

Our Ref. LCG/P121353 [ZET]
Your Ref.
Contact Lucy Greene
Email pi@aberdeencity.gov.uk
Direct Dial 01224 522378
Direct Fax 01224 523180



ABERDEEN
CITY COUNCIL

5 April 2013

Turnberry Planning Ltd
41 - 43 Maddox Street
London
W1S 2PD

Planning & Sustainable
Development
**Enterprise, Planning &
Infrastructure**
Aberdeen City Council
Business Hub 4
Ground Floor North
Marischal College
Broad Street
Aberdeen
AB10 1AB

FAO Chris Pattison

Tel 01224 523470
Fax 01224 523180
Minicom 01224 522381
DX 529452, Aberdeen 9
www.aberdeencity.gov.uk

Dear Chris,

Environmental Impact Assessment (Scotland) Regulations 1999 (as amended)
SCOPING OPINION
Grandhome, Bridge of Don
Proposed urban extension at Grandhome (The site is identified as an
Opportunity Site (OP12) in the Aberdeen City Local Development Plan
Application Ref P121353

I refer to your request for a scoping opinion in terms of the above regulations which was validly received by the planning authority on 26 September 2012 and I apologise for the delay in my response.

The approach that you outline in sections 3.13 and 3.14 is welcomed. It is understood that the proposed Environmental Statement (ES) would cover both the planning permission in principle (PPiP) and full planning permission for phase 1 as well as reporting the effects of the overall masterplan.

In the interests of clarity it is requested that the findings, analysis and mitigation relating to the a) the PIP application area; and b) phase 1 area, be clearly identified in a separate section within each of the topic areas and non-technical summaries, as well as the overall effect of the entire masterplan.

The ES should include consideration of any work required to be undertaken off site as a result of development, including for example, supplying services.

In terms of the subject areas, this planning authority broadly agrees with the approach proposed and I would comment as follows:

GORDON McINTOSH
DIRECTOR

1. Air quality: the detailed scope to be agreed with Aberdeen City Environmental Health (Aileen Brodie). SEPA have also provided comment in the response dated 16 October 2012 (see ACC website). I would further comment that cumulative impacts should be assessed, from other development with planning permission but not yet implemented, including (not an exhaustive list) the Biomass CHP plant at Stoneywood Mill, housing at Stoneywood and at Davidsons Mill. In addition to the receptors identified, any air quality impacts on ecological sites should be assessed, including those protected sites adjacent to the site boundaries.
Advice is provided on behalf of Transport Scotland, by JMP Consultants Limited, in the letter dated 26 October, this is on the Council's website and this approach should be followed with regard to air quality impact of traffic.
2. Climate Change: It is not known what exactly is involved in the carbon footprinting study. However, it is considered that measures to reduce on-going GHG emissions are the important factors, whilst consideration should also be given to alternative methods of construction and materials that would reduce emissions produced in the construction process, transportation and manufacture etc of materials used. Consideration should be given in the ES to the provision of energy via the full range of possible sources, including potential for linking to the biomass CHP plant proposed at Stoneywood Mill.
3. Cultural Heritage: Although the impact on archaeology cannot be fully assessed without some evaluation work, on the basis of advice, it is considered that the approach is acceptable. A dig would be likely to be required as part of a condition on any planning permission. In terms of impact on above ground cultural heritage, a range of mitigation measures should be identified, with reference to the masterplans that will be agreed. In particular, attention needs to be paid to the potential impacts on listed buildings on and adjacent to the site.
Potential for impact on the Foucausie hut circle should be included in the ES in accordance with Historic Scotland's consultation response dated 22 October 2012. It is also suggested advice be sought from the documents identified by Historic Scotland.
4. Ecology: the proposals for surveys of European and UK protected species are accepted. These would need to take place at appropriate times of year and in accordance with the Council's [Supplementary Guides and Technical Advice Notes](#) on Bats and Development and Natural Heritage.
Tree surveys would also be required as part of the habitat survey – a general overview of trees and woodland.
In addition to retention and protection of habitats it is suggested that additionally the EIA considers the scope for management to enhance existing features which could be used to offset impacts elsewhere on the site.
There should be identification of appropriate pollution prevention measures during periods of construction, operation, maintenance, demolition and restoration.
Potential for impact on wetlands present, elements retained and associated proposals for mitigation. Appropriate habitat survey works should be carried out to identify and classify wetland areas.

5. Drainage – including details relating to both surface water drainage and waste water drainage. Please note the comments within SEPA’s letter of 16 October 2012. The ES should identify where temporary / semi-permanent measures might be required for the early phases of development and the impact of these. Although SUDS features may be incorporated within landscaping, where these consist of areas of ground being unusable, this should be taken into account in the design layout and level of open space provided and its location.
Flood risk assessment – refer to consultation responses from SEPA dated 16 October and 4 February 2013.
6. Geo-Environment: no further comments.
7. Landscape and views: in addition to the viewpoints considered, please also include view points on Whitestripes Road through the site and from the minor road that runs along the west side of the site.
8. Noise and Vibration: The letter referred to above, from JMP Consultants, provides advice in relation to traffic impacts and this should be followed in the EIA. This same approach should be applied to traffic on other roads where traffic flows would be increased by the development. Noise assessments should include potential impact on future residents of development with planning permission but not yet built.
9. Socio-Economics: The effects of the full range of residential accommodation to be provided within the overall masterplan area should be considered within the context of the main areas identified. In terms of social infrastructure, the effect of demand for provision of recreational space of all types and recreational routes within and linking to those outside the site should be included. Functional and linking routes both existing and aspirational should be given particular consideration.
10. Transport: The advice provided in the JMP Consultants letter in particular on the assessment of environmental impacts of traffic needs to be considered and this approach adopted.
Key recreational routes, both existing and aspirational, should be identified, as well as functional and linking routes with existing employment / residential areas.
11. Utilities and Waste: comments in relation to energy supply in the Climate Change section above.

Yours faithfully



Dr Margaret Bochel
Head of Planning and Sustainable Development

GORDON McINTOSH
DIRECTOR