

Aberdeen City and Shire Structure Plan

Strategic Options Meeting with Communities and Stakeholders: Kintore

Meeting Note

9 May 2007, 7.00pm

Torryburn Hotel, School Road, Kintore

1. Introduction

- 1.1 A meeting was held on 9 May 2007 to discuss and record opinions on the different strategies that could be followed in the next structure plan – the strategic options. In addition, issues regarding the scale and timing of future development were raised and discussed.

2. The Audience

- 2.1 The following interests were represented at the meeting. A full list of attendees is provided at appendix 1.
- Kemnay Community Council
 - Kintore Residents
 - Norman P. Lawrie Ltd

3. The Content

- 3.1 Mr Piers Blaxter, Team Leader of the Structure Plans Team for Aberdeenshire Council, introduced himself and the other planning officer in attendance, Kevin Thurlow. He welcomed the audience and noted that the meeting was one of a series of workshops being held across the region, with a focus on capturing views on possible strategies for the next structure plan (the Strategic Options). It was explained that views would be sought on the issues of where development should occur, when it should occur and how much should be promoted.
- 3.2 Mr Blaxter explained that the views recorded from the meeting would be part of the evidence base of information that would be presented to elected members in September 2007, to help them decide on a preferred option for the strategy of the draft plan (the preferred strategic option). He noted that a cross-section of community interests had been invited to the meeting, to allow early engagement in the plan-making process. It was stated that a full meeting note for tonight's meeting would be available on the website (www.acssp.net) and would allow attendees to see how their views had been recorded.

Background information on preparing the structure plan

- 3.3 Mr Blaxter provided some information on structure plans and their role in the planning system. He noted that structure plans form part of a Development Plan – something that, amongst other things, provides a set of rules to help make

decisions on planning applications. He contrasted a structure plan with the other part of the Development Plan – a local plan – and noted that a structure plan is not as detailed in specifying the location of future development. A structure plan instead provides a long term (15-25 years), strategic vision for the development of land in an area.

- 3.4 After outlining the role of a structure plan, Mr Blaxter noted that a new planning Act, which will introduce changes to the current planning system, had recently been created. Under the new Planning etc. (Scotland) Act, 2006, structure plans will be replaced with a new style of plan – a strategic development plan. He noted that such a plan would concentrate on setting a vision and a strategy for the development of land across a City Region.
- 3.5 It was stated that the regulations necessary for preparing a strategic development plan had not yet been drafted. As such, the two Councils are still preparing a structure plan, albeit one that will be in the style of the new documents; it is hoped that the end product can be converted into a strategic development plan.

The process of producing the next structure plan

- 3.6 Attendees were informed/reminded of the documents that had been published so far, in aid of producing the next structure plan (these are available from the website: www.acssp.net). Mr Blaxter provided some information on the timetable for the production of the plan, taken from one of these documents: the Development Plan Scheme. He noted that the process of writing the draft plan would not begin until after elected members had decided upon a preferred strategic option. He further noted that this decision, in addition to being based on the views of stakeholders, would also be based on the results of a technical assessment of the Options.
- 3.7 A question was asked as to how a decision would be made on a preferred strategic option, if communities favoured one option and the technical assessment favoured another. Mr Blaxter noted that the decision on a preferred strategic option would be made in view of the draft vision for the plan – as such, the vision would be used to choose between competing alternatives.
- 3.8 Mr Blaxter then drew the audience's attention to the draft vision, as stated in the Issues Report (one of the documents already published, as part of the plan-making process). He noted that the main elements of this vision provide a basis for evaluating the Strategic Options, in the first group exercise that the attendees were to take part in. The themes of climate change, creating a critical mass of development and the balancing of needs (relating to housing and employment and to strategic and local concerns) were highlighted as being of particular interest. The notion of critical mass was explained as the amount of development necessary to make new community services and facilities viable, or to keep existing services and facilities going.

The scale of future development

- 3.9 The issue of the scale of future development was then introduced and a discussion on the “working hypotheses” of the planning team ensued. Three “working hypotheses” were suggested:
- the idea that the next structure plan should only seek to accommodate 75% of development within the strategy, with the rest accommodated as local need in a local development plan;

- the idea that two thirds of development should be suggested for one theme of an Option (the “most” component) and one third in another (the “significant” component);
 - and the idea that there are three possible options for growth: slow growth, continuity or high growth.
- 3.10 Mr Blaxter explained that the planning team were looking to record a gut reaction to the hypotheses and as such were not expecting an in-depth consideration of the ratios or figures suggested. The discussion initially focused on the first of the three hypotheses (the idea that 75% of development should be allocated by the strategic plan). The following bullet points summarise the issues discussed:
- In trying to understand the difference between the 75% strategic allocation and the 25% that would be left for local needs, it was asked whether the Aberdeen Housing Market Area determined which areas would qualify for part of the strategic allocation. Mr Blaxter sought to clarify the issue; he explained that figures of how many houses have recently been built in certain areas (the Housing Market Areas) had been used in drafting the three hypotheses for the scale of development, but that the issue of where development would go was separate to all of this. The issue of where homes should go would not be determined by where homes have previously been built, unless this is the will of elected members, after they have considered all the evidence (including the views of communities).
 - It was remarked that although the figure of 25% could be increased, changing the figure to 50% would mean that the point of the plan would be lost. Mr Blaxter agreed that the strategic vision would not be realised if development for local needs was increased to this level – he suggested that the concentration of development would be too low to provide for major infrastructure improvements.
 - It was suggested that the plan could seek to pick out prime “25% areas” i.e. areas for which infrastructure capacity could cope with small, non-strategic developments, to provide for the continued viability of small towns and villages.
 - The idea of asking for a view on whether the 25% figure is appropriate was criticised. It was suggested that whether this figure is suitable depends very much on the strategy that will be chosen for the plan. To this, Mr Blaxter re-affirmed that the planning team are only seeking to record gut reactions to the hypotheses; in essence, a view was being sought on whether the status quo should be maintained or altered.
 - It was suggested that the figure should be increased slightly, in order to provide more opportunities for small-scale housing developers. It was noted that increasing the size of the overall allocation would mean that major house builders would benefit to a greater extent than small-scale developers, as the latter would not be able to build on the appropriate scale to capitalise on the development opportunities.
 - It was agreed that there was a need to provide for local needs in addition to the development requirements of the city region. In general, the 25% figure was felt to be slightly too low.
- 3.11 The discussion progressed to focus on the third of the three hypotheses (the possible options for growth). The following bullet points summarise the issues raised:

- It was suggested that a high growth option should be chosen, as increasing the supply of new homes could help to limit or lower house prices. Mr Blaxter noted that an increase in the amount of land available for housing could provide an increase in the range of house sizes available to buyers, as well as improving the affordability of homes. He explained that if a large amount of land were provided for house building, developers would no longer have to build only certain types of houses, in order to maximise the profit they make on each site.
- The point was made that although a high growth scenario sounds attractive in principle, when the effects of large-scale development on small communities like Kintore were considered, concerns can be raised. Mr Blaxter suggested that these concerns could be dealt with through the proper management of future development. He explained that the long-term nature of the plan allowed for community growth to be planned, so that the right level of services and facilities are provided alongside the new houses.
- A question was asked as to how existing development would be affected, if new developments proved to be more attractive to new residents. Mr Blaxter suggested that this could be an issue for the next-but-one strategic land-use plan. It could be that such a plan would focus on re-developing what is already in existence, to bring it up to standard. This would depend on the actual effects of the next structure plan.
- It was suggested that the high growth option may be too high, given that the amount of housing land suggested for this option allows for a 20% increase in the number of new houses built, on top of what is already a rapid rate of development. Mr Blaxter suggested that it could be argued that such growth is necessary, in order to provide homes for the number of additional workers that are needed to provide for economic growth and diversification.
- There was no fixed conclusion to the debate on which of the growth options was most appropriate for the plan, although it was agreed that high growth had distinct benefits and that the level of growth should be somewhere between medium and high.

The Group Exercises

- 3.12 Mr Blaxter then introduced the group exercises. He explained that the purpose of the first exercise was to gauge a group's opinions on one or more of the Strategic Options, as these had been presented for their prior consideration. The subsequent exercise – involving a map and some tokens – was to allow groups to demonstrate where they thought development should be concentrated, within the pattern suggested by their preferred Option.
- 3.13 Results from the exercises may be found at appendix 2. The following bullet points summarise findings from the first exercise – the evaluation of the possible Strategic Options:
- Although three groups were involved in the exercise, a total of four different Options were selected as the preferred strategic option. Option 1, Option 2, Option 3 and Option 4 were each chosen once.
 - Of the four options chosen, all were thought to provide transportation benefits. For example, it was thought that Option 2 allowed for an increased use of public transport, whilst Option 1 was felt to allow for reduced travelling times, from the new developments.

- Option 2 was thought to benefit people already living in communities such as Kintore and Blackburn, although it was suggested that this Option could limit improvements to the transport corridor, at the expense of areas such as Banff and Buchan. The investment in less affluent places (such as Peterhead) was thought to be a positive aspect of Option 3, along with the improvements in accessibility that such an option would bring to these relatively inaccessible areas. It was however questioned whether the option was feasible. Option 4 and Option 1 were both separately thought to provide for a choice of places in which to live and work.
- Each group also chose to evaluate a least favoured strategic option. Options 5, 7 and 8 were each chosen once.
- Option 8 was criticised for not allowing the expansion of Aberdeen and concern was expressed that development would lead to a loss of character for rural communities. Option 5 was criticised for the environmental impact it would have, given the amount of greenfield land required for the creation of new settlements. It was suggested that Option 7 could present future transport problems, if the amount of development occurring in each area did not provide for the necessary infrastructure improvements.

3.14 The following bullet points summarise findings from the second exercise – the preferred distribution of development across the region:

- Only one of the three groups chose to distribute development widely across the region; two of the groups chose to limit the number of places involved in the strategic allocation to four or fewer locations.
- Aberdeen received a proportion of the allocation from all of the groups; two of the three groups allocated a substantial proportion of development to the city.
- Only one of the groups chose to distribute a proportion of the strategic allocation to areas north of Ellon.

Timing of future development

3.15 After the group exercises, a brief discussion was held on the timing (or phasing) of development to be promoted by the plan. Mr Blaxter explained that the issue of phasing was being considered simply – in terms of whether the plan should be front-loaded (with land being released at the start of the 25 year plan period), back-loaded (with land released at the end of the plan period), or whether development should occur at a sustained rate. The following bullet points summarise the issues raised by the discussion:

- It was suggested that a plan that back-loaded greenfield land would be suitable, to promote the development of brownfield land in the city. To this, it was suggested that greenfield sites would be needed from the start of the plan period, in order that new developments could provide for the facilities and services needed to make them acceptable, from a planning point of view – it was thought that the costs involved in preparing brownfield land for development would mean that developer contributions (for new facilities etc.) would be small.
- It was stated that by not front-loading brownfield land, the problem of what to do with such land remained and that such a decision constituted a delaying tactic. To this, it was noted that a decision not to offer an alternative to brownfield land at the start of the plan period might result in the stagnation of development, to

the overall detriment of the region. It was noted that the large house builders could choose to build houses elsewhere in the meantime, if it did not make financial sense to build in Aberdeen and Aberdeenshire.

- It was suggested that the plan should be front-loaded, in order to provide for the demand in the housing market that is not currently being met.
- In general, it was agreed that a front-loaded plan that tended towards a sustainable rate of release, is the most preferable alternative. It was emphasised that it was important to provide for sustainable growth.

3.16 Mr Blaxter brought the meeting to a close and outlined the next steps for producing the structure plan. He reminded attendees that the results from the group exercises would be used to inform a recommendation to elected members, on a preferred strategic option. He further stated that a note of the meeting would be placed on the website: www.acssp.net and that the next time community interests would be consulted on the structure plan would be at the draft plan stage. Attendees were thanked for their contribution and the meeting was brought to a close.

Appendix 1

The planning team in attendance during the meeting were as follows:

Piers Blaxter, Team Leader (Structure Plans Team), Aberdeenshire Council

Kevin Thurlow, Policy Planner (Structure Plans Team), Aberdeenshire Council

The following individuals also attended the meeting:

Name:	Interest/organisation:
Chris Hunneyball	Kemnay Community Council
Mavis Wainman	Kemnay Community Council
Neil Johnson	Kemnay Community Council
John Stewart	Resident of Kintore
Hannah Orr	Resident of Kintore
Norman Lawrie	Norman P. Lawrie Ltd

Appendix 2

Over the following pages, information is provided on the responses set down by groups of attendees, when undertaking the exercise to evaluate their preferred Option.

The Options referred to in the following tables are as follows:

Option 1: Most of the development in Aberdeen City, significant development in Edge of City Settlements.

Option 2: Most of the development in Aberdeen City, significant development in the existing transport corridor.

Option 3: Most of the development in Aberdeen City, significant development in a new transport corridor.

Option 4: Most of the development in Aberdeen City, significant development in growth poles across Aberdeenshire.

Option 5: Most of the growth in Aberdeen City and significant growth in new settlements.

Option 6: Most of the development in the existing transport corridor, significant development in Aberdeen City.

Option 7: Most of the development in the existing transport corridor, significant development in growth poles across Aberdeenshire.

Option 8: Most of the development in the existing transport corridor, significant development in a new transport corridor.

A table to show the good points recorded in the evaluation of preferred Strategic Options

Option Chosen as Preferred Strategic Option	Good Points of the Option					
	It reduces resource use and impacts on climate through...	It would be good for environmental quality because...	It would be good for the economy because...	It would be fair because...	It would increase choice and quality of life because...	Other remarks
Option 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most development is within a short distance of Aberdeen city, reducing travel times. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Everything close to the WPR, with significantly reduced travelling times. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It keeps the focus on Aberdeen, where the majority of the people work and shop. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the new development and benefits would be a short journey once the WPR is built. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It gives people a large choice of places to live and work, but still a short distance from the city centre. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gives the outlying developments the chance to grow organically, rather than in huge leaps. • Further outlying areas retain their existing way and quality of life.
Option 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximising potential for use of public transport, especially rail. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximising potential for use of public transport, especially rail. 	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People in already developed areas like Blackburn/Kintore would gain benefit of better transport infrastructure. 	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would allow more mixed development in the city to encourage families etc to move inwards.

Option 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of a good new transport link. Infrastructure is there, whereas new settlement (Option 5) wouldn't have any infrastructure or established community to start with. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A significant part of the development would be in Aberdeen, in the city. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Villages that are currently in decline, with shops closing, would be given an injection of clients! 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The city takes most of the expansion, but smaller, poorer communities get a share of the investment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previously, fairly inaccessible villages (to the northeast of Aberdeen), get more accessible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Places that are currently under pressure with huge development – Kintore, Blackburn, Inverurie get a “breather”, for the community to settle and come together.
Option 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport and infrastructure. 	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concentrated labour force. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many areas benefit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variety of living areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrict development in north Aberdeenshire.
Option 5	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>
Option 6	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>
Option 7	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>
Option 8	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>

A table to show the bad points recorded in the evaluation of preferred Strategic Options

Option Chosen as Preferred Strategic Option	Bad Points of the Option					
	It does not reduce resource use and impacts on climate because...	It would have impacts on environmental quality because...	It would not be good for the economy because...	It would not be fair because...	It would not increase choice and quality of life...	Other remarks
Option 1	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some of the more outlying areas may not benefit as much. 	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<i>No comment recorded</i>
Option 2	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It could restrict improvements to the Garioch/Mearns route, excluding Banff & Buchan, Peterhead etc. 	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<i>No comment recorded</i>
Option 3	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I can't see a new rail network actually being built in this corridor, it requires massive infrastructure investment. So in reality, how do you actually provide the accessibility that this plan requires?
Option 4	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<i>No comment recorded</i>

Option 5	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>
Option 6	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>
Option 7	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>
Option 8	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>

A table to show the good points recorded in the evaluation of least favoured Strategic Options

Option Chosen as Least Favoured Strategic Option	Good Points of the Option					
	It reduces resource use and impacts on climate through...	It would be good for environmental quality because...	It would be good for the economy because...	It would be fair because...	It would increase choice and quality of life because...	Other remarks
Option 1	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>
Option 2	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>
Option 3	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>
Option 4	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>
Option 5	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<i>No comment recorded</i>
Option 6	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>
Option 7	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More choice of where to live. 	<i>No comment recorded</i>
Option 8	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<i>No comment recorded</i>

A table to show the bad points recorded in the evaluation of least favoured Strategic Options

Option Chosen as Least Favoured Strategic Option	Bad Points of the Option					
	It does not reduce resource use and impacts on climate because...	It would have impacts on environmental quality because...	It would not be good for the economy because...	It would not be fair because...	It would not increase choice and quality of life...	Other remarks
Option 1	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>
Option 2	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>
Option 3	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>
Option 4	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>
Option 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It requires completely new infrastructure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It utilises greenfield sites. 	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other communities would lose out on planning gain. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Because it is restricted to one area. 	<i>No comment recorded</i>
Option 6	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>	<i>Not Evaluated</i>

Option 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many of the developments may not reach critical mass to generate improvements in infrastructure, especially transport. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many of the developments may not reach critical mass to generate improvements in infrastructure, especially transport. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would reduce regional cohesion, possibly fragmenting businesses. 	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because of the potential travel difficulties. 	<i>No comment recorded</i>
Option 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No expansion in the city centre/suburbs – everything forced out from focal point. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vast majority having to travel in to city, development focused on narrow corridors that become overloaded. 	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other parts miss out on development and potential benefits. It focuses on places that are growing really rapidly already. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The rural communities that are convenient for Aberdeen lose their character and become anonymous places that are less attractive and have lost character and community due to rapid growth. 	<i>No comment recorded</i>

A table to show the results for the distribution of development within a preferred Strategic Option

Option Chosen as Preferred Strategic Option	Distribution of tokens (settlement, number of tokens)	Additional Remarks
Option 4	Aberdeen: 5 Balmedie: 1 Ellon: 2 Dyce area: 1 Inverurie area: 2 Alford: 1 Banchory: 2 Stonehaven: 2 Portlethen area: 1 Aboyne: 1 Northernmost area of region (from Huntly in the west, to Peterhead in the east): 2	This group suggested that development in the city should be split between brownfield and greenfield sites, with greenfield allocations at Bridge of Don, Kingswells and to the South of the city, around Cove.
Options 1 & 3	Aberdeen: 10 Ellon: 6 Westhill area: 1 Culter/Milltimber/Peterculter: 3	This group suggested that at least half the development should occur in Aberdeen. It was thought that significant development in Ellon could help to provide for a new East Coast tramline. Development was also suggested to the west of Westhill and around Culter, Milltimber and Peterculter, in order to exploit the close connection to Aberdeen and provide for high value, high amenity developments.

Option 2	Aberdeen: 14 Laurencekirk: 3 Insch/Oyne: 3	In addition to allocating large amounts of development land to Aberdeen, this group chose to focus development at what they considered to be the ends of the transport corridor: Laurencekirk and either Insch or Oyne.
----------	--------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------