

Aberdeen City and Shire Structure Plan

Strategic Options Meeting with Communities and Stakeholders - Fraserburgh Meeting Note

23 April 2007, 7.00pm

Royal Hotel, 63 Broad Street, Fraserburgh

1. Introduction

- 1.1 A meeting was held on 23 April 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.
- Aberdeenshire Towns Partnership
 - Fraserburgh Community Council
 - Sandhaven and Pitullie Community Council
 - Fraserburgh Harbour Board
 - Mobile Taxis
 - Maitlands Shop
 - S & E Shephard

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. He welcomed the audience and noted that the meeting was one of a series of workshops being held across the region, designed to capture 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 development 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 stated that a 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. A report summarising the

results of all of the meetings held on the Strategic Options will also be placed on this website; this report should be available by August 2007.

- 3.3 It was noted that a technical assessment of the various Strategic Options would also be undertaken as a separate process and that this would provide additional information for elected members to consider. Mr Blaxter suggested that the views of communities and stakeholders were needed to ensure that the draft plan would reflect something of the aspirations of groups and individuals from the region.

Background information on preparing the structure plan

- 3.4 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, strategic vision for the development of land in an area. It was stated that the Councils' next structure plan is being prepared with the intention of providing a 25-year vision for Aberdeen and Aberdeenshire.
- 3.5 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 passed. Mr Blaxter listed a number of reasons why the new legislations had been written – to speed up the structure and local plan preparation process; to minimise repetition between the two plans; and to increase the level of stakeholder and community consultation earlier in the plan making process. He made reference to Planning Advice Note 61 on community engagement.
- 3.6 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, or “spatial strategy”, for the development of land across a City Region. As such, it is thought that the new documents will contain fewer detailed policies than is typically found in a structure plan.
- 3.7 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.
- 3.8 Attendees were then 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). The public consultation on the Issues Report had attracted over 90 responses, most of which were from developers. The issues/questions set out in the Issues Report were derived from meetings held with the Community Council Forums in September 2006, and included the draft structure plan vision. Mr Blaxter also informed the attendees that the Strategic Environmental Assessment scoping report has recently been published. The document sets out how the council will identify if the structure plan will have any significant environmental impacts in the area, and to set out the monitoring framework once the plan has been adopted.
- 3.9 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 and on a technical

assessment of the Options, would also be made in view of the draft vision for the plan.

- 3.10 Mr Blaxter then drew the audience's attention to the draft vision, as stated in the Issues Report (in para 3.8). 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 (as it is likely to become a reality during the lifetime of the plan), 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

- 3.11 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.
- 3.12 The discussion initially centred on the future decline of the oil industry and the concept of critical mass. The following bullet points summarise the comments made:
- Would the oil industry and Aberdeen City as a whole will still be vibrant over the next 25 years? Mr Blaxter stated that the growth scenarios would seek to address the decline in the oil industry.
 - Given the rate of growth in the city and central areas, it was suggested that the city should 'come to the north' in terms of new build and facilities. Mr Blaxter commented that the north would need to provide a critical mass for such facilities, and that attracting development would remain a challenge.
 - It was reported that some 40% of residents work outside Fraserburgh, and several work on the oilrigs, spending weeks offshore. Mr Blaxter noted that Fraserburgh's quality of life probably attracts people to live in the area, but added that there is a need to consider the transition of the oil industry to other sectors and to start planning for this now.
- 3.13 The discussion progressed to focus 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:
- Mr Blaxter confirmed that the 75%:25% split related to the volume of housing and employment land provided for by the plan and not to the capital value of development, and that retail provision was factored within the employment land

figures. The specific issue of the acceptability of retail on employment land allocations was identified as a matter for the next local plan.

- It was asked how could a figure (%) be placed on the split of development, adding that the 25year timescale is too long. Mr Blaxter responded saying that the lifetime of the existing structure plan is only 15 years, and it is already out of date. However, a longer period (as now required under the 2006 Planning etc Act) provides certainty for developers when determining how much infrastructure will be required to meet the needs of the proposed housing and employment land figures/allocations. Mr Blaxter suggested that the structure plan will be flexible enough to respond to change within an overall strategic direction, as it will be reviewed every five years, and an Action Programme (setting out how the plan will be implemented) will also review the plan on an annual basis.
- It was commented that a 25year plan would be a waste of time. Mr Blaxter reiterated that the need for stable growth and the importance of planning for the likely need of specific infrastructure in different areas.
- A question was asked why the strategic plan would be city based. Mr Blaxter suggested that it is important to recognise the need to maintain the City for the good of the northeast, as well as the needs of other areas.
- Given the location of Fraserburgh, it was stated that people in the City view Fraserburgh as a rural area, but that locals view it as a town. Mr Blaxter confirmed that Fraserburgh is not a rural areas, but that it is situated in the rural housing market area, and that it does have rural needs – this was agreed by the attendees.
- It was raised that the rise in house prices determines where people live. Mr Blaxter agreed, but also suggested that jobs drive peoples choices when deciding where to live.
- It was suggested that 25% of the total development is too low to accommodate local needs and that the figure should be at least 30%, with a wash of development in the City and the Shire.

3.14 The discussion then moved on to discuss the third of the three hypotheses (the possible options for growth). The following bullet points summarise the issues:

- It was asked how flexible each of the scenarios would be. Mr Blaxter suggested that the more allowance for growth, the greater the flexibility.
- A suggestion was made incorporating all three scenarios – to view the city as high growth, Peterhead as medium growth and Fraserburgh as low growth. Mr Blaxter suggested that growth in Fraserburgh could instead be viewed as a local rather than strategic issue, and land for development could be proposed under the next local plan, rather than the structure plan.
- It was raised that Fraserburgh is geographically poor. It is surrounded by water on three sides and has poor road infrastructure. With the harbour, freight could increase, although this was viewed as unlikely, and the poor roads and low job prospects mean that people commute more. Mr Blaxter highlighted that the structure plan cannot dictate the type of development that comes into an area, it can only provide opportunity.
- Mr Blaxter confirmed with the attendees his impression from the discussion that the low growth strategy was preferred due to peoples comments on low job

prospects for the area (lack of skills and no college in the town) and the demolition and rebuilding of new dwellings in Fraserburgh.

The Group Exercise

- 3.13 Mr Blaxter then introduced the group exercises. He explained that the purpose of the first exercise was to gauge a group's opinions on their preferred and least preferred Strategic Option. A subsequent exercise – involving a map and some tokens – was to allow groups to demonstrate where they thought development should be concentrated.
- 3.14 Results from the exercises are to be found at appendix 2. The following bullet points summarise findings on the first exercise – the evaluation of the possible Strategic Options:
- Options 4 came out overall as the preferred strategic option, with one group (out of the five) preferring Option 7.
 - Three out of the five groups least preferred Option 2, with options 1 and 5 also being identified as being the least preferred option with one vote each.
 - The benefit of Option 4 was highlighted as reducing travel distances, congestion and air pollution, increase (local) economic benefits, and bring development to the whole region; one of the groups also suggested that Option 7 would be similarly beneficial.
 - The main reasons given for Option 2 being identified as the least favoured option were it would increase traffic congestion and concentrate development to the city and surrounding area. One group, however, did acknowledge that Option 2 would probably have least development (i.e. infrastructure) costs.
- 3.15 The results to the second exercise, involving the distribution of development, may also be found at appendix 2. The following bullet points summarise findings from this exercise:
- Each of the five groups chose to distribute their tokens in a different manner to that suggested by their preferred Strategic Option. Generally, tokens were more widely distributed across the region than was indicated by the pre-defined possible strategies.
 - All the main coastal settlements in the North received significant allocations from five groups, and new settlements were favoured in two of the final distributions, although only a small allocation was provided.
 - Two groups omitted Aberdeen altogether from the allocations.
 - All the groups proposed only a small proportion of the allocation to the south of Aberdeen.

Timing of future development

- 3.16 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:

- Mr Blaxter highlighted that front-loading could be inflexible, and when he was asked about the risk of sprawling towns, he suggested that this was a function of the scale of development, rather than of phasing.
 - The issue of allocated sites remaining undeveloped was raised. The attendees felt that policy would be required to prevent land remaining undeveloped, and there would be no point front-loading sites if not all the allocations are likely to be built. Mr Blaxter suggested that landowners would have to develop their land allocation or lose it (via the local plan process). He also added that in some areas there are risks of sites remaining undeveloped if either front-loading or back-loading was chosen.
 - Mr Blaxter clarified the definition of development, when asked, as generic development, meaning everything required for a sustainable community.
 - It was asked why brownfield sites are not identified for front-loading? Mr Blaxter intimated that brownfield land supply is now limited, and much of these sites have constraints that require money and time to resolve. Back-loading would favour brownfield sites. In response the need to identify the area of brownfield remaining was stressed, although unlike in Fraserburgh, there has been a large uptake of brownfield sites in the City area.
 - In general it was concluded that a sustained rate of development, or else a plan that was slightly weighted in favour of front-loading, at a sustained rate of release was required. On a scale of 1 (front-loading) to 10 (back-loading), the majority said that 3-4 (favouring front-loading), with a handful saying 6.
- 3.17 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 attendees are unlikely to hear anything on the structure plan until the New Year, when the draft is published for comment. 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

Alison Hogge, Policy Planner (Structure Plans Team), Aberdeenshire Council

The following individuals also attended the meeting:

Name:	Interest/organisation:
Gill Lamont	Aberdeenshire Towns Partnership
Jim Page	Fraserburgh Community Council
Alistair Melville	Fraserburgh Community Council
Mary W Melville	Fraserburgh Community Council
Marjorie Griffiths	Resident
Robin MacKinlay	Resident
Sheila Hogarth	Sandhaven and Pitullie Community Council
Fiona Clark	Sandhaven and Pitullie Community Council
Dennie Duthie	Aberdeenshire Councillor
Wilson Irvine	Resident
Bill Maitland	Maintland's Shop
Alan Kennedy	S & E Shephard
Brian McCann	Fraserburgh Harbour
Kenneth Noble	Mobile Taxis

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	<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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing the need to travel to Aberdeen • Would result in no need to travel/reduce the need to commute • Stabilises the population 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bring jobs to residents • Reduce road traffic • There would be a reduction in congestion • Reduction in air pollution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would encourage diversity of employment • There would be a dispersal of resources • There is variety in the area • Skilled workers would stay in the community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both the City and Shire would develop • Investment would spread throughout the City and Shire • Workers can spend more time with their families 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would bring less stress • Increase the change of a city in rural living • Inward investment is sorely needed • It would stimulate the Fraserburgh area • More equal opportunities could be attained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Going to the city for special and recreation activities would be shorter and cut in their travel distance • Talent would be retained in local area • Would provide opportunities for disadvantaged youth of the town.
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of existing transport services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commuter traffic and air pollution would be reduced 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There would be an increase of development in and around coastal towns (i.e. ports) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport corridor development interaction with the City is balanced with rural areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is a more balanced approach to development across the City and Shire 	<i>No comment recorded</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>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>No comment recorded</i>	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It might have a higher capital cost 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Still the majority of investment in Aberdeen 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investment is not viable to the whole area. The variety ceases to the north of Aberdeen. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a need for investment in transport (A90) and communications to the NE. Infrastructure has been neglected for the past 20 years.
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>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 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>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 2	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It probably has the lowest development costs 	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comment recorded
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>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 least favoured Strategic Options

Option Chosen as least favoured Strategic Option	Bad 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>No comment recoded</i>	<i>No comment recoded</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would be concentrated in the city and surrounding area – it would not encourage development in the rest of the Shire. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would be concentrated in the city and surrounding area – it would not encourage development in the rest of the Shire. • It would drain skills further from Aberdeenshire 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All the jobs would be in one area 	<i>No comment recoded</i>

Option 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would increase the need to travel to the centre 	<i>No comment recorded</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would devalue the NE/coastal strip of investment • It would increase personal travel costs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would devalue the NE/coastal strip of investment • It would lead to strangle the rest of the region 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There would be an imbalance of housing and employment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development /resources would mainly be concentrated in the <u>City</u>; the <u>Aberdeen Green Belt</u>; and along the corridor <u>between Stonehaven and Inverurie</u>
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 would encourage more commuting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would increase pollution and use of natural resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would not be distributed evenly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would be localised to Aberdeen and environs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There would be less time for quality family time 	<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>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 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
Unknown	Fraserburgh: 2 Peterhead: 2 Banff: 2 Mintlaw: 1 Turriff: 1 Ellon: 2 Huntly: 1 Balmedie: 1 Inverurie: 2 Alford: 1 Blackburn: 1 Westhill: 1 Dyce: 1 Cove: 1 Stonehaven: 1	The distribution suggested could be taken to indicate that a distribution in the spirit of Options 7 is preferred, although no development was allocated in Aberdeen. Other reasons given for the distribution: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aimed for sea ports • Aimed for country towns
Unknown	Fraserburgh: 3 Banff: 2 Peterhead: 2 Huntly: 1 Turriff: 1 Ellon: 1 Balmedie: 1 Portlethen/Cove: 1 Aboyne: 1 Aberdeen: 1 Inverurie: 1 Alford: 1 Banchory: 1 Stonehaven: 1 Laurencekirk: 1 New Settlement (near Portlethen): 1	The distribution suggested could be taken to indicate that a distribution in the spirit of Options 7 is preferred, although most of the development was proposed in the North. Other reasons given for the distribution: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dispersal distribution to reduce/minimise congestion • Create more jobs

Option Chosen as Preferred Strategic Option	Distribution of tokens (settlement: number of tokens)	Additional Remarks
Option 4	Fraserburgh: 3 Peterhead: 2 Banff: 3 Mintlaw: 2 Turriff: 3 Ellon: 2 Huntly: 2 Balmedie: 1 Portlethen: 1 Laurencekirk: 1	<p>The group chose to distribute most of their tokens in the north, one allocation in the Portlethen area.</p> <p>Other reasons given for the distribution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share focus of development • Coastal strip and rural areas have not had the same level of investment – stagnant areas • Little employment in Mintlaw • Aim for mixed investment • Decline of fishing industry in the North
Option 4	Fraserburgh: 3 Banff: 1 Peterhead: 3 Turriff: 1 Ellon: 2 Hatton: 1 Mintlaw: 1 Balmedie: 1 Potterton: 1 Aberdeen: 3 Inverurie: 1 Alford: 1 Stonehaven: 1	<p>The distribution suggested could be taken to indicate that a distribution in the spirit of Options 4 is preferred, although significant development was proposed along the new transport corridor.</p> <p>Other reasons given for the distribution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fairness

Option Chosen as Preferred Strategic Option	Distribution of tokens (settlement: number of tokens)	Additional Remarks
Unknown	Fraserburgh: 2 Peterhead: 2 Banff: 2 Rosehearty: 1 Mintlaw: 1 Turriff: 1 Huntly: 1 Balmedie: 1 Portlethen: 1 Laurencekirk: 1 Alford: 1 Aberdeen: 1 Inverurie: 1 Dyce: 1 New Town (Kintore area): 1 New Town (Portlethen): 1 Portlethen: 1	<p>The distribution suggested could be taken to indicate that a distribution in the spirit of Options 7 is preferred, with slightly more development in the north. However two sites for new settlements were also chosen, which is Option 5, although only a small allocation was given to each site.</p> <p>Other reasons given for the distribution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development in Rosehearty/Aberdour • More development in the North, as there has been a lot of development in the south • Community travel costs are greater due to remoteness • Want to see development in the City and central areas and to the North.