

## Response ID ANON-B3JU-DSWB-4

Submitted to **Local Development Plan Main Issues Report 2019 Consultation**  
Submitted on **2019-04-08 13:23:28**

### About You

#### What is your name?

**Name:**

Dr Iain Greig

#### What is your organisation?

**Organisation:**

Long-standing Kingswells Resident

**On behalf of:**

Self and, presumably, many others in Kingswells

#### How can we contact you?

**Email:**

[REDACTED]

**Telephone:**

**Address:**

[REDACTED]

## 1 Introduction

### Section 1 provides a context for the Main Issues Report Do you have any comments in relation to this section?

**Do you have any comments in relation to this section?:**

I, and probably most of the residents of Kingswells, would like to express our deep appreciation for the conclusions you have drawn regarding the bids to place large new developments around Kingswells. There will be great relief that these have been considered as "undesirable". However, residents may feel concerned that a number of these seemed to score well and only current sentiments with regard to not building on cherished green spaces, and avoidance of separate communities merging, seems to have prevented them from being approved.

A particular concern of mine is Gillahill (B03/02), for which, to quote, "The site has scored well in most of the criteria. It is generally flat with reasonable shelter and is well related to the wider Kingswells area."

This seems to ignore the fact that this site is placed up a very steep wooded slope from Kingswells (as traced by the meandering Kingswells Crescent) - the natural boundary of this side of Kingswells - and, rather than being "well-related" to Kingswells, completely breaks its logical boundaries and would overlook the village. In order to access this site, it would have been necessary, according to the development bid, to place two new roads directly off a very sharply-curved stretch of road. This is a clear safety hazard - as one who often cycles to work, I have to rely on hearing cars to know when it is safe to pull out of Wellside Road and onto Kingswells Crescent, as the line of sight is insufficient to be across the road safely otherwise. These access roads would then have cut through ancient woodland (and the line of a well-used path) and steeply up a slope prone to freezing (a noticeable cold-trap).

Residents would have been incredulous at the assertions in the developer bid that they would be "improving the current poor settlement edge through a sensitive design response to the existing landscape". This is in fact a complete fabrication - Kingswells has a settlement edge dictated by the landscape, and it is the developer who has shown precious little sensitivity in their past and current activities. The photos from the developer demonstrate this complete misrepresentation - the photo on p29 neatly emphasises the change in level between Kingswells Crescent and the site.

Should this, or the other bids around Kingswells (B03/14/15 and 21) come up again, I and Kingswells residents, would greatly appreciate an opportunity to respond and make clear how inappropriate we feel these sites are, for reasons both technical and philosophical.

## 2 Settlement Strategy

### Question 1 New Housing Sites

**Do you agree with our preferred housing sites? Are there any other sites that would be suitable for housing?:**

I do agree and am greatly relieved to see that the major developments around Kingswells have been labelled undesirable.

### Question 2 Housing Allowances Beyond 2032

**Is there a need for us to identify further Housing Allowances or sites for the period beyond 2032?:**

No

### **Question 3 Brownfield and other Opportunity Sites**

**Are there any further brownfield or other opportunity sites which would be suitable for redevelopment?:**

No - though it would seem appropriate for something to be done with the site on Lang Stracht that was to have been the Morrisons.

### **Question 4 New Healthcare Facilities**

**Do you have any comments on these sites? Are there any other sites in these areas that we should be considering?:**

No

## **3 Aberdeen City Centre and the Network of Centres**

### **Question 5 City Centre Boundary**

**Do you agree the Local Development Plan should modify its City Centre boundary to match the City Centre boundary shown in the City Centre Masterplan?:**

I am not sufficiently informed (NSI) to judge - sorry

### **Question 6 City Centre Masterplan Intervention Areas**

**Do you agree that the City Centre Masterplan intervention areas should be identified as opportunity sites within the Local Development Plan?:**

NSI

### **Question 7 City Centre Retail Core**

**Should the retail core be reduced to focus on a more compact area of Union Street and the existing shopping centres?:**

NSI

### **Question 8 Union Street Frontages**

**Should the Union Street Frontages percentages be reviewed? Do the current target percentages ensure there is a balance between a strong retail focus and allowing for other uses? What other uses should we allow on the retail core area of Union Street:**

NSI

### **Question 9 Out of Town Retailing**

**Should we direct high footfall uses to existing centres including the City Centre? Should we consider new out of town retail parks? What would the impact of these be on Union Street and the City Centre, and Aberdeen's network of centres?:**

I would not favour more out of town activities - the city centre is already under enough pressure.

### **Question 10 Commercial Leisure Uses**

**Should we continue to direct commercial leisure uses towards existing centres and the beach and leisure area?:**

Yes

### **Question 11 City Centre Living**

**How can we encourage more people to live in the City Centre? Would a document outlining the principles which need to be applied in converting a building into residential use be helpful?:**

There need to be nice places to go when there is nice weather (outdoor places to sit, eat and drink - and Union Terrace Gardens is clearly not the place.

## **MAIN ISSUE 1 Living in the City Centre**

**Should we include a policy in the Local Development Plan supporting residential development in the City Centre, including the conversion of upper and basement floors of premises to provide residential accommodation?:**

Yes

Not Answered

### **Question 12 Residential Development in the City Centre**

**Are there any other locations within the City Centre where residential accommodation could be provided?:**

No opinions

## **MAIN ISSUE 2 A 24-Hour City**

**Should 24-hour activities in Aberdeen be supported and encouraged to grow, especially in the City Centre? Could this be achieved through policy?:**

No opinions - but I cannot really see a market for this

Not Answered

### Question 13 Encouraging the Creative Arts

What can we do to support and encourage the creative sector to ensure a range of distinctive experiences so that Aberdeen City Centre is like no other place?:

No opinions at present

### Question 14 Proposals for Creative Arts

Are there other buildings or areas within Aberdeen that could accommodate the existing, and support an emerging creative sector for desk-based and studio-based artists?:

No opinions at present

### Question 15 Percent for Art

To ensure Aberdeen City Centre retains its distinctiveness, should developments with construction costs of £1 million or over be required to allocate at least 1% of construction costs for the inclusion of art projects in a publicly accessible/ visible place or places within the development?:

No opinions at present

### MAIN ISSUE 3 Support for Visitor Attractions

To support our existing visitor attractions should Aberdeen have a policy about protecting and growing visitor attractions?:

Yes, very much so

Not Answered

## 4 Quality Places

### MAIN ISSUE 4 Minimum Internal Space Standards for New Residential Development

How can we ensure that new residential development delivers an adequate amount of internal floor space for future occupants?:

No opinions

Not Answered

### Question 16 External Space Standards

Do you think that the amenity spaces currently delivered are of a sufficient quality? Should we strive for a better quality/ quantity of private/ semi-private residential amenity space across the city and refuse planning permission to proposals which do not meet our high standards? What standards would you like to see set for new dwellings, flats, and conversions in respect of quality and quantity of external amenity space?:

Yes

### Question 17 Natural Environment

Do you agree that the proposed list of policies for Natural Environment gives a clearer and more coherent structure than at present?:

No opinions - sorry, I haven't read that section, but I feel that the Natural Environment must be held as a top priority for quality of life

### Question 18 Food Growing

How can the Local Development Plan support the delivery of food growing projects in the City? Do you think food growing should be included in the next Plan by way of a new policy, or through existing policy and guidance?:

No opinions

## 5 Transport and Infrastructure

### Question 19 City Centre Parking

Should we reduce car parking in the City Centre to support the City Centre Masterplan? If so, how?:

No

### MAIN ISSUE 5 Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure

How best can we encourage the provision of infrastructure to support changes in transport technologies? :

No opinions on electric vehicles

Not Answered

### Question 20 Digital Infrastructure

Should high speed broadband be mandatory in all new residential developments with 5 or more units? Do you wish to suggest any other proposed changes to the Digital Infrastructure and Telecommunications Infrastructure policies?:

Yes

#### **Question 21 Developer Obligations and Infrastructure Delivery**

**Do we need to change our approach to securing developer obligations for future development proposals?:**

Yes - the developers seem to be able to "pave paradise and put up a parking lot" and walk away contentedly having made life worse for those who actually live in each area (e.g. destruction of road surfaces)

### **6 Resource and Business Policy**

#### **MAIN ISSUE 6 Low and Zero Carbon Generating Technologies and Water Efficiency**

**Should the requirement of existing Policy R7 be changed?:**

No opinions

Not Answered

#### **Question 22 Low and Zero Carbon Generating Technologies and Water Efficiency**

**What methodology should the Council use in calculating compliance with Policy R7, specifically how should the target of reducing carbon dioxide levels be calculated?:**

No opinions

#### **Question 23 Solar Farm Developments**

**Do you agree that Solar Farms should be supported within the Council's policy on Renewable and Low Carbon Energy developments, and should specific guidance be included within Policy R8?:**

No opinions

#### **MAIN ISSUE 7 Heat Networks**

**Should we include a policy in the Local Development Plan supporting the development of Heat Networks within the City?:**

No opinions

Not Answered

#### **Question 24 Supporting Business and Industrial Development**

**Should we carry forward our current policy approach to safeguarding existing business and industrial areas from other development pressures into the next Local Development Plan?:**

No opinions

#### **MAIN ISSUE 8 West End Office Area**

**Should the policy support a mix of uses in the West End Office Area? If so, what types?:**

No opinions

Not Answered

### **7 Affordable Housing**

#### **Question 25 Affordable Housing**

**Do you agree with the Local Development Plan's current affordable housing approach being carried forward? What other measures could the Council consider in order to assist with the delivery of affordable housing units via the Plan? Should the threshold of not applying affordable housing requirements to developments smaller than 5 units remain in place?:**

Not sufficiently informed to offer opinions

#### **Question 26 Private Rented Accommodation and Build to Rent**

**Are there ways that the Local Development Plan can facilitate Build to Rent development, through policy?:**

This is of course of vital importance but afraid I am just not able to provide any useful opinions.

### **8 Sustainable Mixed Communities**

#### **MAIN ISSUE 9 Inclusive Housing Mix (Housing for the Elderly and Accessible Housing)**

**How can the Local Development Plan ensure a greater mix of housing types is achieved in new developments?:**

Don't know

Not Answered

## **MAIN ISSUE 10 Residential Care Facilities**

**How should the Local Development Plan cater for proposals relating to Residential Care Facilities?:**

Don't know

Not Answered

## **MAIN ISSUE 11 Student Accommodation**

**How can the Local Development Plan cater to proposals relating to student accommodation?:**

Is this still a problem?

Not Answered

## **MAIN ISSUE 12 Houses in Multiple Occupation**

**How can the Local Development Plan support sustainable mixed communities, with regards to HMOs?:**

Don't know

Not Answered

**Percentage limit of HMOs in each area:**

Option 1 - Preferred Option (15%)

**Please explain why you chose your answer:**

Afraid I am not up to speed on this issue and will admit I just clicked on the first option

**Geographical boundary of each area:**

Option 1 - Preferred Option (Ward Boundaries)

**Please explain why you chose your answer:**

L kewise

**Threshold for when planning permission is required for a HMO:**

Option 1 - Preferred Option (6 or more people in a flat, 6 or more people in a house)

**Please explain why you chose your answer:**

L kewise

## **Question 27 Community Planning**

**Is there anything else that the Local Development Plan can do to support the objectives of the LOIP or the aims of Community Planning?:**

As one who has despairingly seen the decay of the once grand Union Street, I can only say that the city centre needs to be made "nice"...it really is not great and is not getting better. It will take some inspired minds to sort it out.

## **Question 28 Changing Places Toilets**

**Should large new developments that require public access provide Changing Places toilets? What types of venues should provide them?:**

Not sufficiently informed to offer opinions

## **Appendix 1 Proposed Draft New Policies**

### **Policy D2 Amenity**

**Do you have any comments on the policy?:**

No comments

### **Policy D5 Advertisements and Signage**

**Do you have any comments on the policy?:**

No

### **Policy D8 Shopfronts**

**Do you have any comments on the policy?:**

No

### **Policy D9 Windows and Doors**

**Do you have any comments on the policy?:**

No

**Policy H4 Housing Mix and Housing for Particular Needs**

**Do you have any comments on the policy?:**

No

**Policy H8 Residential Care Facilities**

**Do you have any comments on the policy?:**

No

**Policy H9 Student Accommodation Developments**

**Do you have any comments on the policy?:**

No

**Policy H10 Houses in Multiple Occupation**

**Do you have any comments on the policy?:**

No

**Policy NC9 City Centre Living**

**Do you have any comments on the policy?:**

No

**Policy NC10 24-hour City**

**Do you have any comments on the policy?:**

No

**Policy NC11 Visitor Attractions and Facilities**

**Do you have any comments on the policy?:**

No

**Policy NC12 Public Art Contribution**

**Do you have any comments on the policy?:**

No

**Additional Documents**

**Please include comments on other documents below:**

**Please include comments on other documents below::**

Repeat of comment of development bid assessments:

I, and probably most of the residents of Kingswells, would like to express our deep appreciation for the conclusions you have drawn regarding the bids to place large new developments around Kingswells. There will be great relief that these have been considered as "undesirable". However, residents may feel concerned that a number of these seemed to score well and only current sentiments with regard to not building on cherished green spaces, and avoidance of separate communities merging, seems to have prevented them from being approved.

A particular concern of mine is Gillahill (B03/02), for which, to quote, "The site has scored well in most of the criteria. It is generally flat with reasonable shelter and is well related to the wider Kingswells area."

This seems to ignore the fact that this site is placed up a very steep wooded slope from Kingswells (as traced by the meandering Kingswells Crescent) - the natural boundary of this side of Kingswells - and, rather than being "well-related" to Kingswells, completely breaks its logical boundaries and would overlook the village. In order to access this site, it would have been necessary, according to the development bid, to place two new roads directly off a very sharply-curved stretch of road. This is a clear safety hazard - as one who often cycles to work, I have to rely on hearing cars to know when it is safe to pull out of Wellside Road and onto Kingswells Crescent, as the line of sight is insufficient to be across the road safely otherwise. These access roads would then have cut through ancient woodland (and the line of a well-used path) and steeply up a slope prone to freezing (a noticeable cold-trap).

Residents would have been incredulous at the assertions in the developer bid that they would be "improving the current poor settlement edge through a sensitive design response to the existing landscape". This is in fact a complete fabrication - Kingswells has a settlement edge dictated by the landscape, and it is the developer who has shown precious little sensitivity in their past and current activities. The photos from the developer demonstrate this complete misrepresentation - the photo on p29 neatly emphasises the change in level between Kingswells Crescent and the site.

Should this, or the other bids around Kingswells (B03/14/15 and 21) come up again, I and Kingswells residents, would greatly appreciate an opportunity to respond and make clear how inappropriate we feel these sites are, for reasons both technical and philosophical.

**Additional Files**

**If you have further information you would like to provide you may upload it here.:**

No file was uploaded