

SITE NUMBER: K58

NAME: Waterside Site

**Assessment undertaken by: Sarah MacRitchie**

**Proposer: Robert Gordon University c/o Paull & Williamsons**

**Nature of the proposal: Education, research, recreational and other uses incidental to the university**

**Recommendation: Undesirable**

**Reasoned justification:<sup>1</sup> The site is constrained by flood risk. The site is on green belt land. The site scores 4 on the GAM. The site scores 0 in the SEA.**

The proposal is undesirable as the entire area is designated as being within fluvial flood risk. The site is also adjacent to the River Dee SAC and so drainage could prove difficult.

SITE NUMBER: K58

NAME: Waterside Site

**Constraints mapping**

	Criteria	Score	Justification
<b>Capacity study site?</b>			<b>Which study:</b>
<b>Sustainable Economic Development</b>	Accessibility of Existing centres of Employment	0	<b>As close to Aberdeen as some existing development</b>
	Provision of Business Land	-1	
	Distance to Key Service Centres	0	<b>As close to Aberdeen as some existing development</b>
	pedestrian/cycle links to key services, employment land and surrounding developments	-1	<b>Pedestrian bridge over the River Dee would be required</b>
<b>Encourage and Support Regeneration</b>	Brownfield Development	-1	
	Enhancement of Heritage	0	
	Supporting quality of Services including primary schools	1	<b>Provision of new education facilities</b>
	Resolves Issues of Contamination on Site	0	
<b>Maintain and Enhance the Quality of the Natural Heritage and Built Environment</b>	Quality of Agricultural Land Lost	0	<b>Classified 3.2</b>
	Degree of loss of Biodiversity	0	<b>Agricultural land to housing</b>
	Setting of Historic Buildings Affected (SAM's)	0	
	Archaeology Affected	1	
<b>Landscape</b>	Shelter from cold winds	1	<b>Topography rises to North, woodland to south and west</b>
	Potential for Passive Solar Gain	0	<b>Flat site</b>
	Visual Considerations	0	<b>Low lying site adjacent to River Dee, adjacent to development</b>
	Designed Landscapes Affected	1	
<b>Technical Issues</b>	Availability of Water Supply	1	<b>Invercarnie WTW capacity for 892</b>
	Ease of Providing Drainage	1	<b>Nigg WWTW capacity for 1405</b>
	Costs of Providing Access	0	
	Provision of New Community Services Required	1	

SITE NUMBER: K58

NAME: Waterside Site

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Ok</b>	<b>Relative Constraint</b>	<b>Not Ok</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Hazardous site	x			
Transport safeguarded site	x			
Pipeline constraint	x			
SEPA Fluvial Flood risk (0.5%)			x	<b>Site at flood risk</b>
SEPA coastal Flooding (0.5%)	x			
SAC	x			
SPA	x			
Ramsar site	x			
SSSI	x			
Local Nature Reserve	x			
SESA SINS	x			
Woods for people	x			
Ancient Woodland	x			
“Protected” open space	x			
Other Constraints		x		<b>Green belt</b>

Other constraints include potential impact on critical environmental or social capital of the settlement identified through the characterisation process

SEA Objectives	Effect	Comments
<b>SEA Topic: Air</b>		
1 Protect and improve local air quality.	+	Pedestrian links could be provided, adjacent to service centre
<b>SEA Topic: Water</b>		
2 Sustain and enhance water quality to good ecological status.	-	Development on an area of flood risk
<b>SEA Topic: Soil</b>		
3 Improve and safeguard soil quality.	0	
4 Reduction in the amount of waste going to landfill	0	
<i>Summary of effect:</i>	0	
<b>SEA Topic: Biodiversity</b>		
5 Conserve, protect, maintain and enhance biodiversity (including ecosystems, habitats, species and genetic).	0	Adjacent to River Dee SAC
<b>SEA Topic: Climatic factors</b>		
6 Reduce the causes of adverse climate change (e.g. reduction in CO <sub>2</sub> levels and NE global footprint).	0/+	Reduce travel miles
7 Reduce vulnerability to the effects of climate change (e.g. flooding, public service provision, and habitats).	0	
<i>Summary of effect:</i>	0/+	
<b>SEA Topic: Human health</b>		
8 Safeguard and improve accessibility to open spaces.	0	
9 Decrease deprivation/social exclusion.	0	
<i>Summary of effect:</i>	0	
<b>SEA Topic: Population</b>		

SEA Objectives	Effect	Comments
10 Improve the supply of housing land to accommodate in-migration, an aging population, and the predicted increase in households.	0	
<b>SEA Topic: Cultural heritage</b>		
11 Protect, and where appropriate enhance the historic environment.	0	
<b>SEA Topic: Landscape</b>		
12 Protect, enhance and where appropriate restore the quality & distinctiveness of the area's landscape and townscapes.	0	
<b>SEA Topic: Material assets</b>		
13 Promote the creation of fixed, commercial and industrial assets.	+	Employment / education
14 Regenerate derelict, vacant or contaminated land.	0	
15 Promote the use of sustainable materials and the adoption of Lifetime standards.	0	
<b>Summary of effect:</b>	<b>0/+</b>	
<b>Overall effect:</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally a neutral impact</li> <li>• Some positives: air quality and climate change</li> <li>• Some negatives: water quality</li> </ul>

---

<sup>1</sup> Reasoned Justification

Why should this site be considered or dismissed in the Local Development Plan? Please ensure you cover issues relating to the preferred settlement strategy as part of this justification, particularly where you are making a “Preferred” recommendation. Please also embed (copy and paste from GGP) any suggestion you might wish to make regarding allocating only part of the site, or on phasing.

Please see the spreadsheet “Target housing and employment allocations.xls” for guidance on the indicative scale of allocations to be sought in each area (Use the TRIM search facility to find this). For each of the 8 areas a report on settlement strategy options will have to be prepared that outlines the principles and options that have been considered. I believe that this is an iterative process which starts with the “targets” as modified first by availability of sites and our technical evaluation, and thereafter by the views of members as to what they wish to achieve. I have started that report.

Please maintain a record of your progress in “Spreadsheet to record progress on completing bid assessments Jan 2009.xls”.

Modification of the reasoned justification will be undertaken to reflect the desired settlement strategy following the Member seminars in March 2009 and for the final draft of the main issues report in May, when the sheets will form part of the evidence base for the main issues “proposals” maps ( published separately as a technical appendix.