

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
6.12 Mr A Bradford, Kincardine Estate	Re: Countryside and Open Space Access: No mention is made of the potential of increased access to result in greater damage to the rural environment. For example increased pedestrian, cycle and horse traffic along riverbanks will increase erosive pressures on a very fragile habitat which is already under pressure from increased frequency of flooding. Additionally, no mention is made of the potential of increased access to displace rural jobs. Example given of loss of income if anglers, as high spending tourists, are disinclined to visit Deeside because of higher visitor pressure on riverbanks.	1) Increasing access may lead to damage to sensitive resources.  2) a) There is support for the section on pages 59 and 60 of the Report of Survey. b) Lack of policies on Countryside and Open-space access. c) The implementation of the Countryside Access strategies of both Councils is questioned. d) The heading of section 5.2 should be changed to remove the word "access". e) Linked recreation areas should be protected by a change in the law rather than by fighting through expensive public inquiries.	1) The potential of increased access to result in greater damage to the environment is already acknowledged in the last sentence of paragraph 4.2.7 and in the Report of Survey.  2) a) Support noted. b) Policy Environment 2, bullet point 5 seeks to safeguard the integrity of strategic and local access routes to the countryside and open spaces. It is possible that the respondent did not see this bullet point as Policy Environment 2 addresses several issues. c) Including a reference supporting the Council's Countryside Access strategy would not provide any further weighting to their implementation. d) Noted. e) It is beyond the scope of the structure plan to change the law.  3) a) The amendment to the last sentence of paragraph 4.2.7 is noted. b) It is not necessary to refer to 'Rights of Way' as they are included within the phrase 'strategic and local access routes'. c) Linkages between footpaths and cycleway networks and other transport strategies is already mentioned in paragraph 4.2.7, however this link could be clarified in the transport chapter.  4) Positive actions on provision of new footpaths, cycleways etc. would be best placed in the local transport strategy.	A new Policy 17 has been introduced to ensure that access to open space and the countryside is considered as a strategic issue; and the supporting text adjusted accordingly.  Add an "erratum" to change the heading of section 5.2 in the Report of Survey's Addendum.
44.16 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	Pan 37 section 8 says the plan should contain at least 5 elements. No. 3 is "a complementary strategic approach to conserving and enhancing environmental quality". There is nothing about promoting and increasing access. Increasing access may lead to damage to sensitive resources.	3) Changes/additions should be made to paragraph 4.2.7 in the written statement: a) deletion of the last phrase in the last sentence; b) the inclusion of a reference to rights of way; and c) to encourage better linkages between footpaths and cycleway networks and public transport.		
44.17 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	Report of Survey, Section 5.2, page 49. This main heading should be changed to "Ensuring a good environment". The use of the word "access" is misleading as it can imply that all designated areas should have open access. This, if intended, can result in environmental damage which is in conflict with the policies to safeguard these areas. The real Access issue is effectively dealt with under "Countryside and Open-Space Access" on pages 59 & 60.	4) The addition of positive actions on providing new footpaths and cycleways connecting/linking communities is also suggested.		
44.19 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	Support for pages 59 & 60 on "Countryside Access" in Section 5 of the Report of Survey.			
44.42 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	The last sentence of para 4.2.7 should be altered to read "care must be taken to ensure that damage is not sustained by the natural resource and valuable assets" in their own right and not just because of less tourists!			
44.56 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	Countryside and Open Space Access is considered in the Survey Report in Section 5. Where are the Plan policies to support activity on this front and the implementation of the Countryside Access Strategies of both Councils?			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
56.9 Mr P Dean	Insert some positive actions on providing new footpaths, cycleways connecting/linking communities. Require developers to provide footpaths through housing areas, cycle routes along/adjacent to roadways.			
99.1 Ms J Clark, Scottish Rights of Way and Access Society	The Society would like to see paragraph 4.2.7 include a specific reference to rights of way and the duty of the Council to keep them "open and free from obstruction". Reason: it is our understanding that the proposed new legislation will give guaranteed access along rights of way at all times.			
140.8 Mr K Newton, Formartine Partnership	It is important to stress that not only should footpath / cycleway networks be linked with each other, but also with places to access them through public transport - e.g. train and bus routes. This point isn't made very clearly in paragraph 4.2.7 as only a brief mention is made of 'other transport strategies'.			
150.4 Mrs L C Massie, Culter Community Council	In Culter we have had to fight to public inquiry level to protect public footpaths and tracks for country walks from being closed and/or developed for housing by the owners of the land. If the concept of linked recreation areas is to succeed, then some cheaper method than continued public inquiries is needed to protect them by a change in the law.			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
44.18 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	Report of Survey section 5.2, page 58: the paragraph does not deal with other types of agricultural land so the heading should be altered.	1) It is argued that in NPPG 4, Land for Mineral Working, paragraph 29, it states that prime quality agricultural land can be utilised, providing its value is not permanently lost or irreversibly damaged. This is not acknowledged by Policy Environment 2 bullet point 4.	1) NPPG 4, paragraphs 28 and 29 state that when considering the allocation of land for development, policy should be based on the following principle: "Prime quality land should be protected against permanent development or irreversible damage". Prime Quality Agricultural Land is of national importance and therefore will be protected from any adverse development other than where (i) the objectives of the designation and the overall integrity of the area will not be compromised or (ii) any significant adverse effects on the qualities for which the area has been designated are clearly outweighed by social and economic benefits of national importance.	This policy has been clarified in accordance with wording in government guidance, and is now dealt with under Policy 19.
53.2 Mr C A Ortlepp, RMC Aggregates, Scottish Aggregates Limited	Whilst Scottish Executive guidance promotes the avoidance of development of prime agricultural land there is recognition in NPPG4, paragraph 29 that, in the context of mineral workings, such land can be utilised provided its value is not permanently lost or irreversibly damaged. The fourth bullet point to Policy Environment 2 should be amended to reflect this.	2) A request is made to alter the heading on page 58 of the Report of Survey to 'Prime Quality Agricultural Land' rather than just 'Agricultural Land'	2) Such a change would make no difference to the meaning of the text.	
98.2 Ms L Henderson, Quarry Products Association	Policy Environment 2, Bullet Point 4 should be amended to match Government Policy, one example of which is set out in paragraph 29 of NPPG 4. In order for this Bullet Point to be effective within the Policy, words should be added at the end as follows: "unless restoration to a high standard is feasible."			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
44.41 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	Para 4.2.2, p 26, Biodiversity: this is a very poor text despite the good treatment of the subject in the Survey Report. There needs to be a specific policy to support the work of the Biodiversity Steering Group and the continuous development of the Biological Records Centre.	1) Biodiversity is not given sufficient attention in the structure plan. It is suggested: a) change the existing policy to clarify meaning, expand to include environmental quality, ecological status and viability of a site, protected habitats or species, as well as biodiversity. b) make a separate biodiversity or wider countryside policy with various suggested policy statements for inclusion. c) alter the paragraph of explanatory text (4.2.2) to refer to LBAP's, to mention the protection afforded to wildlife interest in the wider countryside, to explain the value of Biodiversity as an indicator of Environmental Health and therefore sustainable development, to refer to NESBReC, to clarify the need for local action to promote, protect and enhance biodiversity. d) change the text in the report of survey to include the NELBAP priority lists for habitats and species in an Appendix and to refer to the NE Biodiversity Audit (1998).	1) a) & b) & 4) The biodiversity policy needs to be changed in order to make its meaning clearer, and not open to misinterpretation. Biodiversity should be protected, not only in designated areas but in the wider countryside.  1) c) The explanatory text needs to be rewritten in order to clarify the need to protect biodiversity throughout the natural heritage, and to emphasise the fact it can be used as an indicator of sustainable development. The need to promote and enhance biodiversity should also be included.  1) d) The report of survey refers to the LBAP priority lists, so there is no need to include these as an appendix. It is also not necessary to refer to the NE Biodiversity Audit as the NE LBAP refers to this.  2) The Environmental Impact Assessment (Scotland) Regulations 1999 set out which types of applications for planning permission require an EIA. It is not necessary to repeat this in the structure plan.  3) Noted. A general policy encouraging habitat enhancement will cover all policy areas.  5) Noted.	Policy 19 and the supporting text have been amended to provide clarification.  Habitat enhancement is now encouraged under new Policy 21.  Policies 24 and 25 have been amended to recognise the nature conservation value of landfill and mineral sites.
44.45 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	Policy Environment 2: Why does Biodiversity have this complex policy when Built Heritage, Archaeology and Landscape have a simple wording, e.g. "not adversely affect"? The wording should be changed. If "mitigation" can remove the adverse effects then it does not need to be mentioned. And "significant" adverse effect opens up room for argument.			
44.54 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	Another omission is the absence of policies for the "wider countryside". Biodiversity focuses attention on specific habitats and species at threat. The wider countryside beyond the designated sites is still important.			
48.2 Mr R MacMaster, Cairngorm Partnership	Paragraph 4.2.2 should mention the Cairngorms Biodiversity Action Plan, as this covers the Aberdeenshire part of the Cairngorms jointly with the North East LBAP.			
54.10 Mr M Ford	There is no policy specifically covering the conservation of biodiversity outwith designated areas.			
		2) Include a reference in the plan to the need for Environment Impact Assessments and ecological appraisals for certain developments.  3) Policies in the housing, employment and minerals section of the plan should incorporate a requirement for habitat enhancement or creation.  4) It is not clear from the policy whether biodiversity is to be protected only in designated sites.		

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
63.8 Ms E Parkes, NE Local Biodiversity Action Plan	<p>In addition to the comments made on biodiversity policy; Policy - Environment 2 there are two key issues that should also be included in paragraph 4.2.2.</p> <p>1. More emphasis should be put on the importance of biodiversity in all our lives.</p> <p>Agenda 21 states that "our planet's essential goods and services depend on the variety and variability of genes, species, populations and ecosystems. Biological resources feed and clothe us and provide housing, medicines and spiritual nourishment" (UNCED, Agenda 21, Rio 1992).</p> <p>2. The importance of biodiversity as an indicator of sustainable development should be included. We cannot be developing sustainably if we continue to lose biodiversity.</p> <p>Biodiversity in Scotland - the way forward (Scottish Office 1997) states that "Guarding our biological diversity is an integral part of planning for sustainable development. Biodiversity remains one of the most important indicators we have of the continuing health of our nation and culture".</p>	<p>5) Lower grade agricultural land and degraded land (e.g. quarries and landfills) may be of high biodiversity value and such sites should be assessed prior to development or restoration.</p>		
63.9 Ms E Parkes, NE Local Biodiversity Action Plan	<p>In Policy Environment 2 the statement 'have no significant impact on the biodiversity of a site, or where appropriate mitigating measures can be implemented' needs to be both clarified and expanded and linked across to other sections of the document. Biodiversity is not just a consideration during development but cuts across many other policy areas including flood prevention, catchment management, management of forestry, statutory and non-statutory sites, environmental assessment etc.</p>			
63.13 Ms E Parkes, NE Local Biodiversity Action Plan	<p>Accurate, high quality information on habitats and species is essential for the successful development of the LBAP. Habitat and species distribution data is needed to monitor the progress of action plans for priority habitats and species. The developing NESBReC is being set up to record and provide such information. This will also be an essential supporting tool for planning decisions.</p> <p>The Structure Plan should include a clear policy statement in support of the future development of the NESBReC. In recognition of the need for planning decisions to be based on accurate information.</p>			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
63.14 Ms E Parkes, NE Local Biodiversity Action Plan	Environmental impact assessments and ecological appraisals are required for certain developments. The need for these assessments is not clearly identified in the document. Impact assessment are an important tool in assessing the biodiversity implications of a proposed development. This should be included in sections on housing and employment or in a linked statement on development. NPPG 14 (83) "seeks to ensure that where development is likely to have significant effects on the environment the potential effects are systematically evaluated in a formal environmental statement".			
63.15 Ms E Parkes, NE Local Biodiversity Action Plan	When considering development the protection and enhancement of wildlife corridors and habitat networks should be included in policy. Biodiversity is not confined to statutory sites. The protection and enhancement of biodiversity is supported by development of a network of areas of semi-natural habitat linked by wildlife corridors (rivers and burns, hedges, strips of woodland, wetland, rough grassland etc). Wildlife corridors provide habitat in there own right and play a valuable role in providing links between areas of semi-natural habitat and sites of recognised nature conservation value (statutory and non-statutory sites). These 'wildlife links' contribute to the development of habitat networks and should be protected against damaging development. Support for addition: NPPG14 (19) states that "Planning authorities should seek to prevent further fragmentation or isolation (of habitats) and identify opportunities to restore links which have been broken".			
63.16 Ms E Parkes, NE Local Biodiversity Action Plan	Several examples of policy areas where habitat creation and enhancement can be included have been given (housing, employment, minerals etc). Policy in these areas should incorporate a requirement for habitat enhancement and or creation, encouraging best practice in enhancing biodiversity and using LBAP targets as a guide to enhancement. Support for addition: NPPG 14 (18) states that "Planning authorities can make an important contribution to the achievement of biodiversity targets by adopting policies which promote and afford protection to species and habitats identified as priorities in LBAPs.			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
63.18 Ms E Parkes, NE Local Biodiversity Action Plan	The section on biodiversity in the Report of Survey clearly outlines the issues and the policy context and introduces the role of the LBAP. This report of LBAP involvement is not effectively picked up in the written statements. The report on biodiversity refers to the NE LBAP priority lists for habitats and species. It may be appropriate to include this list as an Appendix to the report or to the strategy. These lists could easily be provided in a user friendly form, for an Appendix. In addition to the NE LBAP document noted in the text and the references the NE Biodiversity Audit should also be included and noted in the references. This documents provides key summary information on all priority habitats and species in the North East including maps of distribution. Reference: North East Scotland Biodiversity Audit (1998). NE LBAP Steering Group.			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
63.20 Ms E Parkes, NE Local Biodiversity Action Plan	<p>Policy addition - Clear Statement on Biodiversity</p> <p>NPPG 14 (18) states that "planning authorities can make an important contribution to the achievement of biodiversity targets by adopting policies which promote and afford protection to species and habitats identified as priorities in Local Biodiversity Action Plans (LBAPs)".</p> <p>A clear statement of support for the LBAP Process and for the integration of biodiversity issues into other policy areas is needed in the Structure Plan as a key statement. For example; The policies and proposals contained in the Structure Plan will seek to further the objectives of the UK and Local Biodiversity Action Plans by protecting target species and habitats. This can be clarified further by policy statements including: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· support for the preparation, implementation, monitoring and review of LBAPs in partnership with SNH and other agencies, organisations and individuals.</li> <li>· a statement that targets and objectives of the LBAP should be used to determine the appropriateness of development proposals (ie. 'no significant impact on biodiversity of a site')</li> <li>· support for development policies that incorporate a requirement for enhancement/habitat creation, guided by LBAP targets.</li> </ul> <p>These statements relate to other policy areas in addition to employment and housing. A new Policy is required to clearly state a commitment to biodiversity conservation. Support for addition: Planning for biodiversity (RTPI 1999) states that structure plans should "fully reflect the national and international concern for and commitment to biodiversity conservation, provide a strong nature conservation framework for local plans, nature conservation strategies and biodiversity action plans and ensure that all policies and proposals are consistent with the principles of biodiversity conservation".</p>			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
70.5 Ms J Bryce, Scottish Wildlife Trust	There is little mention of the protection afforded to wildlife interest in the wider countryside. Page 53 of the Report of Survey describes the range of mechanism by which other species and habitats are afforded protection, e.g. Wildlife and Countryside Act and priority lists on LBAPs. These mechanisms are also detailed in NPPG4. This section should make explicit reference to the intent to use these mechanisms to protect important species, habitats and wildlife corridors from inappropriate development.			
72.10 Mr B Wallace, GVA Grimley, Invervale Ltd	It is unclear whether the reference to biodiversity applies to any site or only to those in Designated Areas. The latter should apply.			
88.3 Mr A Ferguson, North East of Scotland Biological Record Centre	Section 4.2.2 does not clearly explain the values of Biodiversity, namely as an indicator of Environmental Health and hence success of any sustainable development. The North East of Scotland Biological Record Centre (NESBReC) is being developed by Aberdeenshire Council and various other agencies as a tool for monitoring Biodiversity in the North East of Scotland. The commitment of the local authorities in this region towards its biodiversity would be enhanced by the adoption of NESBReC as a means by which biodiversity can be monitored. Suggested wording at the end of this section : "The North East of Scotland Biological Record Centre (NESBReC) is being developed to assist with biodiversity monitoring in the region".			
120.4 Ms A Polson, Brodies, The British Wind Energy Association	It is not clear what the first bullet point of Policy Environment 2 means. The words "or where" should be deleted and replaces by the word "unless".			
125.12 Mr B Wallace, GVA Grimley, Barratt Construction Ltd	It is unclear whether the reference to biodiversity applies to any site or to only to those in Designated Areas. The latter should apply.			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
126.3 Mr B Wallace, GVA Grimley, G Gaffney	It is unclear as to whether the reference to biodiversity applies to any site or only to those in designated Areas. The latter should apply.			
141.19 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	Although there is a strong 'international obligation to', the emphasis is on local action to promote, protect and enhance biodiversity. This should be clarified within the text (paragraph 4.2.2). It should also be noted that changes in land use practices can affect biodiversity, especially where species are dependant upon mans actions. SEPA strongly recommend that the text is amended to reflect this.			
141.21 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	It should be noted that lower grade agricultural land may be of high biodiversity value and is at risk of depletion through development demands.			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
141.25 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	<p>Policy Environment 2, bullet point 1, should be expanded to include environmental quality, ecological status and viability of a site, protected habitats or protected species, as well as a site's biodiversity. Provided the range of species a site supports has not been affected then its biodiversity will not have been adversely impacted, however the viability and ecological status of those species could have been impacted upon. Viability is a key issue as for example the loss of one raised peat bog may affect numerous others if it was a key site within the network, the impact of development upon migratory species such as water voles and otters will also affect species viability. It would be beneficial to improve the statement to seek improvements rather than just not impacting or mitigating against impact. Development that enhances environmental quality, ecological status, viability and biodiversity of sites, species and habitats should be supported. This would be in keeping with the aims of the forthcoming Water Framework Directive for sites related to the Directive, and of other environmental legislation.</p> <p>Although this point does refer to biodiversity it does not make a direct link/reference to Local Biodiversity Action Plans (LBAPs) and the Habitat and Species Action Plans they incorporate (HAPs and SAPs respectively). NPPG 14 'Natural Heritage' promotes the integration of Development Plans with achieving the aims of the LBAPs, HAPs and SAPs. Identification of this link is recommended.</p>			
141.32 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	<p>'Degraded land' may be of high biodiversity value, particularly within urban areas. It would be advisable to require such sites to be assessed prior to restoration. Sites could also include quarrys and landfills.</p>			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
166.4 Mr I S Francis, RSPB Scotland	<p>Given the active involvement of both Aberdeenshire and Aberdeen City Councils in the development of the North-East Scotland Biodiversity Action Plan, the RSPB are very disappointed that this subject has not been dealt with in the detail it deserves. This is in significant contrast to the treatment of this subject in both the Aberdeen City and Aberdeenshire Local Plans, yet it is highly appropriate that the Structure Plan should reinforce the conservation of biodiversity. The reference to conserving biodiversity on sites in Policy Environment 2 is only one aspect of the necessary policy framework, since biodiversity encompasses target species and habitats in all appropriate locations within the area. The RSPB strongly suggest that the plan should be changed to include an extra policy specifically on Biodiversity, that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- seeks to further the objectives of the UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) and Local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP);</li> <li>- commits the authorities to preparing, implementing, monitoring and reviewing LBAPs;</li> <li>- commits the authorities to use LBAP objectives and targets to assess development proposals;</li> <li>- commits local plans to identify relevant habitat and species targets, map habitat types and identify strategic links, corridors and stepping stones.</li> </ul> <p>Such a policy would fully accord with paragraph 18 of NPPG 14. The RSPB would be very happy to advise on appropriate wording of such a policy. Alternatively, the views of the NE Scotland Local Biodiversity Action Plan Steering Group could be sought.</p>			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
72.15 Mr B Wallace, GVA Grimley, Invervale Ltd	The reference to "not adversely affect the built heritage etc." should be amended to read "not significantly adversely affect the built heritage etc."	1) It was suggested that the word 'significantly' be inserted prior to 'adversely affect the built environment'.	1) There has been a considerable re-draft of the Built Environment policy which means that the re-wording suggested no longer applies.	A new policy [Policy 21] has been introduced to emphasise the importance of design issues and the built heritage.
125.19 Mr B Wallace, GVA Grimley, Barratt Construction Ltd	The reference to "not adversely affect the built heritage etc." should be amended to " not significantly adversely affect the built heritage etc."	2) In addition, modern buildings should be more appropriately designed and granite buildings should be better protected.	2) It is considered that the other points would be best addressed through local plans, the production of design guidance and the development control process rather than at structure plan level. Nevertheless, the importance of the built heritage has been recognised and should be reflected in greater emphasis in the text and in the addition of a new specific policy.	
126.8 Mr B Wallace, GVA Grimley, G Gaffney	The reference to 'not adversely affect the built heritage etc' should be amended to read 'not significantly affect the built heritage etc.'			
158.1 Ms M Stewart	Everything in paragraphs 4.2.4 and 4.2.5 is endorsed. New building should be appropriate in terms of materials and scale. Modern houses are built too high off the ground, which means that a house that is single storey, is actually the equivalent of one and half storeys in actual height. This should be taken into account.			
160.11 Ms V Munro Stevens	Historic granite buildings must be protected as they will become more interesting in the 21st century. Industry and housing must not tear any more down. Historic Scotland should be more careful to list all our fine granite buildings.			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
44.55 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	Major developments on the National Park are likely to take place affecting the Cairngorms. Surely this is an issue? The Survey Report recognises it in Section 5 on page 55 but it is not carried forward into the Written Statement.	Although the Report of Survey contains a section on the Cairngorms, the written statement only briefly mentions it. This has been identified as an important issue which should be expanded upon in the structure plan.	(a) The Cairngorms section in the Report of Survey will need to reflect changes since the publication of the draft plan.	Amendments will be required as an "erratum" to the Report of Survey's Addendum.
75.1 Ms M Bochel, The Highland Council	Only brief mention is made of the proposed Cairngorm National Park in paragraph 1.20 on page 6. Views on the geographical area which should be covered by the National Park status and the Councils' preferred method of delivery would have complemented the approach taken by The Highland Council in its submitted draft Structure Plan.		(b) The proposed Cairngorms National Park is mentioned in the written statement within the strategy. However the proposed National Park status is an administrative device and as such is not a land-use designation requiring detailed attention in the structure plan.	

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
44.46 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	Para 4.2.10, p28, Coastal Zone Management: It should be recognised that we have a dramatic coastline with an incredible display of geological sequences. It is not just enjoyed by tourists and specialist visitors - it is also a recreational resource for residents.	1) Comments recognise the coast as an important subject and NEST's integrated approach to coastal zoning and management is generally supported.	1) The general thrust of the policy seems to be supported although it is accepted that some re-wording of Policy Environment 3 is required in order to address the respondents main concerns.	Policy 29 "Coastal Planning" has been modified to strengthen it's strategic content. The supporting text has been modified to acknowledge National Guidance.
44.47 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	Soft coast Coastal Protection is a minefield. Coastal Planning must take account of the dynamic nature of the coast. Policy Environment 3 seems to accept this.	2) However, more specific guidance is required and the policy needs to be reworded as a strategic policy statement rather than as an instruction to local plans.	2) Accept.  3) Accept.	
110.4 Mr I Jessiman, Aberdeen Harbour Board	Support for the promotion of an integrated approach to coastal management is expressed. The opportunity to provide input to Coastal Management Plan is requested.	3) More reference to national guidelines is required.	4) Strathbeg is now considered to be undeveloped coast (as shown in Pan 53) and this, together with other designations that apply to it should afford it adequate protection.	
141.28 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	There is no reference to PAN 53 'Classifying the Coast for Planning Purposes' in this section. This is an omission as this document defines the coast as developed, undeveloped and remote.	4) Strathbeg should be designated as remote coast.	5) This point should be covered by a more general reference to Coastal Management Plans and Protection Studies.	
141.29 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	Although there are no areas designated as remote within the Structure Plan area, the Strathbeg area was originally defined as remote and it would be beneficial to define this area as remote/isolated to increase the level of protection against further development.	5) Reference should be made to the Moray Firth Partnership.		
141.30 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	The coastal forum proposed must take into consideration the existing Moray Firth Partnership area and the overarching Scottish Coastal Forum. SEPA will be producing guidance on best practice for coastal development later this year.			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
<p>141.31                      Ms R Rush,                      SEPA North Region</p>	<p>The Structure Plan does not meet the national guidelines, NPPG13 (Coastal Planning) states that 'a strategic planning policy context for the coast is required because the impact of development on natural heritage interests and effects on natural processes are not always confined to local areas'. Development in inappropriate coastal locations may lead to damage to habitats, damage to fisheries, alteration of the natural processes of erosion and deposition and increased risks to existing development and coastal defences through alteration of coastal flooding characteristics.                      NPPG13 then goes onto to state that Structure Plans should:                      1. distinguish between the developed, undeveloped and isolated coast (using the Advice Note on how to do this),                      2. set out general policies for the protection of the coastal environment,                      3. indicate priority coastal areas for regeneration (where appropriate),                      4. identify areas at risk from coastal erosion and flooding and to indicate policy in relation to the location of new development in such areas,                      5. suggest priority areas where a co-ordinated approach to coastal zone management is required.                      The Plan does none of the above in its current form, but passes this on to the Local Plan level. Effective coastal management needs to be seen as a strategic issue and have a positive policy framework to reflect this; especially since the supporting text acknowledges that "the coast is one of the North East's foremost assets". SEPA strongly recommend that this section of the plan is improved to address the points detailed above.</p>			
<p>164.20                      Dr R A MacDonald,                      Scottish Natural Heritage</p>	<p>Policy Environment 3 While we welcome the thrust of this policy, we consider that it needs to be reworded as a strategic policy statement, rather than as an instruction to the Local Plan. The policy also needs to include a statement regarding coastal protection works and the need to assess implications on coastal processes elsewhere within the coastal cell.</p>			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
6.11 Mr A Bradford, Kincardine Estate	The text suggests that changes in hydrology resulting are 'predicted' i.e. in the future. Analysis of river flows suggests that these changes are already evident and that flow patterns started changing around 1970. Also, a prudent approach to dealing with the changes in hydrological performance of rivers is not only to avoid future developments which could impact flooding by rivers or be flooded, but also to try to remedy existing problems. For example where flooding is a frequent problem it should not only be sensible not to allow new development but ways should be sought to promote relocation of affected businesses. e. g. the oft flooded caravan park in lower Deeside.	1) A more cautious approach to flood management is advocated that could include the relocation of development and a general prohibition against development in all areas of risk and on floodplains.  2) Flood risk areas should not be avoided on an absolute basis as there may be cases where flood risk can be attended to and development can proceed.  3) The Plan should recognise that badly managed flood prevention schemes can cause environmental damage.  4) A decision should be made as to whether a policy of managing or avoiding flood threat has been adopted.  5) The text does not accurately reflect the roles of SEPA and the Flood Appraisal Group.  6) There should be a strategic policy seeking to integrate flooding, water quality, pollution and SUDS issues as required by EC Directives.  7) The Plan should recognise it may need amending due to forthcoming legislation.	1) It is beyond the scope of the Structure Plan to promote the relocation of development. Nevertheless, NEST does take a precautionary approach to new development. Its commitment to tackling flooding issues is demonstrated through the inclusion of a new policy specifically dealing with water management issues. Within this there will be a general presumption against development in flood risk areas and on flood plains.  2) NEST takes a precautionary approach to flooding and this is considered appropriate due to the possibility of climate changes triggering more frequent flood events. The general presumption against development in flood risk areas and on flood plains should therefore continue. If developers believe they can deal with flood issues in their proposals, this will need to be justified and demonstrated on a case by case basis.  3) Agreed. A new policy on Water Management will recognise this issue by stating that development should be sited and designed to natural heritage and water quality in the context of water course management.  4) Agreed. The new policy on Water Management states a position of flood avoidance wherever possible.  5) Agree.  6) Agree. This can be addressed	A new strategic policy has been introduced to integrate flooding, water quality, water pollution, and SUDS. Policy 22 also considers issues associated with flood management and flood prevention.
44.44 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	Para 4.2.8, p28: Flooding is often caused by upstream agricultural practice. There should be a specific policy to avoid floodplain habitat.			
44.62 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	Support for pages 59 & 60 on "Flooding" in Section 5 of the Report of Survey.			
72.16 Mr B Wallace, GVA Grimley, Invervale Ltd	It is not necessarily the case that areas at risk of flooding should be avoided on an absolute basis. It is possibly the case that the risk of flooding can be attended to and development proceed.			
87.2 Mr G Low, North of Scotland Water Authority	Full support for the comments made in the Plan about the need to examine measures to reduce the effects of flooding. Offer to contribute towards the effective workings of the Flood Appraisal Groups. It is important, in this regard, that firm policies to reduce the risk of flooding are stated in the Strategic Plan and reinforced in the Local Plans.			
125.20 Mr B Wallace, GVA Grimley, Barratt Construction Ltd	It is not necessarily the case that areas at risk of flooding should be avoided on an absolute basis. It is possibly the case that the risk of flooding can be attended to and development can proceed.			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
126.9 Mr B Wallace, GVA Grimley, G Gaffney	It is not necessarily the case that areas at risk of flooding should be avoided on an absolute basis. It is possibly the case that the risk of flooding can be attended to and development can proceed.		through an overall policy on Water Management.	
140.9 Mr K Newton, Formartine Partnership	No mention is made of the environmental damage often caused by badly managed flood prevention schemes. In order to work with the environment, the flood risk must be effectively managed rather than completely eliminated.		7) As it is the intention of both Councils to review their development plans on a regular basis, it is considered that the inclusion of this comment is unnecessary.	
141.22 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	SEPA objects to the wording of section 4.2.8 as the text does not accurately reflect NPPG 7 'Planning and Flooding', which states that a decision should be made as to whether a policy of 'avoidance' or 'managing the threat' should be adopted. The paragraph should be reworded to more accurately reflect this.			
141.23 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	The wording of section 4.2.9 does not reflect the current situation regarding flooding. Aberdeenshire and Aberdeen City Councils have recently formed a Flood Appraisal Group (FAG) as recommended by NPPG7 'Planning and Flooding'. The text states that FAGs will examine measures to reduce flood damage. This is misleading and not strictly correct. The term 'measures' for reducing damage implies promoting flood alleviation this will not be promoted by the FAG as it goes against the policy of avoidance stated in NPPG7 and has cost implications for the Councils. In broad terms FAG's remit will be to promote best practice, data sharing and to enhance understanding of all of the issues related to flooding in the Structure Plan area.			
141.24 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	The final two sentences of paragraph 4.2.8 regarding SEPA's are misleading. SEPA has a function of assessing as far as it considers appropriate the risk of flooding in any area of Scotland. Our duty is, if requested by the planning authority to do so, to comment on the basis of the information that we hold with respect to flood risk in any part of the planning authority's area and to advise the authority as to such risk. The existing text implies that SEPA can and will do more than we are required under statute. SEPA object to this section of the plan unless it is reworded to reflect the true situation.			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
141.26 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	<p>Bullet point six of Policy Environment 2 is not usable. The term 'known' implies that there is data to prove the risk of flooding. The problem is that there is a lack of data with regard to areas that suffer from flooding, which is why it is difficult to assess planning proposals. In addition this statement does not cover the impact that a development may have in terms of flood risk on sites elsewhere within the catchment.</p> <p>Policy Environment 3 states that development will be prohibited 'on any parts of the coast that are identified as at risk from flooding'. Why can not this Policy prohibit development within any area identified as at risk of flooding? In addition to prohibiting development in areas identified at risk of flooding, development within areas of identified flood plain should be prohibited. We also recommend that there should be a presumption against development within the estimated 1 in 100 year flood envelope, and a presumption against development that will cause flooding elsewhere unless sustainable mitigation measures to the satisfaction of the relevant authorities can be agreed.</p>			
141.55 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	<p>Report of Survey, p60, para3, SEPA objects to the wording of this section for the following reason. The text does not correctly reflect SEPA's remit with respect to this issue and should be amended as follows: 'SEPA has a function to assess the risk of flooding in any area of Scotland as far as it considers appropriate, and a duty to advise planning authorities on the risk of flooding, if requested to do so, based on the information that we hold.</p>			
141.56 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	<p>Report of Survey, p90, SEPA objects to the wording of this section: why do the Councils not feel that it is necessary to 'identify locations where local plans should give detailed attention to flood risk' and why 'flood plains and other low lying land' do not need to be safeguarded from further development? It is clearly stated with NPPG7 that Structure Plans should set a framework for Local Plans to achieve this. As a minimum this document should identify broad areas known to be at risk.</p>			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
141.60 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	This document is lacking in a policy which deals with the water resources and quality issue. Considering the obligation for the River Basin and Sub-Basin Plans required under the EC Water Framework Directive to interact and be compatible with Development Plans, this omission must be addressed. Such a policy could strategically integrate the issues of flooding, groundwater pollution, of expecting developments to incorporate SUDS as standard, and provide a framework to protect and enhance watercourses and riparian areas generally. SEPA would be happy to discuss possible wordings with the Council.			
141.63 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	Forthcoming legislation, in particular the Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control Directive, the Water Framework Directive (mentioned above) and the Landfill Directive will have significant implications for both SEPA and Local Authorities. Recognition that this plan may have to be amended to meet the requirements of new legislation is missing from this document.			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
44.20 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	Report of Survey Section 5, p62-64: Forestry is well presented. Table 2 might be more interesting if broken down by types (e.g. Native Pinewood, Native Broadleaves and Conifer Plantations) to illustrate the composition of the resource.	1) There is general support for the issue of Forestry, as presented in the structure plan.  2) Some concerns were raised about the Indicative Forestry Strategy (Policy Environment 6). One respondent points out that it is only a guide; that it can only be strategic and as such can never effectively deal with local considerations. One commentator asked for more community involvement in control of forestry planning matters and SEPA asked to be consulted on this as it is reviewed.	1) Support noted.  2) The current Indicative Forestry Strategy (IFS), the Regional Forestry Strategy (Grampian Regional Council, 1992) will be included in the addendum to the Report of Survey. It is currently being reviewed to take account of the new circular 9/1999. This will involve a consultation process and once an issues paper has been prepared it will be circulated to statutory consultees for comment.  3) Native pinewoods have been referred to under Biodiversity (p53 of the Report of Survey) as priority habitats. There is no need to mention the Deeside Forest as it is not a strategic issue. There should be a reference to the Forestry and Woodland Framework for the Cairngorms which will be considered as part of the review of the IFS. Promotion of recreational use of forests is included within the section on countryside and open space access.  4) Forestry planting is not subject to statutory development control, however the local authority may comment on forestry proposals and where planting affects a known right of way a request will be made for an alternative route to be marked.	The Indicative Forestry Strategy has been included in the Report of Survey Addendum. The text in the Addendum refers to the Forestry and Woodland Framework for the Cairngorms which will be considered as part of the review of the Indicative Forestry Strategy.
44.21 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	Report of Survey Section 5, page 64, lines 1 and 2 of Para 1: how can local authorities influence planting by means of the Indicative Forestry Strategy? It is only a guide - the real influence comes with a good consultation system for significant forestry proposals.	3) Several additions to the forestry section were suggested for mention: the importance of native pinewoods, the Deeside Forest, the role of Forest and Woodland framework for the Cairngorms, and more active promotion of recreational use.		
44.48 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	The Forestry Strategy can only be strategic and as such can never effectively deal with local considerations which are likely to form the basis of local authority comments on Forestry Commission consultations.	4) A final query was raised concerning the consideration of rights of way in forestry planning.		
44.49 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	Section 4.3.1, 'Forestry', should discuss the prime resource of the Native Pinewoods in the area which are recognised as being of National importance in the Biodiversity Action Plan. A quarter of all native pinewoods are found in the North East. Enterprises such as the Deeside Forest management initiative should be recognised and supported.			
46.1 Mr D Clark, Forestry Commission	The Forestry Commission has enjoyed good support from the Councils in the past for forestry expansion and expansion of processing capacity and this should make the North East an attractive location for any further investments. There is a great deal of potential for new woodland planting still in this area and that too should help to give the North East an edge over other parts of Scotland.			
48.3 Mr R MacMaster, Cairngorm Partnership	Policy Environment 6: Give thought to the role that the Forest and Woodland framework for the Cairngorms will play in forestry proposals in this part of Aberdeenshire.			
56.8 Mr P Dean	Insert a policy to encourage more community involvement and control of forest planning matters. There is a serious drift in this direction and Councils should be putting pressure on the Forestry Commission to allow communities more control. Also actively promote more recreational use (non-motorised).			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
99.2 Ms J Clark, Scottish Rights of Way and Access Society	The Society's understanding, which has not been contradicted in our dealings with the Forestry Commission, is that the exception stated in the first sentence of para 4.3.1 does not extend to rights of way: i.e. forestry planting is subject to consideration of any rights of way which may not be affected.			
105.1 Mr K Pearce, Forest Enterprise	Forest Enterprise supports the policies outlined in the Plan. There should be no conflicts between the Plan and Forest Enterprise's objectives.			
141.36 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	We note that the Indicative Forestry Strategy will be reviewed. SEPA requests that we are involved with and consulted upon the reviewed IFS.			
164.23 Dr R A MacDonald, Scottish Natural Heritage	Policy Environment 6 is not a structure policy but a reference to guidance. Is the Indicative Forestry Strategy to be included within the Structure Plan as per the Government guidance?			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
44.50 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	Appendix 2 gives insufficient thought to the Tier Table. This results in much conflict with other policies in the plan for environmental protection. Tier 3 appears to be reckoned a "go" area and therefore the inclusion of SINS, Local Nature Reserves, Wildlife Sites, Coastal and Dune systems, river and streambeds is completely inappropriate for Minerals and Landfill policies. We accept that Windfarms might be accommodated on some of these designations but not in stream and riverbeds. If Tier 3 is to be an area of search then these designations should be moved to Tier 2.	There was no objection to the principle of tiered policy areas. However, various areas of detail drew a number of comments, viz: 1) The placing of specific designations within the tiers. 2) The types of development covered by tiers. 3) Omissions from the tiers. 4) Detailed policy wording. 5) Buffer Zones. 6) Mineral and landfill development.	1) There is merit in many of these comments - it is accepted that waste disposal for instance should not be permitted in river and stream beds and coastal dunes. Reconsideration will therefore be given to the position of all designations in the tiers to ensure the absence of anomalies  2) The extension of tiers to cover other types of development has merit but may raise practical difficulties in some cases. Development affecting wildlife, landscape and land resources tiers are already covered in Environment Policy 1 in the Plan. This policy extends tier coverage from the corresponding policy in the Draft Plan. In addition the coast is divided into tiers for all types of development. Therefore the principle of using tiers and sequential testing on a general basis is well established through the Plan.	The Tiers of Policy 26 have been amended to reflect the concerns and the text of the policy has been amended to ensure greater consistency with Policy 19 and National Guidance.
56.4 Mr P Dean	Appendix 2 - add 'people' to Tiers 1 and 2.	1) In terms of 1, the position of river and stream beds, settlements, coastal dunes and agricultural land must be reconsidered.	2) The extension of tiers to cover other types of development has merit but may raise practical difficulties in some cases. Development affecting wildlife, landscape and land resources tiers are already covered in Environment Policy 1 in the Plan. This policy extends tier coverage from the corresponding policy in the Draft Plan. In addition the coast is divided into tiers for all types of development. Therefore the principle of using tiers and sequential testing on a general basis is well established through the Plan.	
56.13 Mr P Dean	Elevate people into Tiers 1 and 2 so that we have the same (or greater) importance as flowers, animals, old piles of stones, historic gardens, farmland and so on. This is a serious fault in the Tier system.	2) For 2, other types of development should also be covered as well as minerals, landfill and wind farms. This could include 'all development' Guidance should also be included for other waste facilities.	On a more detailed level however, different types of development are likely to require different tiers (as is the case with landfill, wind farms and minerals) and it would not be practicable at this stage to develop all of them. It would also be inappropriate at a structure plan level. Guidelines on waste facilities other than landfill sites should now appear in the in the text in response to this and other comments. This should be placed in the Waste Management section.	
63.17 Ms E Parkes, NE Local Biodiversity Action Plan	Four Tier Policy Approach To allow integration of Environment policies with employment policies LBAP habitats and species should be added to the tiered list of sites in Appendix 2 Suggested addition: 'Sites supporting habitats and species listed in the LBAP'. This statement should be added to the Tier system in tier 2. Support for addition: NPPG 14 (71) states local plans should "provide for the conservation of biodiversity and the protection and enhancement of natural heritage outwith designated areas".	3) In respect of 3, biodiversity action plan sites, the Cairngorms, houses, people and local landscapes should be included and buffer zones should be extended. Greater prominence needs to be given to local designations.	3) It is accepted that more consideration needs to be given to including other types of habitat or area in the tiers. But it is also	
73.14 Mr D Scott, Halliday Fraser Munro	It is considered that Mineral Extraction in Tier 1 Areas should be allowed if it can be demonstrated that the overall integrity of the area will remain largely unaffected.	4) Contradictions between the tiers and policies are also highlighted, Tier 1 refers to development being allowed, if there is an 'imperative reason of national interest' whereas other policies refer to 'imperative reasons of over-riding public interest.		
73.16 Mr D Scott, Halliday Fraser Munro	Objection to the presumption contained within Paragraph 4.3.10 of the Structure Plan that there should be no landfill facilities located within areas identified as Tier 1 and 2 of the Four Tier Policy Areas. It is considered that Landfill Facilities in such areas should be allowed if it can be demonstrated that the overall integrity of the area will remain largely unaffected.	5) Detailed consideration needs to be given to the nature and extent of buffer zones around houses and		

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
75.2 Ms M Bochel, The Highland Council	The hierarchical approach to designations specified in the Four Tier Policy Areas in Appendix 2 is broadly consistent with the approach taken in The Highland Council's submitted Structure Plan through its General Strategic Policies. There would, however, be value in applying these Areas more generally to any type of development, rather than restricting it to minerals, landfill and wind farms.	settlements particularly in relation to wind farms.  6) Mineral and landfill development should be allowed on international designations if it does not have any significant effects.	necessary to remember that other more detailed policies will deal with specific and local matters. Therefore, issues such as the local effects of development on people, houses and 'local' landscapes are best dealt with at a local plan and/or development control basis.	
75.5 Ms M Bochel, The Highland Council	Add the National Park to the Tier 2 Policy Area in Appendix 2.		The Cairngorms is purely an administrative area that is covered by a variety of local, national and international designations. To treat the whole area the same (as Tier 2) would be over-simplistic and unfair in some circumstances	
95.2 Mr G D Swapp	The previous policy regarding Wind Farms (AS/PU17) said that such development should be excluded from areas where they would impact on "local landscape value". This designation should be retained and placed in Tier 2 or 3. The words "and their settings" should be retained for archaeological sites in Tier 3, as well as Tier 2. Too much emphasis on National and Regional official designations and too little on local feelings about the landscape or heritage worth of sites.		It is not accepted that the status of local areas should be increased. This contradicts the whole point of tiers which works on a sequential examination of local, regional, national and international constraints.	
141.18 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	Tier 1 refers to 'imperative reasons of over-riding public interest', whereas Policy Environment 7 refers to 'imperative reason of national interest' for development within the same protected sites. These Policies therefore seem to contradict. Should not both of these tiers refer to imperative reasons of over-riding international interest, as the site designations are of international importance? Bullet point two should also state that developments that are of imperative reasons of international interest would also be permitted even if it may impact on the status of the designated site. When considering whether a development may affect a Tier 1 designated site consideration must be given to the emissions and discharges that a development may produce, and also to development outwith a site that may affect it. SEPA wish to object to this policy for the reasons detailed above.		4) Accept. The policy wording of both policies should reflect that found in national guidelines.  5) These issues concerning local matters are more appropriately dealt with at a local plan and development control level.  6) Partly accept. The policy wording for international designations is currently inconsistent with national advice and Environment Policy 1. This should be corrected.	

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
141.40 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	Extraction of minerals from river and stream bed should not be permitted unless there is an imperative reason of national interest for doing so and there is no alternative. We therefore recommend that they are classed as Tier 1. The EC Water Framework Directive supports this stance.			
141.41 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	Tier 1 refers to 'imperative reason of national interest', whereas Policy Environment 1 refers to 'imperative reasons of over-riding public interest' for development within the same protected sites. These Policies therefore seem to contradict. Should not both of these tiers refer to imperative reasons of over-riding international interest, as the site designations are of international importance? Tier two should also state that developments that are of imperative reasons of international interest would also be permitted even if it may impact on the status of the designated site. SEPA objects to the wording of this Policy for these reasons.			
141.47 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	With reference to the Tiers detailed in Appendix 2, new landfill sites will not be permitted within river and stream beds, nor coastal sand and dune systems, due to the potential environmental impacts unless there is no alternative site and an imperative reason of national importance. We therefore recommend that these categories are move to Tier 1. In addition, Tier 1 should also specify 'Potable water catchments' and 'Groundwater resource areas e.g. aquifers' for the same reasons.			
141.50 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	With reference to the Tiers detailed in Appendix 2 it would be more appropriate to include river and stream beds within Tier 1, as wind farms would not be permitted within these areas due to the potential environmental impacts unless there is no alternative site and an imperative reason of national importance for siting them there.			
144.1 Mr N Brooks, Cordah Limited	NEST should contain a map showing the areas of search for waste (tier 4 areas) in order to help and inform the developers and public.			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
144.2 Mr N Brooks, Cordah Limited	The tiered approach is stated as being only for landfill. If para 4.3.7 is accepted and that it is unlikely that landfill will remain the dominant means of waste management guidance must be given as to the preferred location of other facilities. Different facilities have different locational constraints and constraints to landfill sites.			
165.2 Mr P Smart	It also needs to be explicitly recognised that wind energy facilities have an adverse impact if sited in proximity to existing housing. This policy should recognise that the scale of wind turbines is escalating (with current turbines and their towers in the range of 70 metres to 90 metres high) and thus areas suitable for such structures should be kept under review as these prevailing size of the structures being erected in the country grows in size.			
165.3 Mr P Smart	(i) A buffer zone of 400 metres from settlements is completely inadequate and falls short of all current buffer zone proposals excepting for very small turbines. (ii) A buffer zone should be created around all housing and not just settlements.			
165.4 Mr P Smart	Buffer zones around housing should be in Tier 1. There is no apparent logic (other than on safety grounds) in protecting Agriculture land in Tier 2 where the adverse affect of wind turbines is only a minimal land take (according to wind turbines advocates) whilst homes are currently not protected in the plan except within settlements as Tier 3. This is the case although wind turbines are acknowledged to have a negative impact on the amenity of homes in the vicinity.			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
19.5 Ms E Farquharson-Black, Paull & Williamsons, Solicitors, J D Paton's Trust	One element of the strategy set out a para 1.2 is "promoting, protecting and enhancing the natural environment". The strategy should be amended to make it clear that it is also designed to promote, protect and enhance the "built" environment.	1) The environment policies pose no issue.  2) A number of shortcomings are identified: a) the strategy does not place enough emphasis on the built environment; b) the Plan does not conform with PAN 37, para 3, final 3 bullet points on the topics of the natural environment and countryside;	1) Support noted.  2) a) the built and natural aspects of the environment should receive more equal attention in the Structure Plan; b) disagree: the Plan includes strategic objectives referring to the natural, built and cultural heritage, policies which provide a sound basis for Development Control and priorities for implementation (the tiered policy sets out the priorities of the importance); c) disagree: the Councils have identified which issues in current National Guidance are relevant to the North East and reasons for any not included are given in section 7 of the Report of Survey; d) disagree the plan looks 10 to 15 years ahead and provides a long term strategic planning framework; e) disagree: environmental change is referred to in the text for example reference to global warming affecting the future climate; f) disagree: the plan relates priorities for development and conservation through the tiered policy approach; g) The introduction to the environment chapter will be reexamined, in light of the revised strategy; h) noted; i) agreed; j) agreed; k) agreed there should be a more pro-active approach to nature conservation; l) this is largely an issue for local plans and development control; m) the policies in the 'Looking after the North East' apply across all policy areas including Housing,	The strategy has been amended to encourage promotion, protection and enhancement of the built environment as well as the natural environment. A new policy [Policy 20] has been created to implement this aspect of the strategy and the introduction to the chapter has been modified. The term "wildlife sites" has been included in the glossary.
44.1 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	The Plan does not conform to PAN 37 Structure Planning, as it does not address para 3, final 3 bullet points on the topics of the natural environment and the countryside.	c) the Plan does not fulfill PAN 37, para 10, which says that authorities should identify which issues addressed by current national guidance are relevant to their area;		
44.2 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	The Structure Plan does not fulfil PAN37 para 10 which says that authorities should identify issues addressed by current national guidance which are relevant to their area.	d) the Plan does not fulfil PAN 37, para 15, where it states that some policies, for example on built or natural heritage, are enduring rather than time limited; e) the Report of Survey fails to adequately assess environmental change;		
44.3 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	The Structure Plan does not fulfill PAN37 para 15 on the Longterm Integrated Strategy where it is recognised that policies on natural heritage are enduring rather than time limited. In para 16 it states that there must be an awareness of how wider environmental change might affect an area. The Report of Survey fails to assess environmental change in the consideration of : habitat and species loss, the decline and diversification of agriculture, the increase in countryside recreation and the increase in countryside conservation. Statistics on natural environmental change in the area could have been obtained from such work as MLURI 'Countryside Change' or SNH 'National Countryside Monitoring Scheme'.	f) the Structure Plan should go beyond statements of intent and seek to relate priorities for development and conservation to the needs of specific areas; g) paragraph 4.1.2 is considered inadequate and the meaning of the last sentence is queried; h) the heading of section 4.2 should be changed; i) it is argued that 'sustainable economic growth' does not support inclusion of biodiversity conservation; j) in the introduction (para 4.1) the emphasis should be on sustainable development as a whole, therefore the removal of the word 'economic' is suggested; k) the commitment to Nature		
44.8 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	Para 4 of draft NPPG1 says that structure plans "seek to coordinate the provision of housing, employment, transport and other services with the conservation of resources such as energy as well as areas of value for nature conservation". They should go beyond statements of intent and seek to relate priorities for development and conservation to the needs of specific areas. It is considered that this has not been done in relation to Natural Environment and Countryside Topics.			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
44.9 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	Para 10 of Draft NPPG1 says that National Policies which are relevant to their area comprise material considerations to be taken into account in preparing the plan. Authorities are to identify issues addressed by current national guidance which are relevant to the area. It is considered that this has not been done in relation to Natural Environment and Countryside topics.	Conservation should be more proactive; l) no reference is made to the requirements of the Control of Major Accidents Hazards Regulations 1999 placed on the Planning System; m) Nature Conservation areas are not linked to the other policy areas.	Economy and Transport.  3) Each of the suggested additions will be considered in turn: a) noted although this is not a Structure Plan matter; b) contaminated land is not a strategic matter in this area; c) this is more an issue for Local Plans; d) The Environmental Impact Assessment (Scotland) Regulations 1999 set out which types of applications for Planning Permission require an EIA. It is not necessary to repeat this in the Structure Plan.	
44.37 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	It is considered paragraph 4.1.2 is totally inadequate. There is: (a) no commitment to support for works to ensure the environmental database is kept up-to-date or for filling gaps in knowledge. What about support to the Biological Records Centre? (b) no commitment to preparing a Nature Conservation Strategy for the area. (c) no commitment to any Countryside action.	3) A number of areas are suggested as additions: a) the necessity for obtaining specialist advice is put forward and the requirement for authorities to employ cores of qualified and experience personnel is suggested; b) the Plan does not refer to contaminated land; c) there should be more green areas; d) there should be a policy on Environmental Impact Assessments.		
44.38 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	What does the last sentence mean in paragraph 4.1.2?		4) The inclusion of a definition of wildlife sites and the amendment to 'SINS' in the Glossary will be taken on board.	
44.39 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	The heading of section 4.2 should be changed to "ensuring a good environment".	4) In the Glossary wildlife sites should be defined. SIN's should be replace by SINS.		
44.53 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	The necessity for obtaining specialist advice on the natural environment should be stressed now that local authority planners have a heavier responsibility for the natural environment. Advice can be obtained from staff with such expertise or supplemented by the employment of outside consultants. The PAN on Natural Heritage stresses this.			
44.60 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	SIN's should be SINS. It stands for Sites of Interest to Natural Science, and is not a plural.			
47.7 Mr. M Wanless, The Moray council	Policies on the environment do not pose any issue to the Moray Council.			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
63.6 Ms E Parkes, NE Local Biodiversity Action Plan	Introduction to Environment Chapter (section 4.1). The emphasis again here is 'sustainable economic growth'. This does not support inclusion of biodiversity conservation. Emphasis should be put on sustainable development as discussed in comments on Strategy - Our Future. Addition to introduction: This introduction should make a clear statement on the importance of the environment and biodiversity to maintaining our long-term health and well being. For example if our goal of sustainable development is to be reached, it is vital that our environment - both natural and man made is protected and enhanced throughout the planning policies. Support for addition: NPPG 14 (63) states that "the development plan should set out the locational policy framework for the protection and enhancement of the natural heritage within the context of an integrated strategy for social, economic and environment development. It should seek to conserve and enhance the natural heritage in ways which bring benefits to local communities and encourage social and economic progress".			
70.6 Ms J Bryce, Scottish Wildlife Trust	There is no mention of Wildlife Sites in the Glossary. Suggest base definition around that in NPPG 14: "Planning authorities and the voluntary nature conservation organisations have carried out considerable survey work with the object of identifying sites of local importance for wildlife and securing appropriate conservation management. Such sites, under a variety of titles, are now quite widely identified and accorded a measure of protection in development plans"			
88.2 Mr A Ferguson, North East of Scotland Biological Record Centre	A general reaction to section 4.1.1 is one of disbelief: the wording "If our goal of achieving sustainable Economic growth is to be reached .." is badly misguided and should not be present in a section regarding "looking after the North East". The emphasis must be on the sustainable development of the whole. I suggest the removal of the word economic from this section.			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
132.1 Mr B Martin, Aberdeenshire Environmental Forum	<p>Section 4.2: commitment to Nature Conservation should be more proactive. Within the document the prime focus is on controlling development within or associated with areas of environmental concern. This approach could in the long term allow incremental encroachment in sensitive areas with the ultimate possibility of a cumulative significant impact.</p> <p>The Environmental Forum would like to see a requirement for the authorities to employ cores of qualified and experienced personnel, at all levels, to monitor and protect the environment. Their function is envisaged as being responsible for developing and thereafter maintaining a comprehensive database of habitats, environments and bio-diversity matters throughout both areas. In addition, providing a monitoring and advice service (perhaps in consultation with specialist interest groups and organisations) to ensure that best advice is given and practices followed.</p>			
141.58 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	<p>Although the plan refers to Brownfield sites no reference is made to the issue of contaminated land. This should be addressed particularly in light of the Contaminated Land Regulations that came in to force this year and make the Local Authorities the lead agency with respect to this legislation. The need to address this aspect within Local Plans should also be highlighted.</p>			
141.62 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	<p>No reference is made within the plan with respect to the requirements that the Control of Major Accident Hazards Regulations 1999 place on the planning system via The Planning (Control of Major Accident Hazards) (Scotland) Regulations 2000.</p>			
160.4 Ms V Munro Stevens	<p>Need for a policy to make more green areas, more tree planting (eg Union Street). Scots pine should be planted on roundabouts and streets (for winter foliage) and to create a more friendly city.</p>			
164.29 Dr R A MacDonald, Scottish Natural Heritage	<p>We are concerned that no policy exists regarding the use of Environmental Impact Assessments. This is an important part of the assessment process and can have important benefits in achieving sustainable development in practice. Government guidance should be reflected in the plan.</p>			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
170.5 Mrs Sheehan, Collieston Ameneties	Nature Conservation policies are not linked to the policy areas, ie Housing and Infrastructure.			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
8.1 Mr T Sprott, Planning and Development Consultant, Mr & Mrs John B Cameron	Land at Craigton Road should be regarded as a gap site and identified as a "small sites" category for housing in the Structure Plan. This is justified because: - small groups of houses, where they largely exist, are permitted under the Green Belt Policy; - the vacant housing site would be occupied by a single large house and garage, and - the chaotic distribution of buildings in the area would be clarified.	Comments on the Green Belt can be split into two broad categories – those who want tighter policies and an extension of the Green Belt and those who want more flexible policies and more allocations for development.  1) In respect of the first group, commitment to retaining the Green Belt is welcomed. Suggestions include more emphasis on habitat creation, design and best practice in development together with restrictions on education and housing uses and the prevention of development along the WPR.	1) NEST Policies already require high quality design in green belt. Best Practice and habitat creation issues are also dealt with in other parts of the Plan (in new policies on design and water management) and repeating them in this Policy would be unnecessary.  National guidance, together with previous Local and Structure Plans have been clear on the types of development allowed in Green Belt. There appears to be little justification in departing from this in terms of housing and educational uses.  2) Support noted.  3) Questions over the need for new development land are dealt with elsewhere in this schedule. In respect of release mechanisms for development land - this is an issue that will be dealt with in other parts of NEST, specifically the Housing and Employment Policies.  Should the need for land release arise (whatever its scale), it will be carried out in the context of a Green Belt Review. It is accepted that a review of the Green Belt is required and this is being carried out at the time of writing. The review will examine the green belt in accordance with the principles outlined in NEST and will feed into the second Finalised Aberdeen City Local Plan. Not only will it identify development land required by NEST but it will also indicate where development beyond that period will be located.	The Policy has been reworked as a strategic policy statement.
19.3 Ms E Farquharson-Black, Paull & Williamsons, Solicitors, J D Paton's Trust	Policy Environment 5 should be amended to make it clear that development may be permitted in the Geen Belt should material considerations outweigh the presumptions contained within the policy.	2) The concept of strategic reserve land is welcomed.  3) More land should be allocated for development purposes (particularly housing and industry) due to the current shortages of development land. This should take place together with the inclusion of mechanisms to allow the release of such land should the need arise. It was suggested that Green Belt deletions should be considerable and should take place before any review.		
63.10 Ms E Parkes, NE Local Biodiversity Action Plan	Policy Environment 5 states that 'developments should be of the highest quality in terms of siting, scale, design and materials'. The creation of new developments in the Green Belt may result in loss, fragmentation and disturbance of habitat, potentially adversely affecting biodiversity. This potential effect on biodiversity should be clearly addressed in the policy. Addition to Policy: Steps should be taken to mitigate negative development impacts. To achieve this proposals should incorporate a requirement for habitat enhancement and creation, encouraging best practice in enhancing biodiversity and using Local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP) targets as a guide. Support for policy addition: NPPG 14 (19) states that "Planning authorities should seek to prevent further fragmentation or isolation (of habitats) and identify opportunities to restore links which have been broken". NPPG 14 (18) also states that "Planning authorities can make an important contribution to the achievement of biodiversity targets by adopting policies which promote and afford protection to species and habitats identified as priorities in LBAPs".	4) A more flexible approach to housing in gap sites is requested. It also needs to be made clear that development in Green Belt should be allowed should material considerations outweigh the policy.  5) The Policy needs to be reworded as a strategic policy statement rather than as an instruction to Local Plans.		
65.8 Mr P Allan, PPCA LTD, Cala Homes (Scotland) Ltd	Policy Environment 4 is endorsed. Consideration might be given to preparing strategic guidance to Local Plans in identifying comparative criteria for boundary adjustments. "White Land" should continue to be identified as appropriate.			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
106.3 Mr J W Findlay, Jenkins & Marr, Alba Homes Ltd.	Policy Environment 4 should be more pro-active in initiating an urgent full review of the Green Belt around Aberdeen to ensure the qualitative as well as quantitative shortfalls in housing land can be adequately addressed.	6) A review of the Green Belt is urgently required.	4) National guidance, together with previous Local and Structure Plans have been clear on the types of development allowed in the Green Belt. There appears to be little justification in departing from this in terms of housing or other uses.	
111.1 Ms J Geddes, Association for the Protection of Rural Scotland	It is considered that the statement "There will of course be occasions when it is appropriate to use Green Belt or countryside for development" gives something of a green light to developers and could be used at a public inquiry to justify development contrary to the Structure Plan. It is considered a less positive statement would be appropriate. The Council's commitment to retaining the green belt is welcomed.		The second point could apply to any policy but can only be treated on its merits on a case by case basis. There is no reason why this point needs to be highlighted in respect of Green Belt or any other Policies.	
112.10 Mr P Clarke, Barton Willmore Partnership, The Countesswells Consortium	The inclusion within Policy Environment 4 of a category of land to be safeguarded for long term developments is welcomed.		5) The point on rewording the Policy as a strategic statement is accepted and the Policy will be adjusted to reflect this.	
112.11 Mr P Clarke, Barton Willmore Partnership, The Countesswells Consortium	The special category of reserved or safeguarded long term development land should not be subject to the same restrictive policies that might apply to the more rural areas of Aberdeenshire, in order that development can take place as required. It will provide a safety valve in seeking to avoid urban cramming. For this reason Policy Environment 5 should be modified to facilitate the release of land safeguarded for long-term development in advance of local plan review "where development would accord with relevant structure plan provisions in maintaining a required effective supply of development land"		6) It is accepted that a review of the Green Belt is urgently required and this is being carried out at the time of writing. The review will examine the Green Belt in accordance with the principles outlined in NEST and will feed into the second Finalised Aberdeen City Local Plan. Not only will it identify development land required by NEST but it will also indicate where development beyond that period will be located.	
113.10 Mr P Clarke, Barton Willmore Partnership, Stewart Milne Group	The inclusion within Policy Environment 4 of a category of land to be safeguarded for long term developments is welcomed.		This exercise should provide further protection for the most valued parts of the Green Belt whilst at the same time satisfy the necessary requirements of the development industry.	

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
113.11 Mr P Clarke, Barton Willmore Partnership, Stewart Milne Group	The special category of reserved or safeguarded long term development land should not be subject to the same restrictive policies that might apply to the more rural areas of Aberdeenshire, in order that development can take place as required. It will provide a safety valve in seeking to avoid urban cramming. For this reason Policy Environment 5 should be modified to facilitate the release of land safeguarded for long-term development in advance of local plan review "where development would accord with relevant Structure Plan provisions in maintaining a required effective supply of development land"			
116.6 Mr R Keeler, North Kincardine Rural Community Council	(i) Housing should not be permitted in the Green Belt. (ii) The implication appears to be that the Green Belt may further contract in the Local Plan, but it should in fact be extended. (iii) Ribbon development along the WPR route will contribute to the urban coalescence which the Green Belt was intended to prevent.			
116.9 Mr R Keeler, North Kincardine Rural Community Council	The Green Belt should be extended on either side of the WPR to prevent its becoming a development corridor.			
125.13 Mr B Wallace, GVA Grimley, Barratt Construction Ltd	Given the particular difficulties encountered in allocating sufficient land for housing and employment purposes in Aberdeen it is clear that significant deletions from the Aberdeen Green Belt are required.			
128.4 Mr S Harrison, Bruce & Partners, Scotia Homes Ltd	The Plan should promote the development of land identified for longer term development needs before any review of green belt boundaries is undertaken within Local Plans.			
141.33 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	Bullet point three. We recommend that the list of habitats and resources detailed is expanded to cover riparian corridors, flood plains, hedgerows, tree belts and drystone dykes.			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
141.35 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	SEPA objects to the wording of Policy Environment 5. We recommend that this Policy is amended to state in the last paragraph that development should also be of the highest quality in order to minimise environmental impact. As a minimum development in the Green Belt should meet current best practice requirements.			
149.19 Mr E Gillespie, Scottish Enterprise Grampian	In paragraph 4.2.15 potential adjustments to the Green Belt for employment land should not be excluded from the narrative. This is particularly important where economic demand justifies further allocations of land. Such economic factors require to be reviewed during the lifetime of the plan as and when required and not simply for the period beyond the Plan.			
160.12 Ms V Munro Stevens	Can the Green Belt around Aberdeen be better protected (eg by taking out exceptions for education as this led to the loss of Garthdee as Green Belt).			
164.21 Dr R A MacDonald, Scottish Natural Heritage	Policy Environment 4 SNH believes this policy should be reworded to provide a strategic policy for the identification and designation of the Aberdeen Green Belt. At present it is an instruction to the local plan. As stated in our comments on Policy Housing 6, we believe that the Structure Plan could make the case for Green Belt designation around settlements other than Aberdeen, where development pressures are particularly high.			
164.22 Dr R A MacDonald, Scottish Natural Heritage	There is a link between environment policy Environment 5 - Development in the Green Belt and the contents of paragraph 4.2.16 that can be incorporated into one policy.			
172.1 Ms V Eadie, Chapman Warren, British Telecommunications Plc	It is noted that development in the Green Belt will not be permitted other than a short list of exceptions. We respectfully request that development essential for telecommunications development is included in this list.			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
13.3 Mr CR Hunneyball, Kemnay Community Council	Overall landscape improvements queried.	Comments received about the landscape express concern that landscape designations are not as clearly defined as in the previous Structure Plan, and that National Scenic Areas are not mentioned.	National Scenic Areas were omitted from Policy Environment 2, 'Designated areas and other considerations', although they are included in Appendix 2. National Scenic Areas and Areas of Landscape Value (formerly Areas of Regional Landscape Value) should be included in a Policy, in addition to the consideration of the landscape in new development everywhere else.	Include reference to National Scenic Areas and Areas of Landscape Value in Policy. Also include in Policy the consideration of landscape in all new development proposals. See new Policy 19.
26.2 Ms J Innes, Banchory Community Council	Landscape designations of local importance are not as clearly defined as in the previous Structure Plan. Larger towns have suffered the increasing spread of development into the immediate countryside and removal of policies that protect the landscape value should remain to strengthen the Inner/Outer Countryside Policies in the Local Plan.			
141.20 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	It is unclear whether these landscape areas (para 4.2.3) are therefore covered by landscape zonings or local designations due to their significance.			
164.19 Dr R A MacDonald, Scottish Natural Heritage	There is no reference or policy relating to the two National Scenic Areas that occur within the Plan area. This needs to be addressed in line with Government guidance.			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
6.13 Mr A Bradford, Kincardine Estate	The last few lines of para 4.3.3 should be altered to read: ". . ., and to minimising the distance materials must be transported to their markets or point of use." Reason: For accuracy. Markets imply 'sale' - some quarries are operated by the end user (e.g. Aberdeenshire Council)	1) The Minerals policy (Policy Environment 7) was criticised in a number of ways: a) preferred areas for mineral working are not identified, therefore it is difficult to have a meaningful assessment of alternatives so the sequential approach is said to be unworkable; b) the Policy should be expanded to include operational requirements and restoration plans which take account of LBAP habitats and species; c) the Policy should explore demand, need and location to markets etc. which are important issues in terms of directing sustainable development; d) the structure plan should include a clear strategy on the use of and winning of minerals based on the principles of sustainability.	1) a) The tiered Minerals policy indicates in what areas, due to environmental, landscape and other factors, proposals to work minerals are likely to prove difficult to reconcile with other policy considerations. The fourth tier indicates other areas, or preferred areas for mineral extraction. In determining a Planning Application for minerals working in, for example, a Tier 2 area (National designations), the applicants case for the proposed development and the environmental implications as well as other material considerations will be taken into account. This may include consideration of alternative sites in 'preferred' areas. b) Accept, although the details of operational requirements, restoration and aftercare can be set out in local plans. c) Policy Environment 7, Minerals, includes reference to the desirability of maintaining a landbank. The calculation of the landbank will involve an assessment of demand and need, and consideration of location to markets (market catchment areas must be defined - at present these are within 15 miles of Peterhead and 20 miles of Aberdeen: see page 65 in the Report of Survey). d) Reconciling sustainability and the use and winning of minerals is problematic as minerals are finite non-renewable resources. The structure plan does include a policy on reduction, re-use and recovery of waste (Policy Environment 8, Waste Management Facilities), and this includes encouraging use of recycled	Modifications have been made to Policy 26 to identify preferred areas for mineral working.  Modifications have been made to Policy 24 to ensure local plans set standards for the working, restoration and aftercare of mineral working, especially considering species and habitats identified as priorities in Local Biodiversity Action Plans. The supporting text to Policy 24 has been amended to reflect the concerns raised.  The situation relating to landbanks is now covered in the Report of Survey's Addendum.  A new Policy 22 has been introduced on Water Management to ensure that the impact of any development on flood plain function and water resources is considered.
44.22 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	Although not a mineral the subject of Peat Extraction does not occur anywhere in the text. This is an issue which is still relevant in the area. There is often conflict with environmental sensitivities. Afteruse proposals can lead to some reinstatement of the bog habitat and so can enhance wildlife interest. Lowland peatmosses are recognised as a priority habitat in the Local Biodiversity Action Plan and is one of Europe's rarest and most threatened habitats. The North East contains many important examples. SWT has this as a priority habitat in their own policies. Report of Survey Section 5: Peat extraction is a missing topic.	2) The explanatory text should be altered in a number of ways: a) 4.3.3 should be changed to include the phrase 'point of use' which is different to 'markets'; b) the statement that all mineral works have significant environmental effects should be changed; c) 4.3.5 the phrase 'at least' should be inserted before landbank periods; d) there should be no extraction without need.  3) A number of omissions were identified: a) there is no mention of peat extraction (2); b) no landbank policy; c) the 10 to 20 year requirements should be stated in the written statement; d) the impact of minerals working on		
53.3 Mr C A Ortlepp, RMC Aggregates, Scottish Aggregates Limited	We welcome the recognition in paragraph 4.3.3 of the importance of minerals to society. However, the second sentence contains a rather sweeping statement which implies that all mineral workings will have significant adverse environmental effects, which is not the case. The impact of individual mineral extraction operations will depend on many factors including the proximity of sensitive receptors and any mitigation measures which can be employed. We therefore suggest that the word 'may' be introduced after 'workings' in the second sentence.			
53.4 Mr C A Ortlepp, RMC Aggregates, Scottish Aggregates Limited	Policy Environment 7, Tier 2 - as the draft Structure Plan does not identify preferred areas for mineral working as perhaps it should (see NPPG4, paragraph 92) it is difficult to see how a meaningful assessment of alternatives can be undertaken. Do the Councils expect an applicant for Planning Permission to examine all potentially mineral bearing land?			
53.5 Mr C A Ortlepp, RMC Aggregates, Scottish Aggregates Limited	Paragrah 4.3.5 provides a helpful explanation of the concept of a landbank. However, both it and the final sentence to Policy Environment 7 omit the words 'at least' which should prefix each landbank period quoted - see NPPG4, paragraph 51. Landbanks are not meant to act as a maximum or ceiling.			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
56.7 Mr P Dean	Para 4.3.5: proposes no extraction without proven need, ie the landbank is falling. Less than 10 years landbank is no reason to change the rules - the protection of nearby housing and communities is paramount.	flood plain function, water quality and water resources; e) lack of emphasis on recycling; f) and change 'catchment' to 'Planning Authority area'.	aggregates.  2) a) Accept. b) Accept. c) Accept. d) NPPG 4, Land for Mineral Working, states that Planning Authorities should provide for an adequate and steady supply of aggregate for the construction industries, with a landbank in permitted reserves equivalent to at least 10 years extraction at all times for an appropriate local market area. Should the landbank fall to less than 10 years the Tiered Minerals Policy guiding minerals extraction from more sensitive areas to 'preferred' areas still applies.	
63.11 Ms E Parkes, NE Local Biodiversity Action Plan	Policy Environment 7 concentrates on new proposals for extraction. Appropriate site selection is of course essential. The Policy could be expanded to include a commitment, not only to site selection, but also to operational requirements and restoration plans, which take account of LBAP habitats and species.			
63.19 Ms E Parkes, NE Local Biodiversity Action Plan	The plan makes no specific reference to peat extraction. Lowland raised peat bogs are a priority habitat in the LBAP and UK action plans and one of Europe's rarest and most threatened habitats. Aberdeenshire is extremely important for raised peat bogs with approximately 10% of the total national resource. Suggested addition: The Plan should make a clear statement supporting the conservation of these valuable sites and guarding against further commercial exploitation.			
73.18 Mr D Scott, Halliday Fraser Munro	Objection to the absence of a Policy in the Structure Plan requiring the maintenance of a minimum ten-year supply of sand and gravel resources and a twenty-year supply of hard rock. We would also suggest that the Structure Plan specifies the respective ten and twenty year requirements in each Market Area. It is insufficient to rely on statements made in the Report of Survey in this regard.		3) a) Peat extraction is not referred to directly in the plan, however under the EC Habitats Directive, active raised and blanket bogs are classed as 'Priority Habitats' and as such are protected in the redrafted Policy 19. b) The Policy statement requiring the maintenance of landbanks occurs in the new Policy 24. c) There are difficulties in specifying the size of the landbanks and this will now be explained in the Report of Survey Addendum. d) Accepted. e) The Structure Plan includes a Policy on reduction, re-use and recovery of waste (new Policy 25, Waste Management Facilities). Although not specified in these terms, this includes encouraging the use of recycled aggregates. f) Rather than use the term 'catchment' or 'local planning area' the term used in NPPG is 'local	
141.37 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	It should be noted that most sand and gravel workings are in fluvio/glacial deposits and extraction of these areas may impact upon flood plain function, water quality and water resources. We recommend that this is noted within the text of the Plan.			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
141.38 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	There is a lack of emphasis on the reuse of building/road waste rather than virgin minerals. The mineral resources are finite in capacity and in the long term it may not be viable to identify the proposed level of landbank. In addition reuse of inert materials for construction, in line with the waste hierarchy, may reduce demand for extraction of minerals. The National Waste Strategy and Waste Hierarchy may also impact upon the ability to source restoration material for the infilling of mineral extraction sites.		market area'.	
141.39 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	It would be better to refer to the Planning Authority area rather than catchment, as this could lead to confusion with river catchments that may be in more than one Authority area.			
164.24 Dr R A MacDonald, Scottish Natural Heritage	Policy Environment 7 is strong on where mineral extractions can be sited so as to protect habitats, species and landscapes of value but does not explore demand, need and location to markets etc. These latter issues are also important in terms of directing sustainable development.			
164.35 Dr R A MacDonald, Scottish Natural Heritage	The Structure Plan should include a clear strategy on the use and winning of minerals based on the principles of sustainability.			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
6.10 Mr A Bradford, Kincardine Estate	Policy Environment 1 should be more circumspect about the relevance and status of non-statutory land designations and should say so explicitly. Often these sites are designated by NGOs without consultation with others or even owners. There is often no holistic approach or assessment of the effects of such designations.	1) Policy Environment 1 'Designated Nature Conservation Areas' is badly worded, completely unacceptable and should be rewritten: more protection is afforded to nationally designated sites than to international sites; words and phrases used require further definition; the wording does not reflect government guidance, especially NPPG 14, para 25; SINS should not be afforded greater protection than wildlife sites;	1) The tiered policy will be written to more closely follow wording in NPPG 14, Natural Heritage.  2) a) The Wildlife and Countryside Act is referred to in the Report of Survey. b) Greater clarity over the wider natural heritage is accepted and a further tier 'Everywhere else' should be added to the policy. c) It is accepted that seeking environmental enhancement is a means of fulfilling the strategic objective of enhancing the natural, built and cultural environment. d) Accepted - a reference should be included to the EU Habitats Directive.  3) The process of designating nature conservation and landscape sites is often beyond local authority control, especially at international and national level.	Policy 19 has been amended to accord with NPPG 14 and the need to consider the wider countryside.  Environmental enhancement is now covered in new Policy 21 on Design.
22.23 Mr D Liddell, sportscotland	Policy Environment 1 appears to offer more protection to nationally designated sites than to international sites: no development of a significant adverse nature is allowed in national sites at all, yet in international sites it may be if there are imperative over-riding reasons.	2) The omission of references to a) the Wildlife and Countryside Act; b) wider natural heritage; c) seeking environmental enhancement; and d) the EU 'Habitats Directive' is noted.  3) The process of designating sites without appropriate consultation is criticised.		
44.40 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	Policy Environment 1 is very badly worded and completely unacceptable. Many of the phrases used have been challenged in previous plans and amendments have been accepted. Surely the Structure Plan should adopt the best practice of its predecessors? The words "significant", "normally" and "appropriate" require further definition. The policies in the Local Plans for these designations are much preferred and simpler. Bullet 1: We are talking about international designations here so only imperative International reasons should be taken into account if protection is to be over-ridden. Bullet 2 contains too many arguable words Bullet 3 "Rigorous examination" is not good enough. This terminology was challenged in CALP and agreed changes made. There must be protection. Why have the Councils abandoned their predecessors policy to protect SINS? Bullet 4: Non-statutory Nature Reserves of the voluntary organisations such as Scottish Wildlife Trust and RSPB also need protection.			
53.1 Mr C A Ortlepp, RMC Aggregates, Scottish Aggregates Limited	The second bullet point to Policy Environment 1 does not reflect the guidance given in NPPG14, paragraph 25 and in NPPG4, paragraph 19. That guidance indicates that adverse effects upon SSSIs, NNRs and other nationally designated areas may be outweighed by significant national benefits which may accrue from mineral working proposals.			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
56.10 Mr P Dean	Policy Environment 1: provide a means by which local communities can have a say in deciding where sites of importance should be. This is imposed at the moment. The result is a better partnership and better guidance of developers to more acceptable areas.			
63.7 Ms E Parkes, NE Local Biodiversity Action Plan	Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 This section should also include reference to species protected under UK and International Law, including the Wildlife and Countryside Act.			
70.4 Ms J Bryce, Scottish Wildlife Trust	Query the order of placing SINS in the 3rd Tier and Wildlife sites in the 4th Tier of Policy Environment 1. This implies that SINS will be afforded greater protection from inappropriate development than Wildlife Sites. The SINS selection by Regional Councils did not follow a quantified selection procedure. Wildlife Sites are a UK wide non-statutory designation and their assessments follow a standard assessment methodology under which some former SINS have scored below the Wildlife Sites criterion. It would therefore seem illogical to afford greater protection to some sites, which may be of potentially lower conservation value. It may therefore be more appropriate to group all non-statutory designations together, but certainly Wildlife Sites are good quality semi-natural habitats that may just fail to qualify as SSSIs and as such require protection from development pressure.			
98.1 Ms L Henderson, Quarry Products Association	The wording of Policy Environment 1, Bullet Point 2 is contrary to relevant government guidance set out in NPPG 14, paragraph 25. Bullet Point 2 should be amended by an addition of words as follows: "or where these effects are clearly outweighed by social or economic benefits of national importance."			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
141.16 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	Policy Environment 1 does not put sufficient emphasis upon protection of the 'wider natural heritage'. This is a key part of NPPG14, which refers to the need for the development plans not just to afford protective policies to those sites which have a specific designation, but also to ensure that environmental protection is applied across the board. For example controlled watercourses, many of which will not have specific designations that protect them, yet they nevertheless represent important strategic components of the environmental resource that require to be protected. The Policy needs to include a statement which expresses the requirement to take account of, and the need to safeguard and enhance the wider natural heritage as outlined in NPPG14. It will then be for Local Plans to define how this is undertaken in light of the principle established by this Structure Plan.			
141.17 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	Seeking to promote environmental enhancement through the planning system is referred to in much of the current guidance. This is detailed in NPPG14, while the proposed revision to NPPG1 (The Planning System) states that 'Protecting and enhancing the quality of the environment is a key objective of the planning system'. Enhancement through the planning system is compatible with and supported by SEPA's own aims, objectives and initiatives (e.g. Environmental Strategy, The Habitat Enhancement Initiative etc.). The principle of seeking environmental enhancement through development within the Structure Plan is not established by the Policy in its present form. "Enhancements" would have to be fair, reasonable and related to the nature, scale and kind of the proposed development.			
164.15 Dr R A MacDonald, Scottish Natural Heritage	Policy Environment 1 needs a much clearer strategic rationale to support it. The origins of the various tiers of designation, and the obligations relating to them need to be explained, as do the implications for dealing with applications that could affect them. This is especially important in relation to European sites and SSSIs, both of which are required to be dealt with in specific ways. NPPG 14 and the recently revised Scottish Office Circular No. 6/1995 are important references.			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
164.16 Dr R A MacDonald, Scottish Natural Heritage	Bullet point 2 - SNH does not agree with the phrase "will not normally be accepted," and believes that the phrasing should state that any development that could have an adverse impact upon the features of interest will not be permitted.			
164.17 Dr R A MacDonald, Scottish Natural Heritage	Bullet point 3 - SNH would hope that development proposals affecting the previous two tiers would also be subject to a "rigorous examination". Furthermore, the phrase "safeguard these sites where appropriate" seems to undermine the importance of such sites suggested by the need for a rigorous examination.			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
<p>166.2                      Mr I S Francis,                      RSPB Scotland</p>	<p>The RSPB recommend strongly that this Policy is amended to adopt a more precautionary tone and to take account of the possible presence of 'priority' habitats under the EU 'Habitats Directive', in order to conform with NPPG14. The recommended wording for this policy is set out below:</p> <p>A.Proposals for development which may affect a designated or proposed European site (Special Protection Area, Special Area of Conservation) or a designated or proposed Ramsar site will be subject to the most rigorous examination. Development which is likely to have adverse effects on the site will not be permitted unless the Authority is satisfied that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) there is no alternative solution, and</li> <li>ii) there are imperative reasons of over-riding public interest for the development.</li> </ul> <p>Where the site concerned hosts a priority natural habitat type and/or a priority species, the development will not be permitted unless the Authority is satisfied that it is necessary for reasons of human health or public safety, or for beneficial consequences of primary importance for nature conservation.</p> <p>B.Proposals for development which may affect a designated or proposed Site of Special Scientific Interest or National Nature Reserve will be subject to the most rigorous examination. Development which is likely to have adverse effects on the site will not be permitted unless the Authority is satisfied that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) there are no reasonable alternative means of meeting the development need, and</li> <li>ii) the reasons for the development clearly outweigh the value of the site.</li> </ul> <p>C.Proposals for development which could adversely affect Sites of Interest to Natural Science, Local Nature Reserves, National Peatland Resource Inventory Sites, Inventory of Ancient, Long-established and Semi-natural Woodland Sites, Non-statutory Nature Reserves or Country Parks will be subject to a rigorous examination. A proposal shall be permitted only if it cannot be located elsewhere or the reasons for the development clearly outweigh the value of the site.</p> <p>Where development is approved which could affect any of the above sites, appropriate measures shall be taken to conserve, and as far possible enhance the site's</p>			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
	<p>ecological, geological or geomorphological interest. The RSPB urges that account be taken of these suggested changes, since in their view, policies which do not adequately consider all relevant aspects of the Habitats Regulations may require subsequent modification, and it is preferable that such modifications should be undertaken at an earlier, rather than later, stage.</p>			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
44.43 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	The issues leading up to Policy Environment 2 raise the necessity for both pro-active and protective policies. However this policy seems only to deal with Development Control and ignores the other issues. The heading is poor. We suggest that the present Policy should be supplemented by another Policy advocating support and action for these topics.	1) Policy Environment 2 is criticised - poor heading, not pro-active (therefore another Policy is required), and not directing Local Plans.  2) South Deeside should be designated as a 'Special Conservation Area'.	1) Policy Environment 2 needs to be re-examined in order to improve clarity etc. This may involve the creation of some new Policies.  2) The Plan does not have powers to designate Conservation Areas of this general kind.	Policy Environment 2 has been amalgamated with Policy Environment 1 to form a new Policy 19, which is clearer and more pro-active.
160.7 Ms V Munro Stevens	Greater protection needs to be given to all of the River Dee. The South Deeside Area should be designated as a Special Conservation Area to safeguard its special environmental qualities and protect it from unsuitable developments.			
164.18 Dr R A MacDonald, Scottish Natural Heritage	SNH welcomes the statements regarding various environmental issues set out in paragraphs 4.2.2 to 4.2.9. We believe, however, that Policy Environment 2 needs to be better constructed to state how the Local Plan needs to address them properly.			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
9.1 Mr S Davidson, Rural Energy Efficiency Advice Project REEAP	NEST makes no reference to harnessing the sun's energy through solar passive, solar water heating and solar energy (photovoltaics) technology. All of these applications can be carried out by house holders as well as developers so the scale of implementation can be greater in comparison with other renewable energy technologies. Solar passive and heating technology is well proven and photovoltaics is rapidly developing. It allows homeowners to save more energy, offset CO2 emissions and generate clean renewable energy. Photovoltaics is the only renewable energy technology capable of implementation within urban areas. As NEST provides a development framework until 2016, it is important to show vision and embrace these technologies which will contribute to a sustainable future.	1) A number of comments stress the need to give every encouragement to the development of renewable energy and that local impacts needs to be balanced against the global impact of development not going ahead. The increasing role of renewable energy should be highlighted and the Plan needs to have a more positive outlook towards such development.  2) Reference should be made to solar energy and the development of offshore facilities.	1) It is accepted that renewable energy development should be encouraged wherever possible but this can only take place in the context of appropriate control policies. A more positive emphasis should be considered where appropriate.  2) Solar energy should be mentioned either in the text or the Report of Survey. Offshore development is outwith the scope of the planning process. This is mentioned in the Report of Survey (which provides guidance on the location of different types of renewable energy facilities).  3) Tiers are now firmly accepted as the best approach to planning for certain types of development and they form a fundamental part in the approach of NEST. Further, areas of search are advocated in the revised NPPG6 on Renewable Energy. It is only right that developers wishing to place proposals in environmentally sensitive locations should justify their approach and that this should include looking at less sensitive alternatives.  4) Whilst it is accepted that development can have impacts on local amenity, it is considered that Local Plans and the Development Control process would provide the best means of dealing with this in detail.  5) The point on energy from waste is accepted.	The Policy and text on Renewable Energy development has been re-written to give a more positive emphasis and moved to the "Working in the NE" chapter (Policy 5 Renewable Energy facilities.)
29.5 Mr P Thorn	Wind energy is only viable due to current energy funding measures, other more environmentally and economically beneficial sources are available.	3) The tiered approach should not apply to wind farms as no area should be regarded as sacrosanct.		
54.11 Mr M Ford	Every encouragement should be given to the development of renewable energy. Whilst it is true that the development of a renewable energy facility can have 'adverse effects on social, environmental and economic assets' locally (p34 Written Statement), not going ahead with the proposal will certainly also have adverse effects (perhaps worse ones) on social, environmental and economic assets, though these effects may be difficult to quantify and diffuse in space and time. The policy on renewable energy should take account of the need to strike a balance between local impact and what may be wider longer-term loss.	4) On the other hand there are a number of concerns regarding the local impacts of renewable energy facilities, particularly on housing and amenity and the well being of people living near to proposals.  5) It was pointed out that energy from waste is not a form of renewable energy and that reference to this should go to the waste management section.		
56.2 Mr P Dean	Para 4.3.13: add to the adverse impacts "loss of amenity to nearby households, quality of life of communities, affect on telecoms transmissions, effect on TV signals"	6) It was asked why the tiers only apply to wind farms and not other forms of renewable energy facility.		
56.3 Mr P Dean	Para 4.3.14: encourage the use of offshore sites for renewable energy facilities. To identify areas suitable for sites leads to pressure on Councils and Area Committees to approve without due objective assessment. Delete such requirement.			
56.5 Mr P Dean	Para 4.3.3: insert requirement to protect well being and happiness of people living close to proposed extraction sites.		6) Different types of development are	

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
111.7 Ms J Geddes, Association for the Protection of Rural Scotland	The revised NPPG 6 on Renewable Energy indicates problems as regards the electricity grid/overloading in North East Scotland and this has to be borne in mind. The whole section should be positively encouraging small-scale wind turbine community developments before large-scale commercial developments.		likely to require different tiers (as is the case with landfill, wind farms and minerals) and it would not be practicable at this stage to develop all of them. It would also be inappropriate at a Structure Plan level However, the Report of Survey contains specific guidance on the location and potential of different types of renewable energy facilities. This is mentioned in both the first and last paragraphs in the Renewable Energy section.	
120.1 Ms A Polson, Brodies, The British Wind Energy Association	It should be noted that the adverse impacts referred to in para 4.3.13 can be mitigated (NPPG6) and, if a balancing exercise is to be carried out that the benefit, global, national and local should be weighed against the adverse impact			
120.2 Ms A Polson, Brodies, The British Wind Energy Association	The first two sentences of paragraph 4.3.14 should be amended. The UK is faced with a pressing need to tackle climate change and to find a suitable way in which to find a sustainable way to meet the growing demand for electricity. The Government is committed to putting in place mechanisms to ensure that by 2010 10% of electricity comes from renewable sources. The EC identified that the UK more than any other member state will need to make rapid progress if this is to be achieved and wind energy is fundamental to achieving this target. The Government has indicated that 26% of the target will be met from onshore wind. In other words "renewable energy will play an increasingly prominent role in the energy sector as required by Government directives, climate change commitments, increasing fossil fuel levies and improved technology."			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
120.3 Ms A Polson, Brodies, The British Wind Energy Association	<p>Support for Policy Environment 9. Policies to support wind energy development in particular should be included in NEST. Clear and detailed criteria are needed in policies in order to assist developers - amend the Policy as follows:</p> <p>How is the tiered approach to apply and why only to wind farms when the policy relates to all types of renewable energy development?</p> <p>In respect of the third bullet point - each wind application should be considered on its own merit as operating standards, restoration etc have to be considered on a case by case basis. A policy stating that permission will be granted subject to acceptable operating standards and appropriate restoration and after case requirements for wing energy development would be acceptable.</p> <p>One difficulty in respect of tiered planning designations in respect of wind energy development is a need to make clear that NPPG6 does not render any area sacrosanct. There should be no in principle exclusions on landscape and/or nature conservation terms.</p>			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
141.49 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	<p>Waste is not a form of renewable energy, if the aims of the National Waste Strategy and the waste hierarchy are successful then this potential source of energy will also be in decline. The emphasis of this Renewable Energy Policy should be on solar, wind, geothermal etc. sources and on promoting efficient energy usage. The energy from waste aspect should be separated out and may be better located within the Waste Management section. If it is decided to keep waste to energy incinerators in the 'Renewable Energy' section, then it should be compatible with the aims of the 'Waste Management' section and Policy. The statement that that such plants may be located outwith 'their normal industrial settings or in rural areas' may contradict paragraph 4.3.8 that states that 'Waste management facilities should be located as close as possible to the source of waste' in accordance with the proximity principle. The text should be amended to state that they will only be located outwith their normal settings provided it complies with the aims of the proximity principle and the location is determined to be the best practicable environmental option. The text should be amended as follows:                      '...is compatible with the National Waste Strategy and subject to satisfactory demonstration that the Best Practicable Environmental Option is being adopted, their location outside...'</p>			
162.4 Mr G Ramsay, Braeside & Mannofield Community Council	<p>The Policies on waste management and renewable energy are welcomed as a way to enhance our environment and contribute to good stewardship of resources for the long-term benefit of all citizens of the North East.</p>			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
44.51 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	Saving Energy: We consider this to be a topic of prime importance that should be given greater prominence and linked to development policies. We support Policy Environment 10.	1) The Policy appears to be supported and comments tend to focus on widening its scope, increasing its prominence and linking it to other development policies.	1) Support for the policy is welcomed. The link to other development policies is accepted and it is considered that this subject would fit well in an overall Policy on good design.	This issue has been incorporated into a new Policy (Policy 21 Design) where energy efficiency and environmentally friendly layouts are specifically emphasised.
116.3 Mr R Keeler, North Kincardine Rural Community Council	Support for Policies reducing energy loss.	2) Reference should be made to insulation and the siting and design of buildings to minimise heat loss.	2) Further discussion on energy saving measures appear in the Report of Survey, although it is felt that the point on housing layout merits attention in the text of the Policy.	
138.4 Ms E Ballantyne, Scottish Homes	Mention should be made to the requirement for maximised levels of insulation within buildings to reduce heat loss and the need to minimise the requirement for additional forms of heating. Appropriate siting and design of buildings to maximise solar heating/energy, reduce heat loss from wind exposure etc may be an addition to consider to this chapter.	3) In addition, the scope of the policy should be widened to include all resources with special reference to the principle of the waste hierarchy and the use of SUDS.	3) Issues such as the waste hierarchy and SUDS are and will be dealt with in other sections of the Plan – principally in a new Policy on water management and in the waste management section. It would therefore not be appropriate to repeat them in this section.	
141.51 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	SEPA objects to the wording of this Policy for the following reason. This Policy is too narrow. It is recommended that it is expand to include resource use and renamed 'Saving Energy and Resources'. Local plans should therefore be required to also promote 'efficient resource use including supporting the principles of the waste hierarchy reduction, re-use and re-cycling' and should cover 'Promoting the use of best environmental practice for example SUDS and low water usage systems'.			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
87.1 Mr G Low, North of Scotland Water Authority	The Plan, whilst recognising the need for sustainability in the wider sense, pays only scant regard towards the promotion of sustainable urban drainage systems. Over the past year or so much effort has been made by the Scottish SUDS Working Party to develop sustainable solutions for the drainage of surface water from premises, roads and paved areas. The Structure Plan needs to demonstrate a clear commitment to the use of SUDS in the North East and reiterate that a collaborative approach to such drainage matters is, essentially, a first stage planning consideration. In essence SUDS must be regarded as a planning requirement for all future developments and not seen as the exception to the conventional piped drainage solutions.	The Plan pays little regard to Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) and the development of more sustainable solutions for the treatment of surface water drainage and the prevention of flooding. NEST should demonstrate a clearer commitment to SUDS and should be regarded as a planning requirement in all development - not just as an alternative to conventional drainage solutions.	It is accepted that the Plan needs to place greater emphasis on the use of SUDS and that more commitment to their use is required.  It is recognised that discussions on these matters are ongoing between Local Authorities, NOSWA and SEPA and through the Flood Appraisal Group. The Plan will make a commitment to continue to find ways of incorporating SUDS into as much development as possible. This should involve all relevant partners along with the development industry.	These issues have been incorporated into the text supporting Policy 22 "Water Management where the Use of SUDS is Promoted."
141.7 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	It is stated that brownfield sites must be developed in a way that maximises their potential. It is unclear how Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) principles would fit in with this aim due to the potential land requirements to incorporate SUDS. This is particularly of concern as the majority of the brownfield sites are within Aberdeen City where the capacity of the combined sewerage system and culverted watercourses for surface water disposal is already severely limited. We strongly recommend that text is incorporated within this document to highlight this issue.			
141.27 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	This Policy should also promote the sustainable use of resources and energy. We recommend that an additional bullet point is included requiring development to 'Incorporate Best Practice in terms of reducing energy consumption, resource use and to reduce environmental impact'. Such a policy could then be used to cover issues such as waste minimisation, reducing water usage, and the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) for surface water treatment and disposal. It would be beneficial to highlight this in the text for clarity. SEPA objects to this Policy unless it is amended to resolve the concerns detailed.			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
141.34 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	<p>SUDS and habitat enhancement are important requirements that should be met by all greenfield developments. The Plan should support a presumption in favour of SUDS for all developments unless it is proved unreasonable or not viable by the developer. This would be inline with the 'SUDS Design Manual for Scotland and Northern Ireland' which all the relevant parties have signed up to. SEPA objects to the wording of this section for the reasons detailed above.</p>			
141.59 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	<p>As the role of the Structure Plan is to identify the broad framework within which Local Plan Policies are developed, it would be appropriate to consider a general Policy on the drainage infrastructure which would take account of both surface water and foul water drainage requirements. In particular, would wish to see a requirement for Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems in all developments unless it is found to be unreasonable or inappropriate by the relevant Authorities. SEPA is disappointed by the lack of reference to SUDS within this Plan. It is strongly recommended that this omission is addressed.</p> <p>Development within settlements that lack mains drainage can lead to the proliferation of private drainage systems. Such proliferation can lead to public nuisance problems e.g. smell, and pollution.</p>			
141.65 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	<p>Paragraph 4.2.8 should refer to the need to conserve flood plain function for the storage of flood waters and promote the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) to manage the disposal of surface water to reduce the risk of development drainage creating or exacerbating flood risk.</p>			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
29.4 Mr P Thorn	Householders should be encouraged to segregate their waste, with financial penalties for those who don't do so, or produce too much.	1) Recycling should be encouraged and means put in place to encourage more householder recycling through tariffs, reducing water usage in the food processing industry, better education and the provision of more facilities to allow recycling to take place.	1) The Planning system has little scope to cover issues such as financial arrangements or on education or the internal processes of specific industries. However, it is accepted that there is a lack of guidance on the provision of specific waste management facilities other than landfill. This will be addressed through the text of the Plan.	<p>Waste management facilities have been included in Policy 26 (Four tier policy areas for minerals, landfill, landraise and windfarm proposals" which gives guidance on the location of landfill and landraise proposals.</p> <p>The policy and supporting text has been modified to provide guidance on the location of waste management facilities.</p> <p>Details of the Area Waste Plan are included in the Report of Survey's addendum.</p>
43.15 Mr D Scott, Halliday Fraser Munro, Robertson Group (Scotland) Limited	Our clients support the identification of the need to identify short-term landfill and land raise options that will meet the needs of the North East until such time as more sustainable alternatives can be developed. However, it is considered that the Structure Plan should also contain a Policy requiring Local Plans to identify sites for the facilities necessary for the sorting, processing and transfer of household, commercial and industrial wastes as part of the overall waste disposal network. For example such a station should be established in the area to the north of Aberdeen.	2) Plans should identify landfill sites - not just areas of search. Local Plans should also identify sites for other waste management facilities.	2) a) It is not accepted that the development plan should identify new landfill sites. The acceptability of landfill on a particular location is not just a matter of planning issues but encompasses environmental health, groundwater, pollution and other technical considerations that are outwith the scope and expertise of the local planning authority to deal with alone. It also runs counter to the polluter pays principle (e.g. the applicant should pay the considerable costs of carrying out an Environmental Impact Assessment - not the planning authority).	
73.15 Mr D Scott, Halliday Fraser Munro	It is noted within the Structure Plan that whilst it is unlikely that landfill will remain the dominant means of waste disposal it has been in the past it is still necessary in the Aberdeen Area to identify short-term landfill and land raise options that will meet the needs of the North East until such time as sustainable alternatives can be developed. We support the Plan's recognition that further landfill facilities are required which is not surprising given the capacity constraints of existing landfill sites in the Aberdeen Area. Whilst the Structure Plan suggests that Local Plans should identify 'Areas of Search' for suitable landfill facilities it is our considered opinion that it would be more appropriate for local plans to identify possible landfill locations. We would wish to discuss the possibility of possible landfill locations with representatives of Aberdeen and Aberdeenshire Council.	3) It should be made clearer that landfill will cease to be the preferred waste management option in future.	b) Similar comments apply to other major waste management facilities. In their case the actual requirements of the north east may not be fully known or understood until the production of the NE Area Waste Plan. As a consequence it would be more appropriate to include further guidance on the provision of specific waste management facilities.	
73.17 Mr D Scott, Halliday Fraser Munro	It is also requested that the Structure Plan contains a policy requiring Local Plans to identify sites for facilities necessary for the sorting, processing and transfer of household, commercial and industrial wastes as part of their overall waste disposal network.	4) Plans should identify the locations of, or give more guidance on the location of other waste management facilities such as recycling centres, civic amenity sites and new technologies on dealing with waste.	3) Accept.	
74.10 Mrs R A Henderson, Cove and Altens Community	Waste management facilities policy is too vague and relies too much on Local Plans. There should be a policy clearly defining the recycling of waste and encouraging NE based centres to re-use the materials.	5) More attention needs to be given to the proximity principle and how it will apply to discreet waste streams.	4) It is accepted that there is a lack of guidance on the provision of specific waste management facilities	
		6) More emphasis needs to be given to the National Waste Strategy and the NE Area Waste Plan as these documents will drive waste management in this area. However, another comment stated that the Policy simply duplicates the role of the National Waste Strategy. Greater co-ordination between the Aberdeen City and Aberdeenshire Waste Strategies is required.		
		7) More emphasis needs to be given to the effects of waste management facilities on the environment and		

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
122.1 Ms D May, Lumphanan Community Council	Support for Environment Policy 8, Waste Recycling.	water resources.  8) The Policy is too vague. It should set clear standards for re-use and recycling and should set a vision for the management of waste in north east Scotland.	other than landfill. As a consequence it would be appropriate to include further guidance on the provision of specific waste management facilities.	
123.14 Ms A Harvie, Aberdeen Chamber of Commerce	1. It is not clear that the sections on waste management and renewable energy meet the requirements for Structure Plans as outlined in the National Waste Strategy, NPPG10 and NPPG6 respectively. The Chamber would expect more specific guidance in the Structure Plan on the preferred location and types of technology likely to be favoured in the Plan Period. 3. The Chamber agrees that this is an important issue in environmental terms but it also represents an opportunity for Aberdeen and NE Scotland to establish a national leadership position in waste management and renewable energy generation, with sustainable benefits to business and the community. 4. Waste Management Strategy needs to move forward as a matter of urgency. It is also essential that City and Shire waste management strategies are co-ordinated. 5. The export of Aberdeen City waste to Tayside is environmentally unsustainable, costly and highly negative to the area's good reputation.	9) Various comments on the Area Waste Plan were received, particularly in terms of co-ordinating the City and Aberdeenshire strategies, correcting terminology, criticism of the policy for repeating the NWS and ensuring that the majority of waste can be dealt with in the area.	5) The importance of the proximity principle is acknowledged in the waste management section. Furthermore, reducing the need to travel is a primary aim of NEST. The Policy will therefore highlight the need to locate waste facilities as close as possible to the source of waste. As a strategic document however, it is not appropriate to detail how the principle will apply to other waste streams. This will be covered elsewhere, including the NWS and AWP and it is unnecessary to repeat details of these documents ad verbatim in NEST.  6) Details of the NWS and NE Area Waste Plan are contained in the Report of Survey. Events have moved on since it was written through the setting up of the North East Waste Partnership (NEWP) and an update will be required. The comment on co-ordination is accepted and NEWP has the role of ensuring this takes place.  7) Although this point is accepted in principle, a redrafted Policy will cover this issue. Although mention is given to safeguarding the natural environment, this is better covered under general policies on environmental and water management (new Policies 19 and 22). Local plans will also be required to set working, restoration and	
140.10 Mr K Newton, Formartine Partnership	(i) In order to reduce the amount of waste landfilled, it will be necessary to alter people's thoughts and views on recycling as well as providing the infrastructure for reduction and recycling schemes to take place. A change in public opinion is required as well as a change in service provision. (ii) Some means should be found to encourage more recycling, particularly in rural communities, where there is no civic amenity site. Perhaps a weighing system at these sites for various re-cycled goods, on a points basis, which could be accumulated to give a reduction in rates.			
141.42 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	SEPA objects to this section unless the wording of this paragraph is amended to the following: 'For various environmental, economic and legislative reasons the landfill of untreated municipal waste will cease to be the preferred means of waste management in the United Kingdom. Greater emphasis.....waste hierarchy. Consequently, more treatment facilities...'			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
141.43 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	It would be beneficial to specify the proximity principle within the text. Facilities for all waste types are required, although for some types this will be one facility for the whole of Scotland. For others such as low level radioactive waste, a new disposal site for the structure plan area will need to be developed before the closure of Aberdeen City Council's landfill at Ness. (See also comments on paragraph 4.3.9 below). We strongly recommend that the text is amended to address this point.		aftercare standards together with other criteria where appropriate.  8) It is accepted that the current wording of the Policy is too vague and it will be re-drafted to make it more meaningful. It should be remembered however, that NEST is primarily a land use document. In the case of waste, it is considered that the best means of setting a vision for its management is through the Area Waste Plan. What NEST attempts to do is to ensure that the outcomes of the AWP (which are not yet known) can be implemented in a sustainable manner. This may involve landfill sites, EFW or recycling facilities etc or in all likelihood, a combination of facilities. A degree of flexibility is therefore required. Consequently, further guidance on alternative waste facilities will be included in the text.	
141.44 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	SEPA objects to the section 4.3.9 unless the second bullet point is amended as follows: 'ensure that, in searching for suitable areas, the provisions of the National Waste Strategy and North East Area Waste Plan are accounted for, and'; and the following additional bullet point is included: 'ensure that adequate facilities are provided to enable the majority of waste arising in the area to be recovered/disposed of within the area'.			
141.45 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	An example of waste reduction for the fifth bullet point would be reducing water usage in the food processing industry. It is recommended that this example is included in the text as water is often forgotten when considering waste.			
141.46 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	In the sixth bullet point as well as safeguarding environmental assets, reference should also be made to minimising the impact on the environment.			
141.48 Ms R Rush, SEPA North Region	The text in section 4.3.10 should be corrected to refer to the National Waste Strategy and North East Area Waste Plan.			
144.3 Mr N Brooks, Cordah Limited	Para 4.3.6, where the NWS is first mentioned, should include a sentence to describe how NEST works with the NWS. For example "the Structure Plan shall guide land use development in a manner consistent with the NWS". We also feel that the majority of Environment Policy 8 duplicates the role of SEPA, who's NWS says how waste should be managed. It is surely the role of NEST to provide policies allowing this management regime to be implemented in land use terms, not simply reiterate SEPA's strategy.		9) a) Details of the NWS and NE Area Waste Plan are contained in the Report of Survey. Events have moved on since it was written through the setting up of the North East Waste Partnership (NEWP) and a re-drafting will be required. The comment on co-ordination is accepted and NEWP has the role of ensuring this takes place.  b) The point on using the correct terminology is accepted as is the comment on the policy content. These will be amended.  c) It is felt that the last point is unnecessary as the role of the proximity principle has been strengthened in both the text and	

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
144.4 Mr N Brooks, Cordah Limited	We fully endorse the use of the proximity principle in waste management planning. However, we feel that para 4.3.8 "waste management facilities should be located as close as possible to the source of waste taking into account the safeguarding of the natural and built environment" is too vague. There should be more guidance as to how the proximity principle applies differently to discreet waste streams and different facilities, even if this is only one disclaiming sentence.		policy. It is also considered that wording of the nature proposed could be used against local authorities as a means of justifying proposals that may otherwise be unacceptable.	
149.20 Mr E Gillespie, Scottish Enterprise Grampian	The Policy approach on waste management is unacceptable. There is no recognition that the cost of dealing with waste in North East Scotland is currently, and will be even greater in future; a significant cost to business and industry. This is caused by lack of appropriate infrastructure in the area and the Structure Plan does not appear to provide an appropriate means of assisting and uniting the implementation of both Councils' individual Waste Management Strategies. Indeed no reference is made to these Policies which seem to be adopting different (and potentially conflicting) methods of dealing with the issue. The Structure Plan must set a vision for the future development of the area and in respect of waste management it is very clear that further work and thought is required.			
161.6 Mr A Finlayson, The Community Councils Forum of the City of Abn.	There should be a more proactive Policy towards the recycling of waste.			
161.7 Mr A Finlayson, The Community Councils Forum of the City of Abn.	There should be a Policy that Planning Approval for development on landfill sites should be withheld until such time as SEPA have issued a clearance certificate for the site.			
162.3 Mr G Ramsay, Braeside & Mannofield Community Council	Fully supports the way the plan seeks to address problems associated with waste disposal and recovery. Had been concerned by a SEPA publication that whilst 50% of waste is recyclable, only 9% currently is.			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
6.14 Mr A Bradford, Kincardine Estate	Re: Waste and Energy: It should be stated in policy that incineration proposals should achieve energy efficiencies equal to the standards achieved by the better examples of such plants, using international comparisons wherever possible.	1) Several specific comments on this issue were received, particularly on energy from waste, although there were no objections in principle to EFW. It was stated that energy efficiencies should be as high as possible and that mention should be made of district heating and combined heat and power schemes.  2) Policy Environment 9 does not demonstrate clear Policy content and it needs to be made clearer to developers which issues need to be addressed.	1) Energy from Waste has been moved from the Renewable Energy Section to Waste Management. Consequently, such plant will be required to conform to the Best Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO). It is considered that this addresses the points on energy efficiency. Mention can also be made in the text of plants that produce both heat and electricity (i.e. CHP).  2) Accept.	Policy Environment 9 has been redrafted as Policy 5 and the supporting text modified to ensure that such proposals conform to Best Practicable Environmental Option.
6.15 Mr A Bradford, Kincardine Estate	Change the wording in the 3rd sentence of paragraph 4.3.12 to read: "Large plants generating heat, or heat and electricity, through incineration . . ."			
44.24 Ms A E Woodward, Aberdeenshire Branch Scottish Wildlife Trust	Report of Survey section 5.6, pages 70-72, sewage sludge and farmed animal waste are not natural resources.			
54.3 Mr M Ford	There is no mention of district heating systems and combined heat and power schemes, despite the Plan's emphasis on housing in settlements, mixed use developments and support for sustainability, saving energy and renewable energy.			
164.25 Dr R A MacDonald, Scottish Natural Heritage	<p>Policies Environment 8, 9 and 10 do not demonstrate clear strategic policy content. What are the strategic policies for waste management facilities, renewable energy facilities and saving energy? These need to be clear so that developers understand the issues they have to address. SNH believes that the plan should clearly set out strategies for waste and renewable energy that are established within the principles of sustainable development.</p> <p>An example of a policy for renewable energy facilities could state:</p> <p>"The council support the utilisation of the areas renewable energy resource including hydro, wind, wave and tidal path." Proposals will be assessed against the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- visual impact; noise;</li> <li>- road producing traffic;</li> <li>- communicative effects etc</li> </ul> <p>Local plans will give more detail on criteria and location". (This approach could apply to the construction of policies in other parts of the plan as well).</p>			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
120.5 Ms A Polson, Brodies, The British Wind Energy Association	It is submitted that either here or in respect of Policy E9 it should be made clear that by nature wind energy development is particularly suited to rural open locations. While it is important to respect the landscape character of an area the nature of wind turbines must be take into account. Wind energy developments should not be regarded as harmful simply because they are different types of structure or because they are visible. This view would not be supported by the findings of many independent public surveys. Concealment is not an option. The logic of their layout design is therefore crucial in making them acceptable additions to the landscape. In other words, the locational requirements and features of wind turbines should be regarded as the starting point in drafting plan policy.	1) NPPG 6 does not exclude wind energy from the Green Belt and renewable energy should be included as an acceptable use in Green Belt.  2) New renewable energy generating facilities should only be allowed where a need has been demonstrated or where extra energy requirement has been mitigated by energy conservation policies.  3) Wind turbines should not be allowed in close proximity to housing and the buffer zone suggested in the tiers should be extended from 400m to 2km - or more as circumstances dictate.	1) The first point is not accepted. NPPG6 states that a cautious approach should be adopted in Green Belts in respect of wind farms. National guidance, together with previous local and structure plans have been clear on the types of development allowed in Green Belt. There appears to be little justification in departing from this in terms of wind farms - particularly when the area covered by Green Belt is very small in the context of the Structure Plan area. Green Belts are therefore placed amongst the second tier areas and it will be incumbent on developers to justify proposals in such areas when other less sensitive alternatives may be available.  2) This approach is clearly contrary to national planning policy and government efforts to encourage the development of renewable energy facilities.  3) Although turbines can cause disturbance in some cases, in others it may be possible to mitigate potential impacts on settlements or houses. It should be pointed out that larger zones will effectively rule out much larger areas for development. Again, this could be contrary to Government and planning objectives. Nevertheless it is accepted that local amenity considerations are important and this will be acknowledged in a re-drafted policy as on of the main considerations that must be accounted for when dealing with proposals.	Wind energy has been incorporated into the redrafted Policy 5 "Renewable Energy Facilities" . Amenity is given explicit consideration within this policy.
120.6 Ms A Polson, Brodies, The British Wind Energy Association	It is submitted that NPPG6 does not support wind energy development being excluded from the Green Belt as a matter of policy. The words "renewable energy development" should be included in the first paragraph of the Policy.	4) Wind turbines should not be placed on ridgelines or in areas regularly overflowed by aircraft or which are visible from roads with poor safety records or where speeding regularly takes place.  5) It should be made clear that the nature of wind turbines mean that they are particularly suitable in open rural areas.		
165.1 Mr P Smart	It should be noted that the provision of extra energy generation facilities (renewable or otherwise) is only useful in cases where such extra energy is a requirement that cannot be mitigated by energy conservation policies. In all other cases where the provision of renewable energy generation facilities is justified on the grounds of emission savings and is expected to substitute for existing energy generation facilities, then it should be a requirement to demonstrate that this substitution can be effected and the emission savings expected can be delivered. This demonstration requirement should take into account the availability of other existing electricity generation, the available capacity for transfer in the electricity grid system, and the expected lifetime of the project (given that some electricity generation stations require structures of limited lifetime e.g. wind turbines).			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
165.5 Mr P Smart	Wind turbines should only be permitted in either proximity or high proximity to housing where no other location further away from housing can be found (High proximity is defined by the recent Scottish Executive report into public attitudes towards wind farms in Scotland on 30th August 2000 as 5 kilometres from housing and medium proximity is defined as being up to 10 kilometres - it should be noted that the above mentioned survey appears to have only tabled responses from approximately 9 people living both in high proximity to wind farms and who could see a wind farm from their home and so whilst the criteria relating to proximity may be valid the survey results are not a reliable indicator of opinion from people whose homes are overlooked by wind turbines).		4) Ridgelines should not be totally excluded from development as there may be circumstances where its effects are considered acceptable or can be mitigated. It is considered that the other issues are best dealt with at Development Control rather than Structure Plan level.  5) A new Policy on Tiers will clearly set out the preferred areas for the location of wind farms. Tiers are now firmly accepted as the best approach to planning for certain types of development and they form a fundamental part in the approach of NEST. Further, areas of search are advocated in the revised NPPG6 on Renewable Energy.	
165.6 Mr P Smart	No wind farm facility should be permitted where it will visually dominate existing housing. Landscape domination has been defined in the proposed redraft to NPPG6 as saying that within 2 kilometres wind turbines are likely to be the dominant landscape feature. Thus the "housing buffer" should be a least 2 kilometres. I propose that the Plan adopts a figure of not less than 3 kilometres as the "Housing Buffer". The "Housing Buffer" should be increased where turbines are proposed to be placed at a higher elevation than existing housing. The "Housing Buffer" should be increased where turbines are proposed along ridgelines and other locations where the proposed configuration is liable to produce a panoramic effect when viewed from nearby housing. This could be addressed by requiring that the turbines should not occupy a field of view more than 46 degrees when viewed from any adjacent home. (46 degrees is a figure for the human eyes field of vision supplied to me by a wind farm developer)			

Source	Summary of Comments	Summary of Points	Analysis	Action
165.7 Mr P Smart	<p>ALTERNATIVE to (6)                      In the event that an absolute exclusion zone defined as the "Housing Buffer" above is not acceptable to the Plan then a "Housing amenity buffer" should be maintained as at least 1.5 kilometres as per what I understand to be a recommendation of a Welsh Affairs Select Committee report on wind farm impact. It should take account of noise, safety and some other amenity issues, and a "Housing Visual Buffer" should be established in exactly the same way as I have proposed above for a "Housing Buffer. In this instance the distances would be calculated only in relation to Housing from which the wind farm could be viewed. In this later case an additional consideration should be the impact that wind farm would have on the landscape setting in which houses are situated. This should be conducted for all houses that are sufficiently close to the wind farm to be considered for the Housing Buffer but from which the wind farm cannot potentially be viewed and so to which the Housing Visual Buffer does not apply.</p>			
165.8 Mr P Smart	<p>Wind turbines should not be placed on ridgelines. If this is not acceptable to the Plan then where wind turbines are proposed for ridgelines it should have to be demonstrated that there is significant extra benefit that can be derived and delivered (accruing to the Plan benefits for renewable energy) by placing the turbines on the ridge over and above the benefits arising from the case if the turbines were placed away from the ridgeline. In many cases it could be that in moving wind turbines away from ridges a large amount of the power output can be preserved while the adverse visual impact would be reducing by a significant amount.</p>			
165.9 Mr P Smart	<p>Specific exclusions should also apply to the installation of Wind turbines in areas regularly overflown by Aircraft. There is special need for them in areas where aircraft manoeuvre and approach laerodromes ass wind turbines are known to interfere with radar and radio and thus represent an unacceptable safety risk.</p>			
165.10 Mr P Smart	<p>Wind turbines should not be allowed where they would be visible from roads with a discernible accident record or record of excessive traffic speeding because of the safety risk of additional driver distraction.</p>			