

APPENDIX 1



CONSULTATION ON DEVELOPMENT PLAN EXAMINATIONS

RESPONDENT INFORMATION FORM

Please Note this form **must** be returned with your response to ensure that we handle your response appropriately

1. Name/Organisation

Organisation Name

Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Planning Authority

Title Mr Ms Mrs Miss Dr Please tick as appropriate

Surname

Jennings

Forename

David

2. Postal Address

Archibald Simpson House

27-29 King Street

Aberdeen

Postcode AB24 5AA

Phone 01224 628210

Email

3. Permissions - I am responding as...

Individual

/

Group/Organisation

Please tick as appropriate

(a) Do you agree to your response being made available to the public (in Scottish Government library and/or on the Scottish Government web site)?

Please tick as appropriate Yes No

(b) Where confidentiality is not requested, we will make your responses available to the public on the following basis
Please tick ONE of the following boxes

Yes, make my response, name and address all available

or

Yes, make my response available, but not my name and address

or

Yes, make my response and name available, but not my address

(c) The name and address of your organisation **will be** made available to the public (in the Scottish Government library and/or on the Scottish Government web site).

Are you content for your **response** to be made available?

Please tick as appropriate Yes No

(d) We will share your response internally with other Scottish Government policy teams who may be addressing the issues you discuss. They may wish to contact you again in the future, but we require your permission to do so. Are you content for Scottish Government to contact you again in relation to this consultation exercise?

Please tick as appropriate

Yes

No

CONSULTATION ON DEVELOPMENT PLAN EXAMINATIONS

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

Question 1: How well do you think the examination process is functioning and should any changes be made to the process at this stage?

The Aberdeen City and Shire SDPA has no direct experience of the examination of strategic development plans to date. However, experience elsewhere appears to indicate that it functions reasonably well but there is scope for improvement.

Question 2: If you think changes are needed which option do you support, and why?

OPTION 2 – Does not apply to SDP Examinations as Scottish Ministers have the discretion to depart from recommendations already.

OPTIONS 3 & 4 – These would be a matter for Scottish Ministers for SDP Examinations as they would need to be satisfied that alternatives would be more efficient. In effect, 'Option 3' could be seen as the old structure plan procedure where an examination took place only if deemed necessary by Scottish Ministers and only on a restricted range of issues.

OPTION 1 – There is scope for the process to be simplified, made more transparent and quicker at reduced cost with a number of minor changes to legislation and practice. Four are identified below, some of which are likely to be applicable to local development plan examinations as well:

- i) The 'Report of Conformity with the Participation Statement' stage appears to be given undue prominence at the start of the examination and result in a 4 week delay to the process before the examination can begin. Given that the focus of participation should be at the main issues report stage, it would appear an anomaly that participation at that stage is never assessed. If this stage is required, the report could be submitted and assessed at any point after close of consultation on the proposed plan rather than wait until the examination is ready to commence.
- ii) A Pre-examination briefing would be helpful to aid transparency on the part of objectors to the plan. While a pre-examination meeting might not be required, more detailed information on what the process will involve and an indicative timetable at an early stage would be helpful.
- iii) There should be an opportunity for the SDPA to explicitly recognise the validity of points made in representations and acknowledge the case for a modification. There should be a mechanism for this information to be conveyed to the examination without the need to re-consult on the proposed plan. The perception could then be removed that the planning authority are not listening to the views being expressed and this should also aid Reporters in their assessment of the representations.

iv) The arrangements around newspaper adverts need to be amended to reduce costs. There is currently a duplication of adverts around submission of the plan for examination and a lack of clarity (as well as poor timing, leading to potential additional costs) around advertisement at the adoption stage.

Question 3: Are there other ways in which we might reduce the period taken to complete the plan-making process without removing stakeholder confidence?

Speed is only an issue when there is urgency to deliver a new plan, particularly when the existing plan is 'out-of-date'. When in a 5-year review cycle, the issue of choreography with local development plans is likely to be more of an issue for strategic development plans.

The period between close of consultation on a proposed plan and submission for examination should be explored in more detail to ensure this is reduced to a minimum.

Question 4: Do you think any of the options would have an impact on particular sections of Scottish society?

No response.