

MEMO



ABERDEEN
CITY COUNCIL

| | | | |
|-------|--|-----------|---------------|
| To | Robert Forbes Planning & Infrastructure | Date | 03/01/2013 |
| | | Your Ref. | P121387 (ZLF) |
| | | Our Ref. | TR/AM/1/51/2 |
| From | Roads Projects | | |
| Email | | | |
| Dial | | | |
| Fax | | | |

Roads Projects
Enterprise, Planning & Infrastructure
Aberdeen City Council
Business Hub 4
Ground Floor North
Marischal College
Broad Street
Aberdeen AB10 1AB

Planning application no. P121387
Land to south of, Shielhill Rd., Dubford, Bridge of Don
Erection of 191 dwellings

I have considered the above planning application and have the following observations :

1 Development Proposal

1.1 I note that the applicant plans to develop the site at Dubford, part of the OP25 allocation contained in the Aberdeen Local Development Plan, to create 191 homes.

2 Walking & Cycling

2.1 In order to achieve adequate connectivity between this phase and the future development site to the east, provision should be made by legal agreement to ensure there are no obstacles to the creation of walking and cycling connections from the proposed roads and paths as part of the full development of the masterplan area.

2.2 I note the applicant has not provided any detail on the delivery of the key shared cycle track facilities on the wider site including the north/ south route following the line of the current public right of way and the facility running east/ west parallel to Shielhill Road. These tracks are key to the access arrangements for the site therefore, a suitable condition is requested to provide greater certainty as to the delivery of individual elements and associated phases.

2.3 It appears the proposal only provides for the creation of the informal path network along the eastern site boundary. It is anticipated that walking and cycling infrastructure within the wider site will be provided as adjacent phases are developed. For this phase the informal paths along the southern site boundary should be included. A suitable condition is requested to provide greater certainty as to the delivery of individual elements associated with this phase.

- 2.4 In order to achieve adequate connectivity for the site a number of the proposed paths require links to be formed outwith the site. It is understood that the applicant has reached agreement with Planning Gain Officers to provide funding for the implementation of these links and other path works. The following links are deemed critical to the adequate connectivity of the site and funding should to ring fenced within any agreement:
- Link to Seaview Place; and
 - Link from southeast corner of site to B999.
- 2.5 Information has been provided on the likely routes to school for primary and secondary school pupils. Bridge of Don Academy lies outwith convenient walking distance making cycling a more convenient alternative. The applicant must agree to create a shared cycle track to be alongside Scotstown Road including the upgrade of crossing facilities at the Parkway to Toucan standard to enable secondary school children to travel to school more safely by bike.
- 2.6 It is anticipated that the above Scotstown Road cycling infrastructure will be provided as part of the first phase of development and that this should be secured by condition and legal agreement.
- 2.7 The current proposed north/ south running footpath within Block 22 gives cause for concern as it appears to run within a narrow area of ground bounded by high fences; together this is likely to create a sense of insecurity for users. The requirement for this path and/ or its design should be reconsidered.
- 2.8 There appears to be a lack of continuity in walking and cycling provision surrounding Block 22 with the proposed informal path connecting with the Block 22 loop road rather than linking up with the formal shared cycle track proposed to the north of the site. This should be addressed and amended plans submitted.

3 Public Transport

- 3.1 I note and welcome proposal to extend Dubford Road through the site and provide a new terminus to the north allowing existing services to be continued into the development. I also note the further potential for services to exit from the site onto Shielhill Road and continue eastwards to service existing industrial areas. However, additional detail is still required on the proposal including:
- when the services will be extended in relation to the number of completed residences;
 - commitment to support the extended service; and
 - commitment to maintain and improve current service frequency.

A suitable condition is requested to secure the provision of adequate public transport for the development.

4 Parking

- 4.1 It appears that parking for terrace properties will be provided through communal parking courts. Where car parking is to be provided on a communal basis all spaces must be unallocated and I would request this be secured by condition and legal agreement. The applicant should confirm this is the proposed approach and provide information for each block stating the property types within the block the car parking requirements and numbers of spaces provided.
- 4.2 The approach described above is markedly different to that taken elsewhere on the wider site. On the western boundary of the site this is likely to cause confusion. Block 12 gives most cause for concern; as it may be very difficult for the user to distinguish between the private spaces to the west of the lane and the communal spaces to the east however, consideration should be given to the arrangements for Blocks 11, 14 and 16 also. Further information should be provided by the applicant as to how they intend to resolve this issue.

5 Local Road Network

- 5.1 The operational performance of a number of junctions within the Bridge of Don road network has been assessed. The assessment indicates that a number of junctions will require works to mitigate the impact of the development.
- 5.2 Revised proposals for the Shielhill Road/ B999 junction; the proposed realignment of the B999 is acceptable addressing the capacity and safety issues associated with the development's impact on the existing junction.
- 5.3 Shielhill Road/ B997 junction; the proposed new location for this junction is acceptable addressing the safety issues associated with the development's impact on the existing junction. It should be noted that any new carriageway provided should be 6.5m in width and that the width of the B997 within the extents of the existing junction should remain consent at 6.5m.
- 5.4 B999/ Denmore Road junction; the proposal to mitigate the development's impact at this junction through the installation of a ghost island arrangement is the Roads Authority's preferred option. However, further design and assessment is required to prove a satisfactory solution is achievable. As a minimum I would anticipate that lane widths on the B999 should be increased to 3.5m and the Denmore Road exiting radius to 15m with flare.
- 5.5 Shielhill Road will provide the principal route for vehicle access to the development. The roads current geometry and condition have been assessed for this function. I note and agree the proposal to lower the speed limit on Shielhill Road to 40mph in order to improve road safety. However, information provided on forward sightlines shows that even at lower speeds there is a length of the road where forward visibility is very limited due to a high wall and embankment to the north. The applicant has agreed to provide funds to the Roads Authority to undertake visibility improvements over the affected length of Shielhill Road; this should be secured legal agreement.
- 5.6 The applicant is still to present an acceptable proposal with regards to the delivery and implementation schedule of the required mitigation works. Until this has been provided and agreed the Roads Authority cannot support this application.

6 Development Vehicle Access

- 6.1 Access to this development relies on junctions and roads to be formed under other planning applications, all of these require infrastructure must be in place prior to occupation of the site.
- 6.2 All design and construction should be in accordance with the standards of Aberdeen City Council and the applicant is advised to contact Colin Burnet of our Road Construction Consent section at the earliest opportunity with regard to this matter.

7 Internal Layout

- 7.1 I note that the internal layout design has looked to address the aspirations of the Designing Streets policy statement. I note the proposals to use horizontal traffic calming features to manage traffic speeds to the desired 20mph for a residential development. I would note that more effective and aesthetic solutions could be available through changes in the proposed layout; as considered for other areas of the wider site. The potential for higher speeds along the north/ south street still gives cause for concern and should be considered further.
- 7.2 A shared surface is proposed around Block 22; there are currently no shared surfaces proposed as streets in the wider site and I have concerns that as the proposal currently stands the layout will not provide a legible environment for the user and could be unsafe. It would appear more appropriate for a similar street form to the other blocks on the site to be used.
- 7.3 It would appear that the current layout that the parking court and access within Block 21 will not conform to British Standards guidance on refuse collection. The reversing length for collecting refuse trucks and/ or both the operative and occupier hauling distances all appear to exceed the stated maximums. Further information should be provided on the proposed servicing arrangements for these properties.
- 7.4 It would appear that the current layout that the access within Block 20 will not conform to British Standards guidance on refuse collection. Both the operative and occupier hauling distances appear to exceed the stated maximums. Further information should be provided on the proposed servicing arrangements for these properties.
- 7.5 In addition, for all other blocks with communal parking it is unclear where bins will be positioned for collection without obstructing traffic, parking spaces and or footpaths. Further information should be provided on the proposed servicing arrangements for these properties.
- 7.6 All design and construction should be in accordance with the standards of Aberdeen City Council and the applicant is advised to contact Colin Burnet of our Road Construction Consent section at the earliest opportunity with regard to this matter.

8 Travel Plan

- 8.1 Travel Plans and Travel Plan Co-ordinators are key tools in managing the impact of developments on the transportation network. As such prior to occupation of the development the applicant must develop and agree with the

Roads Authority a suitable Travel Plan and legal agreement including future modal share targets, monitoring regime, funding commitments, programme of implementation and a mechanism for the review of targets and measures to be implemented. For a residential development the travel plan should include provision for a Travel Plan Co-ordinator to be in place from first to final occupation and the development a distribution of a travel pack to new occupants. This should be a high quality promotional document providing current up to date information on sustainable travel options including a high quality removable neighbourhood map showing walking, cycling and public transport routes to key local and city facilities; information on likely journey times; it should contain removable timetables for bus services accessible from the development; and it should contain contact information for personal travel planning.

9 Drainage Impact Assessment

- 9.1 Following review of the additional information provided the drainage proposals for the site are satisfactory.

10 Strategic Transport Fund Contribution

- 10.1 As the proposed development is within an area allocated for residential & mixed use within the Aberdeen City Local Development Plan a contribution will be required to the Strategic Transport Fund (STF). An estimate of the required contribution is given below, based on the information provided to date. The granting of planning approval should be conditional on an appropriate legal agreement with the applicant being in place, in regards to payment of the STF contribution. It should be noted that if the proportions of proposed units change at any stage, pre or post planning approval, the contribution must be re-evaluated.

| STF Contribution Estimate | | | |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| Residential | | | |
| <i>Unit size</i> | <i>Contribution per unit</i> | <i>Development units</i> | <i>Sub Total</i> |
| 1 bedroom | £1,239 | - | - |
| 2 bedrooms | £1,652 | 28 | £46,256 |
| 3 bedrooms | £2,064 | 105 | £216,720 |
| 4 bedrooms | £2,477 | 54 | £133,758 |
| 5 bedrooms or more | £2,890 | 7 | £20,230 |
| Total | | | £416,964 |

11 Conclusion

11.1 Subject to the provision of suitable conditions and legal agreement with respect all the above comments including the delivery of sustainable transport measures, bus gate enforcement, off site works, Travel Plan and Strategic Transport Fund I have no objection to this application.

Alan McKay
Senior Engineer

From: <webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk>
To: <pi@aberdeencity.gov.uk>
Date: 21/10/2012 12:22
Subject: Planning Comment for 121387

Comment for Planning Application 121387
Name : John Bisset
Address : 42 Dubford Crescent,
Bridge of Don

Telephone : _____

Email : _____
type :

Comment : This type of development has already been proposed by a previous builder and rejected by Aberdeenn City Council because of lack of infrastructure in Bridge of Don (i.e mainly the Aberdeen By-pass. As this is not due to be completed until 2018 and no future plans are yet available for future infrastructure programmes in Bridge of Don. I would like to see this project put on hold until closer to the by-pass being completed.

4 Seaview Avenue
Aberdeen AB23 8RJ

13th November 2012

Planning Authority
Aberdeen City Council
Aberdeen


Dear Sir/ Madam

Planning Applications No 121387

I should like to register strong objections to the above application as this development will cause further transport congestion on roads which are already heavily used particularly at rush hours. Presently, Ellon Road/King Street and access to the Persley Bridge via the Parkway suffer lengthy delays at peak times and also, the access to Scotston Road from Dubford Road. Also I am not reassured that the entrance from Dubford Road into the development will only be used by buses and emergency vehicles.

Until the City Council becomes more pro-active in providing a third crossing across the Don and there are improvements made at the Haudagin Roundabout, it seems inappropriate to build more houses in Bridge of Don - the infrastructure is poor enough at the present time.

Yours faithfully


Mrs Alexis Darg

From: <webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk>
To: <pi@aberdeencity.gov.uk>
Date: 14/10/2012 14:14
Subject: Planning Comment for 121387

Comment for Planning Application 121387
Name : Bridge of Don Community Council
Address : 39 Broadfold Drive
Bridge of Don
Aberdeen
AB23 8PJ

Telephone : [REDACTED]

Email : [REDACTED]

type :

Comment : The Bridge of Don Community like the layout of the plan but our main objection is the amount of traffic the site would generate. Our worry is the traffic volume and the small road it would feed on to. There is already a large volume of traffic passing through the Bridge of Don creating traffic hold ups. The WPR should be in place before this extra traffic is fed into the area as we do not have the infrastructure for more traffic. We want to back up the requests from the local residents that only the buses have access to the site through Greenbrae and that this would not change in the years to come. This would prevent any attempt to use the site as a short cut. We would also like the commercial/retail buildings to be within the first phase showing that the site when finished would be as the residents saw in the consultations. There must be strict safety measures within the area during construction as there will be school children moving around and hours of construction must be reasonable.

From: <webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk>
To: <pi@aberdeencity.gov.uk>
Date: 11/10/2012 15:28
Subject: Planning Comment for 121387

Comment for Planning Application 121387
Name : Gillian Pettigrew
Address : Architectural Liaison Officer
Grampian Police
Woodhill House
Aberdeen
AB16 5AB

Telephone : [REDACTED]

Email : [REDACTED]

type :

Comment : I have now had a chance to view the block plans submitted for the initial phase of this development and would like to offer the following comments for consideration:

There is a great deal of permeability throughout this phase of the development. I understand from the design statement that there is an intention to have a pedestrian trail including shelters, parking and signage. Although pedestrian permeability is desirable, careful consideration needs to be given as to the extent and appropriateness of that permeability. Increased footpaths through and around developments provide numerous access and egress routes for potential offenders and an increased degree of anonymity.

Footpaths should be straight and wide. Any narrow paths e.g. between houses, can become areas where anti social behaviour and youth gathering can take place. Therefore they should be suitably lit and gable windows used where appropriate.

It is vital therefore that surveillance of these areas is maximized through appropriate lighting and landscaping thus increasing the feeling of safety and creating a hostile environment for potential offenders.

Lighting is extremely important in a development such as this. Rather than the level of lighting it is the uniformity or spread of lighting which is most important. Good quality white lighting with an even spread avoiding dark spots, provides the best colour rendering qualities and has been shown to decrease the fear of crime and create safe welcoming places.

I would also recommend the use of different surface treatments to signify the move from public space to semi private space. This acts as a psychological boundary which enforces the feeling of ownership and territoriality for residents and again creates a more hostile environment for potential offenders.

The rear of properties can be particularly vulnerable and every effort should be made to ensure these spaces have robust defensive barriers. It is recommended that there should be fencing or walls to a minimum height of 1.8 metres. Any homes with footpaths or open spaces to the rear should, if it is deemed necessary for access to this footpath/space have lockable gates

There is a significant amount of green and/or public space. In these areas it is important that the site lines are not impeded and as high a level of natural surveillance as possible is achieved, in order that 'hiding places' are not created in which anti- social behaviour could take place

In general terms high level planting, such as trees, are crown lifted to a height of about 2m and that shrubs and bushes are chosen which do not grow to a height of above 1m thus maintaining a 1m 'window' of surveillance. A program of regular maintenance will be required.

Outwith the operating hours of the commercial centre, the lack of pedestrian and vehicular traffic, will mean that natural surveillance at the nearby open playing field will be significantly reduced. This may attract anti social behaviour.

I trust these comments meet your initial requirements however, if you have any queries please feel free to contact me

Gillian Pettigrew
Force Architectural Liaison Officer