

# MEMO



ABERDEEN  
CITY COUNCIL

To	Planning & Infrastructure	Date	11/09/2018
		Our Ref.	DPP 181541
From	Scott Lynch		
Email	SLynch@aberdeencity.gov.uk		
Dial	01224 522292		
Fax			

## Strategic Place Planning

Aberdeen City Council  
Business Hub 4  
Ground Floor North  
Marischal College  
Aberdeen  
AB10 1AB

Tel 03000 200 291  
Minicom 01224 522381  
DX 529451, Aberdeen 9  
[www.aberdeencity.gov.uk](http://www.aberdeencity.gov.uk)

## Planning Application No. DPP 181541

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

### 1 Development Proposal

- 1.1 I note that the application is for the erection of 6 residential flats with associated landscaping to the rear of 44 / 46 Bedford Road, Aberdeen.
- 1.2 The site is located in controlled parking zone RR, in the inner city, operating between 10am and 4pm, Monday to Friday.
- 1.3 This is a follow-on application from DPP 180555, which was largely the same in principal, except for 4 flats as opposed to 6.

### 2 Walking and Cycling

- 2.1 This site is well serviced by a network of public footpaths connecting to the wider area with destinations such as University of Aberdeen, Kittybrewster Retail Park in readily walkable distances.
- 2.2 I can confirm that the site is considered to be well served for cyclists with access to various nearby cycle routes. Existing on-street cycle lanes can be found along Bedford Road as well as National Cycle Route 1 traveling along College Bounds/High Street located some 600m away which has direct links through the whole City and City Centre.

### 3 Public Transport

- 3.1 The site shall be well served by Public Transport with Bedford Road forming part of several bus routes connecting the University of Aberdeen and the wider city at regular intervals.

- 3.2 Bus stops when heading in either direction can be found on Bedford Road within 100m.

#### **4 Parking**

- 4.1 As per ACC supplementary guidance, a maximum of 1.5 spaces should be provided per unit, equating to 9 parking spaces. However, the applicant proposes to provide no associated off-street car parking.
- 4.2 As the site is located within a controlled parking zone, each property would be entitled to apply for a maximum of 2 on-street parking permits which could add a maximum of 12 cars to the existing parking pressures within this area. Furthermore, several nearby streets are outwith any controlled parking zone – so it is far more likely that residents would simply park on these congested streets.

As part of the previous application Roads had no formal objection, provided that mitigatory measures were put in place. The applicant was also informed that future applications for additional flats would not be supported by Roads as on-street parking is finite and more flats would lead to more parking pressures in an already congested area – both the CPZ and the adjacent area outwith any controlled parking zone, within which there is a fear of indiscriminate parking.

Additionally, our Supplementary Guidance document states “In...Inner City locations, low and no car development *may* be acceptable...In Outer City locations it is unlikely” – and this site is on the border of the inner and outer city. Additionally, “when considering the suitability of a site for no car parking...it can be demonstrated through a Travel Plan that significant measures will be undertaken to minimise the number of cars expected to travel to/from the site” and “there will be an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring sites through increasing on-street parking pressures”. There is no way to minimise the number of cars owned by the residents, and this will have an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring streets through an increase in on-street parking pressure.

#### **5 Refuse**

- 5.1 I note the location of the proposed bin site and would advise that the acceptable distance for containers to be transported by collectors should be no more than 15m for a two-wheeled bin and 10m for a four-wheeled bin. Additionally, residents should not be required to carry waste/refuse more than 30m from the flat entrance to the storage point.

#### **6 Conclusion**

- 6.1 Roads would recommend that this application is refused on the grounds of parking pressures in the area. Given that there are a small number of streets outwith any controlled parking zone which are bounded by controlled parking zones, students are known to park here when they drive to the university, as are residents of adjacent sites who do so to avoid paying for parking permits. Whilst the new proposal does only represent 2 additional flats when compared to the old proposal, the original proposal would still result in a net detriment to the area in terms of parking, but not a significant enough detriment to warrant

refusal, however it is felt that the detriment to the area brought about by the introduction of 6 flats *is* great enough to warrant refusal.

Scott Lynch  
Senior Engineer  
**Roads Development Management**