

# MEMO

Strategic Place Planning

## Commissioning

Business Hub 4, Ground Floor North, Marischal College



To	Development Management, Strategic Place Planning		
From	Jack Penman, Engineer, Roads Development Management		
E-mail	<a href="mailto:JPenman@aberdeencity.gov.uk">JPenman@aberdeencity.gov.uk</a>	Date	04/01/24
		Our Ref.	DPP-231380 – V3
		Your Ref.	

### Planning Application No. DPP-231380

I have considered the above planning application have the following observations: This is the **third** revision of Roads comments. For clarity in this memo only pertinent information has been retained with any back and forward between Roads and the applicant removed to produce a final Roads memo.

#### 1. Development Proposal

1.1. I note that this proposal is for a change of use from class 10 (non-residential institutions) to class 4 (business); erection of replacement extension, alterations to door and associated works at Kingswells House, Skene Road, Aberdeen, AB15 8PJ.

1.2. The site is in the outer city boundary and not in a CPZ.

#### 2. Walking and Cycling

2.1. Access to the site by walking can be achieved by the adopted shared use footways along the northern side of Skene Road (A944).

2.2. The shared use footway can also be used by cyclists.

2.3. Access into the site proper would be on carriageway. This is down an access track with no separation from motor vehicles. It is noted traffic volumes will likely be low but given the lack of physical separation, the apparent lack of lighting and heavy vegetation cover it is not considered to be a particularly pedestrian friendly route.

#### 3. Public Transport

3.1. Kingswells Park and Ride is ~15-minute walk from the site and there are bus stops on the eastbound (city) and westbound (Westhill) side of the dual carriageway ~500m from the site. There is an existing signalised pedestrian crossing to access the western side.

## 4. Parking

- 4.1. The applicant is providing 9 parking spaces, 1 of which is accessible. ACC maximum parking guidelines for offices in the outer city boundary are 1 space per 30m<sup>2</sup> GFA. I note the proposed floor space is to be 560m<sup>2</sup>. This would equate to a maximum permitted 19 spaces with accessible requirements on top of this. The proposal is therefore a significant shortfall on this maximum standard. Roads had noted that owing to the constraints of the site this level of parking would unlikely be able to be achieved even if required. Roads had previously indicated a compromise of 12 spaces would likely be acceptable. Reviewing the information put forward the 10 spaces would be acceptable given the applicants comments on not seeking to impact on existing tree root zones. The site is fronted by the A944 where no parking would be permitted and Prime Four has its own parking controls and restrictions to prevent any obstructive parking.
- 4.2. I note the proposed parking bays meet ACC dimensions which is acceptable.
- 4.3. The applicant should be made aware that as of June 2023 EV charging requirements now fall under the remit of building standards. These requirements apply to redevelopment works. The applicant should familiarise themselves with these standards and ensure that they are meeting the requirements. The provision of Active EV charging is always welcomed.
- 4.4. The 3 cycle stands shown are acceptable but these should be covered for long stay parking.

## 5. Vehicle Access

- 5.1. Vehicle access to the site is from an existing access junction on the A944. As per previous discussions with Roads there are significant road safety concerns with this access. These concerns have not been addressed and remain. Roads retain the position as outlined in pre-application discussions and previous responses.
- 5.2. The applicant has noted they would close the gap in the central reservation as per Roads comments. The exact design and specification of this would require to be agreed with Roads. This would need to be in place before occupation of the site should approval be granted.
- 5.3. The access road itself appears to be quite narrow with further localised narrowing where there are bins stored. Looking at the plan provided by the applicant the road is shown as being around 3.5m wide. For this to be suitable for two-way traffic it would need to be a minimum of 5.5m. Visibility of a car looking to exit the site would not be achieved until a vehicle has committed to turning left into the site. This could potentially lead to a vehicle(s) having to reverse back along the long access road or onto the A944. Both of which are not ideal and are a road safety concern. I note the length that would be required to be reversed in the site is around 60m.

This is an excessive distance and would not be appropriate. An alternative passing place nearer the junction should be provided.

## **6. Waste Management Plan**

6.1. The waste bins will be collected from near the access junction. Whilst this is not ideal as an existing situation this can be accepted. The waste collection company would likely undertake their own risk assessment for this location and collection would likely be arranged outwith peak times.

## **7. Drainage Impact Assessment**

7.1. As this is a brownfield site no DIA has been submitted.

## **8. Conclusion**

8.1. Roads would object to this proposal on the grounds of Road Safety owing to lack of appropriate visibility and junction design for the access to the site. This has been discussed with other inter Roads departments such as Traffic Management and Roads Safety and Roads Construction Consent who are in agreement with this stance.

Jack Penman  
Engineer  
**Roads Development Management**