to cover administration costs. This should be removed.</p> <p>The formulaic approach currently used to calculate the scale of contributions takes no account of individual site and local circumstances. It further provides no information on how the various costs are arrived at and then applied to each of the requirements. Greater transparency is required on the cost of providing community infrastructure and if the cost of that infrastructure is ultimately less than the Planning Obligations made then there should be scope for the return of any unspent funds.</p>	<p>The issues raised by the respondents were considered by the reporter during the examination on the Local Development Plan (Issue 22). The Reporter did not recommend the inclusion of explicit reference to Circular 3/2012 or to quote selectively from its contents.</p> <p>Section 1.14 of the LDP specifically states that reference should be made to appropriate supplementary guidance and national policy. The plan does not specifically reference individual guidance and policy documents as to do so would not futureproof the plan for its 5 year lifespan.</p> <p>Policy I1 outlines the tests as per Circular 3/2012. When read in conjunction with Policy I1, the supplementary guidance complies with Circular 3/2012 and there is no need to repeat the tests in the supplementary guidance.</p> <p>Where developers opt to phase payments, which assists the development process, it is to be expected that costs must be recouped at a later date. This is in line with Scottish Planning Policy guidance. The utilisation of a percentage of the overall interest to support the monitoring and management of developer obligations phased payments is required as a result of the development proposed. The alternative to this option is the requirement for full payment towards the provision of infrastructure to be made upfront by the developer, severely impacting on the viability of schemes and delivery of the required infrastructure at the appropriate time. If the objective is to assist developers to address infrastructure impacts and to deliver development then phased funding is a means of achieving this. Where a longer period of capital programming is required for</p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
				<p>major projects, contributions may require to be retained over a longer period due to longer ongoing cost provision.</p> <p>Each planning permission is considered on a site by site basis taking individual and local circumstances into account. Section “Developer Contributions” of the SG is clear that return of funds will be made in the event of all, or some of the contribution not being spent within the agreed time period.</p> <p>Background working on costs and formulae are available from the Developer Obligations Team by request. It is not an appropriate level of detail to include within the main text of the supplementary guidance document.</p>
<p>Planning Obligations, Affordable and Specialist Housing Provision</p>	<p>Planning Obligations</p>	<p>124(16) SEPA</p>	<p>Request text is added at para 6.1.5 to explain the current position with potable water provision within Aberdeen City. Scottish Water should provide an update on the current position and plans for future work in light of development proposals and policies. Provision should come from within existing abstraction limits and the Council should liaise with Scottish Water to ensure this is achievable.</p> <p>Request text is added at para 6.1.5 to clarify the position with the requirement to connect to mains foul drainage. Scottish Water should provide an update on the current position and plans for future work in light of development proposals and policies. Where there is not sufficient mains foul drainage capacity, developers should explore the option of triggering additional capacity provision from Scottish Water before seeking permission for private drainage.</p>	<p>Section “Developer Contributions” of the SG is clear that the provision of water and drainage is not directly relevant to the developer obligations supplementary guidance and that early contact is encouraged with the relevant suppliers. No change is required.</p>
<p>Planning Obligations, Affordable and Specialist</p>	<p>Planning Obligations</p>	<p>132(4) Burness Paull</p>	<p>The wording needs to be amended to comply with Circular 3/2012. Should be justified on a case by case basis and contributions should relate to the impact that the specific development would have on particular infrastructure. It must be clear that contributions sought</p>	<p>Policy I1 outlines the tests as per Circular 3/2012. When read in conjunction with Policy I1, the supplementary guidance complies with Circular 3/2012 and there is no need to repeat the tests in the supplementary guidance.</p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
Housing Provision			<p>under each heading will relate to the impact the development has and not just to a general need.</p> <p>The guidance advises that contributions will be used within 7 years but there is no justification for this period. Currently the period in legal agreements is 5 years. The Council's obligation to use the contributions within 7 years will mean that in most developments the Council won't actually provide the facilities until many years after the development has been completed. It should be reduced to 5 years and the contributions should be used in a phased manner to ensure they comply with Policy I1.</p> <p>Interest which has been accrued on money which the Council has held on deposit should be put towards the cost of providing the infrastructure and potentially set off against the index linking which the council applies to the level of contribution.</p> <p>The applicant should not be required to pay for the Council's costs of preparing a legal agreement. This is a requirement sought by the council, not the applicant. It should already be covered by the planning fee paid to process the application. Concerned that external agents are appointed to negotiate the terms of draft agreements without seeking approval from the applicant who will be required to pay the fees. The requirement to meet the Council's costs for preparing a legal agreement should be removed from the SG.</p> <p>It is unfair to give the non-statutory guidance on the Strategic Transport Fund a statutory status through a cross reference in the LDP without putting forward the guidance for examination as part of the LDP process. Pending ratification of any supplementary guidance on strategic transport contributions by the Scottish Ministers, the LDP must either remove reference to contributions being required or make the guidance available for examination by the Scottish Ministers as part of the LDP process.</p>	<p>The supplementary guidance is clear that contributions can only be requested for elements that would otherwise have been unnecessary, or which have been provided in anticipation of that need. The cumulative impact of new developments can be identified and apportioned.</p> <p>The scale of allocations has been planned to ensure that there is sufficient value in sites to deliver the infrastructure required. Infrastructure requirements remain the same as the extant local development plan.</p> <p>Where developers opt to phase payments, which assists the development process, it is to be expected that costs must be recouped at a later date. This is in line with Scottish Planning Policy guidance. The alternative to this option is the requirement for full payment towards the provision of infrastructure to be made upfront by the developer, severely impacting on the viability of schemes and delivery of the required infrastructure at the appropriate time. If the objective is to assist developers to address infrastructure impacts and to deliver development then phased funding is a means of achieving this. Where a longer period of capital programming is required for major projects, contributions may require to be retained over a longer period due to longer ongoing cost provision.</p> <p>The interest accrued on any one particular development is related to that tranche of payments associated with that development. To use the interest to offset index linking would not allow transparency in the developer obligations process. There needs to be a direct link between the contributions taken and that specific development. To use the interest in the manner</p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
			<p>The LDP seeks contributions towards medical, dental and pharmacies which provide NHS funded services. The majority of medical practices own their existing premises and the NHS pays them rent. They are being gifted land within developments to enable them to move to new facilities, funded by developer contributions, leaving them free to sell or rent their existing premises. This contravenes the principles of Circular 3/2012. The Plan should only seek contributions towards the expansion of existing facilities when the development generates a need or the provision of new facilities where there are no existing.</p> <p>The SG advises that sites have been identified with the potential to construct Regional SUDS but no information as to where and how the Council intends to compensate a landowner/developer for the loss of developable land.</p> <p>No background information is provided on the contribution/rates to be paid towards SUDS, education, healthcare, core paths, open space, community and sports/recreation facilities. Justification is required to demonstrate the amount is fairly and reasonably related to the provision of relevant facilities.</p> <p>No detail on assessing the impact of developer contributions on the viability of a development.</p> <p>The use of a formula based on floorspace does not reflect a proper assessment of whether a development creates a need for additional facilities.</p> <p>It does not specify how the Council is going to seek contributions from residential development where the school roll is expected to exceed planned capacity. The methodology for calculating the impact of a development on a school is flawed and lacking in transparency. It ignores the phasing of the development and that as the development proceeds existing children will be leaving and space will be released.</p>	<p>suggested would break the direct link.</p> <p>With regards to the applicant paying for the costs of preparing a legal agreement; the Planning Review being undertaken by The Scottish Government is looking at this matter. Recommendations put forward by the panel were published on 31 May 2016 and Scottish Ministers published their response in July 2016. A commitment was made to deliver a White Paper, which will include proposals for legislative change, by the end of 2016.</p> <p>With regards to the recent Court of Session judgement on the Strategic Transport Fund; the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Planning Authority has sought leave to appeal the decision of the Court of Session. A change has been proposed to the associated SG following the Reporters recommendations.</p> <p>The issues raised by the respondents, with regards to the contribution topic areas, were considered by the Reporter during the examination on the Local Development Plan (Issue 22). The Reporter did not recommend amendment to the contribution topic areas, with the exception of renaming “water and drainage/regional SUDS” to “regional SuDS”. Appendix 3 of the plan and the Action Programme provide detail on infrastructure requirements. The supplementary guidance is clear that contributions can only be requested for elements that would otherwise have been unnecessary, or which have been provided in anticipation of that need. The cumulative impact of new developments can be identified and apportioned.</p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
			<p>The Council should be required to look at the phasing of the development. Providing land for the school should be provided at nil cost for the proportion needed in support of the new development. It is not fair for a development to provide land to meet existing need outwith the site. The requirement to pay contributions towards a school which is not at 100% capacity should be deleted.</p>	<p>With regards to Regional SUDS the SG is clear that the schemes would be built on land owned by the Council and 'space' made available through agreement. There would be no requirement to compensate.</p> <p>Background working on costs and formulae are available from the Developer Obligations Team by request. It is not an appropriate level of detail to include within the main text of the supplementary guidance document.</p> <p>The proposed supplementary guidance states (Development Viability and Indexation section) "where the developer asserts that the development contributions have an impact on the viability of a development the developer will be required to submit a viability assessment to the council which may require to be independently reviewed. Given the nature of viability, the impact of developer obligations is carried out on a site by site basis. It would be impractical to include further details in supplementary guidance. The advice contained within Circular 3/2012 has been implemented regarding the use of stages or phased payments as a potential solution to issues of viability.</p> <p>All assessments are carried out on the basis of consideration of the impact the proposed development would have on services in terms of capacity only, and not to resolve any deficiencies in infrastructure. This is sufficiently addressed in the supplementary guidance.</p> <p>The use of a formula based approach is a well tested and established process to determine likely contribution levels based on the use class proposed. All applications are considered on a site by site basis to determine</p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
				<p>specific need created as a result of proposed development.</p> <p>The methodology for calculating the impact of proposed development on school roll forecasts is available on request. This is too detailed for inclusion within the supplementary guidance. General methodology principles are included within the supplementary guidance. The housing land audit provides phasing of the development with that information provided by the developer/agent/landowner – this is shared with education colleagues. Land is part of the overall cost of delivering a new school. Proportional land values would be apportioned commensurate with the scale of impact and a land valuation undertaken. Where land is being provided by a developer for a school which would address some existing need and/or cumulative need then the value of land provided to the council could be offset against the required financial contribution for education proportionately to the impact of the development. The supplementary guidance is clear that contributions will be sought where the capacity of the school will be exceeded e.g. over 100% as a result of development.</p>
<p>Planning Obligations, Affordable and Specialist Housing Provision</p>	<p>Planning Obligations</p>	<p>149(4) Homes for Scotland</p>	<p>Generally, the Plan does not include some policy matters contained in Supplementary Guidance, notably around periods for which the Council will retain monies and mechanisms for holding and accounting for monies. There is also no justification in the SG for the costings for facilities.</p>	<p>Policy I1 outlines the tests as per Circular 3/2012. When read in conjunction with Policy I1, the supplementary guidance complies with Circular 3/2012 and there is no need to repeat the tests in the supplementary guidance or procedural matters such as retention of monies and mechanisms in the plan. Circular 6/2013 (paragraph 139) is clear that a suitable topic for supplementary guidance is “exact levels of developer contributions or methodologies for their calculations”.</p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
				<p>Background working on costs and formulae are available from the Developer Obligations Team by request. It is not an appropriate level of detail to include within the main text of the supplementary guidance document.</p>
<p>Planning Obligations, Affordable and Specialist Housing Provision</p>	<p>Planning Obligations</p>	<p>149(8) Homes for Scotland</p>	<p>The Plan does not include some policy matters contained in Supplementary Guidance, notably around periods for which the Council will retain monies and mechanisms for holding and accounting for monies. There is also no justification in the SG for the costings for facilities.</p>	<p>Policy I1 outlines the tests as per Circular 3/2012. When read in conjunction with Policy I1, the supplementary guidance complies with Circular 3/2012 and there is no need to repeat the tests in the supplementary guidance or procedural matters such as retention of monies and mechanisms in the plan. Circular 6/2013 (paragraph 139) is clear that a suitable topic for supplementary guidance is “exact levels of developer contributions or methodologies for their calculations”.</p> <p>Background working on costs and formulae are available from the Developer Obligations Team by request. It is not an appropriate level of detail to include within the main text of the supplementary guidance document.</p>
<p>Planning Obligations, Affordable and Specialist Housing Provision</p>	<p>Planning Obligations</p>	<p>183(25) Bancon</p>	<p>Healthcare is a statutory requirement. Services are not typically delivered by Councils. Healthcare is not governed by requirements around the location of services, and the tendency in healthcare has been centralisation and specialisation. There is no immediate and automatic relationship between new development and the provision of new local facilities. The decisions on if and where to provide new facilities are taken by Health Boards and local bodies such as Primary Healthcare Trusts, or even by GP/dentist surgeries themselves. Therefore it is unclear what evidence the Council can produce of service deficiencies, pressures placed on services by new development, or programmes of new provision. Without the evidence, the planning obligation would not meet the 5 tests of circular 1/2013. See planning appeal in England (Planning Inspectorate Ref: 2157515:Moat House Farm, Elmdon Road).</p>	<p>The issues raised by the respondents were considered by the reporter during the examination on the Local Development Plan (Issue 22). The Reporter made no recommendations with regards to health contributions.</p> <p>Appendix 3 of the Plan and the Action Programme provide detail on infrastructure requirements. Circular 6/2013 (paragraph 139) is clear that “items for which financial or other contributions, including affordable housing, will be sought, and the circumstances (locations, types of development) where they will be sought” is a matter for inclusion within the plan and not supplementary guidance.</p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
			<p>The proposed SG would have to contain clear and firm proposals from the NHS as to what it intended to provide, where and when. As this is an operational matter from the NHS, it is not clear that the Council will be able to produce SG which would meet the tests of Circular 1/2013.</p> <p>Developer contributions are typically provided through planning conditions or agreements. They are paid to the Council and held in clearly-differentiated accounts with the provision for repayment if unused within their anticipated timescales. No such arrangements are in place with the NHS. It is inappropriate for developers to be replacing/supplementing UK taxation expenditure.</p>	
<p>Planning Obligations, Affordable and Specialist Housing Provision</p>	<p>Noise</p>	<p>90(2) Ryden obo Dandara</p>	<p>It should be amended to reflect PAN 1/2011. It fails to acknowledge that the level of detail in a Noise Impact Assessment must be balanced against risk. The SG advises that. "Acceptable noise levels should be achieved within dwellings with windows sufficiently open for ventilation," whereas the PAN advises that "...Preferable that satisfactory noise levels can be achieved within dwellings with windows sufficiently open for ventilation."</p> <p>Where mitigation is necessary it should be conditioned and implemented prior to the occupation of development.</p>	<p>The Proposed Supplementary Guidance was prepared with PAN 1/2011 Planning and Noise as a guide and is considered to be in alignment with national advice. PAN 1/2011 provides advice on the role of the planning system in helping to prevent and limit the adverse effects of noise. Early discussions with the Council will help to determine the suitability of a site for a proposed development and the level of detail and mitigation required from an application in respect of noise.</p>
<p>Transport, Air Quality and Noise</p>	<p>Noise</p>	<p>153(12) NLP Planning obo British Airways</p>	<p>Supports the presumption against the development of sites within the Leq 57dB contour for residential purposes as set out in this SG (para 7.3.3)</p>	<p>Support is noted.</p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
Transport, Air Quality and Noise	Transport and Accessibility	85(15) Ryden obo Stewart Milne Homes	The Council seek to impose a minimum garage size. This is unacceptable and reference to it should be removed. Any such changes require to be subject of full consultation with the house building industry and not simply 'slipped in' under the guise of Transport and Accessibility.	The Proposed size is a local variation that was taken from the Scottish National Roads Development Guide specifications. The proposed sizes are appropriate for the average vehicle being parked inside. They encourage garage use, functionality and reasonable access and egress from a car.
Transport, Air Quality and Noise	Transport and accessibility	158(7) Savills obo Hammersons	<p>Support the guidance provided within Section 7.1, and the general presumption against the creation of free-standing, publicly-accessible car parks, especially in city centre locations.</p> <p>Union Square acts as a strategic car park and should provide additional car parking to help reduce private cars crossing the city centre and encourage walking, in line with the city centre masterplan. This is key to ensure Union Square continues to meet its strategic function, and to facilitate Union Square's growth in floorspace.</p> <p>Support the proposed increase in non-residential maximum car parking standards, proposed for food retail, non-food retail and restaurants and cafes within the city centre.</p>	Support is noted. Comments regarding Union Square acting as a strategic car park have been dealt with in the Proposed Plan Schedule 4's under Issue 23 – Transport and Accessibility. No modification was recommended by the Reporter.
Transport, Air Quality and Noise	Transport and Accessibility	179(3) Old Aberdeen Heritage Society	<p>Section 7.1.9 - 'Parking in Conservation Areas'; pp 192-193 - 'Parking in Front Gardens'</p> <p>This SG does not take full account of the Council's guidance on Conservation Areas. It does not mention the need to assess the possible impact of parked cars directly in front of a property in a Conservation Area. The Conservation Area Strategic Overview and Management Plan contains 'generic guidance for all Conservation Areas'. The Management Plan (p17) states that "Parking in all but the largest front gardens, which already have been designed with driveway access in mind, will have a detrimental effect on the setting of buildings in the Conservation Area, potentially obscuring important features." This statement should be added to Section 7.1.9, Transport</p>	This section of the Guidance was prepared in collaboration with the Masterplanning, Design and Conservation Team who produced the Council's guidance on Conservation Areas. It takes into consideration Scottish Planning Policy and the Council's Conservation Area Strategic Overview and Management Plan. The guidance gives specific requirements of when planning permission is required for parking in Conservation Areas and it also specifies and gives the criteria for assessing applications for parking in front gardens. The criteria set out emphasise the need for applications to have careful consideration of the site characteristics of the relevant Conservation Area. The SG takes full account of Scottish

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
			<p>and Accessibility SG. Without this addition, there is no consideration in the SG of the effect a parked car in front of a building can have on the setting of that building, especially in a relatively confined space.</p> <p>SPP (section 139 & 143) states that LDPs and SGs should 'provide a framework for protecting, and where appropriate, enhancing all elements of the historic environment'; and that 'proposals for development within conservation areas and proposals outwith which will impact on its appearance, character or setting should preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area'.</p> <p>The proposed Transport and Accessibility SG, in the section referred to within this comment does not accord with SPP because it does not provide a framework for protecting all elements of the historic environment. It fails to take into account the clear guidance in the Council's Conservation Area Management Plan, thus making the SG inadequate and misleading to potential applicants, planning officers and the general public.</p> <p>The Government's 'Scottish Historic Environment Policy (SHEP) 2011', and 'Our Place in Time, the Historic Environment Strategy for Scotland' highlight the importance of retaining the setting of the building or landscape.</p> <p>This SG does not fully consider the possible visual impact on a building of a parked car in a Conservation Area, especially in a confined space. This is contrary to advice from Historic Scotland's 'Managing Change in the Historic Environment' document which notes that 'one of the factors to be considered in assessing the impact on the setting of a historic asset is the visual impact of the proposed change relative to the scale of the historic asset or place and its setting'. This factor has not been addressed in this SG. The final part of paragraph J - p17 in the Conservation Area Management Plan should be included in this SG to make it clear that this kind of development would have a detrimental effect on the setting of buildings in the Conservation</p>	<p>Planning Policy, Historic Environment Scotland Policy Statement (2016) and the Council's guidance on Conservation Areas.</p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
			Area, and so, in line with planning legislation, would not be granted permission.	
Townscape and Landscape	Energetica	85(14) Ryden obo Stewart Milne Homes	The SG places an additional burden on development in this area. These burdens are likely to deter development with developers focussing elsewhere. For Energetica to be successful the focus should be on reducing bureaucracy and making it easier to secure planning permission. In particular the need to provide 'compliance statements' should be removed.	<p>It is not considered that any additional 'burden' is placed on development by this Supplementary Guidance. The SG itself recognises that "many of the planning and design actions required to achieve this ambition are common for all developments across Aberdeen City and Aberdeenshire".</p> <p>The 'Compliance Statement' is considered an appropriate means for encouraging developers to think about how their proposals contribute to the Energetica project. Compliance Statements need not be lengthy, additional documents, and may form part of existing documents such as Design and Access Statements. It is not considered that removing the need for a 'Compliance Statement' would be appropriate as it remains a useful tool in assessing whether a development proposal has considered its location within the Energetica Corridor.</p>
Townscape and Landscape	Energetica	120(18) Scott Hobbs obo Scottish Enterprise	Welcomes the enhanced status of Energetica through the publication of specific Supplementary Guidance to guide development within its boundaries. Pleased to note the entire Energetica corridor is shown in the SG. Encouraged to note that the SG is consistent with the Aberdeenshire Council PP.	Support for the SG is noted.
			In relation to the 'Compliance Statement' there is a risk that the requirements may be perceived as an additional stringent test. They are not required for development outside the corridor area and may be interpreted as a requirement to provide more detailed and costly levels of information. SG would be improved if the benefits of preparing a 'Compliance Statement' and clarity on the required	The 'Compliance Statement' is considered an appropriate means for encouraging developers to think about how their proposals contribute to the Energetica project. Compliance Statements need not be lengthy, additional documents, and may form part of existing documents such as Design and Access Statements. Further detail is

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
			contents were outlined.	provided within the Energetica Planning Advice document which sits alongside the SG. It is not considered necessary to provide further explanatory detail on the expected content of a Compliance Statement within the SG as the level of information to be provided will differ depending on the scale of the development proposed.
			Requests that further consideration is given to the tests in the SG for the Energetica corridor (para 2.7.2) to ensure that the Council is satisfied that it is supportive of development proposals and does not introduce unnecessary assessment.	Due consideration has been given and it is considered that no unnecessary additional assessment is being proposed.
			Delete the following second paragraph from Energetica SG 2.7.1 - "The guidelines set out in this document shall apply, on a city-wide basis to listed buildings and those within conservation areas, unless otherwise stated. The document is applicable to residential, commercial, industrial and institutional buildings."	Requested sentence deleted.
			Revise and/or prepare all plans to show Energetica connections into Aberdeenshire Council area.	The entire Energetica Corridor area (covering areas of both Aberdeen City and Aberdeenshire) is illustrated in map form within the Supplementary Guidance.
			Address within the SG the risk that the SG may be perceived as creating more stringent tests for Energetica compared with other locations within and outwith the region.	The suggestion that Energetica is a more 'stringent' test is not supported (see justification above), and therefore no change to the SG is proposed.
			Emphasis that the purpose of the SG is to create a comparatively better quality living and working environment so people are attracted to live and work there, and that planning applications will be considered in this context.	It is considered that the Introductory part of the SG adequately explains both the purpose of the SG and the positive transformations in the Energetica area that is expected with the application of the policy.
			Giving greater clarity relating to the types or sizes of development against which the SG criteria should be tested.	A reference to the Scottish Government's Planning Hierarchy has been included in the SG in order to clarify what is meant by 'Major' and 'Local' developments.

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
Townscape and Landscape	Big Buildings	90(1) Ryden obo Dandara	<p>Object to the statement that developments should adhere to and go beyond low and zero carbon measures.</p> <p>The second para in 2.3.1 should be amended to state that the document will apply on a city wide basis. It is not clear why it applies in a city wide basis to Listed Buildings and those within a Conservation Area.</p> <p>The paragraph "Green Credentials" in section 2.3.2 should be deleted. This is already covered in Policy R7 and should not be duplicated. There is no justification for this requirement and it is not appropriate to impose different requirements from those in Policy R7.</p>	<p>As outlined in the objection, development will have to adhere to the low and zero carbon measures, and water efficiency measures as is outlined under Policy R7 of the plan. There is no requirement to delete this sentence but reference should be made to the policy to add clarity.</p> <p>The introductory text is generic. This is being reworked to be more specific to each SG.</p> <p>Big buildings can help to encourage and embraced a low carbon sustainable agenda through the promotion of innovative design solutions such as green walls, green roofs, and rain water management systems. Text to this effect will be added to the SG for clarity.</p>
Townscape and Landscape	Big Buildings	136(22) Civic Society	<p>When considering views to the building from a distance, the context should include views from 360 degrees around the building rather than just one or two selected views. Buildings granted consent in Aberdeen recently have had a big impact from views in directions other than envisaged and presented as part of the planning application. Buildings should refrain from having standard floor to ceiling heights that tend to horizontalise the elevation.</p> <p>Consideration should also be given to the building's surroundings and historical context to ensure that a large building does not overpower existing buildings that show off Aberdeen's granite heritage. The list must include the fact that a big building must respect it's surroundings and improve rather than detract or overpower the existing heritage.</p>	<p>The supplementary guidance outlines a visual impact and analysis assessment is required. This text should have read a landscape and visual impact assessment is required to be submitted. The LVIA is an industry standard. The requirement to ensure the building has well designed proportions and a vertical emphasis is already outlined in the SG.</p> <p>The requirement for big building to respect, consider and improve the site context is already outlined within the SG. This includes complementing or improving the existing site context, consider the natural topography, scale and height of structures, urban grain, streetscape and built form, open spaces, effect on the skyline, and respect, reinforce and, where applicable create opportunists for enhanced views and vistas and make a positive contribution to the skyline when viewed from all angles from near, middle and distant views, both during the day and at night</p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
Townscape and Landscape	Big Buildings	158(6) Savills obo Hammersons	<p>Hammerson agree generally with the guidance provided, and the recognition of the positive impact [big buildings] can play within the surrounding urban context. In particular, they support the acknowledgement in Para 2.3.2 that "big buildings must be situated in close proximity to good public transport links.. .."</p> <p>We further support the paragraph below and request that the text "city centre retail core" is added to the paragraph as the boundaries of each area vary slightly ("The most suitable location for big buildings is in the city centre, CITY CENTRE RETAIL CORE, and the immediate surrounding area.. .."</p> <p>With regard to building design, the recognition that appropriate design can be both complementary or contrasting with granite is supported.</p>	<p>We note and welcome the support of the text.</p> <p>The City Centre Retail Core is located within the city centre boundary, with the exception of a small block to the south, which is immediate adjacent to the city centre boundary. The requirement to add 'City Centre Retail Core' would appear to be unnecessary as the location of the said designation is already encompassed within the area expressed within the SG.</p>
Townscape and Landscape	Big Buildings	179(1) Old Aberdeen Heritage Society	<p>There are several concerns in relation to the Big Buildings SG. There is no reference to the colossal impact big buildings would have on the character of Conservation Areas. In their response to the Draft Character Appraisal for Old Aberdeen Conservation Area, Historic Scotland noted the possibility of including a policy relating to extremely large buildings and they noted the threat of the visual impact of new development /tall buildings on the setting of the core of Old Aberdeen. They advocated a Tall Buildings Strategy to address this issue. Historic Scotland also emphasised Old Aberdeen as 'one of Scotland's most outstanding historic townscapes'. The Planning Officer's response to Historic Scotland's comments was to draw attention to the new SG on 'Big Buildings', which would apply to any proposed large/tall buildings in the University areas of Old Aberdeen.</p> <p>The Big Buildings Supplementary Guidance is insufficient as it has not recognised the sensitivities of siting big buildings beside Conservation Areas, and also the detrimental impact they could have on the setting</p>	<p>The SG notes proposals for big buildings will need to have a thorough understanding of their context. This includes development proposals respect and consider: form, mass, scale, height, colour, texture, landscape, climate, connectivity, changing seasons, noise, urban grain and permeability. Further to this big buildings should complement or improve the existing site context, consider the natural topography, scale and height of structures, urban grain, streetscape and built form, open spaces, effect on the skyline, and respect, reinforce and, where applicable create opportunists for enhanced views and vistas and make a positive contribution to the skyline when viewed from all angles from near, middle and distant views, both during the day and at night.</p> <p>The SG is specific in stating the site context has to be investigated, acknowledged, complemented and improved. A competent appraisal of site context will note</p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
			<p>of the small-scale vernacular character of Old Aberdeen.</p> <p>This SG concentrates on big buildings in the city centre and the immediate surrounding area but adds that if a big building is proposed beyond these locations (such as Old Aberdeen), it will be "assessed against the criteria within this document". It is a shock that there is no criteria in reference to the character, appearance or setting of Conservation Areas. Old Aberdeen has outstanding historical and architectural value and so should be given special consideration and strict safeguards should be in place to protect its setting.</p> <p>The Big Buildings SG is inadequate, in that it does not place at the heart of its concerns the imperative to protect the setting of buildings, streetscapes and views in the City's conservation areas. It needs to be re-written to take account of all the comments made, and incorporate effective policy to protect conservation areas from the detrimental impact of Big Buildings on their setting.</p>	<p>if a site is located within a conservation area. This will itself flag that developments have to be assessed to ensure there is a neutral or positive impact on the character, appearance of setting of the conservation area. As is outlined in the SG big buildings can have a positive impact on their environments.</p>
Townscape and Landscape	Temporary Buildings	179(2) Old Aberdeen Heritage Society	<p>Section 2.5.1 - Introduction to the Topic</p> <p>The SG notes that "<i>The placement and length of time a temporary building is in place can have a significant impact on the appearance of the building next to which it is located and to the streetscene.</i>"</p> <p>This is an inadequate assessment of the impact of these buildings. It assumes that the temporary building is in a street. This is often not the case. Very often it is placed in the grounds of a public building or institution and it can often, unfortunately, be placed in a landscaped area; or, indeed, in a conservation area, or even a landscaped area within a conservation area. This needs to be reflected in the SG.</p> <p>Perhaps it could read "<i>can have a significant impact on the appearance of neighbouring buildings, and of the streetscene, or grounds within which it is located. This impact is particularly</i></p>	<p>This sentence has been reworded in order to better reflect the potential impact that a temporary building could have without proper consideration.</p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
			<i>detrimental if it is sited within a landscaped area and/or a conservation area, where it will cause harm to their character and amenity".</i>	
			<p>Section 2.5.2 - General Guidance</p> <p>-The first sentence should be more prescriptive, as it was in the 2012 SG, and so read "are designed to cater for short term needs only, and not for longer term accommodation purposes"</p>	<p>Due to advances in their design and technologies, some modular buildings are now of a high enough standard that the Council may, in some circumstances (as described in the SG) consider these structures appropriate for longer term purposes. As such, no change to the noted section is proposed.</p>
			<p>Section 2.5.2 - General Guidance</p> <p>-The heading 'Commercial Buildings', should read 'Commercial and Institutional Buildings', as institutional buildings are otherwise not adequately covered by this SG. These represent a significant proportion of temporary buildings, especially in the grounds of educational institutions.</p>	<p>To ensure clarity, the headings have been changed.</p>
			<p>-Under 'Demountable Buildings', the SG must include provisions which ensure that these buildings do not significantly exceed the required amount of time originally stipulated in the planning permission. There have been occasions in the past where permission was granted for demountable buildings on landscaped amenity areas with established tree and shrub planting. This was allowed despite being contrary to Council guidance by virtue of exceptional circumstances.</p>	<p>Any breaches of planning consent can be reported to the Council's Enforcement Team for their investigation.</p> <p>The SG has been amended to read that temporary buildings should <i>"avoid areas of landscaping, especially those with established tree or shrub planting. In exceptional circumstances this may be unavoidable, and where this is the case, appropriate justification must be provided to demonstrate why development in areas of landscaping is necessary. In such circumstances, a Condition will be attached to any planning permission requiring new landscape to be planted in an agreed timescale following removal of the temporary building."</i></p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
			<p>After the following sentence on demountable buildings <i>'Thereafter, units may be considered for additional shorter periods if:-'</i>, we suggest a third bullet point be added: <i>'the building is not sited on what was formerly a landscaped amenity area, especially one with established tree and shrub planting. If it is, then no extension to the permission will be given, and the landscaping must be fully restored'</i>.</p> <p>This addition is essential to prevent the abuse of the planning system by applicants wishing to find cheap and easy solutions to accommodation problems with no regard to the environment or amenity of the area.</p>	<p>As noted above, the SG has been amended to read that temporary buildings should <i>"avoid areas of landscaping, especially those with established tree or shrub planting. In exceptional circumstances this may be unavoidable, and where this is the case, appropriate justification must be provided to demonstrate why development in areas of landscaping is necessary. In such circumstances, a Condition will be attached to any planning permission requiring new landscape to be planted in an agreed timescale following removal of the temporary building."</i></p>
Townscape and Landscape	Shops and Signs	179(4) Old Aberdeen Heritage Society	<p>This SG is to be used for listed buildings and those within conservation areas, however there is little reference to the distinctive character of these areas and buildings.</p> <p>-Shopfronts There is little acknowledgement of the kind of 'shopfront' found on some historic buildings that are from the 18th or 19th century vernacular. It's important that the shopfront should be true to the character of the building and appropriate to its historical context.</p> <p>-Materials (p21) The guidance is ambivalent as it notes that timber is traditional for Aberdeen and it is therefore to be expected. However it also notes that other traditional materials are also acceptable.</p> <p>This does not address the need for shopfronts in Conservation Areas to follow the traditional pattern. The kind of clear guidance that is needed is noted in the 1993 'Conservation Area Report' for Old Aberdeen. It notes that 'new or replacement shopfronts should be to a design contemporary with the building to which they are attached'.</p>	<p>The SG on Shop and Signs provides general guidance on a city wide basis for all retail and commercial premises, and for developments which are still being built out. The guidance is also to be used on advertisements in industrial areas and the west end office area. The SG covers listed building and buildings within conservation areas.</p> <p>The role of the SG is to provide guidance for those developing shop and signs. Understanding the shopfronts and designing for the context are two general principles outlined on the second page of the SG. Therefore, designers/owners will be expected to assess this prior to developing a design, therefore have an understanding of the age and period of their shop. Historic Environment Scotland have publications on shops and signs which can aid understanding on this topic, such as the online Traditional Shopfronts: A short guide for shop owners and the hard copy Scotland's Shops. These publications will be referenced in the SG</p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
			<p>-Signage The guidance on fascia signage carries little weight as it talks of 'the expected' method but does not affirm the appropriate and correct method that required.</p> <p>It is unclear what 'painted lettering within the shopfront window' means. This would be inappropriate and historically incorrect for listed buildings.</p> <p>The suggestion that 'individual cut out metal or coated metal letters may be appropriate if fixed to a rail' is out of character with the historic 18th and early 19th century buildings of the High Street in Old Aberdeen, for instance. The Conservation Guidance for Old Aberdeen (1993) notes that 'shop signs should be painted timber'. In sensitive areas like the High Street, this should be so.</p> <p>-Hanging and Projecting Signs This section notes that (non-illuminated) box projection signs with brackets will be permitted if the design is of very high quality and they project no more than 650mm. This is unacceptable as there are many listed buildings where box projection signs would be out of character and historically incorrect. The High Street in Old Aberdeen is an example of such areas.</p> <p>Illuminated sign are not appropriate for historically important buildings where no such signs would have existed. This highlights a lack of regard for the character of Conservation Areas or for the integrity of listed buildings. Moreover, if one illuminated sign is given permission, this will set a precedent which will damage the historic character and integrity of a conservation area/historic building.</p> <p>The Conservation Area Report for Old Aberdeen states that for the core heart of Old Aberdeen, 'no illuminated signs will be permitted'. Conservation Areas are there to be preserved, protected and</p>	<p>-Materials Aberdeen has examples of timber, brass, tile and 1950's style chrome detailed shopfronts. These are also traditional materials used on shopfronts.</p> <p>The SG is to be used citywide and also gives guidance to all conservation areas and listed buildings. The SG outlines, traditional features and proportion which are in situ must remain, the street and surrounding context has to be established and then a design suitable for this needs to be worked up. It is not a requirement to design a shopfront contemporary with the building to which they are attached. Modern interventions can be appropriate.</p> <p>The sentence on fascia signs for listed buildings and conservation areas will be modified to state, '<i>the preferred lettering method is painted or applied lettering of wood, metal or porcelain onto a timber fascia</i>'.</p> <p>With regard to the painted lettering within the shopfront window, this will be explained by the associated image in the final SG. To explain, the shop name can be painted/gilded to the window. Typically, this is associated with high-class retailers.</p> <p>The guidance is city wide, and as is outlined above designers need to understand the shopfront and have an awareness of the context. There may be instances where 'individual cut out metal or coated metal letters may be appropriate if fixed to a rail' may be appropriate. The SG has been modified to make it more explicit what is expected as general guidance, what is expected in conservation areas and listed buildings, and what is expected in completely new developments. On listed</p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
			<p>enhanced. Illuminated box signs don't contribute to this aim and so should not be permitted within Conservation Areas or on listed buildings. This guidance fails in these respects and instead poses a threat to buildings that the Council has a duty to protect.</p> <p>While non-listed buildings in some Conservation Areas could have box projecting signs, these would be inappropriate in other Areas. This guidance has taken a 'one size fits all' approach to all of Aberdeen's Conservation Areas. However Aberdeen's Conservation Areas differ from each other in terms of size, geographical setting, historical background and distinctive character. This diversity should be the prime consideration when forming policies/guidance on listed buildings/conservation areas. This SG has failed to take account of this diversity. Moreover, the Conservation Management Plan (2013) and Draft Conservation Area Character Appraisal for Old Aberdeen also do not contain guidance on shopfronts or signage.</p> <p>This SG should be re-written to present a robust and protective policy on shopfronts and signage in the historic environment. A specific policy should also be included in the Character Appraisal to protect High Street and its environs. This is because it has long been acknowledged as worthy of exceptional attention, demonstrated by its designation as the City's only Area of Special Control for advertisements before the creation of any of Aberdeen's Conservation Areas.</p>	<p>buildings and in conservation areas where a fascia exists, the preferred lettering method is painted or applied lettering onto the fascia.</p> <p>-Hanging and Projecting Signs As outlined in the general guidance at the start of the document, the context has to be considered and though needs to be given to the impact of the proposed sign on the surrounding area.</p> <p>The guidance now states bespoke well-crafted, generally top hung hanging signs, supported from brackets are preferred and will be supported. Box projecting signs may be used outwith conservation areas and on buildings with no statutory designation if they comply with the general guidance.</p> <p>The guidance on illumination now states, 'External illumination should be sympathetic and appropriate to the commercial frontage, and discrete.' The Conservation Area Character Appraisal for Old Aberdeen has replaced the 1993 Conservation Area Report.</p> <p>Signage has to, as is outlined under paragraph 2.2.2 Guiding Guidelines (now 1.2.2 General Principles), states signs should complement the character, height and period of the building and be in proportion with the building in which is it proposed. A new sentence has been added to the General Principles to states signs are requires to be a positive impact on the building and setting from the signage. This can include not allowing illuminated signs.</p>

SG Topic	SG Name	Rep ID and name	Comment	Response
				<p>The SG is used for the whole city but within it the guiding principles as the start of the document ensure the context of the shopfront, streetscape and signage is addressed, and that interventions are appropriate. The SG does present a robust and protective policy on shopfronts and signs. The SG will not be used in isolation to assess applications, policies from the local development plan and other material considerations will also be used. The Area of Special Control will only add to strengthen arguments ensure signs adhere to the general principles.</p>
<p>Townscape and Landscape</p>	<p>Landscape</p>	<p>179(5) Old Aberdeen Heritage Society</p>	<p>An addition should be made to this SG which would give protection to areas of landscaping around buildings in years to come, to protect them from proposals for further building in these areas. There have been examples of planning permission being given for a large building with conditions that certain landscaping be provided, only to be followed some years later by an application to build on that landscaped area. It is our view that if the landscaped area was judged important enough to be required for permission for the original building, then it must be protected against further development in the future, which would then detract from the setting of that building.</p>	<p>Additional text has been inserted into the Supplementary Guidance to provide further information on what is expected of development proposals. This advises that a thorough assessment of a site is expected, and that this will include consideration of any existing landscape features. Applications for planning permission will be considered on this basis.</p>