

**Main Issues Report 2014 – New Development
Bids
Development Options Assessment Report**

Respondent Number 59495 Travelodge

SITE NUMBER: 59495	NAME of SITE: Travelodge Burnside Drive	
Proposer: Energy Dawn Limited		
Nature of the proposal: Propose rezoning site from Green Belt to Mixed Use, to allow for expansion and reconfiguration of the Travelodge hotel.		
Checklist Score: 49	Constraints: None.	SEA: +/-
Recommendation: Desirable		
Justification: This site is already developed and does not perform the functions of Green Belt. It is situated adjacent to an existing Mixed Use area and would be a logical extension to this area. In principle, there are no constraints to the redevelopment or expansion of the hotel in this location.		

Criteria	Score	Justification
Exposure	3	The site is well sheltered with existing mature tree cover around the site.
Aspect	3	The site is predominately south facing.
Slope	3	The site is flat.
Flood risk	2	The site is an existing built up area SEPA flood maps indicate there is a partial flood risk (1 in 200) along the bank of the River Dee and the burn sunning down to the Dee from the west. Any future development would need to consider this.
Drainage	3	The site is an existing built up area with no signs of any drainage issues.
Built / Cultural Elements	3	There are no Built/Cultural elements of note which the site will impact on.
Natural Conservation	2	The site is an existing built up area however the site is identified as a bat habitat. The river and bank will also likely represent a rich habitat for wildlife and insects. There is significant tree cover on the site which if impacted on would represent a significant loss of habitat.
Landscape Features	2	There is significant tree cover on the site which if impacted on would damage the landscape of the area.
Landscape Fit	2	The development would be well screened if the existing trees remain in place.
Relationship to existing settlement	3	The site is an existing built up area close to housing and business uses.
Land Use Mix / Balance / Service Thresholds	1	Would not contribute to a greater mix of uses.
Accessibility	2	There are bus stops within 800m

Proximity to facilities - shopping / health / recreation	3	The site is located in a built up area and has access to multiple facilities within 800m
Direct footpath / cycle connection to community and recreation facilities and resources.	3	There are core paths and cycle path adjacent to the site.
Proximity of employment opportunities	3	There are employment opportunities both on the site and in close proximity.
Contamination	3	The site is unlikely to be contaminated and is already developed.
Land Use Conflict	2	The proposal is for the expansion of the existing use and its removal from the greenbelt designation. While no landuse conflict as the building is currently operating as a hotel any expansion or removal of trees may result in a conflict.
Physical Infrastructural Capacity	3	Site it already in use as a hotel and is therefore connected to all utilities. There is likely to be capacity and availability of services within the area.
Service Infrastructure Capacity	3	n/a for this proposal
Other Constraints		None.

Respondent Number 58738 Mains of Charleston, Nigg

SITE NUMBER: 58738		NAME of SITE: Mains of Charleston Nigg	
Proposer: Mr. Arnold Strachan			
Nature of the proposal: Release this site from the Green Belt and allocate for further development. A range of uses could be considered, including Park & Ride facility, leisure, employment, mixed use.			
Checklist Score: 36	Constraints: Accessibility, landscape fit.		SEA: +/-
Recommendation: Undesirable			
Justification: The overall vision and spatial strategy of the Local Development Plan is considered to remain appropriate and was established following the Examination into the 2012 LDP. Adequate housing and employment land had been provided to meet the allowances set in the emerging Strategic Development Plan. The emerging SDP already seeks to supply a generous supply of employment and housing land and there is no numerical justification to allocate further employment or housing sites. Under these circumstances, it is considered that there are insufficient over-riding benefits arising from this site which would justify allocating it for development.			

Criteria	Score	Justification
Exposure	1	The site was divided by the A90 with the section to the West of the road elevated and exposed with no cover. The area to the East while sheltered by the tree cover along the A90 was exposed on all other sides.
Aspect	3	The site had multiple aspects due to its shape however it was largely south and West.
Slope	2	There were slopes on both parts of the sites with some parts being severe.
Flood risk	2	A Burn and drainage channels run through the eastern part of the site and certain areas appears boggy suggesting some flood risk.
Drainage	2	A Burn and drainage channels run through the eastern part of the site and certain areas appears boggy suggesting poor drainage to parts of the site. The Western part of the site is elevated and sloping.
Built / Cultural Elements	3	There will be no loss or disturbance of built or cultural heritage elements.
Natural Conservation	2	There are wooded features identified as potential bat habitat on limited parts of the site.
Landscape Features	2	Some dry stone walls on site but overall minimal features.
Landscape Fit	1	Development on this site would be very prominent on the landscape and would significantly intrude on the landscape. The site to the west of the A90 is significantly raised both in the surrounding landscape and above the A90 and any development would be very prominent and visible from some distance away. The site to the East of the A90 while not elevated has limited cover to the east and south and would be very prominent.
Relationship to existing settlement	2	The site is not related to the existing areas of Cove or Charlestown but would be adjacent to the employment allocation OP78.

Land Use Mix / Balance / Service Thresholds	1	The proposed employment land would not contribute to a mix of uses in the area.
Accessibility	1	The eastern part of the site has no direct public transport links but does have access onto the A90. The western part of the site does have access onto the A90 but this would not be a feasible access for new development and the eastern part of the site has limited access.
Proximity to facilities - shopping / health / recreation.	1	The site has no facilities within the immediate area or access to facilities.
Direct footpath / cycle connection to community and recreation facilities and resources.	1	There are no cycle or core paths connecting the site.
Proximity of employment opportunities.	3	The site is adjacent OP78 and employment allocation.
Contamination	2	The south eastern part of the site is identified as contaminated land (Moss-side Croft Landfill). The Western part of the site contains a small mechanics yard
Land Use Conflict	2	Additional employment land within the area will not improve the land use mix as OP78 is a significant employment allocation.
Physical Infrastructural Capacity	2	Limited services due to the sites location however the development of housing to the south and the future development of OP78, is likely to improve the services in the area.
Service Infrastructure Capacity	3	n/a for this proposal.
Other Constraints		

Respondent Number 59809 Land at Highview House, Countesswells Road

SITE NUMBER:		NAME of SITE: Highview House, Countesswells Road	
Proposer: Mr Michael Robertson			
Nature of the proposal: Release site from the Green Belt to allow residential development.			
Checklist Score: 35		Constraints: Accessibility, relationship to existing settlement, landscape fit	SEA: +/-
Recommendation: Undesirable			
<p>Justification: The overall vision and spatial strategy of the Local Development Plan is considered to remain appropriate and was established following the Examination into the 2012 LDP. Adequate housing and employment land had been provided to meet the allowances set in the emerging Strategic Development Plan. The emerging SDP already seeks to supply a generous supply of employment and housing land and there is no numerical justification to allocate further employment or housing sites. Under these circumstances, it is considered that there are insufficient over-riding benefits arising from this site which would justify allocating it for development.</p> <p>Furthermore, this site is undesirable for residential development given its isolation from existing settlement. There are no shops, services or employment opportunities accessible by public transport or walking, meaning that households are very likely to be car dependent. Furthermore the development would intrude significantly into the open and rural landscape setting of this part of Deeside.</p>			

Criteria	Score	Justification
Exposure	2	Very exposed from south. Tree belt on north-east and west.
Aspect	3	South/south-west facing
Slope	2	Steep slope to front flat on majority of the site
Flood risk	2	Elevated site so limited risk of flooding. Risk of run-off to the south of site and road.
Drainage	3	There was no evidence of bad drainage at the site on the most recent site visit.
Built / Cultural Elements	3	There will be no loss or disturbance of built or cultural heritage elements.
Natural Conservation	3	There are recordings of bats in the trees surrounding the site. Trees to immediate north are designated as Ancient Woodland. The site is arable land (although not in that use) and does not provide a valuable habitat.
Landscape Features	3	Minimal features on the site.
Landscape Fit	1	Development would be highly visible from the south.
Relationship to existing settlement	1	The site is isolated from the any settlement.

Land Use Mix / Balance / Service Thresholds	1	The proposal would not bring a greater use of mixes to the area as it is predominantly in agriculture, forestry and residential use.
Accessibility	1	The site is isolated from the any settlement with no bus service evident.
Proximity to facilities - shopping / health / recreation.	1	The site is isolated from the any settlement with no facilities evident.
Direct footpath / cycle connection to community and recreation facilities and resources.	1	There are no direct footpaths or cycle connections in the area and limited access to recreation facilities.
Proximity of employment opportunities.	1	The site is isolated from the any settlement with no employment opportunities evident apart from agriculture/forestry.
Contamination	3	There are no known contamination issues.
Land Use Conflict	1	The site is designated as Green Belt and as such there would be a conflict of uses.
Physical Infrastructural Capacity	1	Limited services available due to isolated location.
Service Infrastructure Capacity	2	Site is proposed for 2/3 houses which are unlikely to generate significant pressure on local schools infrastructure. Local capacity would have to be determined in consultation with Education.
Other Constraints		

Respondent Number 54957 Land adj. to OP Countesswells

SITE NUMBER: 54957		NAME of SITE: Land adj. to OP58	
Proposer: Mr. Andrew Thompson			
Nature of the proposal: Site is proposed for a small extension to the Countesswells Opportunity Site, for residential development.			
Checklist Score: 34	Constraints: Accessibility, relationship to existing settlement, landscape fit		SEA: +/-
Recommendation: Undesirable			
<p>Justification: The overall vision and spatial strategy of the Local Development Plan is considered to remain appropriate and was established following the Examination into the 2012 LDP. Adequate housing and employment land had been provided to meet the allowances set in the emerging Strategic Development Plan. The emerging SDP already seeks to supply a generous supply of employment and housing land and there is no numerical justification to allocate further employment or housing sites. Under these circumstances, it is considered that there are insufficient over-riding benefits arising from this site which would justify allocating it for development.</p> <p>Furthermore, this site is undesirable for residential development given its isolation from existing settlement. There are no shops, services or employment opportunities accessible by public transport or walking, meaning that households are very likely to be car dependent. Furthermore the development would intrude significantly into the open and rural landscape setting of this part of Deeside.</p>			

Criteria	Score	Justification
Exposure	3	The site is well sheltered from the North, East and West due to the significant surrounding trees.
Aspect	3	The site is largely South-facing
Slope	2	The site slopes slightly from North to south at the entrance from the north.
Flood risk	2	Southern edge of the site is boggy, and may present some flood risk.
Drainage	2	The majority of the site appears well drained however the southern edge of the site is boggy and appears poorly drained.
Built / Cultural Elements	3	There will be no loss or disturbance of built or cultural heritage elements.
Natural Conservation	1	The entire site and surrounding trees are identified as Bat habitat. The site is a mix of overgrown scrubland and boggy/marshy land to the south. It will likely represent a loss of habitat.
Landscape Features	3	There are no landscape features visible on the site.
Landscape Fit	2	Development would be visible from the south and east. While there are houses to the north the type and scale of development would currently be prominent.
Relationship to existing settlement	1	The site is isolated from the any settlement.

Land Use Mix / Balance / Service Thresholds	1	The proposal would not bring a greater use of mixes to the area as it is predominantly in agriculture, forestry and residential use.
Accessibility	1	The site is isolated from the any settlement with no bus service evident.
Proximity to facilities - shopping / health / recreation.	1	The site is isolated from the any settlement with no facilities evident.
Direct footpath / cycle connection to community and recreation facilities and resources.	1	There are no direct footpaths or cycle connections in the area and limited access to recreation facilities. There is a core path some distance to the west.
Proximity of employment opportunities.	1	The site is isolated from the any settlement with no employment opportunities evident apart from agriculture/forestry.
Contamination	3	There are no known contamination issues.
Land Use Conflict	1	The site is identified as Greenbelt and would represent a conflict. There are some houses adjacent but the area is currently largely agricultural and woodland.
Physical Infrastructural Capacity	1	Limited services available due to isolated location.
Service Infrastructure Capacity	2	Local capacity would have to be determined in consultation with Education.
Other Constraints		

Respondent Number 54298 Area East of Malcolm Road

SITE NUMBER: 54298		NAME of SITE: Area East of Malcolm Road	
Proposer: Mr. J Mitchell			
Nature of the proposal: Sites proposed for future development			
Checklist Score: 27		Constraints: Accessibility, landscape fit, relationship existing settlement, slope, exposure.	SEA: +/-
Recommendation: Undesirable			
<p>Justification: The overall vision and spatial strategy of the Local Development Plan is considered to remain appropriate and was established following the Examination into the 2012 LDP. Adequate housing and employment land had been provided to meet the allowances set in the emerging Strategic Development Plan. The emerging SDP already seeks to supply a generous supply of employment and housing land and there is no numerical justification to allocate further employment or housing sites. Under these circumstances, it is considered that there are insufficient over-riding benefits arising from this site which would justify allocating it for development.</p> <p>Furthermore, this site is undesirable for residential development given its isolation from existing settlement. There are no shops, services or employment opportunities accessible by public transport or walking, meaning that households are very likely to be car dependent. Furthermore the development would intrude significantly into the open and rural landscape setting of this part of Deeside. It is also exposed and elevated and sloping.</p>			

Criteria	Score	Justification
Exposure	1	The site is elevated and prominent with little screening.
Aspect	2	The site is largely west facing and slopes East to West.
Slope	1	The site is sloping and undulating but predominantly slopes East to West.
Flood risk	2	The undulations across the site suggest parts of the site are likely to suffer from flood risk.
Drainage	2	The site appears largely well drained however there are large sections which due to the topography drain poorly.
Built / Cultural Elements	2	The site is currently in active agricultural use. There are significant dry stone wall field boundaries on the site.
Natural Conservation	3	The site is identified as possible habitat for bats. There are pockets of trees in several areas of the site and the site is likely a habitat to other wildlife.
Landscape Features	2	There are significant dry stone wall field boundaries on the site.
Landscape Fit	1	Both the prominence of the site and the proposed scale of development would result in a very poor landscape fit. The surrounding area is largely agricultural land with some housing.
Relationship to existing	1	The site is remote from the nearest settlement of Peterculter and would not form a natural extension to the settlement.

settlement		
Land Use Mix / Balance / Service Thresholds	1	The proposal would not bring a greater use of mixes to the area.
Accessibility	1	The site is isolated from the any settlement with no bus service evident.
Proximity to facilities - shopping / health / recreation.	1	The site is isolated from Peterculter with private car likely to be the only means of getting to services.
Direct footpath / cycle connection to community and recreation facilities and resources.	1	There are no direct footpaths or cycle connections in the area and limited access to recreation facilities.
Proximity of employment opportunities.	1	The site is isolated from the any settlement with no employment opportunities evident apart from agriculture/forestry.
Contamination	3	No contamination recoded or likely as the site is agricultural land.
Land Use Conflict	1	The site is designated as Green Belt and as such there would represent a conflict of uses. There are some existing houses with the area but it is predominantly agricultural/forestry.
Physical Infrastructural Capacity	1	Limited services available due to isolated location.
Service Infrastructure Capacity	2	Local capacity would have to be determined in consultation with Education.
Other Constraints		

Respondent Number 57894 Altens East

SITE NUMBER: 57894	NAME of SITE: Altens East	
Proposer: SITA UK		
Nature of the proposal: Proposal to extend the Altens East opportunity site eastward, to enable the site to accommodate new waste management facilities.		
Checklist Score: 44	Constraints: Accessibility, exposure	SEA: +/-
Recommendation: Desirable		
Justification: This site is already allocated for development. The additional extension is necessary to efficiently accommodate the required waste management facilities. A strip of land will remain between the site and the coast road.		

Criteria	Score	Justification
Exposure	1	The site is exposed located on the coast road close to the sea. It is open towards Doonies farm to the north and to the sea to the east and south.
Aspect	2	The site is predominately East/West facing, however due to the slope the site has largely an Eastern aspect..
Slope	2	The site slopes slightly from West to East towards the coast.
Flood risk	2	Due to the site being located at bottom of a slope, there is a likelihood of some flooding caused by runoff from the surrounding land and sites.
Drainage	3	No obvious signs of drainage issues
Built / Cultural Elements	3	There will be no loss or disturbance of built or cultural heritage elements as the site has no structures.
Natural Conservation	3	There will be no loss or disturbance to habitat as the site is largely unworked arable land.
Landscape Features	3	No landscape features visible on the site, field boundary's are marked with wire fences.
Landscape Fit	2	Proposal would be obtrusive given the proposed location adjacent to the coast road but given the existing backdrop of industrial developments in Altens not over obtrusive.
Relationship to existing settlement	3	The proposed development would be well related to existing uses to west and north.
Land Use Mix / Balance / Service Thresholds	1	Would be commensurate with existing uses to west and south but would not bring additional uses to or facilities to the area.

Accessibility	1	The site is isolated from the any settlement with no bus service evident and is likely only accessible by private transport
Proximity to facilities - shopping / health / recreation.	1	The site is isolated from the any settlement with no facilities evident, nearest facilities are some 2 miles away.
Direct footpath / cycle connection to community and recreation facilities and resources.	2	The coastal core path runs along the coast from the site on the opposite side of the coast road, and a cycle path runs along the coast road.
Proximity of employment opportunities.	3	There are significant employment opportunities within Altens East industrial estate.
Contamination	3	The site is unlikely to be contaminated.
Land Use Conflict	3	Similar uses to south and west. Nearest other use is to north (Doonies farm) where there is also a residential house
Physical Infrastructural Capacity	3	There is likely to be capacity and availability of services within the area.
Service Infrastructure Capacity	3	n/a for this proposal
Other Constraints		

Respondent Number 58812/57242 Murtle Den Road

SITE NUMBER: 58812/ 57242		NAME of SITE: Murtle Den Road	
Proposer:			
Nature of the proposal: Identify land for residential development			
Checklist Score: 33		Constraints: Accessibility, relationship to existing settlement, drainage	SEA: +/-
Recommendation: Undesirable			
<p>Justification: The overall vision and spatial strategy of the Local Development Plan is considered to remain appropriate and was established following the Examination into the 2012 LDP. Adequate housing and employment land had been provided to meet the allowances set in the emerging Strategic Development Plan. The emerging SDP already seeks to supply a generous supply of employment and housing land and there is no numerical justification to allocate further employment or housing sites. Under these circumstances, it is considered that there are insufficient over-riding benefits arising from this site which would justify allocating it for development.</p> <p>Furthermore, this site is undesirable for residential development given its isolation from existing settlement. There are no shops, services or employment opportunities accessible by public transport or walking, meaning that households are very likely to be car dependent.</p>			

Criteria	Score	Justification
Exposure	3	In general the site is fairly well sheltered due to the surrounding topography and trees.
Aspect	2	East facing
Slope	1	Part of the site had a very steep slope down to the Murtle Dam whilst the other part is gently sloping.
Flood risk	2	Eastern side of site towards Murtle Dam - Ground saturated but the site sloped steeply suggesting poor ground drainage. Western side appeared well drained.
Drainage	1	Eastern side of site towards Murtle Dam - Ground saturated but the site sloped steeply suggesting poor ground drainage. Western side appeared well drained.
Built / Cultural Elements	3	There will be no loss or disturbance of built or cultural heritage elements.
Natural Conservation	2	There are recordings of bats (including roosts) in and around the sites.
Landscape Features	2	There is the potential for some tree loss on site.
Landscape Fit	2	Site is very well sheltered on all sides due to the topography and trees surrounding the site.

Relationship to existing settlement	2	A number of residential properties in close proximity, as well as the Oldfold Farm residential scheme to the immediate west. Remote from the main settlements of Milltimber and Bielside
Land Use Mix / Balance / Service Thresholds	1	The proposal would not bring a greater use of mixes to the area as it is predominantly residential use.
Accessibility	1	Numerous bus stops available on North Deeside Road around 0.5km to the south of the site However the site is remove from the main settlements
Proximity to facilities - shopping / health / recreation.	1	Site is approximately 3lm from the nearest facilities in Peterculter and Cults.
Direct footpath / cycle connection to community and recreation facilities and resources.	1	No footpath provision from North Deeside road to site. Cycle lane provision on North Deeside Road to east and west. Reasonable connection onto Deeside Railway cycle/footpath to south.
Proximity of employment opportunities.	1	The site is isolated from the any settlement with no employment opportunities evident.
Contamination	3	There are no known contamination issues.
Land Use Conflict	3	The site is designated as Green Belt and as such there would be a conflict of uses.
Physical Infrastructural Capacity	2	Limited services available due to isolated location.
Service Infrastructure Capacity	2	Local capacity would have to be determined in consultation with Education.
Other Constraints		

Respondent Number 59124 Station Road, Pitfodels

SITE NUMBER: 59124		NAME of SITE: Station Road Pitfodels	
Proposer: Cults Property Development Company			
Nature of the proposal: Identify site for residential development			
Checklist Score: 41		Constraints: Accessibility	
		SEA: +/-	
Recommendation: Undesirable			
<p>Justification: The overall vision and spatial strategy of the Local Development Plan is considered to remain appropriate and was established following the Examination into the 2012 LDP. Adequate housing and employment land had been provided to meet the allowances set in the emerging Strategic Development Plan. The emerging SDP already seeks to supply a generous supply of employment and housing land and there is no numerical justification to allocate further employment or housing sites. Under these circumstances, it is considered that there are insufficient over-riding benefits arising from this site which would justify allocating it for development.</p> <p>Furthermore, vehicular access to the site is extremely poor, with only one access point with limited road capacity and vision.</p>			

Criteria	Score	Justification
Exposure	3	In general the site is fairly well sheltered due to the surrounding topography and trees.
Aspect	3	The site is south, south-west facing.
Slope	3	The site was largely flat with some scrub and self-seeded trees.
Flood risk	2	No known risk of flooding but land to east is elevated so potential for run-off into the site.
Drainage	2	Site appears to be fairly well drained.
Built / Cultural Elements	3	There will be no loss or disturbance of built or cultural heritage elements.
Natural Conservation	2	There are recordings of bats in and around the site. Former Deeside Railway line abutting the site to the immediate north is a Local Nature Conservation Site.
Landscape Features	2	There is the potential for some tree loss on site.
Landscape Fit	3	Site is very well sheltered on all sides due to the topography and trees surrounding the site.
Relationship to existing settlement	2	Site is around 1.5km from the majority of amenity's/facilities within Cults.

Land Use Mix / Balance / Service Thresholds	1	The proposal would not bring a greater use of mixes to the area as it is predominantly residential use.
Accessibility	2	The site is around 0.5km to the nearest bus stop on the A93 to the north, and around 1km to bus stops on Garthdee Road.
Proximity to facilities - shopping / health / recreation.	2	Adjacent to Deeside Railway core path. Other shopping/health facilities around 1.5km away in Cults.
Direct footpath / cycle connection to community and recreation facilities and resources.	2	Adjacent to Deeside Railway core path. Footpath on Pitfodels Station Road which links to facilities to the north and south.
Proximity of employment opportunities.	2	Some small employment opportunities at RGU on Garthdee Road and within Cults settlement.
Contamination	3	No obvious contamination on site
Land Use Conflict	3	The site is designated for residential purposes.
Physical Infrastructural Capacity	1	Access to site is very limited. One access point with limited road capacity and vision.
Service Infrastructure Capacity	2	Local capacity would have to be determined in consultation with Education.
Other Constraints		