

[Redacted]

**From:** [Redacted]  
**Sent:** 22 May 2018 08:58  
**To:** Claire McArthur  
**Subject:** FW: Strategic Development Plan Review

---

**From:** Townsley, Ann [Redacted]  
**Sent:** 21 May 2018 11:59  
**To:** [Redacted]  
**Subject:** FW: Strategic Development Plan Review

Q14 Should read  
YES I absolutely agree that any greenfield allocations should **under** 100 houses. I would prefer this to be under 10 houses.

Regards,

Ann

---

**From:** Townsley, Ann [Redacted]  
**Sent:** 21 May 2018 10:58  
**To:** [Redacted]  
**Subject:** Strategic Development Plan Review

Mrs Ann Townsley  
[Redacted]

Yes please add to distribution list

Q5- I do not agree that we should take an optimistic view of future economic growth. Even the base forecasts are in my opinion very optimistic. Putting too much land into planning blight when it will not be used has an extremely negative effect on local people and communities.

Q9 – The planning system should focus on addresses attached to enabled cabinets but too far from them. They appear in the statistics as a success, i.e. being broadband enabled, but are not. They would be relatively cheap to enable given the short distances.

Q10 – No – It is absolutely clear from Fig 3, that the need for new housing is reducing the Aberdeen area. Given the forecasts for the oil industries long term future this is likely to continue. The major sector likely to increase in the future is retirees. They will be less likely to remain in or relocate to the area if there are a vast number of houses despoiling our countryside.

Q12 – I do not agree with adding ANY generosity to the plan in the short to medium term (next 10 years) we already have multiple half finished developments spoiling our environment.

Q13 - I do not believe that we need more housing allocations, but if they are to be made they should be allocated to locations well outside Aberdeen to prevent urban sprawl into the countryside.

Q14 YES I absolutely agree that any greenfield allocations should be used 100 houses. I would prefer this to be under 10 houses.

There wasn't a question on the managing flood risk, but I believe that this is key. Housing should not be allowed in the identified areas. Particularly those that affect the River Dee due to its environmental status.

This e-mail and any attachments are intended only for the addressee. It is to be treated as confidential and may not be used other than for the purpose for which it has been sent. If you are not the addressee any use of this communication is strictly prohibited. In this case please delete it and notify the sender immediately. Any communication of a defamatory or illegal nature is contrary to company policy and outside the scope of the employment of the individual. The company will not accept liability arising in respect of such communication and the employee will be personally liable. It is the responsibility of the addressee to scan this email and any attachments for computer viruses or other defects. The sender and/or the company do not accept liability for any loss or damage of any nature, however caused, which may result directly or indirectly from this email or any file attached.