

PI

From: webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk
Sent: 31 May 2014 15:07
To: PI
Subject: Planning Comment for 140730

Comment for Planning Application 140730

Name : Nicholas Gibson
Address : 2 Kirkbrae View
Cults
Aberdeen
AB15 9RU


type :

Comment : I wish to object to this planning application on the following grounds:

The submitted Traffic Assessment is inadequate, as it does not include the Friarsfield committed development (currently 82 dwellings under construction and a further 110 dwellings subject to planning approval, plus a further potential 88 dwellings allowed for in the masterplan), nor the Oldfold Farm committed development (550 units) in the list of committed developments in para 8.2.3.

The traffic assessment states that the Kirk Brae / Friarsfield junction is already at capacity. The increase in traffic from the proposed Countesswells development will push the junction even further over capacity. The mitigation proposed is to install traffic lights, although this appears to be required as part of the Friarsfield committed development which is mentioned in para 12.3.1 but is not included in the list of committed development in para 8.2.3? Traffic lights will increase both traffic queues and waiting times significantly at this junction, so can this really be considered to be mitigation?

Additionally, Appendix J to the traffic assessment which considers the Kirk Brae / Friarsfield junction compares observed data from 2011 surveys to the modelled data. The observed data shows significantly more queuing traffic than the modelled data - for instance 8 vehicles rather than 1 or 0, and 10 vehicles rather than 3 or 4. This indicates that the model used is not valid, and the statement made in para 1.2.3 "as can be seen from the comparison of queues above, the queue lengths are not significantly different and the model can therefore be considered valid" is plainly ridiculous as the observed queue lengths are close to an order of magnitude larger.

The traffic generated by the Friarsfield committed development will significantly impact Kirk Brae and therefore it must be included in the traffic assessment. The report should clarify whether Friarsfield is included in the list of committed developments as it is omitted from the list in para 8.2.3 but specified as a committed development in para 12.3.1.

Given that Kirk Brae forms the southern route into the proposed Countesswells development, the traffic assessment should be clear and comprehensive as to which data has been used, and the traffic model used must be demonstrated to be valid. The level of inaccuracy and ambiguity in the submitted document is unacceptable.

Yours

Nicholas Gibson