

ALDP - OUR OBJECTION.

The operational functions of the waste recycling centre (OP67) are incompatible with both the ethos and the activities associated with the recreational area of the site (OP66). Therefore that portion of the site approved for waste recycling would detract from the value of the much greater recreational area and disadvantage it as an amenity.

This proposed mixed use of the Grove Nursery site does not only encapsulate designations of purpose which are at odds with each other, it also conflicts with the existing uses and character of the surrounding area. In its present ALDP format, it does not represent an efficient use of land because it contains development opportunities whose co-existence is potentially unsustainable in the sense that one of the planned industries (waste recycling) will inevitably impinge upon the other (sporting activities) to the extent that the recreational portion of the site will be rendered financially unviable and as such, will not attract businesses.

The feasibility of OP67 and OP66 has to be viewed as though they are proposed designations of use by two completely different industries which serve two diverse community needs, each generating different types of vehicular traffic, thus placing varying and differing demands on the surrounding roads infrastructure. In common, OP67 and OP66 represent examples of flawed planning because they both have the potential to generate increases in vehicular movements on an already overburdened public roads infrastructure which includes the frequently congested Hazlehead roundabout and the main access road to Hazlehead Park (Hazlehead Avenue), which is also crossed by large numbers of pupils going to and from Hazlehead Primary School and Academy. The risk of road traffic accidents involving school pupils, inherent in the planned designations for the Grove Nursery, has been frequently pointed out to Craigeibuckler and Seafield Community Council by the worried parents of the pupils of both schools.

However, considering the feasibility of each proposed designation in isolation, Craigeibuckler and Seafield Community Council have concluded that OP66 (sport and leisure) is the more sustainable of the two development opportunities because sport and recreational activities are more likely to be economically viable and aesthetically desirable in the vicinity of a popular recreational venue such as Hazlehead Park. Furthermore, although OP66, as previously stated, has the potential to burden an already congested infrastructure with an increase in vehicular traffic, the DVLA category of that traffic (ie motor cars or light vans with up to eight passengers) will likely remain unchanged from the vehicle types which presently access the car parks for Hazlehead Park. Whereas OP67, as a concept, threatens the ambience and popularly recognised ethic of one of Aberdeen's premier public parks as well as its role as a source of revenue from tourism. Its access roads, particularly Hazlehead Avenue - a road punctuated along its length by speed tables - is wholly unsuitable for both the frequency and types of vehicles which would have to access the site before that type of industry could be economically viable. The site would have to be serviced by vehicles

categorised by the DVLA as having an unladen weight of over 7500kg - a type which, at present, does not frequently travel on Hazlehead Avenue. In fact, on the admission of Aberdeen City Council's Housing and Environment Officers, the site will be serviced by vehicles weighing 20 tonnes. Therefore, OP67 differs from OP66 in that it represents a proposed land use designation that is not viable because, even before its inception, it has been the subject of public derision and opposition, not only because of its incompatibility with the immediate environs of Hazlehead Park, but by reason of its functional dependence on vehicular traffic of types that are wholly unsuited to the designs of its access roads, which are also bordered by family homes and two schools.

In summary, OP66 is not only the more compatible designation, but a more credible use for the whole site that is comprised of the Grove Nursery. This will have the desired effect of eliminating the conflicting and publicly opposed designation, OP67, from the Aberdeen Local Development Plan.

The majority of the residents who have objected to the building of a waste recycling centre in the Grove Nursery wish the land to be retained for horticultural use because that type of activity is wholly compatible with the rural aspect of the location and its surroundings. Craigiebuckler and Seafield Community Council, therefore also support that view.