

# Outline/Full Business Case (Transportation Projects)

<b>Project Name</b>	<b>A947 Bucksburn Roundabout to Parkhill Junction Multi-modal Corridor Study Outline Business Case</b>		
<b>Author</b>	Tony Maric	<b>Date</b>	02/10/24
<b>Sponsoring Cluster</b>	City Regeneration and Environment	<b>Version</b>	2

## Contents

(Press F9 function key to update table of contents after completion of Business Case – [guidance here](#))

1.	Introduction and Project Overview .....	2
2.	Executive Summary .....	2
3.	Strategic Fit.....	5
4.	Business Aims, Needs and Constraints .....	6
5.	Objectives .....	8
6.	Scope .....	8
6.1	Out of Scope .....	8
7.	Options Appraisal .....	9
7.1	Option 1 – Do Nothing / Do Minimum .....	9
7.2	Option 2 – Option Name .....	10
7.3	Option 3 – Option Name .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
7.4	Scoring of Options Against Objectives .....	13
7.5	Recommendation.....	14
8.	Benefits .....	15
8.1	Customer Benefits .....	15
8.2	Staff Benefits.....	16
8.3	Resources Benefits (Financial).....	16
9.	Costs .....	16
9.1	Project Capital Expenditure and Income.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
9.2	Project Revenue Expenditure and Income .....	18
9.3	Post- Project Capital Expenditure and Income .....	18
9.4	Post- Project Revenue Expenditure and Income.....	19
10.	Key Risks.....	20
10.1	Risk Summary .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
11.	Procurement Approach .....	20
12.	Time .....	21
12.1	Time Constraints and Aspirations .....	21
12.2	Key Milestones .....	21
13.	Governance .....	21
14.	Resources .....	21
15.	Environmental Management .....	22
16.	Preserving Our Heritage .....	23
17.	Stakeholders .....	23
18.	Assumptions .....	25
19.	Dependencies .....	26
20.	Constraints.....	26
21.	ICT Hardware, Software or Network infrastructure .....	26
22.	Public Sector Equality Duty .....	26
23.	Change Controls Issued by the Project .....	27
24.	Support Services Consulted .....	27
25.	Document Revision History .....	29
26.	Decision by Capital Board .....	29

[Find further guidance in the ACC Project Management Toolkit online](#)

## 1. Introduction and Project Overview

Briefly describe the basic project concept. Describe the current business situation as it relates to the problem or opportunity that gave rise to the idea, including any other drivers such as regulatory or legal compliance requirements

If taking no action may have a negative effect on the organisation, then also describe what will happen if the project is **not** undertaken.

This document sets out the Outline Business Case (OBC) for the agreed package of options (within Aberdeen City) to improve transport connections along the A947 corridor between the Aberdeen Western Peripheral Route (AWPR) Parkhill Junction and the A96/A947 Junction. The OBC has a particular focus on active travel (walking, wheeling and cycling) and public transport along the corridor and on adjacent routes. A map of the study area is shown in Appendix 1.

Aberdeen City Council (ACC) commissioned AECOM to develop a Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance (STAG)-based appraisal of options for improving transport connections on the corridor. This included the identification of key problems, issues, opportunities and constraints on the corridor; development of Transport Planning Objectives (TPOs) for the study; generation of a long list of options; preliminary appraisal of options; and then further sifting and detailed appraisal of the remaining options.

This OBC builds on the previously identified and appraised options for improving transport connections for all users on the A947 corridor. It includes more detailed consideration and development of the options recommended for progression at the end of detailed appraisal, comprising a preferred package of interventions to take forward for further development, design and delivery.

If the project is not progressed, the opportunity to enable and facilitate a significant increase in walking, wheeling and cycling on the corridor via infrastructure improvements will be lost, potentially putting at risk the Council's ability to realise a range of health, transport and environmental objectives.

## 2. Executive Summary

Provide a clear, concise summary of the key features of the business case, briefly describing what the project will deliver, any key decisions associated with it, the expected costs and the funding position (showing any budgets already identified/ expected and the ask of Capital). Include an outline of the benefits, and any disbenefits, what risks and assumptions are associated with the project, and summarise planned or agreed dates and time constraints. Indicate who is the project sponsor and how the project will be owned and governed and what form the project board will take.

This OBC sets out a preferred package of options (within Aberdeen City) to improve transport connections along the A947 corridor between the Aberdeen Western Peripheral Route (AWPR) Parkhill Junction and the A96/A947 Junction.

The outcomes of the detailed appraisal were reported to the Net Zero, Environment and Transport Committee of 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2024, where the package of measures outlined In Table

1 below was approved with an instruction to present a OBC report to the Finance and Resources Committee.

Table 1: Options to Progress to OBC

Options to Progress to Outline Business Case	
<b>AT4</b>	Active Travel Priority Crossing on Riverview Drive across Burnside Drive.
<b>AT13</b>	Toucan crossing north of A947 / Riverview Drive roundabout.
<b>AT14</b>	Toucan crossing on Riverview Drive to link two sections of existing shared use path.
<b>AT16</b>	Toucan crossings on all arms of the Riverview Drive / Stoneywood Road roundabout to link existing and proposed cycle routes. New-improved shared pedestrian and cycle routes on crossing approaches.
<b>AT17</b>	Formal pedestrian crossing at Tesco on Victoria Street.
<b>AT32</b>	Add missing section of footway on Pitmedden Road.
<b>AT59</b>	Widen existing section of shared use path north of Riverview Drive / A947 roundabout.
<b>AT60</b>	Add missing link on shared pedestrian and cycle route on the west side of Riverview Drive.
<b>O15</b>	Introduce placemaking and gateway features on Victoria Street.
<b>AT35a</b>	Traffic calming measures (give way chicane) on Greenburn Road around Stoneywood School. Active travel priority crossings on Bankhead Road (Crossgates, Station Road and Millhill Brae junctions). Footway widening and carriageway narrowing on Bankhead Road and Millhill Brae. New signalised pedestrian crossing on Bankhead Road.
<b>AT41a</b>	New shared use path between Old Meldrum Road crossing and Lidl/McDonalds entrance, to tie in with existing provision.
<b>AT41b</b>	New segregated 2-way cycleway between Old Meldrum Road crossing and Lidl/McDonalds entrance, to tie in with existing provision.
<b>O10</b>	Crossing improvement and footway widening around the A947/McDonalds access road junction.
<b>AT31</b>	Pedestrian crossing improvement of Riverview Drive at Todlaw Walk junction. New path between Riverview Drive and the River Don Core Path (opposite Todlaw Walk) to formalise an obvious desire line.
<b>AT33</b>	Introduction of a one-way system on Station Road, Merrivale and Skene Place. Contra-flow cycle lane along Station Road.
<b>O2</b>	Review the layout of the Victoria Street/Skene Place Junction.
<b>AT61a</b>	Shared use footway between Victoria Street / Riverview Roundabout and Farburn Terrace. Speed limit reduction between Farburn Terrace and Pitmedden Road. Shared use footway between Pitmedden Road and the A947/Riverview Drive roundabout.
<b>AT51</b>	New segregated cycle facilities on Oldmeldrum Road.
<b>O7</b>	Splitter island and increased junction radii to prevent illegal manoeuvres at the A947/Stoneywood Road Junction at Co-Op/Marks and Spencer.
<b>O8</b>	Carriageway narrowing and tightening of the A947/Stoneywood Brae Junction radii to reduce speeds.
<b>AT48a</b>	New / improved shared use and new segregated cycle facilities along the length of the A947 to create a continuous cycle route.
<b>AT58</b>	Completion of missing section of shared pedestrian and cycle route on Dyce Drive between the A947 and Kirkhill Industrial Estate to the north of Aberdeen International Airport.

Table 2 below, shows a summary of the base capital costs for the OBC Package (rounded to nearest thousand). This shows a total base cost of £13,871,000.

It is unlikely that these works could be delivered as a package, however, given the significant funding required to deliver all of the recommended measures, albeit securing funding for the package as a whole would introduce more certainty into the project. It is more likely that individual projects will be taken forward independently on a prioritised basis, taking advantage of different funding streams as they arise, hence costs will be spread over multiple years.

Table 2: Recommended Package – Base Capital Costs

Option	Construction Costs Sub-Total	Risk and Contingency	Design	Placemaking	Site Supervision and Project Management	Traffic Management	Monitoring and Evaluation	Base Construction Costs Total (inclusive of Risk, Contingency and Overheads)
Table 1 Options								
AT4	£114,000	£50,000	£16,000	£8,000	£8,000	£16,000	£8,000	£221,000
AT13	£143,000	£63,000	£21,000	£10,000	£10,000	£21,000	£10,000	£278,000
AT14	£140,000	£62,000	£20,000	£10,000	£10,000	£20,000	£10,000	£272,000
AT16	£591,000	£260,000	£85,000	£43,000	£43,000	£85,000	£43,000	£1,149,000
AT17	£102,000	£45,000	£15,000	£7,000	£7,000	£15,000	£7,000	£198,000
AT32	£61,000	£27,000	£9,000	£4,000	£4,000	£9,000	£4,000	£119,000
AT59	£258,000	£114,000	£37,000	£19,000	£19,000	£37,000	£19,000	£502,000
AT60	£93,000	£41,000	£13,000	£7,000	£7,000	£13,000	£7,000	£182,000
Table 2 Options								
AT31	£29,000	£13,000	£4,000	£2,000	£2,000	£4,000	£2,000	£56,000
AT33	£44,000	£19,000	£6,000	£3,000	£3,000	£6,000	£3,000	£84,000
AT35a	£154,000	£68,000	£22,000	£11,000	£11,000	£22,000	£11,000	£299,000
AT41a <sup>1</sup>	£78,000	£35,000	£11,000	£6,000	£6,000	£11,000	£6,000	£153,000
AT41b	£288,000	£127,000	£42,000	£21,000	£21,000	£42,000	£21,000	£562,000
AT48a	£2,540,000	£1,118,000	£366,000	£183,000	£183,000	£366,000	£183,000	£4,939,000
AT51	£415,000	£182,000	£60,000	£30,000	£30,000	£60,000	£30,000	£807,000
AT58	£1,801,000	£793,000	£259,000	£130,000	£130,000	£259,000	£130,000	£3,502,000
AT61a	£331,000	£146,000	£48,000	£24,000	£24,000	£48,000	£24,000	£645,000
O2	£3,000	£2,000	£1,000	£300	£300	£1,000	£300	£8,000
O7	£16,000	£7,000	£2,000	£1,000	£1,000	£2,000	£1,000	£30,000
O8	£9,000	£4,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£18,000
<b>Total<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>£7,132,000</b>	<b>£3,141,000</b>	<b>£1,027,000</b>	<b>£514,300</b>	<b>£514,300</b>	<b>£1,027,000</b>	<b>£514,300</b>	<b>£13,871,000</b>

Base cost estimate year: Q3, 2023

The project was initiated following the opening of the Aberdeen Western Peripheral Route (AWPR) and the corresponding revisions to the city's Roads Hierarchy which saw Victoria Street become declassified and the A947 diverted along Riverview Drive. This in turn allowed for an opportunity to conduct a STAG based appraisal of options to improve walking and cycling facilities in the centre of Dyce, to take advantage of the traffic reduction experienced as a result of the opening of the AWPR, and to allow the main streets in Dyce to perform in accordance with their role in the revised hierarchy.

The recommended package has the following key benefits:

- It provides a much improved pedestrian environment;
- It provides and enhances active travel routes to key employment, travel and leisure destinations such as Dyce Railway Station, Aberdeen International Airport and associated employment areas, and TECA;
- It therefore significantly improves the sustainable travel offering in the area, supporting mode shift and net zero targets.

In terms of risks and disbenefits the following have been identified:

- It will require significant funding and resources to deliver the package in its entirety;
- There is currently no funding allocated to the next stage of the project or for the delivery of project outcomes;
- Highway boundary constraints may necessitate the acquisition of third-party land;
- Extent of utility diversions and protection works is unknown at this stage.

Improved active travel connections along the A947 corridor contribute to the delivery of Local Outcome Improvement Plan objectives relating to health, active travel and carbon reduction,

as well as a range of national, regional and local policies and strategies relating to transport, the economy and the environment.

At this stage, the construction cost of the full package of recommended measures within the City boundary is estimated at £13.9 million inclusive of a 15% uplift for preliminaries, and 44% for Optimism Bias. This is a high-level estimate, based upon Outline Design work. This does not include the costs of any land acquisition that may be required, as this has not been quantified at this stage. Should the OBC be approved, more Detailed Design work would be undertaken to allow a more accurate cost assessment to develop, including land acquisition costs, to inform a Full Business Case and/or individual project-level business cases.

Although no budget is currently identified to allow for progression of subsequent stages of work, there are opportunities to attract external funding, given the Scottish Government's commitment to supporting and enabling active travel.

There are no timescales or deadlines currently identified. Progression of the individual projects comprising this OBC will depend on available resources, particularly external funding support for further design and delivery. It is anticipated that, for the individual projects requiring Full Business Cases, these could be completed within 12-18 months, upon identification of appropriate funding.

The current Project Sponsor is the Chief Officer – Strategic Place Planning. Upon approval of an OBC, sponsorship of individual projects will be shared amongst the Chief Officer – Strategic Place Planning, Chief Officer – Capital and Chief Officer – Operations, depending on their type and scale.

The project is currently being managed by the Transport Strategy and Programmes team within Strategic Place Planning, and governed by the Transportation Programmes Board. As projects move towards delivery it may be that management of individual projects fall to different Clusters.

### 3. Strategic Fit

This section will consider how the project fits with the list of projects identified in the Local Outcome Improvement Plan). Firstly, state if the project is identified within the LOIP. If it is not, how does it work with the Council's strategic objectives such as:

- Prosperous Economy
- Prosperous People (Children and Young People)
- Prosperous People (Adults)
- Prosperous Place

This project, while not directly referenced within the LOIP, will contribute to the delivery of:

- the Prosperous People objective, specifically Stretch Outcome 11 – *Healthy life expectancy is five years longer by 2026*. The proposed improvements will support and encourage more walking and cycling - increasing physical activity is linked with increasing life expectancy;
- the Prosperous Place objective, specifically Stretch Outcomes 13 - *Addressing climate change by reducing Aberdeen's carbon emissions by at least 61% by 2026 and adapting to the impacts of our changing climate*, and 14 - *Increase sustainable travel: 38% of*

*people walking and 5% of people cycling as main mode of travel by 2026, in that the proposals may encourage a shift from motorised to active and sustainable forms of transport, with associated carbon emissions reduction.*

#### **4. Business Aims, Needs and Constraints**

Provide an overview of the sponsoring organisation and explain how the project supports the existing policies and strategies, and how it will assist in achieving the business goals, aims and business plans of the organisation. Include any relevant information about the current business situation, such as the organisational structures, business model, buildings, processes, teams and technology currently in place.

Aberdeen City Council is the sponsoring organisation.

The proposal supports delivery of the following aspects of ACC's policy statement:

- *We seek to invest in our road and pavement network, ensuring active and green travel is at the forefront of any new projects and a review of existing transport infrastructure is progressed, taking account of the need to expand the city cycle network;*
- *Reviewing our cycle and active transport network, and work with Aberdeen Cycle Forum to deliver our shared vision of making Aberdeen a cyclist friendly city and provide covered secure cycle storage in suitable locations across Aberdeen; and*
- *Improving cycle and active transport infrastructure, including by seeking to integrate safe, physically segregated cycle lanes in new road building projects and taking steps to ensure any proposal for resurfacing or other long-term investments consider options to improve cycle and active transport infrastructure.*

By enabling and encouraging a shift from motorised to healthier and cleaner forms of transport, the project supports the outcomes and objectives of various other regional and local policies and strategies relating to transport, the economy and the environment, including:

- Regional Economic Strategy;
- Aberdeen Local Development Plan;
- Aberdeen City Centre Masterplan;
- Aberdeen Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan;
- Regional and Local Transport Strategies;
- North East Scotland Roads Hierarchy;
- Regional and Local Active Travel Action Plans;
- Aberdeen Air Quality Action Plan;
- Net Zero Aberdeen Routemap; and
- Mobility Strategy - Net Zero Aberdeen.

The outcomes are fully aligned with the Regional Active Travel Network Review, which identifies the A947 corridor as a priority corridor for active travel improvements.

Describe the purpose of the project, why it is needed, establishing a compelling case for change based on business needs, e.g. demand for services, deficiencies in existing provision etc. Where are we now and where do we need to get to.

Several previous studies have considered transport improvements on the A947 corridor and within the study area. In 2016, the Dyce Sustainable Travel Study was undertaken to investigate the feasibility of improving sustainable travel links within the Dyce area. The study involved a review of the existing sustainable travel network including walking, cycling and bus routes,

identifying problems associated with each mode in the area. The key problems identified during the study were poor public transport permeability to key locations in Dyce, gaps in existing walking and cycle networks, general traffic congestion in the Dyce area and journey time unreliability for public transport.

In 2021, ACC commissioned AECOM to develop a STAG-based appraisal of options for improving transport connections on the corridor. This included the identification of key problems, issues, opportunities and constraints; development of TPOs for the study; generation of a long list of options; preliminary appraisal of options; and then further sifting and detailed appraisal of the remaining options.

This OBC builds on the previously identified and appraised options for improving transport connections for all users on the A947 corridor. It includes more detailed consideration and development of the options recommended for progression at the end of detailed appraisal, comprising a preferred package of interventions to take forward for further development, design or delivery.

Facilitating and encouraging an increase in active travel is central to national, regional and local transport and climate change policy which seeks to reduce the negative impacts of private car use and encourage a greater uptake of healthier and less-polluting forms of transport. Concurrent with the STAG appraisal work, the Scottish Government introduced a target to reduce vehicle kilometres by 20% by 2030 which further adds urgency to the need to provide safe and attractive alternative transport options.

Identify any constraints, e.g. timing issues, legal requirements, professional standards, planning constraints. What assumptions have been made, and any linkages and interdependencies with other programmes and projects should be explained, especially where the proposed project is intended to contribute to shared outcomes across multiple Clusters.

Currently, the main constraint is funding to progress to the next stage, although officers are confident that this can be overcome given the availability of external funding for active travel.

There are design constraints and challenges, primarily in terms of the highway boundary, road widths, and on-street car parking which are identified in section 20 of this OBC. These will be further explored and quantified at the next stages of design and development.

The design will be subject to further consideration of issues relating to construction, use, maintenance and demolition throughout its development, including identification of suitable solutions and / or mitigation measures as appropriate.

Assumptions are identified in section 18 and primarily relate to costings and quantification of benefits, given the early and high-level stage of design the project is at.

Aside from the above, no additional significant dependencies have been identified at this stage (see section 19).

State what impact the project will have on business as usual, e.g. temporarily reduce capacity or divert resources.

Resources will have to be identified to guide the projects through subsequent stages – Detailed Design, Full Business Case, Pre-construction, Construction, Post-construction, etc. Delivery will have to be assessed and prioritised against other existing and proposed Council projects.

The nature of some of the proposals are such that disruption to the area is to be expected during construction, with most impacts felt on the surrounding properties, businesses and road network. Disruption would be expected on the local traffic network as well as the wider Aberdeen area due to the traffic management measures required to maintain movement of traffic through the area during construction works. This is, however, typical of an urban transport project and suitable traffic and construction management would minimise the impacts.

During construction works, and upon completion of all improvements, it is anticipated that existing access will be maintained to all businesses, properties and amenities.

## 5. Objectives

List the project's objectives. Make these tangible and clear as they will influence which option is recommended and will be used to monitor project progress and success.

TPO1 – Increase the number of walking and wheeling trips in the study area by 20% within 5 years of project delivery (against a 2024 baseline).

TPO2 – Increase the number of cycling trips in the study area by 20% within 5 years of project delivery (against a 2024 baseline).

## 6. Scope

What will the project produce? What are its outputs?

Consider what business services, processes, people and environments will be delivered, affected or changed by the project.

Also define the work the project will carry out to make the transition from the project to 'business as usual' – the handover period.

State the project success criteria.

The scope of this OBC is improved active travel facilities within Dyce, and between Dyce and major employment, travel and leisure hubs such as Aberdeen Airport and TECA, using the A947 and routes near to this corridor.

Delivery of attractive and popular active travel facilities will support a range of transport, health and environmental policy goals and objectives.

Success will be measured by an increase in the number of people walking and cycling on the corridor within Dyce, and between Dyce and these major trip attractors.

Preliminary design has been undertaken as part of this OBC. Further engineering assessments and detailed design will follow, subject to approval of the OBC, and will provide further information on benefits, risks and challenges of delivering the individual options.

### 6.1 Out of Scope

List any notable exclusions, those areas that may be viewed as associated with the project or the affected business area, but which are excluded from the scope of the project.



The junction with the A96 is out of scope of this project as the A96 corridor is the subject of a separate STAG based Multi-modal corridor study. This study will present options for the A96 corridor as a whole, with discussions taking place with the relevant project teams to ensure that the A947 will tie in with any options proposed for this junction in the A96 detailed appraisal report. Discussions will also take place with Aberdeenshire Council to ensure that the A947 proposals tie in with any proposals that Aberdeenshire Council may take forward within their boundary on the A947 corridor.

While this study looks to improve linkages to existing Core Paths in the area (such as the Fortmartine and Buchan Way and the River Don path), improvements to or enhancements of the Core Path network has not been considered as this is the subject of a separate study, with project teams liaising as appropriate.

## 7. Options Appraisal

Please refer to the guidance at the end of this template on [Estimating Project Costs](#) to ensure whole life costing has been considered.

### 7.1 Option 1 – Do Nothing / Do Minimum

<b>Description</b>	This option assumes no significant changes to the existing network other than routine maintenance.
<b>Expected Costs</b>	Assumed to be zero, other than regularly scheduled and planned maintenance.
<b>Expected Benefits</b>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No additional costs associated with this option.</li> </ul> <p>Disbenefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not increase the attractiveness of public transport or active travel, so unlikely to result in modal shift.</li> <li>May result in additional vehicle trips being attracted to the network over time, exacerbating existing problems.</li> <li>Fails to address the issue of a lack of a coherent walking and cycling network along the corridor to key trip attractors.</li> </ul>
<b>Risks Specific to this Option</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unlikely to encourage modal shift.</li> <li>Fails to address the issue of a lack of a coherent walking and cycling network along the corridor to key trip attractors.</li> <li>Reputational risks around not supporting cleaner, greener, and healthier transport choices and undermining net zero aspirations.</li> </ul>

<b>Advantages and Disadvantages</b>	<p>Advantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No cost, low resource option, maintaining business as usual.</li> <li>• Likely to be acceptable to some groups and stakeholders who are opposed to other options.</li> </ul> <p>Disadvantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not increase the attractiveness of public transport or active travel hence unlikely to result in mode shift.</li> <li>• May result in additional vehicle trips being attracted to the network over time, exacerbating current problems.</li> <li>• Does not contribute to national or local net zero targets and aspirations.</li> <li>• Does not contribute to LOIP stretch outcomes related to healthy lifestyles, active travel and carbon reduction.</li> </ul>
<b>Viability</b>	This option is viable, as a no-cost option.
<b>Other Points</b>	N/A

<b>7.2 Option 2 – Implement recommended package of active travel measures from Detailed Appraisal STAG report on A947 corridor as a package.</b>	
<b>Description</b>	Implement package of active travel measures to maximise walking and cycling opportunities along the A947 corridor and improve placemaking in the centre of Dyce.
<b>Expected Costs</b>	At Outline Design stage the estimated cost of option 2 is £13.9 Million. Table 2, in Section 2 above provides a full breakdown of estimated costs.
<b>Expected Benefits</b>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved walking, wheeling and cycling infrastructure within Dyce and on the A947, encouraging more active travel and healthier lifestyles.</li> <li>• Improved cycle and walking connections between Dyce and major employment areas such as Aberdeen Airport and associated business parks and TECA, potentially encouraging more walking and cycle commuting, with increased health benefits for staff.</li> <li>• Delivery as a package, rather than as incremental projects, would result in more immediate and tangible benefits for the community and users.</li> </ul> <p>Disbenefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires significant investment.</li> <li>• Likely to result in significant disruption within the area.</li> </ul>
<b>Risks Specific to this Option</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May require third party land acquisition.</li> <li>• May require removal/relocation of on-street parking in some areas.</li> <li>• Currently no funding identified to progress the package.</li> <li>• Likely to be challenging to obtain funding for the entire package at one time.</li> </ul>

<b>Advantages and Disadvantages</b>	<p>Advantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significantly improves sustainable travel offering.</li> <li>• Provides much improved pedestrian environment.</li> <li>• Provides a coherent active travel network between Dyce and major trip attractors in the area such as Aberdeen Airport and TECA.</li> <li>• Delivery as a package, rather than as incremental projects, would result in more immediate and tangible benefits for the community and users.</li> </ul> <p>Disadvantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires significant investment;</li> <li>• May require significant disruption to the area as a result of concurrent infrastructure works.</li> </ul>
<b>Viability</b>	Notwithstanding the issues and constraints noted, the option is considered viable.
<b>Other Points</b>	N/A

<b>7.3 Option 3 – Implement recommended package of active travel measures from Detailed Appraisal STAG report on A947 corridor on a phased basis.</b>	
<b>Description</b>	Implement package of active travel measures to maximise walking and cycling opportunities along the A947 corridor and improve placemaking in the centre of Dyce, on a phased basis.
<b>Expected Costs</b>	At Outline Design stage the estimated cost of option 3 is £13.9 Million. Table 2, in Section 2 above provides a full breakdown of estimated costs.
<b>Expected Benefits</b>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved walking, wheeling and cycling infrastructure within Dyce and on the A947, encouraging more active travel and healthier lifestyles.</li> <li>• Improved cycle and walking connections between Dyce and major employment areas such as Aberdeen Airport and associated business parks and TECA, potentially encouraging more walking and cycle commuting, with increased health benefits for staff.</li> <li>• Phased approach is likely to be more deliverable based on the current funding landscape, and will spread the impacts of any construction disruption.</li> </ul> <p>Disbenefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires significant investment</li> <li>• Seeking funding for individual phases provides less certainty than seeking funding for the whole package.</li> <li>• Benefits will be less immediate, as the full package will likely take a number of years to be realised.</li> </ul>
<b>Risks Specific to this Option</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May require third party land acquisition.</li> <li>• May require removal/relocation of on-street parking in some areas</li> <li>• Phasing means that some projects may take a long time to come forward as a result of competing priorities.</li> <li>• Currently no funding identified to progress the package.</li> </ul>

<b>Advantages and Disadvantages</b>	<p>Advantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significantly improves sustainable travel offering.</li> <li>• Provides much improved pedestrian environment.</li> <li>• Provides a coherent active travel network between Dyce and major trip attractors in the area such as Aberdeen Airport and TECA.</li> <li>• Phasing provides a more realistic pathway to delivery.</li> </ul> <p>Disadvantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires significant investment.</li> <li>• Seeking funding for individual phases provides less certainty than seeking funding for the whole package.</li> <li>• Benefits will be less immediate, as the full package will likely take a number of years to be realised.</li> </ul>
<b>Viability</b>	<p>Notwithstanding the issues and constraints noted, the option is considered viable.</p>
<b>Other Points</b>	<p>N/A</p>

## 7.4 Scoring of Options Against Objectives

Use the table below to score options against the objectives in order to create a shortlist of options to be considered.

Objectives			
	1	2	3
TPO1 – Increase the number of walking and wheeling trips in the study area by 20% within 5 years of project <b>delivery</b> (against a 2024 baseline)	0	2	1
TPO2 – Increase the number of cycling trips in the study area by 20% within 5 years of project delivery (against a 2024 baseline)	0	2	1
<b>Total</b>	0	4	2
<b>Ranking</b>	0	3	2

### Scoring

- 3 Fully Delivers
- 2 Mostly Delivers
- 1 Delivers to a Limited Extent
- 0 Does not Deliver
- 1 Will have a negative impact on objective

## 7.5 Recommendation

Using evidence based on the options appraisal and the objectives scoring, clearly articulate the recommended option, showing the best fit against the project's stated objectives, and balancing cost, benefits and risk. Note, if an option fails to deliver any essential objective then it must be discounted as unsuitable. The recommendation should not be made on objectives scoring alone but the table can be used to eliminate those options that score poorly as a first stage, with the second stage being a more detailed analysis of the remaining options. Bear in mind:

- Investment Appraisal
- Assumptions
- Constraints
- Dependencies

While Options 2 and 3 are similar 'do something' options:

- Option 2 (implementing as a package) aligns most closely with the project objectives, will significantly improve the walking and cycling infrastructure within Dyce in a shorter timeframe, and therefore aligns more closely with local, regional and national aspirations and policies.
- Option 3 (phasing implementation), although ultimately resulting in the same benefits, will see these benefits arise over a longer timescale.
- Option 2 is preferable in terms of maximising the benefits, and presenting the options as a package would allow potential funders to see the wider picture and may facilitate external funding if viewed as part of a wider package rather than standalone options.
- Given the current funding landscape, however, it is considered unlikely that funding will be available for the whole package at once, and Option 3 is likely to be more deliverable, as it allows officers to target different funding sources (appropriate to each project) over a number of years.
- Option 3 may introduce more uncertainty around funding, if this is only sought incrementally, over a number of years.

Therefore, while Option 2 is preferable from a number of perspectives, Option 3 is considered more realistic.

It is recommended that officers therefore proceed on the basis of Option 3 (i.e. seek funding to progress individual elements of the package as funding becomes available, and take forward further individual Full Business Cases as required, depending on the scale of these individual projects), while also monitoring whether any funding sources are conducive to progression of Option 2.

## 8. Benefits

In the tables below, identify the key benefits the project will deliver.

All benefits need to be measurable, realistic and have a baseline or comparable starting point. These benefits will be monitored during and after the project close to gauge project success and value for money. If a benefit is more subjective, then that should be supported by, for example, staff or customer surveys taken **before and after** the project.

Give an idea of the total financial benefits, if these exist.

List any disbenefits where appropriate, eg the loss of a disposal receipt where it is proposed to utilise a surplus building instead of selling it.

The benefit and disbenefits should also be used to inform the Integrated Impact Assessment ([IIA pages](#)).

### 8.1 Customer Benefits

Benefit	Measures	Source	Baseline	Expected Benefit	Expected Date	Measure Frequency
Improved walking, wheeling and cycling infrastructure within Dyce and on the A947, encouraging more active travel and healthier lifestyles.	Number of people walking	Automatic pedestrian and cycle counters	Currently no baseline data, but studies will be carried out and automatic counters are currently in the process of being procured for this purpose.	More people walking and cycling	Upon Scheme Delivery	Annual
	Number of people cycling					

8.2 Staff Benefits						
Benefit	Measures	Source	Baseline	Expected Benefit	Expected Date	Measure Frequency
Improved cycle and walking connections between Dyce and the city centre, potentially encouraging more cycle commuting, with increased health benefits for staff.	An increase in the proportion of staff cycling to work.	Staff travel survey	4.1% cycle to work (2022)	Increase in the proportion of staff cycling to work.	Upon scheme completion	Biannual

8.3 Resources Benefits (Financial)							
Benefit	Measures	Source	Capital or Revenue?	Baseline (£'000)	Saving (£'000)	Expected Date	Measure Frequency
Not applicable							

**9. Costs**

Use the tables below to provide cost information. Costs must include capital investment and where relevant any ongoing revenue costs incurred by the project or as a result of the project.

The source/basis of any estimates should be clearly identified.

Refer to the Government Green Book and the Supplementary Guidance on Optimism Bias for information on determining costs. Outline any assumptions in estimating costs in Section 17, **and** confirm in the Checklist that you have followed this guidance.

[Green Book Supplementary Guidance Optimism Bias](#)

[The Green Book 2022 \(HM Treasury Guidance\)](#)

To improve the design development process for capital projects there is a need to consider full life cycle costs, including maintenance. Therefore, costs should be considered at least over a 5-year period. It is an estimate of the resources and capabilities (people, physical resources, and funding) needed to deliver the project and sustain the benefits. The estimates need to cover both the direct project costs and the ongoing (business as usual) costs for the lifetime over which the benefits are to be considered.



Include information on where the budget will come from.

Full costs breakdown to be included.

Any impact on business as usual or service delivery.

Please refer to the guidance at the end of this template on [Estimating Project Costs](#) to ensure whole life costing has been considered.

9.1 Project Capital Expenditure and Income								
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Total
<b>Staffing Resources</b>	£37,400	£37,400	£37,400	£269,300	£538,600	£538,600	£56,200	£1,514,900
<b>Land Acquisitions</b>								
<b>New Vehicles, Plant or Equipment</b>								
<b>Construction Costs</b>	£336,600	£336,600	£336,600	£2,423,700	£4,847,400	£4,847,400	£505,800	£13,634,100
<b>Capital Receipts and Grants</b>								
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>£374,000</b>	<b>£374,000</b>	<b>£374,000</b>	<b>£2,693,000</b>	<b>£5,386,000</b>	<b>£5,386,000</b>	<b>£562,000</b>	<b>£15,149,000</b>

These are high-level cost estimates of Project Capital Expenditure, based on Outline Design Work, and exclude costs associated with land acquisition, as these have not been fully identified or quantified at this stage. Costs will be fully identified and quantified during detailed design and subsequent project-level business cases, as projects proceed to subsequent stages. All costs subject to assumptions set out in Section 17.

<b>9.2 Project Revenue Expenditure and Income</b>											
(£'000)	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10	Total
<b>Staffing Resources</b>											
<Add cost items under each heading>											
<b>Non-Staffing Resources</b>											
<b>Revenue Receipts and Grants</b>											
<b>Sub-Total</b>											

No costs identified at the current stage of design – these will be determined at the detailed design stage, and in subsequent project-level business cases.

<b>9.3 Post- Project Capital Expenditure and Income</b>											
(£'000)	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10	Total
<b>Staffing Resources</b>											
<Add cost items under each heading>											
<b>Land Acquisitions</b>											
<b>New Vehicles, Plant or Equipment</b>											

<b>Construction Costs</b>											
<b>Capital Receipts and Grants</b>											
<b>Sub-Total</b>											

No costs associated with Post- Project Capital Expenditure expected. To be confirmed during detailed design, and in subsequent project-level business cases.

<b>9.4 Post- Project Revenue Expenditure and Income</b>											
(£'000)	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10	Total
<b>Staffing Resources</b>											
Add cost items under each heading											
<b>Non-Staffing Resources</b>											
<b>Revenue Receipts and Grants</b>											
<b>Sub-Total</b>											

Revenue and ongoing maintenance costs will be associated with individual schemes, but have not been identified at the current stage of design – these will be determined at the detailed design stage and reflected in any subsequent project-level business cases.

## 10. Key Risks

Description	Mitigation
<p>Fully explain any significant risks to the project that you are aware of, especially those which could affect the decision on whether and in what form the project goes ahead.</p> <p>Append your full Risk Log if available.</p>	<p>Details of any mitigating action already taken or suggested.</p>
<p>Funding: If funding is not made available, the package will not be able to progress.</p>	<p>Identify and seek to take advantage of all available external sources and ensure funding is in place before progressing subsequent phases of work.</p> <p>Phased approach to delivery allows for targeting of multiple funding sources.</p>
<p>Demand: If the level of demand for the scheme is lower than anticipated, it may be difficult to deliver the mode share targets outlined in the scheme objectives.</p>	<p>Continued consideration as part of Detailed Design and subsequent Business Case work.</p>
<p>Public / Stakeholder Buy-in: Public and stakeholder buy-in is needed to ensure support for any options implemented following the detailed appraisal and OBC. A Stakeholder Engagement Plan was prepared to set out scope and aims of engagement activities to ensure meaningful engagement including multi-pronged engagement techniques to ensure the approach is inclusive as possible. Engagement has been completed as part of the OBC.</p>	<p>Continued stakeholder and public engagement as part of Detailed Design and subsequent Business Case work.</p>
<p>Political Buy-in: Political buy-in is needed to ensure support for any options implemented following the detailed appraisal and OBC. Due to the historic prevalence of private car travel in much of the study area, measures focused on enhancing walking, cycling and public transport use may not be supported by the public, which could reduce political support for such measures.</p>	<p>Continued engagement with Elected Members as part of Detailed Design and subsequent Business Case work.</p>
<p>Changing travel patterns: Increased working from home and propensity to travel resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic may continue, impacting demand and patterns for public transport and active travel journeys.</p>	<p>Continued consideration as part of Detailed Design and subsequent Business Case work.</p>

## 11. Procurement Approach

If this project will involve the procurement of products or services, describe the approach that will be taken based upon the recommended option.

The Design Teams must conduct a check on the Health and Safety track record on tender documentation and submission prior to award and confirm this has been done.

The draft procurement strategy acknowledges that there will be a need to follow an open, fair and transparent process that is developed in full compliance with the Public Contract Regulations (2015), which are the rules governing UK procurement.

Furthermore, the strategy respects that all procurement will be subject to ACC's constitution, policies and procedures relating to procurement, including the Joint Procurement Strategy between ACC, Aberdeenshire Council and The Highland Council (2017-2022).

The procurement strategy has also been developed in accordance with the detailed local procurement manual and guidance note, PGN 10 Sustainable Procurement Policy.

## 12. Time

### 12.1 Time Constraints and Aspirations

Detail any planned or agreed dates, any time constraints on the project or the affected business areas and any other known timescales.

There are no timescales or deadlines currently identified. Progression of the individual projects comprising this OBC will depend on available resources, particularly external funding support for further design and delivery. It is anticipated that, for the individual projects requiring Full Business Cases, these could be completed within 12-18 months, upon identification of appropriate funding.

### 12.2 Key Milestones

Description	Target Date
OBC	February 2025
Detailed Design and FBC	From April 2025

## 13. Governance

Include any plans around the ownership and governance of the project and identify the people in the key project roles in the table below.

Role	Name	Service
Project Sponsor	David Dunne	ACC, Strategic Place Planning
Project Manager	Tony Maric	ACC, Strategic Place Planning
Lead Designer	Andrew Robb	AECOM

## 14. Resources

List the staff resources and expertise required to implement the project. Ensure support services are included, such as Project Management, Legal, Procurement and Communications.

Task	Responsible Service/Team	Start Date	End Date
Project Management – prioritisation of individual projects; seeking external funding; co-ordinate delivery of small-scale works.	Transport Strategy and Programmes	From April 2025	Ongoing (as funding permits)
Implementation of small-scale works	Traffic Management and Road Safety	From April 2025	Ongoing (as funding permits)
	Roads Operations	From April 2025	Ongoing (as funding permits)
Detailed Design and FBC of larger-scale works	Roads Projects	TBC – dependant on outcomes of Regional Active Travel Network prioritisation exercise.	
Technical Review – Detailed Design and FBC	Traffic Management and Road Safety		
	Roads Operations		
Communications about infrastructure works.	Communications	From April 2025	Ongoing (as funding permits)

## 15. Environmental Management

Fully explain any impacts the project will have on the environment (this could include, eg, carbon dioxide emissions, waste, water, natural environment, air quality and adaptation). Include both positive and negative effects and how these will be managed. Include details on how this has been assessed, giving an idea of the cost implication if this exists.

The environmental impacts of the proposed project were assessed under the Environment and Climate Change criteria during Detailed STAG appraisal.

The assessment identified the following impacts:

- Mode switch from car to active travel would reduce traffic related carbon and other harmful emissions;
- The provision of improved active travel connections from Dyce to the major trip attractors in the area such as Aberdeen Airport and TECA would help encourage shorter distance ‘everyday’ trips to transfer to active travel – these account for a large proportion of daily trips within Scotland. Aberdeen is a compact city with high potential for increased walking and cycling;
- The provision of connected active travel provision along the corridor would tie into Aberdeen’s strategic city-wide Green Space Network (GSN) connecting natural green and blue spaces and habitats to each other.

- While new infrastructure is proposed, this can typically be achieved within the existing road envelope. However, there are sections where land take and new ‘tarmac’ may be required. This additional hard construction will impact on the environment at these locations with an increase in the embedded carbon of the scheme;
- As the infrastructure being developed is likely to primarily involve only localised path and road widening, it is unlikely there will be any significant impacts on biodiversity and habitats, geology and soils, water, drainage and flooding, or landscape;
- There will be impacts during construction works, in terms of noise, vibration and air quality, although these will be temporary and localised.

It is considered therefore that on the whole, proposals will have a positive impact on the Environment with any negative impacts localised and short-term in their duration.

	Yes	No
<b>Is a Buildings Checklist being completed for this project?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>If No, what is the reason for this?</b>		
The project is unlikely to impact on any buildings		

## 16. Preserving Our Heritage

Describe fully any impacts the project will have on the heritage of the city or more widely in the region or nationally. This could include but is not exclusive to the following examples:

- Specific historical items of interest;
- Features of significant local or regional importance/interest;
- Granite elements of existing structures.

Include both positive and negative effects and how these will be managed.

Include details on how this has been assessed, giving an idea of the cost implication if this exists.

No significant impacts have been identified on the natural heritage of the area.

## 17. Stakeholders

List the key interested individuals, teams, groups or parties that may be affected by the project or have an interest in it, including those external to the organisation. Show what their interest would be and their level of responsibility. Also note any plans for how they will be engaged including the use of any existing communication channels, forums or mechanisms already in place.

In the event the Business Case projects a total capital expenditure of more than £10 Million, stakeholders should include “ACC Bond Investors” who may require to be communicated with through the London Stock Exchange.

Proposals have been guided by a local working group, made up of representatives of ACC, Aberdeenshire Council, and Nestrans. The following Council teams are represented on that group – Transport Strategy and Programmes, Traffic Management and Road Safety, Roads Projects, Passenger Transport Unit, Street Lighting, Environmental Policy, Local Development Plan, Development Management, and Communications. The working group has been invited to contribute to proposals, comment on emerging designs, and review documentation submitted by the consultant. Members have been instrumental in helping determine the preferred options and will continue to be consulted as the projects move forward. Engagement has been via regular project group meetings and sharing of information via a dedicated MS Teams site.

Engagement with external stakeholders and members of the public has been undertaken at all appraisal stages (Case for Change, Initial Appraisal, Detailed Appraisal) to inform the Public Acceptability criteria of the STAG appraisal. Engagement has also taken place with stakeholders and members of the public to help determine the final preferred package of options.

Specific stakeholder groups contacted to date, and who will remain key stakeholders during the next stages of development, are listed below:

- Active travel: Aberdeen Outdoor Access Forum, Aberdeen Cycle Forum, Grampian Cycling Partnership, Cyclists Touring Club Grampian, Cycling Scotland;
- Accessibility / Equality - Aberdeen Disability Equity Partnership, Aberdeen Action on Disability, Aberdeenshire Disability Equity Partnership, Paths for All,
- Bus operators – Stagecoach, First;
- Public transport - Aberdeen Taxi and Private Hire Car Consultation Group, Bus Users UK, Confederation of Passenger Transport, Community Transport Association (Scotland);
- Health - NHS Grampian, Health & Transport Action Plan Working Group;
- Freight – Logistics UK, Road Haulage Association;
- Emergency Services - Police Scotland, Scottish Ambulance Service, Scottish Fire and Rescue Service;
- Business - Aberdeen and Grampian Chamber of Commerce, Federation of Small Businesses, Opportunity North East, Scottish Enterprise Grampian, Aberdeen Inspired Business Improvement District, Aberdeen Council of Voluntary Organisations;
- Environment – SEPA, Aberdeen Climate Action, Aberdeen Friends of the Earth, Aberdeen City Heritage Trust, Historic Scotland, NatureScot (Scottish Natural Heritage);
- Elected members - local Councillors, MSPs and MPs;
- Community Councils – Dyce and Stoneywood Community Council, Newmarcher Community Council;;
- Local residents and business frontagers.

These are all potential users of any improved active travel infrastructure or have the potential to be impacted by new infrastructure, therefore will remain key consultees during subsequent stages of work to ensure design solutions maximise benefits for all and minimise any potentially negative impacts.

As individual projects progress, stakeholder databases will be reviewed and updated to ensure all those affected by the projects, including potential users of new infrastructure, are engaged with.

During Detailed Appraisal, an online consultation was live during summer 2023 (and available in hard copy upon request), providing background to the study, presenting the various options with pros and cons listed, and seeking feedback on the options. The survey was publicised



through ACC's Citizen Space portal and media channels, as well as through direct contact with local Councillors, Community Councils, schools along the route, and local interest groups and stakeholders. Individual discussions were also held with bus operators and interested Community Councils.

## 18. Assumptions

Document the high-level assumptions that have been made during the development of the Business Case and any other unanswered questions that may be significant. Refer to the Supplementary Guidance on Optimism Bias and detail the assumptions you have made in constructing the costs and business case.

[Green Book Supplementary Guidance Optimism Bias](#)

The scheme costs have been prepared using SPONS as the primary data source. Equivalent local authority framework rates have also been used, where known, to capture lessons learned from recent project delivery experience. Cost certainty is commensurate with the current level of design, which is at the initial concept stage.

Key capital cost assumptions are set out below:

### *Construction Works costs*

- Costs reflect the core intervention associated with each option – extras that would likely be considered in more detailed scoping of design schemes for delivery, such as general carriageway resurfacing, have not been accounted for;
- 15% allowance of the construction works costs has been allowed for preliminaries and 10% of construction costs has been added for the utility diversions
- Commensurate with the current design stage, a 44% risk and contingency allowance based on the construction works costs has been included.

As individual projects move forward to further design and business case work, costs will be revisited and updated to better reflect current available information and cost assumptions.

Various assumptions were made during the AMAT (Active Mode Appraisal Toolkit) Analysis to understand the benefits of cycle infrastructure improvements. These included:

- Average cycle trip length of 4.8km;
- Where a trip starts and ends within the same section study area, it will use 25% of the section infrastructure; and
- Where a trip starts in one section study area, but ends in another, it will use 50% of the infrastructure in the origin and destination areas, as well as 100% of the infrastructure within the intermediary areas.

## 19. Dependencies

Document any projects, initiatives, policies, key decisions or other activities outside the control of the project that need to be considered or which may present a risk to the project's success, or on which this project depends.

The main dependency at this stage is the availability of funding to continue into the next stages of work. While no additional funding has been confirmed at present, the presence of external funding sources for active travel ensures that officers are confident in the ability to progress this project in the future with external funding.

## 20. Constraints

Document any known pressures, limits or restrictions associated with the project.

The following key strategic constraints have been identified for the scheme:

- **Public and Political Support:** Due to the historic prevalence of private car travel in much of the study area, measures focussed on enhancing walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport use may not be supported by the public should any roadspace reallocation be required, which could reduce political support for such measures.
- **Funding:** While the availability of increased funding at a national level provides an opportunity for investment in sustainable modes, funding streams will be competitive. Furthermore, a 2019 report by Audit Scotland found that Scottish Government revenue funding to local authorities has been increasingly constrained in recent years, with national policy initiatives making up an increasing proportion of Council budgets, which limits flexibility for local authorities to plan how to allocate funds.
- **Environment:** There are a number of environmental constraints that will require consideration as the study develops, particularly as options are assessed against environmental criteria to ensure identified options avoid or seek to mitigate adverse environmental impacts. There are segments of the A947 with a high likelihood of river flooding where they cross the River Don and its tributaries, and along the course of the river which runs adjacent to the study corridor. Options along the River Don are also constrained by wildlife habitats.

## 21. ICT Hardware, Software or Network infrastructure

List any new ICT systems or changes likely as a result of the project. If there are no ICT changes, then record as 'none'.

Description of change to Hardware, Software or Network Infrastructure	Approval Required?	Date Approval Received
None		

## 22. Public Sector Equality Duty

Aberdeen City Council uses the Integrated Assessment (IIA) as a way to ensure we understand the impact of our business proposals, policies or decisions on different groups of people as

described in the Equality Act and includes our community of workforce as part of our Public Sector Equality Duty.

An IIA should be completed and returned to the Equality & Diversity Team as indicated on the IIA template.

IIA Completed.

### 23. Change Controls Issued by the Project

Date	Change Ref ID	Approval Route	Change Description

### 24. Support Services Consulted

The minimum **consultation period for Outline/Full Business Cases is 10 working days** unless the Programme Board Chair agrees there are exceptional circumstances that require a shorter turnaround time.

**Note:**

- **It is mandatory for Capital projects to consult with the full list below.**
- If any services are not consulted, this should be indicated in the Comments section, along with the reason why. All comments received should also be noted, or reasons given for discounting them.

**Note:** There is a copy and paste version of the consultation list below which you can use for circulating your Business Case – [Support Services Consulted Circulation List](#)

Service	Consultee	Comments	Date
City Regeneration and Environment	Chief Officer, Capital		
City Regeneration and Environment	Chief Officer, City Development and Regeneration		
Communications	David Ewen, Communication & Marketing Manager		
Corporate Services	Chief Officer, Finance		
Design – Public Buildings	Ian Flett, Senior Architect <a href="mailto:laFlett@aberdeencity.gov.uk">laFlett@aberdeencity.gov.uk</a>	No comments	20/09/2024

Service	Consultee	Comments	Date
Emergency Planning Officer	Fiona Mann		
Families & Communities	Chief Officer, Corporate Landlord		
Finance	Scott Paterson, Finance Partner	Minor comments incorporated into OBC	18/09/2024
Fleet (if your project has fleet implications)	John Weir, Fleet Manager	No comments to add	25/09/2024
Governance	Chief Officer, Governance j		
Grounds Maintenance	Steven Shaw, Environmental Manager	No comments to add.	18/09/2024
ICT – Digital & Technology	Steve Robertson, Service Manager, Engineering & Operations		
Legal – Planning, Licensing & Environment Team	Elena Plews	Minor Comments Received.	24/09/2024
Legal (as above)	Fiona Closs	Minor Comments Received	24/09/2024
Legal (Commercial & Procurement)	Michele Pittendreigh, Team Leader		
Operations	Chief Officer, Operations		
Operations (Facilities)	Andy Campbell, Facilities Manager	No Comments	19/09/2024
People & Citizen Service	Linsey Blackhurst, Organisational Change & Design Lead (Interim)	No comments	25/09/2024
PMO	PMO Programme Manager	Minor Comments Received	30/09/2024
Procurement	Gillian Ross		
Roads Management	Stuart Allan, Team Leader Technical Vycki Ritson, Team Leader Engineering		
Roads Projects	Alan McKay, Team Leader		
Strategic Place Planning	Chief Officer, Strategic Place Planning		

You can attach a link to your document to the list above but will need to attach **a copy of your document** to the consultees below as the link function doesn't work for generic addresses:

Service	Consultee	Comments	Date
Asset Management			
Climate & Environment Policy		Minor comments received	26/09/2024
Equalities Team			
Estates	Property Estates Manager		
Planning	Local Development Plan Team Development Management	Minor Comments received	24/09/2024
Transportation Strategy and Programmes			

25. Document Revision History			
Version	Reason	By	Date
2	Incorporation of feedback received into OBC	TM	02/10/2024
3			
4			

26. Decision by Capital Board	Date
* Approved/Not Approved to:	

\* Insert approval decision from Capital Board.

## Appendix 1 – Study Area



