



COMMENTS & RESPONSES
SUMMARY DOCUMENT

Union Terrace Gardens – Response to comments from stakeholder consultations held in September, October and December 2016

| Stakeholder Consultation comments | Reflected In Proposals | Consideration of comments in the proposals |
|---|------------------------|--|
| <i>Improving Connectivity and Accessibility</i> | | |
| Access is the no. one issue at UTG – current access is off-putting to older/less ambulant people | Yes | The accessibility of the gardens will be significantly improved with a range of new accessible routes from surrounding street level at Union Street, Union Terrace and Rosemount Viaduct down into the gardens. This will include both gently sloped paths allowing step free access to all parts of the gardens and lift access via new gateway buildings and walkway; existing level access from the north, via Lower Denburn, will be retained. Ongoing dialogue will be had with stakeholders including the Disability Equity Partnership and the Bon Accord Access Panel to ensure accessibility concerns are fully considered. |
| The proposal improves accessibility a lot especially for disabled users - always involve relevant groups | Yes | As above. |
| Primary issue is access and improving this | Yes | As above. |
| Primary issue to address – getting people into the park | Yes | As above. |
| People should not be discouraged to enter the gardens by the physical effort involved in getting into them – make new access as easy as possible e.g. escalators could be explored to create automated access | Yes | As above. |
| Key focus of the UTG improvement should be as an access and connectivity project | Yes | As above. |
| The gardens shouldn't be treated as an amenity on their own, need to give connectivity to other streets and spaces and amenities in the city centre | Yes | As above. |
| Disabled access from all entrances - Visual and hearing disability | Yes | As above. |
| Accessibility is key for all – old, young and disabled, with increased safety | Yes | As above. |

| Stakeholder Consultation comments | Reflected In Proposals | Consideration of comments in the proposals |
|---|------------------------|--|
| Good proposed link from south but proposed sloped access from HMT end looks contrived and uncomfortable to use | Yes | As above. In addition to providing an accessible route, the graded paths to the north of the gardens provide an experience in their own right as a floriferous journey through the gardens and provide further functional use as an informal amphitheatre for events in the lower gardens. |
| Due to the current accessibility, you have to have a reason to go into the gardens, not one you would simply wander into | Yes | The proposals improve accessibility and connectivity for all users in order to create the 'destination' potential of the Gardens. |
| Desirable to create stronger visual connection to gardens generally - accessibility & intuitive wayfinding are key | Yes | As above. The creation of new access points from street level and management of existing trees will help improve the visual permeability of the gardens. Additionally a wayfinding strategy within the gardens will be considered within the context of the wider aspirations of the city centre masterplan. |
| Main issue with current UTG relates to connectivity and views | Yes | As above. |
| Accessible route past theatre should be improved – this is a must | Yes | Existing access to the rear of HMT will be retained and will be one of many access points into the gardens. Primary entrances will be those on Union Street, Union Terrace and the new Rosemount Plaza. |
| Safe routes through the car park | | As above. |
| HMT – carpark functionality needs retained/ careful consideration given if looking at this as an access route | Yes | Existing parking and operational uses will be retained in this area. |
| Rosemount Viaduct – make safe and continue function of space for theatre. Access from north – need to make it safe and useful | Yes | As above. |
| Loading Bay/ Get In | | As above. |
| Car parking provision – disabled parking spaces necessary to let people use the park. Not everyone can use public transport | Yes | Existing provision along Union Terrace will be retained with a number of additional spaces are also currently proposed. |
| Will Vehicle access remain the same? | Yes | The proposals envisage the vehicular access remaining the same. |
| Only two disabled parking spaces at rear of HMT | Yes | Disabled parking spaces are also proposed on Union Terrace. |
| Union Terrace – Disabled parking. Does this mean no other parking will work? | Yes | The proposals seek to prioritise disabled parking provision. |
| Keen to see link to Belmont Street – believe deck foundations exist across dual carriageway which could facilitate this | No | This is not being progressed as part of the current project although the proposals do not preclude this being investigated further at a later date. |

| Stakeholder Consultation comments | Reflected In Proposals | Consideration of comments in the proposals |
|--|------------------------|---|
| Some materials cause issues e.g. Caithness slippery/ riven surface not good for cane users | Yes | The material palette proposed will be simple, elegant and robust and reference will be made to the wider city centre palette of materials. Ongoing dialogue regarding materials and finishes will be had with stakeholders including the Disability Equity Partnership and the Bon Accord Access Panel to ensure that the final palette of materials, chosen finishes and detailing address issues and concerns with regard to accessibility. |
| Tactile – brass/steel buttons slippery & cause issues for electric chairs (as tactile does generally but required for visually impaired) | Yes | As above. |
| Consider cues – including textures as means of navigation/ wayfinding | Yes | As above. |
| Stainless steel - reflective properties can cause issues for partially sighted e.g. bollards go unseen | Yes | As above. |
| Think about accessibility through park, not just into the gardens (railway link, east-west as well as north-south) | Yes | The proposals allow step free access throughout the park with all stepped routes having an alternative graded route. Accessible entrances at Union Street, Union Terrace and Rosemount Viaduct allow multiple entrance/exit opportunities for all users wanting to simply pass through the gardens. In particular, the proposals create a new traffic free connection between Union Street and His Majesty's Theatre through the gardens. |
| How do people get through the park? Key Element of successful parks is People going through parks (not been one of the guiding principles) | Yes | As above. |
| Disabled/ wheelchair access and spaces are an essential, in particular through gardens and to HMT | Yes | As above. |
| Additional Link to gardens from east (Linkage to Belmont Street) | No | The proposals create multiple new accessible entrances to the north and south of Union Terrace Gardens which will provide fully inclusive access, directly into the lower level of the Gardens, greatly improving the relationship with not only Belmont Street but other surrounding streets. The benefits, risks and opportunities arising from a potential bridge link with Belmont Street were considered early in the design process and it was determined that the additional cost and complexity of such a project did not justify the marginal potential gains in the context of the wider proposals. |

| Stakeholder Consultation comments | Reflected In Proposals | Consideration of comments in the proposals |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| Reconsider access from station (think outside box – London underground/ well lit routes or tie in with lift connection) | No | Engineering teams have led an investigation into the potential route which has concluded that the layout of columns and the taper in the existing platform make it unnatural for pedestrian traffic and the wall at the end blocks off connection to the gardens. The platform below the buildings is dark and cold, and does not feel like a secure area to walk through; even with improved lighting it is not anticipated that it would be a busy route and so the likelihood for it to be a focal point for antisocial behaviour would remain high. |
| Would have liked improved access from all four compass points | Yes | As above. |
| Belmont Street crossing – not viable in short term | Yes | As above. |
| Size of lifts for access | | Proposed lifts will be sized appropriately to accommodate expected levels of use. |
| Need to consider segregated access | | The proposals have been developed to promote inclusive access for all users. |
| Union Terrace use and open times | Yes | The park will remain accessible at all times of day. |
| Sensory experience for all - Children. Older people. Those with health concerns or challenges such as dementia, autism, down syndrome etc | | Planting within the gardens will be given a complete overhaul as part of the proposals and will include species rich perennials and native wildflowers along with more formal areas of planting, providing a range of sensory experiences. Moving water, a mixed palette of materials and a playful lighting strategy will provide further sensory stimulation for a range of users. |
| Sensory stimulation in the city centre | | As above. |
| <i>Enhancing Heritage Assets and Cultural Associations</i> | | |
| Retain and Enhance Architecture/listed items | Yes | The vast majority of the existing architecture and heritage features within the gardens will be retained/repared or reused as part of the proposals. The architectural concept for pavilions and structures within the Gardens centres around the notion of lightness of touch, minimal intervention and celebration of historic assets. The delicate architectural events incorporated throughout the Gardens are carefully designed to be constructed independently from the historic fabric. This ensures that if required, the structures can be removed at a later date and the Gardens returned to their original design. |
| Balustrades & Arches are key heritage/ characteristic features that should be retained and enhanced | Yes | As above. |
| Celebrate Victorian setting/ garden | Yes | As above. |
| Cleaning existing granite feature would give this place an instant lift | Yes | As above. |
| Retain essence of the Victorian Gardens | Yes | As above. |

| Stakeholder Consultation comments | Reflected In Proposals | Consideration of comments in the proposals |
|---|------------------------|--|
| Essence of Victorian heritage in danger of being lost | N/A | As above. |
| Listed building consents. Road. Positive views. Public toilets. Balustrades. Arcades | Yes | As above. |
| Many existing cultural assets | Yes | As above. |
| Adopt a design which recognises the historical aspect but doesn't shy away from significant change | Yes | The proposals aim to deliver a careful balance between delivering 'transformational' change whilst preserving the unique green space qualities and heritage assets of the gardens. The elevated walkways and central light sculpture introduce bold new features while the retention and repair of existing features such as monuments, balustrades, stairs, Victorian toilets, etc. celebrate the history of the gardens. |
| Conserve Mature Elms/ legacy trees | Yes | The majority of the existing trees will be retained as part of the proposals with those being removed largely in poor health or of lower quality. A significant number of new mature specimen trees will also be planted to offset the losses and provide a diverse and healthy tree stock well into the future. |
| Retain Floral Arch – iconic view | Yes | The floral crest, forming part of the iconic view up to His Majesty's Theatre from within the gardens, will be incorporated into the proposals. |
| Retain iconic crest (in proportion) and view from gardens and Union Street Legacy | Yes | As above. |
| Re think crest shape and form | Yes | As above. |
| Union Street Bridge; Largest single span granite arch in the world. Unique structure should be celebrated. | Yes | A new elevated walkway allowing access into the gardens from Union Street is located adjacent to the Union Street Bridge and will provide new opportunities to view this structure. |
| Lighting of key features such as arches and bridge desirable to highlight heritage assets | Yes | A comprehensive lighting strategy for the gardens will be implemented as part of the proposals and will include elements to highlight heritage assets. |
| Victorian Toilets; Quality features within interior of toilets worth restoration with alternative function | Yes | The Victorian toilets will be refurbished as part of the proposals and incorporated within a new building at the Union Street entrance to the gardens. |
| Rail turntable; Only the stone circle remains not the workings. Other turntable being restored near Duthie park more appropriate and fully functional | N/A | Restoration of the turntable does not form part of the proposals. |

| Stakeholder Consultation comments | Reflected In Proposals | Consideration of comments in the proposals |
|--|------------------------|--|
| UTG can support Cultural Strategy for creation of 'Culture lab' – promoting culture through both space and education | Yes | The proposals will support the cultural strategy and celebrate the existing heritage and cultural features within the Gardens and will provide improved connections and a new destination location within the heart of the city which provides a range of flexible spaces suitable for a wide range of events, exhibitions and cultural activities. |
| More focus on art, creativity, culture and exhibition gallery spaces | Yes | As above. |
| UTG can support Cultural Strategy for City - 'Telling our story' – enhancing current and historical cultural associations and interpretation | Yes | As above. |
| Keen to see industrial heritage reflected in the UTG proposals. Previous ideas exist for creation of an 'Oil Experience' – ideas promoted for educational, heritage and technology showcase centre link to former and current oil industry/ entrepreneurs in Aberdeen. | Yes | As above. |
| Doric language – heritage & interpretation in UTG would be positive e.g. Local writer Lewis Grassie Gibbon, Thomas Glover 'Scottish Samurai', Scottish Merchant | Yes | As above. |
| Cultural infrastructure provided needs to be sustainable with identifiable market | Yes | The proposals seek to create a flexible hub to complement, rather than compete with, existing facilities such as His Majesty's Theatre and the diverse range of venues around the Union Street and Belmont Street area. A detailed business case is being developed as part of the proposals to ensure the long term sustainability of the new facilities. |
| Businesses – Encouragement of local business, self-employed, artists and artisans | Yes | As above. The new facilities including the gateway buildings and gallery spaces would encourage use by local businesses and artists. |
| What will the gardens look like in 2100? | Yes | As with all civic landscapes the demands placed on them and the desires of the local population will change over time such that it is not possible to say for sure what the gardens will look like that far into the future. The proposals do however aim to ensure longevity in terms of the choice of robust and long lasting, high quality materials and the creation of flexible space that is adaptable to a wide range of future needs. New trees will also be planted throughout to ensure a continued legacy of mature tree canopy within the gardens as some of the existing trees begin to reach the end of their natural lives. |

| Stakeholder Consultation comments | Reflected In Proposals | Consideration of comments in the proposals |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| Chess boards should be integrated | Yes | There are opportunities within the proposals for these to be integrated. |
| Concerns about hot dog vans in the future. How to avoid this? | Yes | Street/food vendors within the gardens would be subject to the usual consents and permits. |
| <i>Improving safety and amenities within the park</i> | | |
| Retail/ Café use in the garden would assist safety and security creating a permanent presence including evening activity | Yes | Three new buildings are being proposed within the gardens providing a range of new uses such as restaurant/café/bar, gallery and retail which will encourage new use throughout the day and increase passive supervision of the space. |
| A significant change is required to get rid of the hangout space for 'junkies', drunks and predators | Yes | As above. |
| Good quality café / gift shop desirable | Yes | As above. |
| Bandstand/Café – Alvar Alto Glass pavilion, Helsinki is a good precedent | Yes | As above. |
| Café space key to encouraging access into the gardens – needs to be right quality to create attraction and differentiate offer from other | Yes | As above. |
| Safety is perceived as a prominent issue meaning people don't access the gardens as often as they might | Yes | As above. New facilities and improved access will increase activity and supervision throughout the day and night and a comprehensive lighting strategy will ensure that the space is appropriately lit at all times and discourage antisocial behaviour. The lighting strategy takes account of potential impacts on wildlife and has been designed to allow darker corridors, such as along the railway, to minimise disruptions. |
| Create balanced/ adjustable lighting to make space safe & inviting | Yes | As above. |
| Lighting issues – make sure people feel safe | Yes | As above. |
| Evening lighting & during opening hours | Yes | As above. |
| Avoid over lighting – impacts on wildlife | Yes | As above. |
| Improve onsite facilities e.g. toilets at lower level | Yes | The proposals will create a range of new facilities accessible by all within the Gardens providing facilities for events, play, community growing, education and new places to eat and drink. The Victorian toilets will be comprehensively refurbished as part of the proposals and incorporated within a new building at the Union Street entrance to the gardens which provides access to and from the lower level of the gardens. Further proposed buildings within the gardens will offer additional opportunity for the incorporation of accessible facilities. |

| Stakeholder Consultation comments | Reflected In Proposals | Consideration of comments in the proposals |
|---|------------------------|--|
| Victorian Toilets; Location not suitable to service the park, requirement for accessible toilets at lower level | Yes | As above. |
| Amenities required e.g. toilets at lower level | Yes | As above. |
| Provision of public toilets 'reimagining' will toilets be provided | Yes | As above. |
| Management and opening times of toilets – will these be public toilets? | Yes | New facilities such as lifts and toilets will be incorporated into the proposed gateway buildings with responsibility for management and maintenance falling to the building tenants. These facilities will be publicly accessible irrespective of building use with opening times a matter to be determined by the building owner (i.e. the Council) and operators. |
| Safety and Management of Lifts including access | Yes | As above. |
| Help operators share management responsibility / ownership | Yes | As above. |
| Maintenance is key – too many uses may cause maintenance difficulties | Yes | As above. |
| Arches have good potential for café/ gallery/ retail use | Yes | The proposals incorporate the infill of the arches with glass to create a weatherproof space suitable for a range of uses, complimenting those of the new building at the Burns monument. |
| UTG arches better suited to flexible / temporary space or 'artisan' market than permanent studio or gallery space | Yes | As above. |
| Gallery space in gardens could be created and used as part of the RGU degree show – potential to create gallery/exhibition space e.g. in arches that could showcase degree show work from the art or architecture departments | Yes | As above. |
| Utilising arches – not convinced temporary pop-up uses would be a success, quality permanent uses desirable | Yes | As above. |
| Improve quality 'dwell' space creating shelter and amenity | Yes | In addition to opportunities offered by new the proposed buildings there will be extensive new seating throughout the gardens and a range of newly created spaces to pause and gather. |

| Stakeholder Consultation comments | Reflected In Proposals | Consideration of comments in the proposals |
|---|------------------------|---|
| Choose materials and surfaces carefully to use safely | Yes | The material palette proposed will be simple, elegant and robust and reference will be made to the wider city centre palette of materials. Ongoing dialogue regarding materials and finishes will be had with stakeholders including the Disability Equity Partnership and the Bon Accord Access Panel to ensure that the final palette of materials, chosen finishes and detailing address issues and concerns with regard to accessibility. |
| No Caithness Stone to be used for walkways | Yes | As above. |
| Materials used for various amenities | Yes | As above. |
| Can DEP get access to see samples of materials to be used? | Yes | As above. |
| Appropriate seating for all users to be safely used | Yes | There will be a wide range of seating available within the park catering for a wide range of users. |
| Safety of bringing access to rear of HMT – issues if it's a main access point | Yes | Existing access to the rear of HMT will be retained and will be one of many access points into the gardens. Primary entrances will be those on Union Street, Union Terrace and the new Rosemount Plaza. |
| Rosemount Viaduct – currently operational working area | Yes | As above. |
| Elevated Walkway – concerned with height / suicide – Not caged | | Elevated walkways will have guard rails to the perimeter and be fully compliant with relevant health and safety standards. |
| Need a park manager – long term management for safety issues | Yes | There is the potential for revenue generated from building rental and park events to provide long term funding for the employment of a park manager. |
| Is the park closed at night? Who closes it? | No | The park will remain accessible at all times of day. |
| Management of safe cycling / boarding | Yes | The inclusive design of the park will allow for a range of concurrent uses. Cyclists will be encouraged to visit the gardens as a destination rather than a through route. Strategically located cycle parking will be provided in visible, well-lit locations. Shared footway/cycleways will be designed to allow 'share with care' use. |
| More focus on family orientation and play for children and all ages | Yes | There will be a range of new facilities within the gardens providing interest for the whole family. Opportunities for both formal and informal play will be incorporated throughout the gardens, catering to a wide range of ages and abilities. |
| Safety of water features | Yes | Water features will generally be shallow and will be fully compliant with relevant health and safety standards. |
| Concerns about expense / maintenance of water features | Yes | Water features will be designed to be low maintenance with provision for the first five years maintenance is built into the construction cost plan for the proposals. |

| Stakeholder Consultation comments | Reflected In Proposals | Consideration of comments in the proposals |
|--|------------------------|--|
| New design needs to focus on the negative aspects of UTG – bad weather, gardens are low down, proximity to the railway line – look at Clarke Quay, Singapore as a good example | Yes | The design development has undertaken a thorough analysis of the site and the proposals reflect this process. |
| <i>Activation of the gardens with attractions, events, destination draw</i> | | |
| UTG can Support Cultural Strategy for city 'City as a Stage' - use of outdoor space (as well as indoor) for events/ niche festivals | Yes | The improved access, flexible event space and provision of event services (electricity, water, etc.) throughout the gardens will allow for a wide range and scale of events to be held. The draft Aberdeen 365 Events Strategy 2016-2021 has been used to inform the business case for the proposals while simultaneously the draft strategy is cognisant of the proposals for the gardens. It is envisaged that the gardens will become a hub in the overall events strategy for the city centre. |
| Successful large scale events have been held in the gardens (Jubilee Tea) – improving access would allow more events | Yes | As above. |
| Need programme of events – 365 events strategy built into proposals | Yes | As above. |
| Provide 'plug & play' power options for 'appropriate' events & storage for onsite production | Yes | As above. |
| Scale of events suited to UTG via APA organisation – 500-1000 people | Yes | As above. |
| 2 or 3 key / 'signature' events a year – right kind of activity level for UTG | Yes | As above. |
| 'Proms in the Park' – possible future link desirable. Global Brand – right kind of association for Aberdeen – Proms link up recently held in Glasgow Green. | Yes | As above. |
| Jazz festivals/ higher end signature events appropriate for UTG | Yes | As above. |
| Would like to see a 'city centre gala' | Yes | As above. |
| Arts and Culture ought to be reflected in the gardens – part of the culture and arts quarter | Yes | As above. |

| Stakeholder Consultation comments | Reflected In Proposals | Consideration of comments in the proposals |
|---|------------------------|--|
| Coordination of temporary events in UTG need to be carefully coordinated with HMT | Yes | It is envisaged this will be considered as part of a wider events strategy for the city however, any temporary event within the gardens would be subject to the usual consents and consultation requirements. |
| Acoustics important – noise conflict (HMT/Garden event) | | As above. |
| Cornwall ‘Minack’ Theatre / outdoor amphitheatre referenced (holds 750) – flexible outdoor amphitheatre in UTG would be a positive asset for events | Yes | Proposed seating along the new accessible route from Rosemount Viaduct would act as an informal ‘amphitheatre’ space to view events in the lower lawn area. |
| Large music operators require 5000-7000 to make a commercial return - UTG too small | Yes | The proposals will increase the total area of flexible events space within the gardens, supporting a wide range of potential uses. Individual operators will make commercial decisions based on the facilities available. |
| Address flooding lower green space to facilitate better use for events | Yes | The proposals will include a comprehensive drainage strategy in order to minimise potential for flooding. Additionally, the potential for a reinforcing structure to be incorporated into the lawn in order to minimise damage during events use will be explored. |
| Issue of drainage post events – drainage very important for new frequency | Yes | As above. |
| Drainage for hard surfaces | Yes | As above. |
| Cover for a temporary structure would be required – tented structures of right quality/storage/ ease of use are key | Yes | The gardens will be able to accommodate temporary structures to support events. |
| Proposals for UTG need to deliver something ‘transformational’ | Yes | The proposals aim to deliver a careful balance between delivering ‘transformational’ change whilst preserving the unique green space qualities and heritage assets of the gardens. The elevated walkways and central light sculpture introduce bold new features while the retention and repair of existing features such as monuments, balustrades, stairs, Victorian toilets, etc. celebrate the history of the gardens. |
| Previous idea for ‘Louvre’ Pyramid – raising gardens and housing meeting space and mini conference centre below | No | Raising of the gardens do not form part of the proposals. |
| Recognition UTG needs a key attraction e.g. water feature to create a destination ‘event’ in the gardens | Yes | Formal water features will be a feature of the gardens. The proposals also include a sculptural lighting feature over the main lawn to create a further destination feature. |

| Stakeholder Consultation comments | Reflected In Proposals | Consideration of comments in the proposals |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| Adult Outdoor gym | Yes | Formal exercise equipment is not being proposed, however, the main lawn is a flexible space and may be used for fitness activities such as yoga, pilates, etc. and the range of different paths and routes through the gardens may be used as part of a route by runners, walkers, etc. |
| New Coffee Pavilion | Yes | Three new pavilions are proposed within the gardens with food and drink opportunities being supported by the business case. |
| New pavilion tourist centre | Yes | Tourist information has recently invested elsewhere within the city centre with an “iCentre” located on Union Street. It is not envisioned that there would be additional requirement within the gardens. |
| Link inter-activities | Yes | The proposed amenities and facilities are connected by easily accessible footways throughout the gardens |
| Play and Family uses very important | Yes | There will be a range of new facilities within the gardens providing interest for the whole family. Opportunities for both formal and informal play will be incorporated throughout the gardens, catering to a wide range of ages and abilities. |
| Too many ideas/uses – insufficient = dead space | No | A comprehensive business plan is being developed to support the proposals and ensure long term financial viability of the gardens. |
| <i>Improving the quality of the greenspace</i> | | |
| Landscape; Management of vegetation required e.g. crown lifting/ thinning trees | Yes | The majority of existing trees will be retained and managed, also supplemented with new specimens, to ensure mature trees remain characteristic of the gardens well into the future. Some trees will however be removed due to being in poor health or of low quality and a small number will be removed to improve the overall aesthetic appeal and usability of the gardens. More generally, planting within the gardens will be given a complete overhaul as part of the proposals and will include species rich perennials and native wildflowers along with more formal areas of planting. A comprehensive, long-term landscape maintenance regime will be implemented as part of the proposals. |
| Mature trees key part of existing character/ asset to gardens/ city centre | Yes | As above. |
| Trees are important for environmental quality | Yes | As above. |
| Careful management of trees – open space but keep value for nature | Yes | As above. |
| Remove trees to create open spaces | Yes | As above. |
| Long term management and maintenance plan and associated budget provision essential | Yes | As above. |
| Improve greenspace (planting heritage, sensory planting) | Yes | As above. |

| Stakeholder Consultation comments | Reflected In Proposals | Consideration of comments in the proposals |
|--|-------------------------------|--|
| Consider planting heritage i.e. roses to be included within gardens | Yes | As above. |
| Vegetation in need of some management | Yes | As above. |
| High quality of the green space | Yes | As above. |
| Aspiration for Floral and Arboretum aspect to be enhanced: Butchart Gardens, Vancouver – referenced as a good example of a flora/arboretum | Yes | As above. |
| Municipal planting is a key existing strength for ACC | Yes | As above. |
| People want the gardens to be for them. Prior concerns around ‘privatisation’ of UTG/ removal of greenspace | Yes | The proposals maintain the gardens fully within public ownership and preserve green space within the heart of the city. |
| Inclusion of ‘quiet space’ important | Yes | There will be a range of new spaces created within the gardens including both busy and active as well as quieter areas away from the hustle and bustle of the surrounding city. |
| Informal play/ learning - Beastie garden/ wormery/mud/sand water/ digging all popular for children play & learning | Yes | Opportunities for incidental play and learning will be incorporated throughout the gardens and the provision of artificial habitats such as bird and bat boxes, bug hotels, etc. will be implemented as part of the Biodiversity Enhancement Plan. |
| Formal play - Cradle swings are popular but not ‘wheelchair’ swings and a slide – not accessed by steps would be great | Yes | Play equipment suitable for a range of abilities will be included within the gardens. |
| Plan useable space well – maximise use of sunny areas | Yes | The proposals take full account of environmental conditions within the gardens. |
| Drainage is an issue in UTG – re-profiling may alleviate | Yes | The proposals will include a comprehensive drainage strategy in order to minimise potential for flooding. |
| The garden is local residents ‘garden in the city – this is my garden’. Residents should be given a facility they want to use | Yes | The proposals will create a range of new facilities, accessible by all, within the gardens providing facilities for events, play, community growing, education and new places to eat and drink. Extensive stakeholder and public consultation has been undertaken to inform the proposals and ensure they reflect the wishes of the local community. |
| Upkeep of gardens part funded by operators | Yes | It is envisaged that revenue from park events and building operators would be used in part to fund ongoing maintenance and management of the gardens. |
| Maintenance of the water feature | Yes | Water features will be designed to be low maintenance with provision for the first five years maintenance is built into the construction cost plan for the proposals. |

| Stakeholder Consultation comments | Reflected In Proposals | Consideration of comments in the proposals |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Conflict arboretum / community garden | Yes | These two areas are physically distinct from one another, separated by both a fence and notable change in level. |
| Appropriate use of the community garden and sensory planting | Yes | Basic facilities will be provided (including water and electricity) as part of the proposed works although ultimately the content and use of this asset will be determined by the community groups taking ownership. |
| Community garden limited due to shading and position | No | The community garden area enjoys a relatively open south-easterly aspect which provides sufficient sunlight for a wide range of plants to thrive. Some trees that overhang the western boundary of this area will be removed as part of the proposals which will further help light levels. The position of this asset allows it to be segregated and secured from the wider public gardens. |
| Accommodation of 'wildlife corridor,' variety of flora and fauna, community garden | Yes | The proposals incorporate recommendations of the Biodiversity Enhancement Plan and create a range of new habitats and wildlife corridors to enhance those already found within the gardens. |
| Retain railway habitat | Yes | As above. |

Union Terrace Gardens – Additional comments from the Public Consultation (refer to section 10 of *Aberdeen City Council: Union Terrace Gardens Public Engagement Report*, January 2017)

| Other Comments provided by the public on the proposals | Reflected In Proposals | Consideration of comments in the proposals |
|--|-------------------------------|--|
| Advertising spaces | Yes | Existing advertising space within bus shelters on Union Terrace is not currently used. This facility will, however, be retained. |
| Areas for pop up bars, clubs, eateries, etc | Yes | Connection to services will be available at multiple points throughout the gardens providing opportunity for a range of pop up events. |
| Art throughout the gardens | Yes | There will be opportunities for art installations throughout the Gardens, including a central lighting sculpture above the main lawn and within the archway galleries. |
| Central artwork | Yes | A central artwork is proposed in the form of the lighting sculpture above the main lawn. |
| Community book box where people can place and take books for sitting and reading | Yes | A book box could be accommodated within the gardens subject to agreement on ownership and ongoing upkeep with interested community groups. |
| Cycling facilities, including bike storage and rent-a-bike | Yes | The proposals cater for leisure cyclists and cycle parking will be incorporated within the gardens. 'Rent-a-bike' does not form part of the current proposals however a cycle hire scheme may be implemented in the future as part of the city centre masterplan project IN04. |
| Dog park and water fountain for dogs | No | There will not be a dedicated dog park however the gardens will be dog friendly. |
| Drone racing | No | This is unlikely to be feasible due to legal and public safety reasons. |
| Free wifi hotspots | Yes | This does not form part of the current proposals although may be implemented in the future as part of the city centre masterplan project IN11. |
| Ice skating in the winter | Yes | The gardens will provide a range of flexible event spaces which will include areas suitable for a temporary winter ice rink. |
| Indoor play area | Yes | There will be a range of formal and incidental opportunities for play within the gardens although no provision for indoor play has been made within the proposals. There may be opportunity for some exterior play elements to include shelter. |
| Means of preventing skateboarding and cycling on walkways | Yes | The inclusive design of the park will allow for a range of concurrent uses. Walkways are sized to accommodate use by both pedestrians and leisure cyclists. |
| Orchard | Yes | There is opportunity for orchard planting to form part of the area identified for use as a community garden. |
| Orienteering or obstacle courses | Yes | These will not form a permanent feature within the park however the flexible design of the gardens allows the opportunity for temporary events subject to appropriate consents. |
| Paddling pool | No | A paddling pool does not form part of the current proposals although it is intended water features are incorporated, providing opportunity for incidental water play. |
| Paintball events | No | This is unlikely to be feasible due to legal and public safety reasons. |

| Other Comments provided by the public on the proposals | Reflected In Proposals | Consideration of comments in the proposals |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Reinstating Schoolhill railway station | N/A | The reinstating of the railway station does not form part of this project brief. |
| Reintroduce garden draughts | Yes | It is intended that this feature be incorporated within the reimagined gardens. |
| Rooftop café | Yes | The design of buildings proposed within the gardens, including café/bar/restaurant use, incorporate roof terraces. |
| Small animal petting zoo | No | The gardens would provided limited potential space for this kind of enterprise. |
| Sports and fitness facilities | Yes | No specific facilities are proposed, however, the paths and walkways would be suitable for runners. The main lawn is a flexible space and may be used for fitness activities such as bootcamp, yoga, pilates, etc. |
| Tourist information | Yes | One of the three proposed buildings may be able to accommodate a tourist information centre if deemed appropriate. |
| Treehouses | No | Treehouses are not being proposed however the proposed elevated walkways will give the experience of being within the trees. |
| Workshops for gaming | Yes | The proposals include a range of flexible spaces that may be able to cater to this use. |
| Zipwire from the roof of HMT to the gardens | No | This is unlikely to be feasible due to legal and public safety reasons. |

^A Sovereign House

158 West Regent Street
Glasgow G2 4RL

^T +44 (0) 1412 229 780

^F +44 (0) 1412 229 789

^W www.lda-design.co.uk

LDA Design Consulting Ltd
Registered No: 09312403
17 Minster Precincts, Peterborough PE1 1XX