

[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 22 May 2018 08:55
To: Claire McArthur
Subject: FW: MIR Consultation Response
Attachments: 180521 MIR submission.pdf

From: Kyle Wise [Redacted]
Sent: 21 May 2018 11:36
To: [Redacted]
Cc: Paul Scott [Redacted]
Subject: MIR Consultation Response

Dear Sir / Madam,

Please find attached a consultation submission to the Aberdeen and Aberdeenshire Strategic Development Plan Main Issues Report consultation, submitted on behalf of Ashfield Land (Aberdeen) Ltd.

Please contact myself or my colleague Paul Scott (CC'd) should you have any queries over the submission. Can you also add us both to the SDPA distribution list to be kept informed of progress on the next SDP.

Can you please confirm receipt of the submission.

Kind Regards,

Kyle Wise

Kyle Wise BSc (Hons) MRTPI
Planner



Scott Hobbs Planning

[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

Registered in Scotland No. SC338885

Main Issues Report

Aberdeen and Aberdeenshire SPD

Ashfield Land (Aberdeen) Ltd

1. This submission is made on behalf of Ashfield Land (Aberdeen) Ltd ('Ashfield') and relates to allocation OP1 at Blackdog, as defined in the adopted Aberdeenshire LDP. Aberdeen and Aberdeenshire Strategic Development Planning Authority ('the SDPA') is currently inviting comments on the Aberdeen and Aberdeenshire Strategic Development Plan ('the SDP') Main Issues Report ('the MIR'), by 21 May 2018. The MIR explains that the next SDP will set a framework to develop Aberdeen City and Shire over the next 20 to 25 years.

Q1 – Do you agree with the updated Vision, as set out in the Preferred Option?

2. Ashfield agrees with the preferred option.

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?

3. Ashfield recognises that there has been widespread support for the spatial strategy as included in the SDP, and that there is no justification to depart from it in general terms. However, Ashfield is disappointed with the failure, at paragraph 4.5 of the MIR, to make reference to the most significant progress made in the delivery of major employment-generating mixed use development since the SDP was approved, at Blackdog.
4. Planning permission in principle (PPP) was granted on 7 December 2017 for: *"Mixed use development comprising town centre including regional food hall, retail, leisure and class 3 uses; business and industrial uses (classes 4, 5 and 6); alterations to access from A90 roundabout, local access, landscaping, car parking, cycle and pedestrian facilities and low carbon infrastructure"* at Blackdog. The PPP relates to the northern part of the overall OP1 allocation in the adopted LDP, and PPP for a predominantly residential development was granted in 2017 for the southern part of the overall allocation.
5. Whilst the references to Ellon, Peterhead and the Energetica Business Park are welcome in this paragraph, they are of less significance than progress made with the implementation of the Blackdog development, and this should be reflected with the appropriate degree of profile, in the next SDP.

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?

6. Ashfield agrees with the alternative option of leaving decisions on individual proposals to be considered through existing and emerging Local Development Plans without any strategic direction from the SDP. The LDPs have sufficient clarity on policy in relation to land uses sought for development in and around the junctions of the AWPR to allow decisions to be made with clarity and consistency on a case by case basis. In addition, there may be more localised reasons why certain developments are more acceptable in these locations than others, necessitating a degree of flexibility rather than imposing a SDPA-wide policy. One example was the recent approval in April 2018 by Aberdeen City Council of Aberdeen Football Club's



planning application for a Community and Sports Facilities, Football Academy, and Stadium (Application Reference: 170021/DPP), which was considered to be appropriate based on existing development plan policy.

Q5 – Do you agree that we should present an optimistic view of future economic

7. Ashfield considers that the SDP should reflect a realistic position regarding future economic growth, based on the most accurate research and data available. Adopting an overly optimistic approach risks identifying and safeguarding excessive levels of employment land which may prejudice the implementation of established supply of marketable land in the best locations in the SDPA area.

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?

8. Ashfield agrees that land identified for the period beyond 2030 continues to be safeguarded and protected in the new Strategic Development Plan, but it is imperative that the employment land audits are updated to accurately reflect the effectiveness of the employment land included within the overall supply. It is clear that there are some significant doubts over the marketability of some of the land included in the overall supply and this is not currently reflected in the relevant employment land audit.