



Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance

Housing Land Release 2006 - 2010

Consultation Report

Part II: Summary of Responses

November 2005

Contents

- 1) Introduction
- 2) Consultation Responses

This forms Part II of the consultation report on the preparation of supplementary planning guidance on the release of housing land. Part I comprises a report on the consultation process itself from the initiation of the project through to the adoption of the SPG.

1) Introduction

This report forms Part II of the consultation report on the preparation of supplementary planning guidance for the release of housing land for the period 2006 – 2010. It provides details of the all responses to the consultation exercise along with a response to them and identifies any action required in response to them. As such it complements Part I which focuses on the consultation process.

Comments have been quoted verbatim if at all possible, although in order to provide a brief and succinct statement, summaries have been included where it was not possible to take it directly from the response.

On the pages which follow, comments have been categorised using the headings provided in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Categorisation of Comments

Discussion Paper Question	Heading
	General Comment
	General Comment on process used
	General Comment on Housing Land Supply
	General Comment about proposal
(Q1)	Importance and Use of a Pragmatic Solution
(Q2)	Sites Limited to Local Plan Sites
(Q3)	Limited Release
(Q4)	Two-stage Release
(Q5)	Dates of Release
(Q6)	Inclusion in Schedule 2
(Q7)	Nature of Minor Change
	Specific Text Changes

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action
General Comment			
Mr J Benton Association of Builders & Developers	How do Aberdeenshire Council intend to implement SPP15 if no NEST review is to be undertaken? This will be required to be agreed prior to the release of sites through SPG. 18.9	This is not an issue for the SPG.	None
Mrs S Jenkins Belhelvie Community Council	We would like to see the infrastructure for any large developments as an integral part of the development and not an afterthought. 9.8	Agree in principle. However, this is not an issue for this SPG.	None
Mr J Risby Forestry Commission Scotland	The Forestry Commission consider it may be useful to consider and identify any woodland planting as part of the green space associated with these sites, a process which we would be happy to support. 4.2	Noted	None
Mr J Benton Osprey Homes	How do Aberdeenshire Council intend to implement SPP15 if no NEST review is to be undertaken? This will be required to be agreed prior to the release of sites through SPG. 17.9	This is not an issue for the SPG.	None
Mr B Smith Paull & Williamsons Solicitors [Stewart Milne Homes]	It is important that sites released through the SPG are not viewed as significant development plan departures for the purposes of processing planning applications. 16.2	It is accepted that, although such applications will be departures, they will not be considered significant departures from NEST Policy 9 or ALP Policy Hou\2.	A paragraph has been added to the SPG at the end of the 'Proposal' section - "Sites which meet the requirements of this SPG will not be treated as significant departures from NEST Policy 9 or ALP Policy Hou\2a."
Ms C Pritchett Scottish Environment Protection Agency	SEPA has no objections to the proposed SPG. 3.1	Noted	None

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action
Mr R Davidson Tarves Community Council	23.11 Where a settlement may have more than one site allocated, it should be of utmost importance that the Community has sufficient input into deciding which site is developed first.	Partially Agree. Consultation on the local plan is the process through which such comments can be made.	None
Mr R Davidson Tarves Community Council	23.12 All development for housing should be staged, and come forward at a rate that the Community can deal with. This may mean developing sites in line with the size of the existing community so that it can cope with the demand brought about by new development. Further to this, some larger sites may need to be split into two or three stages in order to mitigate the impact that large scale development can have on a small community.	This is an issue for the local plan process rather than this SPG.	None
Mr R Davidson Tarves Community Council	23.13 It would be appropriate to insist on Development Briefs for any land for housing that has been included as a result of the reporter's decision or from boundary changes at a late stage in the Local Plan process.	Do not agree. The need for development briefs is often flagged up in the local plan and relates to the issues needing to be addressed on the site rather than the stage at which the site enters the local plan process.	None
Mr R Holland Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	8.1 We welcome the approach by Aberdeenshire Council to maintaining the five-year land supply by seeking to introduce supplementary planning guidance.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Ms P Smith The Charlton Smith Partnership [Mr R Cameron]	6.1 We would wish our client's site to be included in the next Housing Land Audit as part of the available supply and have the future housing land allocations for Laurencekirk increased.	This consultation exercise is neither about the identification of new sites or identifying the scale of future housing land allocations. This is the role of future development plans.	None
Mr E Innes Tor Ecosse Ltd	5.1 Tor Ecosse are pleased that the SPG has been produced	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action
Mr I Downie	The problems faced today are an inevitable consequence of a seriously defective structure plan. 10.1	Do not agree. The problem has been the inability to review the structure plan on the timescale originally envisaged.	None
General comment on process used			
Mr Ian Mollison Newtonhill, Muchalls and Cammachmore Community Council	I would commend the plain English guidelines to the writers of these papers. 22.3	Noted	None
General comment on housing land supply			
Mr J Benton Association of Builders & Developers	The deficit in the minimum 5 year effective land supply has now, as of 30 June 2005, reached a level greater than the total Phase II sites (1,700). 18.6	Do not agree. The Housing Land Audit is conducted annually by the Council with a base date of 1 January. Any calculation reached between Audits is based on speculation. The effective land supply will be audited again on a base date of 1 January 2006 and this will include the substantial amount of land released through the local plan.	None
Mr H Cormack Cormack Development Company	My particular area of interest is in the Rothienorman area and I take the view that it is imperative to maintain an effective supply of housing land in the area in order to safeguard the existence and the development of the settlement. 12.3	Housing land supply is addressed at an area far wider than any individual settlement. Rothienorman has considerable potential to grow in the years ahead even without the release of further housing land.	None
Mr J Risby Forestry Commission Scotland	The Forestry Commission note that any potential sites for affordable housing on national forest land are not covered by this release and as previously indicated, this would need to be subject to separate discussions. 4.1	Noted	None

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action
Mr J Benton Osprey Homes	17.6 The deficit in the minimum 5 year effective land supply has now, as of 30 June 2005, reached a level greater than the total Phase II sites (1,700).	Do not agree. The Housing Land Audit is conducted annually by the Council with a base date of 1 January. Any calculation reached between Audits is based on speculation. The effective land supply will be audited again on a base date of 1 January 2006 and this will include the substantial amount of land released through the local plan.	None
Mr W Lippe William Lippe Architects Ltd [Mansell Watson (Builders) Ltd]	1.9 It is essential that the second phase of Dunnydeer Park (Insch) is allowed to commence in January 2006 to ensure continuity of work and to meet the demands for housing in the Insch area.	The factors noted are not relevant to the determination of which schedule the specified site appears in but Dunnydeer Park does appear on Schedule 1 to be released on 31 December 2005 due to only minor modifications being proposed to the site which should be taken into account in any planning application.	None

General comment about proposal

Mr J Benton Association of Builders & Developers	18.14 It would be wise to consider the action proposed by this SPG in the context of the position outlined to several objections at the Local Plan Inquiry if a site's status in the Local Plan is an issue of any significance (particularly 1136.1.7).	The response to the noted objection remains valid, which is why this SPG is being produced. However, 2006 is fast approaching and it is not clear when a review and alteration of the structure plan can be achieved given the current position of Aberdeen City Council.	None
Mr J Benton Association of Builders & Developers	18.3 If land is released in the manner that this SPG is suggesting, the development plan (such as it exists) will no longer have any relevance to the strategic planning of housing and land supply.	Do not agree. The structure and local plans are fundamental to the context for this SPG as it operates within the framework set by these documents.	None
Mr J Benton Association of Builders & Developers	18.11 Under the current proposals, an examination of the current allocation strategy is being denied to those who have consistently pointed out the fatal flaws in the strategy.	Accept. This is an unavoidable consequence of failure to agree with Aberdeen City Council on the need for a review of the structure plan.	None

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action	
Mr H McNab Bancon Developments	21.1	We see it as a very positive step forward in maintaining a 5 yr land supply and thereby helping to stabilise land prices, provide certainty for both communities and developers, and accordingly help all parties in the development process to embark on longer term forward planning.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None.
Mrs S Jenkins Belhelvie Community Council	9.7	We do question if this action sets a precedent for any future housing supply plans or if it will result in greater pressure for an increase above that intended for the period after 2010.	These concerns are noted.	None
Mr S Harrison Bruce & Partners [Scotia Homes Ltd]	13.1	Whilst I very much welcome the acknowledgement of Aberdeenshire Council that there is a real problem concerning housing land supply, I am not sure that your proposed SPG note does anything more than the policies of the NEST Structure Plan do not already authorise. I therefore fail to see the purpose for this SPG that seemingly takes us no further in addressing the limitations of NEST.	Noted. The SPG is not seen as an alternative to a structure plan review and cannot deal with the breadth of issues that such a review would address.	None
Mr S Harrison Bruce & Partners [Scotia Homes Ltd]	13.2	The structure plan housing requirement should be reviewed so that additional housing land can then be brought forward, and by additional I mean land not already identified in the Finalised Aberdeenshire Local Plan (such land identified to meet the terms of the current NEST Structure Plan requirement for housing land) but additional land to that already identified.	This SPG is being produced because a review of the structure plan is not possible at the current time. An SPG produced by one of the structure plan authorities cannot completely revisit that plan.	None

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action
Mr S Harrison Bruce & Partners [Scotia Homes Ltd]	13.3 I am surprised that Aberdeenshire Council should take the view that this SPG is required because they perceive that the wording of the Structure Plan (NEST) Policy 9 contains a presumption against planning permission being granted for sited needed in the period 2006-2010 prior to a review of the Structure Plan. As indicated above, read as a whole I do not draw this conclusion from my interpretation of the policies of the NEST Structure Plan, and I note that this is also the advertised position of Aberdeen City Council who are likewise of the view that Policy 9 does not prove such a restraint.	Noted. However, this conflicts with the advice received by the Council that the release of land on sites contrary to ALP Policy Hou\2a would constitute a departure from the plan.	None
Mr H Cormack Cormack Development Company	12.2 I support the publication of SPG as a means of addressing the situation.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr B Wallace Hargest & Wallace Planning Ltd [Barratt Construction Ltd]	14.1 Barratt Construction welcome the SPG proposed by Aberdeenshire Council as a method of releasing the Phase II sites identified in the Aberdeenshire Local Plan.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr Ian Mollison Newtonhill, Muchalls and Cammachmore Community Council	22.1 The Community Council is opposed to further release of land in the Newtonhill area.	Noted. However, the location of housing sites is addressed through the local plan process. The identification of land in Newtonhill in the Aberdeenshire Local Plan is in line with the recommendations of the independent Reporters and is subject to consultation through the local plan process.	None
Mr Ian Mollison Newtonhill, Muchalls and Cammachmore Community Council	22.2 The consultation may be purely about the principle of "releasing" land. If this is the case , then we are not opposed. Just not here!	The support for the proposals in principle is welcomed. However, the location of housing sites is addressed through the local plan process.	None

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action
Mr J Benton Osprey Homes	17.14 It would be wise to consider the action proposed by this SPG in the context of the position outlined to several objections at the Local Plan Inquiry if a site's status in the Local Plan is an issue of any significance (particularly 1136.1.7).	The response to the noted objection remains valid, which is why this SPG is being produced. However, 2006 is fast approaching and it is not clear when a review and alteration of the structure plan can be achieved given the current position of Aberdeen City Council.	None
Mr J Benton Osprey Homes	17.3 If land is released in the manner that this SPG is suggesting, the development plan (such as it exists) will no longer have any relevance to the strategic planning of housing and land supply.	Do not agree. The structure and local plans are fundamental to the context for this SPG as it operates within the framework set by these documents.	None
Mr J Benton Osprey Homes	17.11 Under the current proposals, an examination of the current allocation strategy is being denied to those who have consistently pointed out the fatal flaws in the strategy.	Accept. This is an unavoidable consequence of failure to agree with Aberdeen City Council on the need for a review of the structure plan.	None
Mrs H Wood Planning Division Scottish Executive	20.1 As indicated in Jim Mackinnon's letter of 8 July, we consider that SPG is an appropriate mechanism through which to release housing land identified in the structure plan. SPP 3 supports the streamlined release of longer term housing land allocations, and this step towards ensuring that Phase II sites from NEST are made available for development is welcome.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr J Findlay Ryden Property Consultants [Alba Homes Ltd]	15.9 The release of housing land through this supplementary guidance is to be welcomed. However, it can only be a short-term "fix" and should not detract from an early and full review of the structure plan by Aberdeenshire and Aberdeen City Councils.	The support for the proposal is welcome. It is recognised that the publication of this SPG does not negate the need for an early review of the structure plan	None
Mr J Low Stewart Milne Homes	2.1 Stewart Milne Homes applaud Aberdeenshire Council in taking pro-active action.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action
Mr R Holland Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	8.2 The approach of the Council to propose a pragmatic solution which manages the housing market and responds to desire for certainty on Phase II sites should be loudly applauded.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr W Lippe William Lippe Architects Ltd [Mansell Watson (Builders) Ltd]	1.2 We welcome Aberdeenshire Council's pragmatic approach to ensuring continued land supply.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr I Downie	10.7 Clearly the housing land supply crisis now has to be addressed through SPG rather than through the development plan.	Do not agree that there is a crisis in housing land supply but the recognition given to the use of SPG is welcome.	None
Mr I Downie	10.8 The SPG affords the opportunity to address the serious and substantial shortfall in both housing market areas because the mechanism itself is outwith and not bound by the development plan.	Do not agree. The SPG cannot address the breadth of issues that a review of the structure plan could address. The SPG is not "outwith and not bound by the development plan" - it is a pragmatic means of implementing the development plan in current circumstances.	None
Mr I Downie	10.2 My primary concern is that the proposed SPG is totally inadequate.	The SPG takes the reasonable and measured, yet pragmatic approach of releasing sites for development which have already been identified through the local plan process.	None
Mr I Downie	10.4 A planning authority is clearly seriously exposed to planning by appeal in circumstances where a competent development plan does not exist and alternative procedures capable of delivering and maintaining an adequate housing land supply are not in place.	The Council, at the current time, is taking all reasonable measures to increase the supply of land for housing in an equitable way in accordance with the strategy and policy direction of the structure plan as well as the proposals of the local plan. The suggestion that the Aberdeenshire Local Plan and NEST are devalued is not accepted.	None

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action
Mr I Downie	10.5 SPG can be readily extended in scope to resolve the housing land supply shortfall merely by accepting that such shortfalls are a material consideration that warrants development plan departures in respect of applications on non-allocated sites. This will require action that does not give precedence to NEST Policy 12 or the constraints mentioned in NEST paragraph 3.13.	Do not agree. What is being suggested is that the Council ignores the development plan (NEST and ALP), its strategy, policies and proposals and instead grants consents for housing on an ad-hoc basis to any application received. This is not acceptable.	None
Mr I Downie	10.3 It is, in my view, grossly optimistic to the point of being misleading to suggest that SPG will provide an adequate quick fix sufficient to see the Shire through until the new replacement development plan comes into being. SPG in its current form will not provide a supply sufficient to cover the situation on 1 January 2006.	The proposed SPG is action that can be taken by the Council which will have a significant impact on the supply of land for housing. Continued monitoring will assess the impact of the SPG and whether any additional action is required. In any event, the Aberdeen Housing Market Area covers Aberdeen City and part of Aberdeenshire. Both Councils are required to maintain the housing land supply within this area. Aberdeenshire cannot be expected to deliver it to an extent greater than would be equitable given the strategy of the structure plan.	None
Mr I Downie	10.6 The lack of public consultation within the development plan context should not preclude consent for non-allocated sites.	Do not agree. The consultation through the local plan process is important because in some cases it will be addressing the principle of development rather than issues of detail. It would not be appropriate to consider the issue of principle through a planning application.	None
Q1 Importance and use of a pragmatic solution			
Mr J Benton Association of Builders & Developers	18.1 The Council has a statutory duty to maintain a minimum 5 year supply of effective housing land, something it has not done during the lifetime of NEST.	Do not agree. The requirement to maintain a minimum 5 year supply of effective housing land is contained in the structure plan and Scottish Executive planning policy (SPP3), not legislation. It is not accepted that this has not been done since 2001.	None

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action
Mr J Benton Association of Builders & Developers	18.2 It is clear that the only legal method of land release on the scale now required to achieve the minimum level of land supply as at today's date, far less maintain that level at all times as NEST and ALP require, is through a structure plan review (see legal opinion from Colin Campbell, Dean of the Faculty of Advocates). However, many hundreds of jobs in the construction industry depend on a pragmatic solution being found.	The desirability of a structure plan review is not disputed. The recognition of the importance of pragmatic action is welcome.	None
Mr H McNab Bancon Developments	21.2 We think it is vital to maintain the land supply and (in the absence of a SP review) very much welcome the pragmatic response being advocated by the Council.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mrs S Jenkins Belhelvie Community Council	9.1 We agree that it is important to maintain the supply of housing land in Aberdeenshire and that a supplementary Planning Guidance Note should be issued.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr W Burr Chap Homes Ltd	7.1 We fully support the proposal to introduce SPG to allow the release of land on the scheduled timescale (2006 - 2010).	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr H Cormack Cormack Development Company	12.1 It is extremely important to maintain a supply of housing land in Aberdeenshire, and a pragmatic solution should be adopted in order to address the situation given that a review of the structure plan cannot be achieved.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr M Naysmith George Wimpey East Scotland Ltd	11.1 George Wimpey agree that it is important to maintain the supply of housing land in Aberdeenshire and that the pragmatic solution of SPG should be adopted if a review of the structure plan cannot be achieved.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action	
Mr B Wallace Hargest & Wallace Planning Ltd [Barratt Construction Ltd]	14.2	It is essential to maintain at least 5 a year housing land supply at the end of the plan period and the effective supply must be carefully monitored and further proposals may be required to address further identified shortfalls. Paragraph 64 of SPPG3: Planning for Housing states: "Local Plans must conform to the structure plan and provide sufficient effective land to meet the housing land requirement for at least 5 years from the date of adoption. Local Plans should also identify further sites to meet requirements in the medium term" - Thus it is agreed that the SPG is an appropriate mechanism.	The support is welcome but it should be recognised that the SPG is not intended to replace either the structure or local plan.	None
Mr B Melville Homes for Scotland	19.4	Homes for Scotland agrees that, in these circumstances, the SPG is a pragmatic short-term approach.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr J Benton Osprey Homes	17.2	It is clear that the only legal method of land release on the scale now required to achieve the minimum level of land supply as at today's date, far less maintain that level at all times as NEST and ALP require, is through a structure plan review (see legal opinion from Colin Campbell, Dean of the Faculty of Advocates). However, many hundreds of jobs in the construction industry depend on a pragmatic solution being found.	The desirability of a structure plan review is not disputed. The recognition of the importance of pragmatic action is welcome.	None
Mr J Benton Osprey Homes	17.1	The Council has a statutory duty to maintain a minimum 5 year supply of effective housing land, something it has not done during the lifetime of NEST.	Do not agree. The requirement to maintain a minimum 5 year supply of effective housing land is contained in the structure plan and Scottish Executive planning policy (SPP3), not legislation. It is not accepted that this has not been done since 2001.	None
Mr J Findlay Ryden Property Consultants [Alba Homes Ltd]	15.1	Generally, in the absence of a structure plan review, the issue of supplementary guidance to secure the release of housing land for the structure plan period 2006 - 2010 is to be welcomed.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action
Mr J Low Stewart Milne Homes	2.2 Stewart Milne Homes do not merely consider maintaining the supply of housing land in Aberdeenshire important but consider it necessary.	The importance of maintaining the supply of housing land is recognised.	None
Mr R Davidson Tarves Community Council	23.1 We agree that it is important to maintain the supply of housing land in Aberdeenshire and that a pragmatic solution (i.e. the publication of SPG) should be adopted if a review of the Structure Plan cannot be achieved.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr R Holland Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	8.3 We firmly agree that it is important to maintain the supply of housing land. SPG should be used to bring forward sites that meet the numerical requirement as well as the quality and spatial elements of housing site identification.	The support for the proposals is welcomed. The SPG delivers the spatial, quality and quantity elements of both the structure and local plans.	None
Mr E Innes Tor Ecosse Ltd	5.2 Tor Ecosse totally agree that it is important to maintain the housing land supply and on the use of a pragmatic solution.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr W Lippe William Lippe Architects Ltd [Mansell Watson (Builders) Ltd]	1.1 We strongly believe that it is important to maintain the supply of housing land in Aberdeenshire and that the publication of the supplementary planning guidance should be adopted given that the structure plan [review] cannot be achieved.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None

Q2 Sites limited to local plan sites

Mr J Benton Association of Builders & Developers	18.7 Additional sites to those identified in ALP must also be released.	This conflicts with the opinion of the Reporters at the recent Local Plan Inquiry. New sites will be identified through the next development plan as to do otherwise would be contrary to the plan-led approach promoted by the Scottish Executive and the structure plan.	None
-----------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action
Mr J Benton Association of Builders & Developers	18.5 The solution which should have been adopted was the one agreed at the meeting at the Scottish Executive with Jim Mackinnon on 26 September 2003 to advance only those Phase II sites which could contribute towards the effective supply together with any other objection sites which could likewise contribute to the effective supply	Do not agree. The Scottish Executive have been consulted and accept the position set out in the draft SPG. This issue was considered in the context of the Local Plan Inquiry and the Reporters did not advocate such an approach, concluding that additional sites were, in general, not required.	None
Mr H McNab Bancon Developments	21.3 We agree that the SPG should be limited to those sites which have emerged through the ALP process. To do otherwise would we believe undermine the legitimacy of the SPG procedure.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mrs S Jenkins Belhelvie Community Council	9.2 The release should be limited to the sites identified through the local plan process.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr W Burr Chap Homes Ltd	7.2 We agree that the SPG should be limited to sites identified through the local plan process.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr H Cormack Cormack Development Company	12.4 It is important for the SPG to promote the release of sites which have been identified through the local plan process as being suitable for housing in the period 2006 - 2010.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action	
Mr B Wallace Hargest & Wallace Planning Ltd [Barratt Construction Ltd]	14.3	In an ideal situation Barratt agree that this SPG should be limited to sites identified through the local plan process. However in the event of a housing land shortfall emerging on the basis of regular Housing Land Reviews consideration must be given to a further SPG releasing housing land in the medium term. The opportunity to provide flexibility and address housing land shortfalls particularly applies in the major settlements which currently have no allocations i.e. Ellon and Stonehaven. These form two of Aberdeenshire's five towns and Capacity studies have already been prepared for both sites.	The support for the proposals is welcomed. However, future housing land identification needs to be taken forward through the next development plan. An SPG cannot consider all the issues which may arise from a structure plan review.	None
Mr B Melville Homes for Scotland	19.5	Homes for Scotland would agree that only those sites identified through the Local Plan process, and recommended by Aberdeenshire Council for inclusion in the adopted plan, should be covered by the SPG. To do otherwise would invited challenge and delay which, in the current situation of land supply shortages, would be extremely harmful to both builders and house purchasers. The SPG does not, of course, preclude windfall sites which comply with the policies of the plan also coming forward for consent.	The support for the proposals is welcomed. Windfall opportunities on brownfield or infill sites will continue to be addressed through the policies of the development plan and are not affected by this SPG. A note will be added to this effect.	A new paragraph has been added to the SPG at the end of the 'Proposal' section - "It should be noted that this SPG does not impact on the acceptability or otherwise of brownfield or infill development opportunities which will continue to be addressed in the normal way through the planning process."
Mr J Benton Osprey Homes	17.7	Additional sites to those identified in ALP must also be released.	This conflicts with the opinion of the Reporters at the recent Local Plan Inquiry. New sites will be identified through the next development plan as to do otherwise would be contrary to the plan-led approach promoted by the Scottish Executive and the structure plan.	None

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action
Mr J Benton Osprey Homes	17.5 The solution which should have been adopted was the one agreed at the meeting at the Scottish Executive with Jim Mackinnon on 26 September 2003 to advance only those Phase II sites which could contribute towards the effective supply together with any other objection sites which could likewise contribute to the effective supply	Do not agree. The Scottish Executive have been consulted and accept the position set out in the draft SPG. This issue was considered in the context of the Local Plan Inquiry and the Reporters did not advocate such an approach, concluding that additional sites were, in general, not required.	None
Mrs H Wood Planning Division Scottish Executive	20.2 At this stage, in the interests of minimising delay in adoption of the SPG, I would support the approach of focusing on the release of sites where there has already been consideration through the local plan process.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr J Findlay Ryden Property Consultants [Alba Homes Ltd]	15.2 It would seem reasonable to limit the supplementary guidance to sites identified through the local plan process. Nevertheless, as with any application considered against the development plan, this should not preclude the possibility of other "windfall" sites coming forward should these be capable of justification against other development plan policies.	The support for the proposals is welcomed. Windfall opportunities on brownfield or infill sites will continue to be addressed through the policies of the development plan and are not affected by this SPG. A note will be added to this effect.	A new paragraph has been added to the SPG at the end of the 'Proposal' section - "It should be noted that this SPG does not impact on the acceptability or otherwise of brownfield or infill development opportunities which will continue to be addressed in the normal way through the planning process."
Mr J Low Stewart Milne Homes	2.4 Windfall sites can also be suitable for development and granted consent in addition to what is mainly greenfield releases covered under NEST Policy 9 and the local plan allocations which this SPG addresses.	Agree. This SPG does not impact on the suitability or otherwise of brownfield redevelopment which will come forward under other policies of the development plan.	A new paragraph has been added to the SPG at the end of the 'Proposal' section - "It should be noted that this SPG does not impact on the acceptability or otherwise of brownfield or infill development opportunities which will continue to be addressed in the normal way through the planning process."
Mr J Low Stewart Milne Homes	2.3 Stewart Milne Homes agree that the SPG should refer to sites identified through the local plan process and that it is imperative to consult and have an independent review to enable the Local Authority to consider recommendations made by the Reporters.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action
Mr R Davidson Tarves Community Council	23.2 We agree that this SPG should be limited to sites identified through the local plan process as suitable for housing for the period 2006 - 2010 given the consultation and independent review that this process affords.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr R Holland Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	8.5 In relation to Schedule 2 sites, we believe that this SPG should not be limited to those sites identified through the local plan process.	Do not agree. The purpose of this SPG is to facilitate the release of sites identified in the Aberdeenshire Local Plan, not the identification of new sites. The proper place for such identification is the next local plan.	None
Mr R Holland Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	8.4 We agree that Phase II Schedule 1 sites should be identified through the SPG for immediate development due to the fact that these sites have largely been consulted on and their inclusion within the local plan is no longer contested.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr E Innes Tor Ecosse Ltd	5.3 Tor Ecosse agree that the release should be limited to sites identified through the local plan process, otherwise rogue sites could be included which could undermine the process.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr W Lippe William Lippe Architects Ltd [Mansell Watson (Builders) Ltd]	1.8 There may be opportunities for alternative sites to be considered through departure procedures if any Phase II sites are constrained.	Do not agree. Any constraints emerging on Phase II sites would not justify consent on an alternative site.	None

Q3 Limited release

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action
Mr J Benton Association of Builders & Developers	18.4 There is no justification for releasing a large number of sites, mainly in the RHMA, which cannot possibly contribute to the effective land supply by virtue of being constrained for a variety of reasons. Only sites that can contribute to the effective housing supply have a justifiable claim for release.	The extent of this issue is overstated. It is often through the release of such land that constraints can be addressed. However, even if construction were to commence in 2010 a site would still contribute to the effective supply in the 2006 Audit and justify release. In addition, it would be inequitable to make a judgement on the basis of opinions about whether a particular site is likely to be developed in the next five years.	None
Mr H McNab Bancon Developments	21.4 We agree with the thinking behind the release if all sites (subject to Q4) at one time. This also provides more flexibility for developers - and hence for customers - which is to be welcomed.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mrs S Jenkins Belhelvie Community Council	9.3 All sites should be released rather than a limited release.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr W Burr Chap Homes Ltd	7.3 We agree that all sites should be released because consistency is paramount to support the policy.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr H Cormack Cormack Development Company	12.5 The SPG should release all sites identified for this period across Aberdeenshire. Any other approach to the release of sites would be unworkable.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr M Naysmith George Wimpey East Scotland Ltd	11.2 We agree that this SPG should release all sites identified for this period across Aberdeenshire.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action	
Mr B Wallace Hargest & Wallace Planning Ltd [Barratt Construction Ltd]	14.4	Barratt agree that all sites should be released as this is a fair and flexible approach whilst providing certainty to both communities and the development industry.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr B Melville Homes for Scotland	19.6	Homes for Scotland supports the release of all sites.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr J Benton Osprey Homes	17.4	There is no justification for releasing a large number of sites, mainly in the RHMA, which cannot possibly contribute to the effective land supply by virtue of being constrained for a variety of reasons. Only sites that can contribute to the effective housing supply have a justifiable claim for release.	The extent of this issue is overstated. It is often through the release of such land that constraints can be addressed. However, even if construction were to commence in 2010 a site would still contribute to the effective supply in the 2006 Audit and justify release. In addition, it would be inequitable to make a judgement on the basis of opinions about whether a particular site is likely to be developed in the next five years.	None
Mrs H Wood Planning Division Scottish Executive	20.3	The intention of releasing all sites identified in the structure plan for the 2006-2010 period, rather than a more limited release is welcome.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr J Findlay Ryden Property Consultants [Alba Homes Ltd]	15.3	I would agree that the release should apply to all sites rather than to a select few. Provided that each application has been subject to the proper planning process and all other areas of planning policy have been satisfied, there should be no restriction on the grant of planning permission for that site.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr J Low Stewart Milne Homes	2.5	Stewart Milne Homes agree that the SPG should release all Phase II sites rather than a limited release.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action
Mr R Davidson Tarves Community Council	We agree that this SPG should release all sites identified for this period across Aberdeenshire rather than a more limited release. 23.3	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr R Holland Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	It would be prudent to release all the sites identified for this period across Aberdeenshire to provide flexibility, certainty that completions will be delivered and that an effective land supply will be maintained. 8.6	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr E Innes Tor Ecosse Ltd	Tor Ecosse agree that all Phase II sites should be released across Aberdeenshire. 5.4	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr W Lippe William Lippe Architects Ltd [Mansell Watson (Builders) Ltd]	We believe that all sites identified for this period should be released rather than a limited release. 1.7	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None

Q4 Two Stage release

Mr J Benton Association of Builders & Developers	The only possible justification which the Council could offer for approving planning applications on any of these sites under s25 of the T&CP(S)A '97, bearing in mind that such action is strictly prohibited under the terms of NEST Policy 9 and ALP Policy Hou\2, is that a shortfall currently exists in the 5 year effective housing land supply. No other material consideration could possibly justify approval in the current circumstances. That being so, a site's current progress through the local plan process is entirely irrelevant. 18.13	Do not agree. It is important that releases take place in an orderly way in accordance with the strategy, policies and proposals of the development plan. A two stage release allows for proper consultation and ensures an equitable approach.	None
--------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action
Mr J Benton Association of Builders & Developers	18.12 Sites which are being released under the SPG should all be released at the same time, irrespective of their progress through the local plan process.	Do not accept. Public consultation on the proposed modifications to Finalised ALP is essential before the Council can make a final decision on the form of the plan to be adopted.	None
Mr H McNab Bancon Developments	21.4 We accept that those sites which have only fully emerged as development options through the ALP process should be subject to further public scrutiny, but would suggest that this could be achieved through the planning application/development control process rather than by their 'quasi zoning' through the SPG process being delayed.	Do not agree. The consultation through the local plan process is important because in some cases it will be addressing the principle of development rather than issues of detail. It would not be appropriate to consider the issue of principle through a planning application.	None
Mrs S Jenkins Belhelvie Community Council	9.4 It is appropriate to release sites in two stages depending on status through the local plan.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr W Burr Chap Homes Ltd	7.4 Consistency is important and a two-stage release would be the best way to ensure the release of the approved sites.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action
Mr H Cormack Cormack Development Company	12.6 I do not agree that it is appropriate to release sites in two stages. Given the acute shortage of housing land in some areas of Aberdeenshire, the release of housing land is a matter of urgency. The Area Committees and Infrastructure Services Committee have met to discuss the Reporters' recommendations in relation to allocation of land for residential development. Where the elected members who sit on the relevant Area Committee and the Infrastructure Services Committee have voted to support the Reporters' recommendations to release land for residential development (albeit subject to the outcome of the public consultation exercise), there is no good reason to delay the release of land until the local plan is adopted. Sites in this position should be released as soon as possible. There is no justification for the release of land to be delayed in order for the public consultation exercise to take place, particularly in relation to sites which have proved to be uncontroversial in terms of the Local Plan Inquiry process. In any event, this approach would not deprive the public of an opportunity to participate in the local plan process given that the public have already had ample opportunity to raise objections in relation to sites through the Local Plan Inquiry process.	Do not agree. This undermines the importance of public consultation and the impact that this can still have on the final form of the plan. In addition, it disregards the fact that sites which are recommended by the Reporters have in some cases never been subject to any public consultation.	None
Mr M Naysmith George Wimpey East Scotland Ltd	11.3 We accept that releases should be in two stages as suggested.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr B Wallace Hargest & Wallace Planning Ltd [Barratt Construction Ltd]	14.5 Barratt agree that it is appropriate to release in two stages.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action
Mr B Melville Homes for Scotland	19.7 Homes for Scotland is content with this proposal. As part of the democratic testing of the Local Plan, some sites do require to be advertised as Modifications to the Finalised Plan and it is right that this process should be allowed to run its course.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr J Benton Osprey Homes	17.12 Sites which are being released under the SPG should all be released at the same time, irrespective of their progress through the local plan process.	Do not accept. Public consultation on the proposed modifications to Finalised ALP is essential before the Council can make a final decision on the form of the plan to be adopted.	None
Mr J Benton Osprey Homes	17.13 The only possible justification which the Council could offer for approving planning applications on any of these sites under s25 of the T&CP(S)A '97, bearing in mind that such action is strictly prohibited under the terms of NEST Policy 9 and ALP Policy Hou\2, is that a shortfall currently exists in the 5 year effective housing land supply. No other material consideration could possibly justify approval in the current circumstances. That being so, a site's current progress through the local plan process is entirely irrelevant.	Do not agree. It is important that releases take place in an orderly way in accordance with the strategy, policies and proposals of the development plan. A two stage release allows for proper consultation and ensures an equitable approach.	None
Mrs H Wood Planning Division Scottish Executive	20.4 As regards the two-stage approach to release of sites, there appears to be a good justification for releasing without delay those sites where no outstanding objections remain. In theory, the adoption of the local plan provides an appropriate date for the release of sites likely to form part of 'Schedule 2'.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Ms C Pritchett Scottish Environment Protection Agency	3.2 SEPA agrees that it is appropriate to release sites in two stages depending on their status through the local plan process.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action
Mr J Low Stewart Milne Homes	Stewart Milne Homes agree with a two-stage release based on a site's status through the local plan process. 2.6	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr J Low Stewart Milne Homes	Stewart Milne Homes reserves its position regarding sites where it supported the Local Authority at the Local Plan Inquiry but where the report subsequently recommended an alternative (eg Westhill). 2.7	This position is noted in relation to the scale and boundaries of sites and any changes following the Local Plan Inquiry. However, the issue of site identification is one for the local plan rather than this SPG.	None
Mr R Davidson Tarves Community Council	We agree that it is appropriate to release sites in two stages depending on their status through the local plan process. 23.4	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr R Davidson Tarves Community Council	It is important that the general public has sufficient time to input into the process that allows housing land to be allocated. 23.9	Housing land is not identified through this SPG. The local plan is the means by which new sites are identified and public consultation is at the heart of that process. A two-stage release is proposed in this SPG to ensure that consultation takes place on sites which have not been part of the plan to date or where the changes to individual sites are significant.	None
Mr R Holland Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	It is considered appropriate to release sites in two stages depending on their status through the local plan process. This will ensure that sufficient consultation is undertaken and that each of the sites is open to public scrutiny. 8.7	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr E Innes Tor Ecosse Ltd	Tor Ecosse believe it is only reasonable that sites are released in two stages depending on their status through the local plan process. 5.5	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action
Mr W Lippe William Lippe Architects Ltd [Mansell Watson (Builders) Ltd]	1.6 The Aberdeenshire Local Plan Inquiry has given adequate opportunity for consultation and as such the reporters recommendations should be released at the same time as other local plan sites.	Do not agree. It is important that adequate consultation takes place through the local plan process prior to sites being released.	None
Q5 Dates of release			
Mr J Benton Association of Builders & Developers	18.15 Since each site must be considered on its merits, any particular date which may trigger the release of sites is irrelevant. This process is entirely outwith any development plan function. It would therefore make more sense to release all the sites on the date that ISC agree the SPG.	Do not agree. This process sits within the framework set by the structure and local plans. The action proposed would undermine the local plan.	None
Mr H McNab Bancon Developments	21.5 Subject to our answer in Q4, we feel that the dates suggested are sensible.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mrs S Jenkins Belhelvie Community Council	9.5 31 December 2005 and the point of adoption of the local plan are appropriate dates provided that there is appropriate consultation and the status of sites is confirmed through the local plan process.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr W Burr Chap Homes Ltd	7.5 We agree with the release on 31 December 2005 but would not wish that date to slip.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr H Cormack Cormack Development Company	12.7 Land release for residential development is required as a matter of urgency. Therefore, my preference would be for all sites to be released on 31 December 2005.	Do not agree. This undermines the importance of public consultation and the impact that this can still have on the final form of the plan. In addition, it disregards the fact that sites which are recommended by the Reporters have in some cases never been subject to any public consultation.	None

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action
Mr M Naysmith George Wimpey East Scotland Ltd	11.4 Appropriate timescales for release would be 31 December 2005 and the point of adoption of the local plan depending on the status of the sites in the local plan process.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr B Wallace Hargest & Wallace Planning Ltd [Barratt Construction Ltd]	14.6 Barratt propose that Schedule 2 sites become effective at the same stage of the process as Schedule 1 sites, i.e. when the Schedule 2 sites are approved at ISC. This is simple, fair and transparent. Adoption of the Local Plan although desirable is not essential and given the complexities of the process is an unnecessary hurdle to attain. Should the Local Plan not be adopted for whatever reason - what will happen? This approach would not be consistent with providing certainty.	Do not agree. The point of adoption is an appropriate point to release Schedule 2 sites. This conforms to the legal advice received by the Council. In any event, the timescale between the approval of sites by ISC and the adoption of ALP should be short and developers will be able to progress applications to a point where they are capable of being approved in advance of this point.	A statement has been added at the end of the 'Position Statement' - "(expected May / June 2006)."
Mr B Wallace Hargest & Wallace Planning Ltd [Barratt Construction Ltd]	14.10 Barratt agree that the Schedule 1 sites should become effective on 31st December 2005, subject to approval at ISC on 1st December 2005.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr B Melville Homes for Scotland	19.8 Homes for Scotland is content with these dates, although it may be possible to consider a date for the second stage release as the closing date for any challenges to the proposed Modifications to the Plan. If that date passes with no material challenges to proposed Modifications, then it could be reasonably be concluded that the Plan will be adopted with the proposed modifications.	The support for the proposal is welcomed. However, the point of adoption is an appropriate point to release Schedule 2 sites. This conforms to the legal advice received by the Council. In any event, the timescale between the approval of sites by ISC and the adoption of ALP should be short and developers will be able to progress applications to a point where they are capable of being approved in advance of this point.	A statement has been added at the end of the 'Position Statement' - "(expected May / June 2006)."
Mr J Benton Osprey Homes	17.15 Since each site must be considered on its merits, any particular date which may trigger the release of sites is irrelevant. This process is entirely outwith any development plan function. It would therefore make more sense to release all the sites on the date that ISC agree the SPG.	Do not agree. This process sits within the framework set by the structure and local plans. The action proposed would undermine the local plan.	None

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action	
Mr B Smith Paul & Williamsons Solicitors [Stewart Milne Homes]	16.5	We assume that where a site is subject to an advertised modification and there are no material objections to that modification, then the site could be released thereafter on the basis that this element of the Local Plan would then be beyond legal challenge.	The SPG has been written on the basis of a two-stage release rather than a trickle of sites. Schedule 2 sites will be released at the point of adoption and the expected timescale for this has been included within the revised SPG.	A statement has been added at the end of the 'Position Statement' - "(expected May / June 2006)."
Mrs H Wood Planning Division Scottish Executive	20.5	Paragraph 66 of SPP 3 indicates that where there is a need to maintain the supply of land, planning permission should be granted in advance of local plan adoption, provided proposals comply with other policies of the development plan. The sites in Schedule 2 should therefore be released as necessary to maintain the effective land supply.	Agree that theoretically there may be a need to release Schedule 2 sites in advance of adoption, if for example there is a significant unexpected delay in the adoption process. SPP1 (para 42) notes the importance of keeping SPG up-to-date and this will be done. However, the focus should remain on the point of adoption rather than an earlier release, especially since adoption is anticipated within the next 6-8 months.	A statement has been added at the end of the 'Position Statement' - "(expected May / June 2006)."
Mr J Findlay Ryden Property Consultants [Alba Homes Ltd]	15.4	It would seem appropriate to release the sites in two stages.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr J Findlay Ryden Property Consultants [Alba Homes Ltd]	15.5	Those sites which were included in the original plan or were introduced as subsequent modifications to that plan, have been advertised and been through the consultation process and Local Plan Inquiry, should be released immediately, if not immediately they should certainly be released after 31 December 2005.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr J Findlay Ryden Property Consultants [Alba Homes Ltd]	15.6	Sites which have not yet been before the public and require to be advertised as modifications should not be released until such time as any objections to those sites have been considered. Adoption of the local plan would seem an appropriate time for the release of these sites.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action
Mr J Low Stewart Milne Homes	Stewart Milne Homes believe Schedule 2 sites should be considered for release at the point where a "Notice of Intention to Adopt" is published to retain control within known timescales. 2.9	Do not agree. The point of adoption is an appropriate point to release Schedule 2 sites. This conforms to the legal advice received by the Council. In any event, the timescale between the approval of sites by ISC and the adoption of ALP should be short and developers will be able to progress applications to a point where they are capable of being approved in advance of this point.	A statement has been added at the end of the 'Position Statement' - "(expected May / June 2006)."
Mr J Low Stewart Milne Homes	Stewart Milne Homes are relaxed about the Local Authority seeking to release Schedule 1 sites on 31 December 2005. 2.8	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr R Davidson Tarves Community Council	We agree that 31 December 2005 and the point of adoption of the local plan are appropriate for the release to take place given the need to ensure sites are subject to appropriate consultation and that the status of sites is confirmed through the local plan process. 23.5	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr R Holland Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	We believe that there should be definitive timescales for the release of this land. Perhaps the releases should be on 31 December 2005 and 31 December 2007. 8.8	While it is accepted that a definitive timescale is appropriate, it is not accepted that this can be done for Schedule 2 sites. In any event, delaying Schedule 2 sites until the end of 2007 would not be equitable. However, it is appropriate within the SPG to be clearer on the expected timetable for local plan adoption.	A statement has been added at the end of the 'Position Statement' - "(expected May / June 2006)."
Mr R Holland Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	I would raise the concern that the local plan may never be adopted. Therefore a more definitive timescale should be set which allows for further consultation on Phase II Schedule 2 sites which allows for their release before 2010. 8.9	The Council intend to adopt the local plan in May/June 2006.	A statement has been added at the end of the 'Position Statement' - "(expected May / June 2006)."
Mr E Innes Tor Ecosse Ltd	Release of sites before 1 January 2006 makes sense in terms of the Housing Land Audit. 5.6	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action	
Mr W Lippe William Lippe Architects Ltd [Mansell Watson (Builders) Ltd]	1.5	We agree with 31 December 2005 as the release date for Phase II housing (identified through the local plan process as suitable for housing).	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Q6 Inclusion in schedule 2				
Mr H McNab Bancon Developments	21.6	Again subject to our answer to Q4, we feel that the sites which have emerged from the ALP PLI unscathed - albeit subject to some minor adjustments - should be released at the end of the year and all others following appropriate consultations.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mrs S Jenkins Belhelvie Community Council	9.6	We do not agree that sites should be included in Schedule 2 where only "minor" changes are identified to Finalised ALP. All issues must be resolved prior to any areas being included in Schedule 2.	It is recognised that the question was worded in such a way as to heighten the possibility of misunderstanding. It is proposed to list all sites in either Schedule 1 or 2. It is not reasonable to require all issues to be resolved as the development control process will be able to deal with those of a minor nature. Proposed modifications would be a material consideration in the determination of any planning applications.	None
Mr W Burr Chap Homes Ltd	7.6	We fully agree that sites should be included in Schedule 2 unless no or only minor changes are being proposed to sites identified in Finalised ALP.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr H Cormack Cormack Development Company	12.8	I do not accept that the release of sites should take place in two stages and therefore I believe that the division of sites into two schedules is unnecessary. All sites which the Reporters have recommended for allocation for residential development in the adopted plan should be released under the SPG.	Do not agree. Consultation on proposed modifications is important prior to the Council's final position on the local plan is taken. In addition, it is the Council's response to the Reporters recommendations rather than the recommendations themselves that are the important issue.	None

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action	
Mr M Naysmith George Wimpey East Scotland Ltd	11.5	We agree that there should be a Schedule 2 of sites which can be released on the adoption of the local plan.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr B Wallace Hargest & Wallace Planning Ltd [Barratt Construction Ltd]	14.9	Schedule 1 - those sites identified in the Local Plan and considered through the Local Plan Inquiry. Schedule 2 - Those sites not identified in the Local Plan and considered at the local plan inquiry and recommended to be included by the Local Plan Inquiry Reporter. This would allow for these sites to be advertised as modifications to the Local Plan.	The support for the proposals is welcome.	Schedules 1 and 2 have been compiled and appended to the SPG.
Mr B Wallace Hargest & Wallace Planning Ltd [Barratt Construction Ltd]	14.7	Barratt agreed that minor changes can be accommodated as a pragmatic approach	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr B Melville Homes for Scotland	19.9	Homes for Scotland agreed that, wherever possible, sites should be in the proposed Schedule 1.	Agree - sites are only listed in Schedule 2 where it would be unreasonable to include them in Schedule 1.	Schedules 1 and 2 have been compiled and appended to the SPG.
Mr B Smith Paull & Williamsons Solicitors [Stewart Milne Homes]	16.4	We assume that where there is no change to the site or the site boundary and only a change to the phasing or density within a site, the site would be listed under Schedule 1 and not Schedule 2.	Agree in respect of changes between Phase I and Phase II but this would not apply where the phasing of an fh* area of search is involved.	Schedules 1 and 2 have been compiled and appended to the SPG.
Mr J Findlay Ryden Property Consultants [Alba Homes Ltd]	15.7	I would contend that any sites which are subject to only minor changes should be included in Schedule 1 and released after 31 December 2005.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action
Ms C Pritchett Scottish Environment Protection Agency	3.3 SEPA considers that sites to which it objected to and the Reporters recommended for deletion should not be released, if at all, until their inclusion is resolved at the point of adoption of the local plan.	Do not agree. Objections by SEPA will be treated in the same way as any other objections to the local plan and will not be given special status through this SPG.	None
Mr J Low Stewart Milne Homes	2.10 Stewart Milne Homes agree that sites should be included in Schedule 2 unless no or only minor changes are proposed to sites identified in the Finalised Local Plan.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr R Davidson Tarves Community Council	23.10 Where a site has been included as a result of the Reporter's recommendation it is important that there is further consultation.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr R Davidson Tarves Community Council	23.6 We agree that sites should be included in Schedule 2 (release on adoption of the local plan) unless no, or only "minor" changes are being proposed to sites identified in Finalised ALP given the need for appropriate consultation.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr R Holland Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	8.10 Schedule 1 sites should be allowed minor changes as the finalised local plan should only to serve to establish the principle of development and not determine its detail.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr R Holland Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	8.11 Any site that is included in Schedule 2 should be subject to further consultation but should not be restricted to those included in the Finalised Local Plan.	Do not agree. This conflicts with the opinion of the Reporters at the recent Local Plan Inquiry. New sites will be identified through the next development plan as to do otherwise would be contrary to the plan-led approach promoted by the Scottish Executive and the structure plan.	None
Mr E Innes Tor Ecosse Ltd	5.7 I agree that sites should be included in Schedule 2 unless the modifications are minor since appropriate consultation is important.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action
Mr W Lippe William Lippe Architects Ltd [Mansell Watson (Builders) Ltd]	Given the potential delays, as many sites as practically possible should be brought forward and made available on 1 January 2006. 1.3	Agree - sites are only listed in Schedule 2 where it would be unreasonable to include them in Schedule 1.	Schedules 1 and 2 have been compiled and appended to the SPG.

Q7 the nature of minor change

Mr J Benton Association of Builders & Developers	Although there should not be two schedules, if two are to be adopted, Schedule 2 should contain any site where there is an increase in the number of units; changed site designation; alteration of boundaries; or any site which is dependent on external factors (such as significant uncommitted Council expenditure). 18.16	Partially accept. It is accepted that changes to site designation (i.e. between different land uses) would require a site to form part of Schedule 2. Equally, if boundary alterations are significant and represent a site expansion. However, issues in relation to site capacity can be dealt with at the application stage. Overcoming potential constraints is largely an issue for developers to address.	Schedules 1 and 2 have been compiled and appended to the SPG.
Mr H McNab Bancon Developments	We feel the sort of issues mentioned in your preamble are relevant, and that it would be sensible, given the variety of sites involved, to consider each case on its merits. 21.7	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	None
Mr W Burr Chap Homes Ltd	We believe that "minor" changes should be a stated percentage fluctuation in numbers or size (e.g. 10%); boundary changes which do not have a direct effect on neighbouring properties; or changes that reduce the impact of the development. 7.7	The criteria of changes that reduce the impact of the development is particularly helpful. Increases in site size of 10% may be significant in some cases, as might changes which do not have a direct effect on neighbouring properties, although these are useful factors to take into account in coming to a determination.	Schedules 1 and 2 have been compiled and appended to the SPG.
Mr H Cormack Cormack Development Company	I am of the view that the definition of "minor changes" is irrelevant and does not require to be considered. 12.9	Do not agree. Dividing sites into two schedules is necessary because the consultation through the local plan process must be real and it is the principle as well as the detail which is often the subject of consultation.	None

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action
Mr M Naysmith George Wimpey East Scotland Ltd	11.6 The level of minor changes allowed should be limited to the reduction in size of development sites, the introduction of strategic landscaping or other such issues which have been the subject of discussion at the Local Plan Inquiry.	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	Schedules 1 and 2 have been compiled and appended to the SPG.
Mr B Wallace Hargest & Wallace Planning Ltd [Barratt Construction Ltd]	14.8 The criteria to determine minor changes could include the following: a) non material changes or issues which can be conditioned. B) finalising boundaries for landscaping etc	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	Schedules 1 and 2 have been compiled and appended to the SPG.
Mr B Melville Homes for Scotland	19.8 It is suggested that "minor changes" should include changes to site capacities or densities which nevertheless comply with the general policy framework of the Plan, or changes to boundaries to reflect actual ownership boundaries or to relate better to natural boundaries on the ground.	Comments in relation to site capacities and densities are accepted. Changes in relation to boundaries should relate to the materiality of the change rather than the reason for it.	Schedules 1 and 2 have been compiled and appended to the SPG.
Mr J Benton Osprey Homes	17.16 Although there should not be two schedules, if two are to be adopted, Schedule 2 should contain any site where there is an increase in the number of units; changed site designation; alteration of boundaries; or any site which is dependent on external factors (such as significant uncommitted Council expenditure).	Partially accept. It is accepted that changes to site designation (i.e. between different land uses) would require a site to form part of Schedule 2. Equally, if boundary alterations are significant and represent a site expansion. However, issues in relation to site capacity can be dealt with at the application stage. Overcoming potential constraints is largely an issue for developers to address.	Schedules 1 and 2 have been compiled and appended to the SPG.
Mr B Smith Paull & Williamsons Solicitors [Stewart Milne Homes]	16.3 If proposed modifications are not to be considered "minor" there should be material changes to site boundaries rather than minor adjustments or corrections.	Agree that material changes should be included in Schedule 2.	Schedules 1 and 2 have been compiled and appended to the SPG.

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action
Mr J Findlay Ryden Property Consultants [Alba Homes Ltd]	I would construe minor changes as those which do not involve an extension of the site boundaries. 15.8	The support for the proposals is welcomed.	Schedules 1 and 2 have been compiled and appended to the SPG.
Mr J Low Stewart Milne Homes	Stewart Milne Homes believes that it would be most appropriate for the Local Authority to determine the nature of "minor" changes and seek consultation from key stakeholders. 2.11	Noted. However, time will not permit further consultation and the principles derived from this consultation will be used to inform this process.	None
Mr R Davidson Tarves Community Council	There should be discretion for the local Councillor, Community Council and Local Plan Team to satisfy local feeling and demand. 23.7	Do not agree. A definitive list of sites is required for this SPG and that list should be prepared on the basis of valid planning considerations rather than the views of Councillors, Community Councils or individual members of staff. This would provide no confidence to the development industry.	None
Mr R Davidson Tarves Community Council	Sites with no recognisable boundaries should be given less priority due to the potential for conflict and difficulty in securing accurate consultation on an undefined site. 23.8	All sites identified within the Finalised Local Plan (and proposed modifications) for the period 2006 - 2010 have definitive boundaries. However, new sites or sites where there has been a material change to the boundary since the finalised plan will be included in Schedule 2.	Schedules 1 and 2 have been compiled and appended to the SPG.
Mr R Holland Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Minor changes should relate to changes in capacity or boundaries as a result of amendments to the layout or masterplan. 8.12	The "minor changes" referred to are modifications to the local plan. As a result, layout and masterplans are not of direct relevance here.	None
Mr E Innes Tor Ecosse Ltd	Tor Ecosse consider "minor" changes to be boundary alterations or a change in the number of units. 5.8	Agree as far as boundary changes not represent a significant extension of the site. All changes to site capacity (in isolation) will be considered minor.	Schedules 1 and 2 have been compiled and appended to the SPG.

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action	
Mr W Lippe William Lippe Architects Ltd [Mansell Watson (Builders) Ltd]	1.4	Minor changes should be changes to housing numbers not varying by more than 20% of the housing allocation.	Do not agree. Site capacity is considered to be less significant than boundary changes.	None

Specific text changes

Mr J Benton Association of Builders & Developers	18.8	It is not correct to say that all sites identified for the period 2006 - 2010 have been assessed as suitable for housing.	Discussion Paper (preamble to Q3): This reference is not to the findings of the Local Plan Inquiry. It is the Council which decides on the suitability of sites for housing development in light of consultation responses.	None
Mr B Melville Homes for Scotland	19.3	Section: Proposal; Paragraph 4 & Conclusion; Paragraph 2 - This addresses the issue of house type and size. It seems odd that an SPG on land supply should devote so much time to a detailed policy issue. It is unnecessary to repeat the policy framework to which proposals should comply and inappropriate to highlight one aspect of the policy framework in the plan when there are many other policies to which proposals should comply. It is suggested that these referenced are overstated.	The references mentioned cover eight lines in the draft SPG. However, it is accepted that these references could be reduced and kept at a less specific level so as not to give the appearance of over-emphasis. However, SPP3 emphasises that quality and location as well as quantity are important considerations in planning for housing.	'Proposal' paragraph 4 - replace "pay particular attention to the need identified in both plans" with the following text "have regard to the need". In addition, replace "particular attention should be focused on" with the following text "Regard should be had to". 'Conclusion' paragraph 2 - delete the text following "all relevant" and replace with the following text "structure / local plan policies and create mixed communities, providing for the needs of all."

Consultee [Representing]	Comment Comment ID	Response	Action
Mr B Melville Homes for Scotland	19.1 Section: Background; Paragraph 5 - Paragraph was incomplete pending the publication of the 2005 Housing Land Audit. Homes for Scotland does not dispute any individual sites but does disagree with the interpretation of the effective supply in the Audit. We would therefore wish to see Homes for Scotland's interpretation of the Audit in this paragraph with respect to the use of NEST Table 3 without a small sites allowance, and that the 2004 Strategic Forecasts should have flexibility added to them.	The draft SPG was issued for consultation prior to the finalisation of the Audit which meant that this paragraph had to be left incomplete. Agreement on all sites in the 2005 Audit was welcome but Homes for Scotland and all other audit participants also agreed to the inclusion of a small site allowance in the Audit. The inclusion or otherwise of flexibility is an issue for the structure plan, not the forecasts.	'Background' paragraph 5 has been inserted following the publication of the 2005 Housing Land Audit. The text reads - "The 2005 Housing Land Audit shows that housing completions have been running at a high level over recent years, particularly in the Aberdeenshire part of the Aberdeen Housing Market Area. This faster than expected take-up of land has meant that the effective land supply situation has deteriorated at a faster pace than expected. This points to the need to release land for housebuilding so as to ensure continuity of supply and avoid a hiatus based on the timetable for local plan adoption in both Aberdeen City and Aberdeenshire."
Mr B Melville Homes for Scotland	19.2 Section: Background; Paragraph 7 - The phrase "manages the housing market responsibly" is considered inappropriate. This is not the role of the planning authority and the phrase should be replaced by "responds to the need to address land shortages".	Do not agree. The planning authority does have a role (along with others) in the management of the housing market since the availability and location of available land will have an impact on that market.	None
Mr J Benton Osprey Homes	17.8 It is not correct to say that all sites identified for the period 2006 - 2010 have been assessed as suitable for housing.	Discussion Paper (preamble to Q3): This reference is not to the findings of the Local Plan Inquiry. It is the Council which decides on the suitability of sites for housing development in light of consultation responses.	None