

[Redacted]

From: Allison Carrington [Redacted]
Sent: 09 May 2018 09:07
To: Tom Walsh
Subject: RE: Notes from today's Regional Economic Strategy Group Meeting

Tom

Sorry for the confusion – I meant I am agreeing with point 4.13:

'4.13. The preferred option looks to be more explicit about the need to avoid high footfall generating uses locating near the AWPR's junctions and make it clear that any such development should only come through the full and open development plan process. This allows us to consider proposals in a strategic perspective whilst enabling detailed options to be tested in an open way through the LDP process. It provides a clear policy position for speculative applications. '

Rather than point 4.14 which leaves

'decisions on individual proposals to be considered through Local Development Plans without any strategic direction from the SDP'

Hope that makes sense

Allison

Dr Allison Carrington

[Redacted]

From: Tom Walsh [Redacted]
Sent: 08 May 2018 17:43
To: Allison Carrington [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Notes from today's Regional Economic Strategy Group Meeting

Hi Alison,

I was wondering if you could clarify one of the points in your response.

"Point 4:13 – I prefer the preferred option of ensuring planning applications around the AWPR go through the full and open development process and are not considered via local development plans."

I assume by agreeing with the preferred option you does want new development at the AWPR to be considered through the LDPs – could you confirm this please?

I'm chasing up the 3,300 CRD jobs figure and will get back to you when I've an answer.

Tom

From: Allison Carrington [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 May 2018 16:22
To: Tom Walsh [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Notes from today's Regional Economic Strategy Group Meeting

Tom

Thanks for forwarding this on again. Re comments / feedback:

I agree with the point [REDACTED] made at the RES Group meeting around Peterhead and the need for better transport links if this area is to be encouraged to grow and is to be a focus of regeneration activity (point 4:19).

Also - has consideration been given to rail links to the west - Westhill and Banchory?

Point 4:13 – I prefer the preferred option of ensuring planning applications around the AWPR go through the full and open development process and are not considered via local development plans.

Challenges and Opportunities: While I do agree that we need an optimistic economic outlook in the plan I think care should also be taken to create a realistic picture which includes the need to diversify the economy in order for the region to remain successful and competitive

5.4 The lower wages and house prices may serve to make the area more attractive for business growth but the extremely high business rates will not.

“5.5 It has been estimated that 3,300 jobs will be created over the next decade on the back of the City Region Deal.” This suggests a growth in the number of jobs over the coming decade – are these totally new roles or are some/many of these through replacement demand in current roles?

5.6 – you mention decommissioning is projected to be worth approx. £47 bn over the period to 2050 – is there an indication of how much of this work is likely to come to the NE?

5.11 yes – I agree that we should defer the release of safeguarded employment land until after 2030 and look at re-energising existing employment areas for future use?

5:19 You make a commitment to increase broadband speeds in certain areas but do not say to what level.

There is a considerable drive to build more new housing. Has consideration been given to including ways of generating renewable energy alongside this – solar panels/individual windmills etc on each new house/building site?

All the best

Allison

Dr Allison Carrington
[REDACTED]

From: Tom Walsh [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 April 2018 17:49

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Notes from today's Regional Economic Strategy Group Meeting

All,

Attached is the consultation submission form for the MIR. All feedback is welcome and the consultation closes on the 21 May.

Thanks for the opportunity to present and the initial feedback.

Tom

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 April 2018 17:02

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Notes from today's Regional Economic Strategy Group Meeting

All

Attached note of today's meeting, along with copy of the SDPA draft (we won't embed them in Agenda's from now on) and also latest version of the RES action plan so you can email [REDACTED] by Thursday this week with an additions/word changes. << File: 2018 04 30 Note of RES Regional Economic Strategy Group meeting.docx >> << File: RES action plan update - v6.xlsx >> << File: SDPA Main Issues Report January 2018.pdf >>

Regards
[REDACTED]

This e-mail may contain privileged information intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. If you have received this e-mail in error, please accept our apologies and notify the sender,

deleting the e-mail afterwards. Any views or opinions presented are solely those of the e-mail's author and do not necessarily represent those of Aberdeenshire Council. www.aberdeenshire.gov.uk Dh'fhaodadh fiosrachadh sochaire, a tha a-mhàin airson an neach gu bheil am post-dealain air a chur, a bhith an seo. Ma tha thu air am post-dealain fhaighinn mar mhearachd, gabh ar leisgeul agus cuir fios chun an neach a chuir am post-dealain agus dubh às am post-dealain an dèidh sin. 'S e beachdan an neach a chuir am post-dealain a tha ann an gin sam bith a thèid a chur an cèill agus chan eil e a' ciallachadh gu bheil iad a' riochdachadh beachdan Chomhairle Shiorrachd Obar Dheathain. www.aberdeenshire.gov.uk