

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 May 2018 08:50
To: Claire McArthur
Subject: FW: ACTION: Aberdeen City and Shire SDP Main Issues Report - Public Comments
Attachments: Main Issues Report Comments.pdf

From: Charlie Taylor [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 May 2018 16:18
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: ACTION: Aberdeen City and Shire SDP Main Issues Report - Public Comments

Please find attached my response to the questions posed in the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan Main Issues Report 2018.

Best regards
Charles W Taylor, MBA, BSc (Hons)
Westhill

Strategic Development Plan Review

Main Issues Report Consultation **12th March - 21st May 2018**

The Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Planning Authority are currently reviewing the Strategic Development Plan for the area. Our Development Plan Scheme outlines a timetable for the review of the Plan, and also identifies where there are opportunities to participate. It is available to view at:
<http://www.aberdeencityandshire-sdpa.gov.uk/DevelopmentPlan/DevelopmentPlanSchemes.aspx>

The **Main Issues Report** is the first formal stage in the review process – it describes and invites discussion on options for future policies, as well as employment and housing land targets for the next Plan. No settled view on the content of the next Strategic Development Plan has yet been reached, making the Main Issues Report the key stage for public consultation. Giving us your views will help to shape the future strategy for development and the policies by which future planning applications are determined.

You can view a copy of the Main Issues Report on our website at:
<http://www.aberdeencityandshire-sdpa.gov.uk/CurrentWork/CurrentConsultations.aspx>

Copies are also available to view at all Council Offices and Libraries within the Strategic Development Plan Area.

A series of accompanying documents, including an Interim Environmental Report, Monitoring Statement, Housing Needs and Demand Assessment and Interim Cumulative Transport Appraisal can also be viewed on our website (by following the above link).

How to Respond

The Main Issues Report contains a series of issues and questions on which we would like to hear your views. Please use this form to respond to these, or any other issues raised by the Main Issues Report or any other accompanying documents.

Consultation Responses must be received by 12pm on Monday 21st May 2018

You can make your views heard in a number of ways:

- **By Post - please return a completed version of this form to:**
Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Planning Authority, Woodhill House, Westburn Road, Aberdeen, AB16 5GB
- **By Email - please return a completed version of this form to:**
team@aberdeencityandshire-sdpa.gov.uk
If you choose to fill out our online Word form, please be aware that you must download the form and save any changes before submission.

Letters and emails which do not make use of this form will also be accepted, however please make sure include your name, address, telephone number and email address (if applicable), as well as the details of anyone you are representing, if you would like us to be able to contact you with any queries on your submission.

Using your Personal Information

Information you supply to the Strategic Development Planning Authority (SDPA) by responding to this consultation will be used to prepare the next Strategic Development Plan for the area. The SDPA will not share the personal information provided in response to this consultation with other parties or organisations. The SDPA will not disclose any contact information about you to any organisation or person unless it is authorised or required to do so by law.

The SDPA Officers may use your contact details to contact you about the comments you have made. Your name and organisation may be published alongside your comments but contact details will not be made public. If you chose not to provide a name or contact details, your comments will still be valid but we will not be able to contact you in the future.

For further information on how your information is used, how the SDPA maintain the security of your information, and your rights to access information the SDPA holds about you, please contact: Claire McArthur, Acting Team Leader, Strategic Development Planning Authority, Woodhill House, Westburn Road, Aberdeen, AB16 5GB.

Contact Details

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Name (Mr/Mrs/Miss/Ms) | Mr Charles W Taylor |
| Organisation (if relevant) | |
| Address | [REDACTED] |
| Postcode | |
| Telephone | |
| Email | |

Please tick this box if you wish further correspondence to be directed to this address:

If you are completing this form on behalf of an organisation, group or landowner, please provide their details below.

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Name (Mr/Mrs/Miss/Ms) | |
| Organisation (if relevant) | |
| Address | |
| Postcode | |
| Telephone | |
| Email | |

If you wish to be added to the SDPA distribution list to be kept informed of our progress in producing the next SDP, please tick this box and provide the you wish to be added to our database (if different from above):

email

Email : _____

Your Views

Please use a separate box for each issue/question you wish to respond to. If you wish to continue on a separate sheet, please attach to the paper copy or email.

| Main Issue / Question Number: | |
|---|--|
| See attached comments on pages 1-8 which cover all questions. | |

| Main Issue / Question Number: | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| | |

| Main Issue / Question Number: | Main Issue 1 – The Vision/Q1 |
|--|------------------------------|
| Q1 – Do you agree with the updated Vision, as set out in the Preferred Option? | |
| <p>European City Region:- The updated vision sees the City and Shire as a “European city region”. No explanation is provided as to what is meant by “European”. If it simply relates to a city region geographically located within Europe then it is a somewhat redundant use of the word; it is equally a “world city region” as well as a British Isles’ or Scottish city region. A more logical reason for including the word is that the city region ranks highly and is somehow important in a European context (economically, culturally, sporting, etc.).</p> | |
| <p>The Introduction to the Main Issues Report choses to highlight that “both Aberdeen City and Aberdeenshire are in the top 10 places to live in Scotland for quality of life”. That is hardly significant in a European context or even a UK context (Aberdeenshire certainly ranks highly in a UK context but this hasn’t been highlighted in the report). The report’s authors appear to be stuck in a Scottish paradigm and failing to meet its own Vision. So how relevant is the term European in the Vision?</p> | |
| <p>For many years Aberdeen has self-styled itself as the European Oil Capital or, more recently, European Energy Capital. That places the region in a European context. However, the oil majors and energy companies have their UK (and in some cases world) headquarters in London; the major UKCS offshore structures were project managed and engineered in London; oil and energy trading is largely based in the financial capitals of Europe (including London). It is therefore difficult to see how Aberdeen can correctly claim to be the UK capital of energy let alone Europe’s. Certainly with respect to the operation and maintenance of offshore fields in the UKCS (and to some extent Norway) it is a European leader but is that enough for the claim?</p> | |
| <p>The offshore oil industry based in Aberdeen is in natural decline due to the maturity of the basin. This is recognised in the SDP work. Globally BP, in its Energy Outlook for 2018, has identified “peak oil” demand in the mid 2030s with declines by the 2040s (due to change in source of energy for transport). The recent UKCS Workforce Dynamics Review by OPITO sees the North Sea workforce shrinking from 170,000 to 130,000 (24% decline) over the next 20 years. So a claim to be European Oil or Energy Capital will have significantly less importance on the European stage by the mid 2030s.</p> | |
| <p>So the question arises if other economic/civic areas place Aberdeen City and Shire in, say, the top 50 European city regions.</p> | |
| <p>Culturally this is not the case. The world class regional talent (e.g. Annie Lennox, Evelyn Glennie, Emeli Sandé) have to go elsewhere in the UK to develop their talent and succeed in their careers. The demise of the International Youth Festival removes the one major international cultural event. The quantity and quality of other cultural events are typical of a regional UK town/city and certainly not of a European city standard (Berlin Philharmonic, Vienna State Opera, Milan Opera, Edinburgh Festival, etc.).</p> | |
| <p>The difficulty in getting public contributions (individuals and organisations) to the finance for the expansion of the Aberdeen Art Gallery highlights a lack of interest in culture within the region. The opening of the V&A museum in Dundee highlights how Aberdeen lags behind within Scotland let alone Europe. Aberdeen therefore has little if any cultural impact on a European scale.</p> | |
| <p>On a sporting level our world class athletes (e.g. Katherine Grainger, Tim Baillie, Neil Fachie) also have to go elsewhere to train and compete. Aberdeen Football Club are the second best team in Scotland yet struggle against the minnows of Europe. The club have publically stated that they have difficulty in attracting talent to the club as players prefer to live in the central belt. Aberdeen is seen as remote and distant.</p> | |
| <p>In the sporting arena Aberdeen City and Shire is therefore not a European city region.</p> | |
| <p>In terms of perception by others it is highly unlikely people living in continental Europe perceive any UK city as being “European” post Brexit. They are therefore unlikely to view Aberdeen City and Shire as a “European city region”.</p> | |
| <p>A Vision has to be progressive and ambitious. It must encourage people to strive to achieve the Vision. It must be uplifting. But it must also be realistic. People must have a belief that the Vision is achievable and within</p> | |

reach. That believe must be self-evident and not caused by Groupthink. I would argue that Aberdeen City and Shire being significant on a European scale is not realistic. Europe stretches from the Arctic circle to Gibraltar, Malta and Cypress in the South and from Iceland in the West to the Urals in the East. That is too large for the region to impact. It is the difference in shooting for the stars and shooting for the moon. Both are ambitious but only shooting for the moon is realistic.

So what is a more realistic ambition? Options include;

1. Significant North Sea coastal city region
2. Significant Northern North Sea coastal city region
3. Significant UK city region
4. Top Scottish city region

My own preference would be for either 1 or 2 as it retains an outward looking ambition post Brexit and reflects regional needs (food and technology exports into Europe via mainland European ports)

Knowledge Economy:- The new vision states an aim to be recognised for “our enterprise and inventiveness in the knowledge economy”. The term “knowledge economy” first appeared in the 1960s and came to prominence in the 1990s with the surge of the internet and world wide web. It is not a term that is heard much nowadays in the popular media (TV, Radio and internet news). We are more likely to hear the terms Social Media, Technology and AI. So the question I would ask for a Vision of the next 20+ years is: Is the use of term “knowledge economy” suitably current and forward looking to describe what is being aimed at?

Environmental protection/enhancement:- I have concerns regarding a lack of prominence in the Vision for environmental protection/enhancement.

The Vision talks about being a “sustainable European city region”; it mentions “unique qualities of our environment”; it talks about “development being sustainable” and “dealing with climate change”. Much of this hinges on what is understood by the term “sustainable” or, hopefully, more precisely, “sustainable development”. I would argue that it is unlikely that many people reading the Vision will know what “sustainable development” actually means, and those who do will argue till the end of time as to what precisely it means and how to achieve it. I am particularly concerned that developers won’t understand it or chose to ignore it. There is a need, I believe, for more precise language and relevant goals/aims to be articulated.

The specific mention of climate change, whilst understandable, is likely to have the effect of a concentration on this issue at the cost of all others. For example; the climate change agenda resulted in Governments concentrating on CO₂ reduction which in turn resulted in a push to reduce the number of petrol driven cars and an increase in diesels. Whilst this has reduced CO₂ emissions it has led to an increase in emission of other noxious substances with a resulting negative impact on local air quality and, it is reported, 1,000s of unnecessary, additional deaths in the UK. So as well as climate change we need to be cognisant of local air conditions (Wellington Road in Aberdeen for example) within the development planning. This is particularly important given the large increase in vehicle journeys predicted in the Cumulative Transport Appraisal.

It is also worth mentioning that a single TV programme seems to have woken up the entire world to the issue of discarded plastics. A tsunami of announcements has been made by governmental and commercial organisations about banning or reducing single use plastics. Yet the 1,000s of deaths from air pollution does not appear to have triggered a similar response. The plastics issue may, of course, be a “low hanging fruit” in comparison to vehicle emissions but it does highlight the issue of environmental protection/enhancement is vast and difficult to manage.

Public Safety:- There is no mention in the Vision of Public Safety. This is a major missing.

Dame Judith Hackitt’s report on the review of building regulations has just been published. It highlights;

- ignorance of regulations and guidance,
- indifference resulting in the primary motivation being to do things as quickly and cheaply as possible,
- lack of clarity on roles and responsibilities
- inadequate regulatory oversight and enforcement tools

Dame Judith concludes “The above issues have helped to create a cultural issue across the sector, which can be described as a ‘race to the bottom’ caused either through ignorance, indifference, or because the system does not facilitate good practice. There is insufficient focus on delivering the best quality building possible, in order to ensure that residents are safe, and feel safe.”

Whilst Dame Judith’s report deals with design, construction and maintenance of buildings there is, of course, a step before building which is the choice of location for buildings, and, in particular, their relationship to natural and man-made hazards. Dame Judith’s findings are likely to apply equally, and possibly more so, to this phase of the development process.

The SDP Main Issues Report includes a section on Flood Risk, one of the natural hazards. But within the city and shire we also have a range of man-made hazards and it is not clear that they are adequately addressed within the strategic and local planning processes. These man-made hazards include;

- A number of major accident hazard sites and pipelines (e.g. St Fergus gas terminal, Cruden Bay pumping station, Forties pipeline, St Fergus-Mossmoran NGL pipeline, etc.,)
- Dyce Airport and associated flight paths (both for fixed wing and helicopters)
- Railway lines
- Heavily used urban and town roads and streets
- Tortuous country roads
- Etc.,

It is not clear that the various planning processes adequately deal with these hazards. The recent crack in the Forties pipeline at Netherley highlights the risks we run. A 300m exclusion zone had to be instigated resulting in families being moved from homes. If that had happened in, say, Westhill or Dyce, the businesses located adjacent to the pipeline would likely be out of business due to the business disruption (I suspect few will have adequate business recovery plans). And that ignores the scenario that the escaping pipeline contents catch fire with resultant fatalities.

Review of recent planning applications near to the Forties pipeline has highlighted issues including ignorance and indifference by developers and lack of competence by the planning authority in using the Health and Safety Executive’s guidelines. Dame Judith’s findings clearly exist within the development community as well as with the building industry.

The North East has been dominated over many decades by the oil and gas industry. This industry has a very strong safety focus, particularly related to managing major accident hazard risk (fires, explosions, structural collapse, etc.). This focus has been driven by a number of major disasters. It is incumbent on the local authorities to learn from, and emulate, the culture and practices of its predominant wealth creator.

I strongly believe that public safety needs to be raised higher in the development agenda as part of the culture change sought by Dame Judith and that needs to start by being clearly articulated in the SDP Vision for the region.

| | |
|---|---|
| Main Issue / Question Number: | Main Issue 2 – The Spatial Strategy/Q2 |
| Q2 – Do you agree with the Preferred Option that the existing spatial strategy, in general terms, remains fit for purpose and should be carried forward? | |
| <p>I agree that the existing spatial strategy is currently appropriate and should be carried forward, in general.</p> <p>Western expansion (via the A944 and A93) is not currently acceptable due to a large number of constraints. The Main Issues Report highlights transportation issues and it would appear, for Westhill at least, the AWPR makes the situation worse rather than better (or perhaps more accurately moves the problems to different locations along the A944). Until clear and reasonable solutions are found for these constraints development should continue along the corridors already identified and within the city.</p> <p>The completion of the AWPR establishes a new natural boundary between the city and the shire, namely, the centreline of the dual carriageway. It is unlikely that there will be political agreement to change the political boundary to this centreline but I would recommend that the SDP updates the city strategic growth area so as to be restricted to <u>inboard</u> of the AWPR. It provides a clear, natural boundary between city and shire, between built up area and countryside and helps with a clear and consistent understanding by developers and residents.</p> | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Main Issue / Question Number: | Main Issue 3 – Aberdeen Western Peripheral Route/Q3 |
| Q3 – Do you agree with the Preferred Option that the new plan should protect the junctions of the Aberdeen Western Peripheral Route from inappropriate speculative development? | |
| <p>The original design premise of the AWPR, to move traffic around Aberdeen and hence help city congestion, city centre pollution and help existing businesses reach markets quicker, should be protected. Hence no development should be allowed near to junctions which negatively impact on the original design premise.</p> <p>The predicted congestion at the A944/AWPR junction highlights that even the current design is unsuitable for the current situation. The proposal to build the new football stadium close to this junction will only exacerbate the congestion. The AWPR and the A944 junction were used by Aberdeen FC to justify their choice of location suggesting it would help fans get to the site (presumably by car). Hence it would appear that such locations are attractive to developers. This should be resisted strenuously to protect the AWPR and the legitimate traffic that wishes to use it to by-pass Aberdeen City.</p> <p>I therefore agree with the preferred option as the option to go forward.</p> | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Main Issue / Question Number: | Main Issue 4 – Regeneration Priorities/Q4 |
| Q4 – Do you agree that the Preferred Option for the new plan should focus on the towns of Banff, Macduff, Fraserburgh and Peterhead for regeneration? | |
| <p>There is no information, data or analysis available to make any meaningful comment on the preferred option of concentrating on Banff, MacDuff, Fraserburgh and Peterhead.</p> <p>The new SDP looks 20 -25 years ahead. It is unlikely that regeneration of these 4 towns will need to last for that period of time (if it does then the regeneration plans will have failed). It is also likely that other, inland, towns may experience difficulties over this timeframe requiring a change in focus. Long term trends affecting such towns include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long term decline in oil industry affecting employment, population, house prices, location of preferred housing (particularly towns near to Aberdeen) • Changing retail trends affecting shopping/footfall in town centres and old retail parks <p>Regeneration in Aberdeenshire will need to remain flexible to anticipate and react to such changes. Priority may have to shift from the north coast towns to others.</p> | |

| | |
|--|--|
| Main Issue / Question Number: | Main Issue 5 – Economic Growth/Q5 |
| Q5 – Do you agree that we should present an optimistic view of future economic growth in the new plan? | |
| I agree with the position set out in paragraph 5.8 of the Main Issues Report. It is essential that the SDP sets out an optimistic future and contributes, positively to achieving that future. This means strenuous efforts to make up for the long term decline in the oil industry as well as meeting reasonable growth for the area to provide employment opportunities for young people in the area who wish to stay here. | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Main Issue / Question Number: | Main Issue 6 – Employment Land/Q6 |
| Q6 – Do you agree with the Preferred Option that the new plan should delay releasing safeguarded employment land until after 2030 and look at improving existing employment areas for future use? | |
| I agree with the Preferred Option as presented. Westhill, for example, has a large amount of land, with planning permission, where no building has occurred for years due to the current lack of demand. This land should be used up before allowing release of new land. | |
| We have been lucky in that some empty buildings have been taken over, for whatever reason, by companies moving from their existing premise (Total taking over some Subsea 7 properties being the prime example). We are also currently seeing companies refurbishing old industrial units to try and improve their leasing potential. This highlights the reuse/regeneration potential that exists in and around Aberdeen and confirms the SDP proposals. | |

| | |
|--|--|
| Main Issue / Question Number: | Main Issue 7 – Tourist Development/Q7 |
| Q7 – Do you agree with the Preferred Option that the new plan should take a stronger and more flexible approach to long-term tourist development? | |
| Section 5.17 of the Main Issues Report is very unclear. There appears to be a number of hidden messages and an attempt to hide a critical, negative message. Tourism development has the difficult task of balancing the economic benefits from tourists and the costs of destruction to existing natural environment (land loss, habitat destruction, local pollution, spoilt views, etc.). I assume this is what section 5.17 is trying to say. | |
| I am not convinced that the planning system should be “sympathetic” to tourism proposals. This will lead to the destruction of environmental gems as has happened with the Trump International golf course at Menie. Continued destruction of the natural environment will lead to a loss of the reason for tourists to come to the area in the first place. The planning system should contain a balanced approach to all planning applications, including tourism proposals. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Main Issue / Question Number: | Support Sustainable Economic Growth/Q8 |
| Q8 – Is there anything more the planning system should do to support sustainable economic growth? | |
| The key word in this question is “sustainable” (see answer to Q1 above). It would help the planning system if SDPs and LDPs provide a very precise, clear definition of “sustainable development” and include examples of developments deemed to be sustainable and examples deemed not sustainable (including reasons why). This will greatly help all those involved in the planning process (politicians, planners, developers, consultees, the public). | |

| | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| Main Issue / Question Number: | Digital infrastructure/Q9 |
| Q9 – Is there anything more that the planning system can do to help improve mobile data coverage and ultrafast broadband? | |
| I'm not sure that this is a planning issue per se. It appears to be purely financial (who pays for it). The demand is clearly not there to pay for it (otherwise the companies would be doing it) hence the need for public money. It is therefore difficult to identify what else the planning system can do to improve the situation. Planning applications for wireless masts appear to go through without problems. | |

| | |
|--|---|
| Main Issue / Question Number: | Main Issue 8 – Housing Supply Target/Q10 |
| Q10 – Do you agree that the housing supply target should be based on a composite scenario rather than directly on any of the three scenarios identified in the Housing Need and Demand Assessment? | |
| Figure 3 in the Main Issues Report highlights the high variability in housebuilding in the region over the years. But it also shows a long term decline in house building from above 2500pa in the '80s to c2000pa in the mid-2010s. It is not clear from the analysis within the HNDA whether this decline reflects long term decline in demand or relates to a declining ability of the industry to deliver the number of homes required (for example due to a concentration on building larger, detached 4-5 bedroom "executive" houses compared with earlier concentration on semi-detached 3 bedroom properties). | |
| The long term decline of the North Sea oil industry (irrespective of realistic oil price movements) and implications of Brexit on EU immigration to the area are significant downward pressures on population within the North East of Scotland. The very latest available population figures (2015/16) within the HNDA document shows depopulation in both the city and shire primarily caused by the recent downward trend in oil industry activity. This can be expected longer term if nothing else changes, irrespective of oil price recovery. Can new industry sectors and businesses make up for this falling job demand <u>and</u> match the growth expected in more balanced economic areas of Scotland? | |
| In the real world there is little difference between targets of 1950pa, 2100 pa and 2200 pa (max c13% difference). As shown in the text of the Main Issues Report Section 6, actual builds over a 6 year period were 2,769 less than the SDP target of 14,202 (c19%). The difference between targets of 1950pa and 2200pa is thus within the error range of the markets current likelihood to match SDP targets. This makes the concept of varying target rates over different phases of the total plan period largely irrelevant and academic. | |
| The composite scenario should be simplified to, say 2000pa for the whole period out to 2030. Beyond 2030 becomes pure speculation. A higher rate may be useful to ensure land is allocated and available when required. So a rise to, say 2300pa, would be appropriate (a figure of 2340pa is simply too precise given the vast uncertainties in forecasts that far out). | |

| | |
|--|--|
| Main Issue / Question Number: | Main Issue 9 - Affordable Housing/Q11 |
| Q11 – Do you agree that we should assume continued funding for affordable housing at 2020/2021 levels from the Scottish Government for the whole of the next plan period? | |
| There does not appear to be any evidence that the funding will continue after the current Scottish Parliament. This would appear to apply equally to a returned SNP Government let alone a Government of another party(s). | |
| It is easy to understand why the Preferred Option is to assume continuation of this funding level. It avoids difficult choices and provides someone to blame should the funding reduce/disappear in the future. | |
| Alternative mechanisms therefore need to be established to provide the affordable housing requirement. You have to build your own future and not rely on others. | |

| | |
|--|---|
| Main Issue / Question Number: | Main Issue 10 – Housing Land Requirement/Q12 |
| Q12 – Do you agree that significant generosity should be included in the early years of the plan but, for the later periods, no generosity should be added? This would be subject to review in future plans. | |
| I agree that the 20% generosity should be added for the period up to 2030 and reduced to zero for years thereafter. Keeping this position under review provides the flexibility sought within the plan. | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Main Issue / Question Number: | Main Issue 11 – Housing Land Allowances/Q13 |
| Q13 – Do you agree that our Preferred Option should allow Local Development Plans to make some further housing allocations? | |
| I agree with the Preferred Option to make further housing allocations. These can be reviewed and challenged, if necessary, through the LDP development process. | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Main Issue / Question Number: | Main Issue 11 – Housing Land Allowances/Q14 |
| Q14 – Do you agree that any new greenfield allocations should preferably be under 100 houses in size? | |
| I agree with the proposed restrictions on greenfield housing proposals. | |

| | |
|--|---|
| Main Issue / Question Number: | Main Issue 12 – Renewable Energy/Q15 |
| Q15 – Do you agree with the Preferred Option that the new plan should target generating 5 Gigawatt hours of renewable electricity and seek to diversify non-wind based generation by 2040, along with energy storage? | |
| I would support the 5 GWh target and the push for energy storage and diversification of sources. I would however caution on the approach to biomass. The Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Interim Environment Report highlights “(w)here biomass is likely to be encouraged there could be problems with air quality”. Air quality is one of the major resources of Aberdeenshire in terms of quality of life of residents and attraction to visitors. | |

| Main Issue / Question Number: | Strategic Transport Appraisal/Q16 |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| <p>Q16 – Do you agree that the next Strategic Development Plan should continue to identify regionally significant long-term transport projects and cumulative transport interventions?</p> | |
| <p>I agree with the proposal.</p> <p>A transportation issue not dealt with in the Main Issues Report is the move to electric cars which is expected to be at a large scale in the period covered by the plan (leading to “peak oil” demand in the mid 2030s according to BP).</p> <p>The Main Issues Report does not explicitly mention the region’s proposed strategic approach to the move away from petrol/diesel driven cars. The UK Government is proposing a ban (presumably on their sale) of such cars by 2040. France has similar proposals. This will mean a very significant change in fuelling infrastructure including additional electricity supply and distribution (as mentioned in the Main Issues Report). The SDP needs to address where Aberdeen city and shire wishes to be positioned in this change. Does it wish to be a Scottish leader in it’s roll out?; a UK leader?; a European leader; or a world leader? Or does it simply wish to be a follower and see what happens?</p> <p>In planning terms there are issues around charging infrastructure along roads, at public buildings, within car parks, at commercial premises, within homes, etc. Some of this will relate to planning policies (e.g. car parking policy) and building standards (e.g. new home builds) but some may require a strategic approach for infrastructure. This needs to be addressed within the SDP.</p> | |