

# MEMO



ABERDEEN  
CITY COUNCIL

To Garfield Prentice  
Planning & Infrastructure

Date 27/02/2017

Your Ref. P170021

Roads Projects  
**Communities, Housing and Infrastructure**  
Aberdeen City Council  
Business Hub 4  
Ground Floor North  
Marischal College  
Broad Street  
Aberdeen AB10 1AB

## Planning Application No. P170021

I have considered the above planning application (with the additional information submitted) and have the following observations:

### 1 Development Proposal and Planning Context

- 1.1 I note that the application is for the development of a new 20,000 capacity stadium and associated community, football, sports and leisure facilities on land at Kingsford located on the north side of the A944 between Westhill and the Aberdeen Western Peripheral Route (AWPR).
- 1.2 The proposed ancillary facilities at the stadium would consist of a restaurant, heritage museum, club administration offices, club shop and ticket office.
- 1.3 It is noted that the site would be built in two phases with the training and community facilities comprising Phase 1 of the site (open by 2018) and the stadium comprising Phase 2 (open by 2020).
- 1.4 The site would have an internal road network and would be accessed by three junctions located on the A944.
- 1.5 It is understood that detailed planning permission is sought. Therefore the TA should provide sufficient detailed evidence and assessment of impacts to allow the implications of the proposal to be considered.
- 1.6 **It is considered that, some aspects, of the TA do not provide sufficient detailed information and thus additional information has been requested to assist the local authority and members of the public to better understand the implications of the proposal.**
- 1.7 It is recognised and supported that the proposal has been subjected to a number of public consultation events. The applicant notes that comments from the public have been taken into account within the TA.

- 1.8 **In line with the current policy rhetoric for development design and layout to be an iterative process it is requested that a summary of public consultation comments (relating to transport) is provided and evidence as to where public feedback has been incorporated either within the design and / or as part of the TA.**

## **2 Trip Generation & Modal Split**

- 2.1 It is recognised and welcomed that the TA considers quantitative match data for recent fixtures over the last three years to inform its potential attendances. This is considered to be a reliable method by which to base the assessment.
- 2.2 It is noted that the modal split has initially been based upon a travel survey undertaken by Dons Supporters Together (DST); however, no information has been provided within the TA as to the methodology for undertaking this survey, wording of questions etc. It is surprising and apparently contradictory that the anticipated car mode share as a means of accessing the proposed stadium is reduced compared to Pittodrie considering the number of residents residing within walking distance and comparing the public transport availability of the two sites. **We therefore request receipt of the methodology and questions asked within these surveys so as to establish that they were undertaken objectively and impartially and that they can be used as a suitable basis by which to assess the anticipated travel demand to the proposed stadium in accordance with Transport Assessment Guidance (2012).** It may be necessary to seek further justification of the mode share used.
- 2.3 Despite this survey being undertaken, the proposed match day mode split (Table 6.1) is not quantified within the TA and is unjustified in comparison to the Dons Supporters Together (DST) survey that was previously undertaken which established differing modal splits.
- 2.4 The applicant has provided some justification for this difference, however, we do not necessarily agree that a mode share of 48% is sufficiently close to 50% considering the overall number of supporters that this equates to (equivalent to approximately 275 supporters for an average match). Similarly, the modal split for bus travel (42.5%) is considerably higher than the modal split identified in the original DST survey (34%) and no evidence has been provided for this increase (approximately 1169 supporters for an average match). Moreover, these modal splits contain a further breakdown of travel by shuttle buses, supporters coaches and public buses, however, no evidential justification from has been identified as to why these are considered appropriate.
- 2.5 **In a similar light, we would request modal splits and a breakdown of supporters travelling to be provided for both European games and Old Firm match scenarios.** It is considered that there would be various capacity constraints which would fundamentally change the various travel

modes that a capacity crowd would use to get to a game.

- 2.6 In addition to this, the modal splits presented do not account for the primary mode of travel that supporters use to get to the stadium. For example, the modal splits presented for bus travel include those travelling by car to the park and ride at Kingswells. **In this case, the car would constitute the majority of their journey time to the stadium and this should be reflected within the modal splits provided. It is acknowledged that these vehicular trips have been accounted for in the modelling.**
- 2.7 The car mode share has been based upon 3.0 people per car to assess the number of people who would arrive by a car. A justification has since been provided for this but this only relies on anecdotal evidence and not any statistical evidence. Car occupancy statistics for journeys to sport / entertainment using Scottish Household Survey Data (2012) is significantly lower than this figure at approximately 1.7 - 1.8 people per car. **We would therefore query why 3 people per car is considered appropriate in this instance and what measures would be in place to achieve such an unusually high level of car sharing compared to the national average. A numerical, evidence based justification is required.**
- 2.8 The TA appears to make the assumption that 100% of away supporters will travel to matches by supporters' coach and the applicant has since provided an explanation in subsequent correspondence. This correspondence has identified that some away supporters may in reality choose to drive and would use the park and ride located at Kingswells whilst some may also use the shuttle bus from the city centre. **It is appreciated that the needs of away supporters vary by game, however, it would be appreciated if the applicant can provide a similar modal split breakdown for away supporter travel patterns for an average away attendance so that the suitability of this arrangement can also be assessed.**
- 2.9 It is noted that the scoping correspondence previously received in December 2016 identified the likely trips to be generated on a day to day basis to and from the proposed stadium, however, there is no mention of this within the main body of the Transport Assessment. **We would therefore request that that the anticipated multimodal trips to the various land uses proposed are clarified so as to assess the suitability of the assumptions made. Subsequent to this, an accessibility assessment for everyday use by all modes of transport should be undertaken. Based on these it may be necessary to provide traffic modelling results for the evening peak hour traffic.**

### **3 Walking**

- 3.1 It is accepted that the proposed stadium's location means that it would not constitute a large residential walking catchment. It is agreeable that the majority of journeys would therefore primarily be made by modes other than walking. The adjusted mode share would initially appear to be optimistic even considering a wider area, however comments above in relation to the

derivation of the mode share account for this.

- 3.2 Despite this, it is noted that the TA ascertains that only supporters who live within 1600m proximity of the stadium will consider walking as a means of access. We do not agree that the use of this 1600m distance in this context is appropriate considering that PAN-75 identifies that this is relevant for *“accessibility to local facilities.”*
- 3.3 The stadium would clearly be a facility of regional importance and therefore it is considered that there would be walking trips made notably in excess of this distance. This has been based upon Transport Assessment Guidance (2012) which identifies in Section 5.20 that *“people may be prepared to travel further for some activities, for example, to a sports stadium rather than a shop.”*
- 3.4 In this regard, it is considered likely that walking trips would be made from a much larger catchment in Westhill, Skene and Elrick and from Kingswells; including from the Prime Four Business Park and from the Kingswells Park and Ride facility. It is considered unlikely that supporters would choose to wait for a bus for up to 54 minutes (section 6.10.29 of the TA) to access the Kingswells Park and Ride when a walking journey time is likely to be significantly shorter.
- 3.5 Whilst a basic assessment has been undertaken of the walking routes from Westhill, there is no assessment of the suitability or safety of walking routes from the east including at the AWRP grade separated junction included within the TA. **A further detailed assessment of the pedestrian provision on this route is therefore requested so as to allow the safety merits of a high pedestrian flow using this route to be suitably determined. Aspects such as footway widths and pedestrian crossing provision should be considered along with vehicle speeds, mix and volumes and the number of pedestrians likely to be making this journey.**
- 3.6 It is noted that to accommodate the uplift in pedestrian movements, it is proposed to widen the existing footway between the A944 Arnhall Roundabout and the ‘Six Mile’ Junction from its existing width of 2m to 3m.
- 3.7 It is noted that the intention is to provide a toucan crossing across the main site access junction to integrate with the shared use path for periods outwith match times. It is understood that the other two access points would be equipped with dropped kerb crossing provision. **Notwithstanding the above comments it will be necessary to deliver cycle provision that offers cyclists priority over all vehicles at all times, including over vehicles emerging from all side roads to the A944.**
- 3.8 In terms of pedestrian access provision, the TA identifies that all three vehicular access points would be equipped with footway facilities, however, the site layout drawing provided does not appear to include a footway alongside the easterly access point. **Confirmation is therefore requested that this route would be suitable for use by pedestrians.**
- 3.9 The TA does not undertake an assessment as to the pedestrian provision

within the internal layout of the site other than it would be controlled by stewards / Police Scotland. No detail has been provided in relation to the proposed footway widths, the location of any crossing points or a general assessment of the proposed infrastructure's suitability to safely accommodate high pedestrian flows on match days when immediately adjacent roads may be busy with high vehicular flows. **Further detail is requested as to footway widths and crossing points within the site in the interests of pedestrian safety. In addition, the production of a Traffic Management Plan outlining in detail the intended pedestrian / cyclist access arrangements during match days would form a condition of any consent for the proposed development, should it be granted.**

- 3.10 It is noted that it is proposed that the A944/ B9119 junction will operate at a cycle time of 120s. As identified elsewhere, large volumes of pedestrians are predicted to make use of the pedestrian crossing facilities in this junction before and after events. With a two minute cycle time significant volumes of pedestrians will have built up that require to cross in the available time. Comment is required in relation to the suitability of the crossing to accommodate large volumes of pedestrians in a short period of time, space for pedestrians to wait, and the propensity for pedestrians to cross the A944 outwith the crossing point. While it is acknowledged that it would normally be outwith the scope to allow for pedestrians crossing outwith crossing points, in circumstances where there are large volumes of pedestrians and limited crossing facilities (one crossing point over the A944 called once every two minutes), from a safety point of view it is a factor that must be taken into account. Stewarding and/or the presence of Police Officers is unlikely to be of a scale to control this behaviour.

#### **4 Cycling**

- 4.1 The TA suggests that the proposed stadium would have a large cycling catchment and incorporates a provision of 220 cycle parking spaces, which is to be welcomed. These would require to be sheltered.
- 4.2 It is understood from the TA that cyclists accessing the stadium would do so by means of the existing shared use path (Core Path 91) located alongside the A944. This is considered to be more desirable than using the main A944 carriageway, which would likely be heavily trafficked before and after events.
- 4.3 The TA asserts within Section 6.5.1 that Cycling by Design suggests that a 3m wide shared use path is sufficient *"avoiding the need for pedestrians and cyclists to take evasive action as they pass one another."* Table 6.2 of Cycling by Design states that a 3.0m shared use footpath is *"the minimum acceptable for combined flows of up to 300 per hour."* According to Table 6-1 of the TA pedestrian flows to the stadium on these 3.0m wide shared use footpaths to the west of the stadium would constitute approximately 3657 pedestrians which is significantly in excess of this threshold.

- 4.4 Bearing in mind the point raised in **Section 3.4** above, this situation could also be faced on the A944 to the east of the proposed stadium. This suggests that either wider shared use footpaths or segregated provision should be provided to avoid cyclists and pedestrians taking evasive action. **Further information is therefore requested in relation to how cyclists would safely access the stadium from all directions.**

## **5 Public Transport**

- 5.1 Section 3.3.5 of the TA references Policy RT2 (Out of Centre Proposals) within the Aberdeen Local Development Plan (2012) which identifies that where proposed leisure development are located on a site out with a centre, a series of requirements must be met. One of these requirements is that the *“proposed development would be easily accessible by regular, frequent and convenient public transport services and would not be dependent solely on access by private car.”* In this regard, we would agree that it is vital the bus access proposals needs to demonstrate that travelling by bus offers a better alternative to travelling by car.
- 5.2 **It is acknowledged that a full public transport management plan would be provided should the development be granted consent, however, we would request that this is provided at the planning stage so as to fully assess the merits of the development to satisfy the above policy requirement. Revisions could then be made at a later date once revised bus routes are known following the opening of the AWPR and any other wider route alterations.**
- 5.3 We would agree with the notion in the TA that to ensure that the bus is more attractive than travelling by car to the proposed stadium, journey times must be substantially more competitive. The traffic modelling results suggest that there would be notable queuing on the approach to several junctions on the A944 and the AWPR to and from the stadium that would affect buses journey time and their ability to adhere to a timetable. It is welcome that stewards / police would assist with letting buses out of the junction as quickly as possible after a match ends, however, **we would query if any further wider bus priority measures have been considered to speed up journey times on match days.**
- 5.4 In relation to the public bus service, it is noted that 1513 home supporters are identified to travel by this method for a typical home game only. We would agree that the existing X17 / X18 bus service is insufficient to accommodate this demand associated with the proposed stadium. It is welcome that discussions have taken place with Stagecoach who have identified that they would increase frequency from 7 to 17 buses per hour before and after a game. **The bus management plan needs to identify measures to make these services attractive for supporters and to avoid excessive waiting times; particularly at the end of matches.**
- 5.5 It is noted that public bus services would drop-off and pick-up from a

dedicated area within Arnhall Business Park. No information has been presented regarding the intended provision at these bus stops. **It is accepted that this would be a matter for Aberdeenshire Council, however, we would request further information as to the proposed provision for these stops.**

- 5.6 **It would also be appreciated if further information can be provided as to the suitability of the walking route from these bus stops to the proposed stadium so that the safety merits of this arrangement can be appropriately assessed. Reference should be made to footway widths and crossing points and the discussion presented above in relation to pedestrian access.**
- 5.7 It is noted that the proposals also consist of providing a series of shuttle bus services, which is also to be welcomed as a means of transporting supporters efficiently before and after games without the need to stop to pick up further passengers. The dedicated access junction and the bay provision outside the stadium appear to be suitable in this regard, however, **we would request swept paths are undertaken at this junction to provide sufficient comfort of its suitability.**
- 5.8 We also have concerns at this stage regarding the capacity of buses proposed. Almost every bus identified is shown to be 100% full incorporating those seated as well as standing on these buses before and after a game. It is welcome that discussions have taken place with First Bus who have confirmed they have a suitable number of buses to accommodate the identified demand for an average attendance match, however, we have concerns that some of these buses identified may be relocated from other existing city wide routes and cause further capacity issues on these routes; particularly for matches played on a weekday evening. **It would be appreciated if further information can be provided as to these buses and confirmation provided that this would not affect the frequency of services or capacity of services on other city wide routes for games both on a weekday evening or at a weekend.** The majority of Aberdeen's bus fleet is made up of single deck buses, and it would appear prudent to assume that this bus is used for the assessment.
- 5.9 We also have concerns about the provision identified for the city centre. Only 500 supporters have been identified as using the shuttle buses to and from the city centre for a typical game. Considering the shuttle bus would not serve any bus stops on route and would stop directly outside the stadium, it is considered far more likely that supporters would opt to use this shuttle service as opposed to the public bus service from the city centre itself.
- 5.10 A pick up point within the city centre for the shuttle bus services must be identified and agreed to by the Council at this stage in the planning process. **Additional information in this regard is sought.**
- 5.11 Moreover, the current bus route network is radial in nature and therefore it is considered likely that the city centre would form a key interchange for bus

travel to the proposed stadium for those who cannot or do not wish to drive to a park and ride site or want to visit bars or restaurants in the city centre before a match. The bus station and railway station are also located in the city centre which will also continue to form a key interchange for longer distance regional and national routes for supporters from further afield, including away supporters.

- 5.12 **On this basis, the 500 supporters identified to be using the shuttle bus service to and from the city centre for a typical match is considered to be inadequate and we would request that the opportunity is taken to revise this to a more appropriate number and reanalysis of the bus routing undertaken bearing in mind the point raised in Section 3.4.**
- 5.13 No information is presented within the TA regarding the location of pick up and drop off within the city centre for these shuttle buses. **Bearing in mind the point raised in 5.11, we would request that these location(s) within the city centre are identified so that that their suitability can be assessed.**
- 5.14 It is noted that the wider shuttle bus routes would only serve Park and Ride sites and would not serve any established large residential areas for those unable or unwilling to drive or access a park and ride site; particularly in areas located in and to the south of the city. **We would request clarity as to whether an arrangement such as this has been considered.**
- 5.15 Public transport provision is centred around services from the city centre (special bus and service bus enhancements) and from the Dyce Park and Ride, with the Kingswells Park and Ride effectively acting as a remote car park to the stadium. There is therefore no public transport provision from the south, from either the City or Aberdeenshire. Public transport from the City is limited to the city centre and the B9119/ A944 corridor.

## **6 Parking**

- 6.1 It is noted that 1,600 spaces are proposed to be provided within the footprint of the site. This is 267 spaces in excess of maximum car parking standards identified in ACC supplementary guidance and in Scottish Planning Policy (2014) which both identify that 1,333 spaces is appropriate for a stadium of this size in an outer city location.
- 6.2 Current policy makes it a priority that sustainable transport should primarily be used to access new developments and it is concerning that a “*predict and provide*” approach therefore appears to have been adopted in relation to vehicular travel and parking provision, referencing not just the parking but the methodology applied in the approach to analysing travel behaviour to the stadium and the impact of that to the network.
- 6.3 A justification has been provided for exceeding parking standards by making reference to other developments across the city. Providing justification for the proposed car parking provision based on another development is not appropriate and not in keeping with the requirements to

assess the implications of developments on a site specific basis. **Parking for the development should therefore be justified on site specific information before the suitability of this increase above established parking standards can be assessed. Considering national transport policy, parking should only be provided for those who cannot access a facility by any other means, and considered after pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users have been fully provided for and all attempts have been made to accommodate as many trips as possible by sustainable and active travel.**

- 6.4 The TA fails to provide a breakdown of the average number of hospitality guests and how these equate to the home support attendance used within the TA and the resultant impact on parking given that 250 spaces will be allocated to hospitality guests. **Further information is therefore requested in this regard.**
- 6.5 It is noted that a further 600 spaces would be provided at the Arnhall Business Park remotely from the site. These spaces do not form part of the redline boundary for the proposal and therefore any agreement reached or not reached with local businesses is not enforceable within the planning system. The medium and long term availability of these spaces is insecure and would not normally be allowed in terms of transport planning guidance. This will be taken into consideration in final comments. **We would request confirmation that this arrangement would be in place for games with evening kick offs when the car park would presumably be in use by staff during its normal operational hours.**
- 6.6 In addition to this, no information has been provided within the TA as to the suitability of this area to accommodate car parking, drop offs and taxis. It is accepted that this is primarily a matter for Aberdeenshire Council, however, **it would be appreciated if further information can be provided in this regard and the locations of parking and how the spaces would be managed on match days provided.**
- 6.7 The TA identifies that a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) would be located within a 1600m walk of the proposed stadium which is to be welcomed as a means of discouraging parking and promoting more sustainable modes of travel as a means to access the stadium in line with transport policy. Despite this, the applicant admits within Section 8.4.18 of the TA that supporters will park and walk for at least 30 minutes and not just the 1600m identified. This is also identified as a suitable walking distance within TAG (2012) as previously identified in Section 3.4.
- 6.8 **We would therefore request that this CPZ is extended for a 30 minute walking proximity assuming typical walking speeds for able bodied individuals. Subject to this being resolved, it would form a condition of any consent for the proposed development, should it be granted.** It is likely that in the event of consent being granted there would be an additional condition requiring formal monitoring take place at events throughout the rest of Westhill and that if necessary the CPZ be extended as necessary at the applicant's cost.

## **6.9 We would also request further information as to how this CPZ would be enforced during match days.**

6.10 It is envisioned that it will take a relatively large amount of time to clear the car parks at the stadium following the end of an event. Parking outwith, including at the Kingswells Park and Ride and beyond the CPZ may be more attractive than the ensuing delays exiting the site. Therefore traffic to and from the Kingswells Park and Ride may have been underestimated.

## **6.11 Park and Ride**

It is proposed to make use of the Park and Ride (P&R) at Kingswells and Dyce. Shuttle bus services from both to the stadium will be offered during events. The TA contains details of how visitors to the stadium would be ferried from the stadium after an event, however no information is provided as to how customers will be taken to the stadium before the event, and how services will operate. This information is requested.

As with other elements of the assessment, the TA has predicted the number of people that will make use of P&R services and then sought to provide that number of seats assuming high capacity on buses. In line with national, regional and local transport planning guidance the opportunity should be taken to maximise the number of people that will make use of P&R services. This stage in planning is the most effective opportunity to enhance use of public transport, and therefore revisions to the approach of the TA should be taken at this stage.

The Kingswells P&R will effectively act as a remote car park to the stadium. This parking provision will be attractive to stadium visitors, however as with the impact of P&R generally, will not remove traffic from the local road network. It is acknowledged the impact of this traffic is accounted for in the modelling, however the potential exists for the demand at Kingswells P&R to exceed capacity as it essentially offers nearly 1000 unrestricted spaces and will encourage additional vehicles. This has not been accounted for in the TA, nor has the impact of vehicles attempting to park in the Kingswells P&R finding it full and then having to seek parking elsewhere.

It is stated in section 6.10.24 that all 'special bus service' customers travelling to the city centre will have exited the stadium complex by bus within 18 minutes. This figure would appear to be at odds with AFC's stated aim of a matchday experience and encouraging customers to remain at the stadium following conclusion of the event, and information is sought how customers wishing to stay beyond the 18 minutes will be accommodated. Similar departures are predicted for the P&R buses within approximately 30 minutes.

## **6.12 CPZ Elsewhere**

A similar condition to that identified above requiring monitoring of parking in Kingswells with parking controls implemented as identified as necessary at the cost of the applicant.

## **7 Development Vehicle Access and Internal Road Layout**

- 7.1 It is noted that there would be three vehicular access points to the site located on the A944. It is understood that the westerly junction would be available for Car Park 1 and supporter buses and the easterly junction for shuttle bus access only. The centre junction would form the main vehicular access point. We would agree in principle that the incorporation of three appropriately managed junctions controlled by stewards would assist with the flow of traffic before and after a match.
- 7.2 It is understood that the centre junction would involve the removal of central reservation bollards during events on the A944 to allow for right turning vehicles and that this would be controlled by signals or Police Scotland. **We have concerns regarding the safety of this arrangement and would ask that further clarity is provided as to whether this would be controlled by signals or the Police so that the merits can be appropriately assessed.**
- 7.3 In addition to this, the TA suggests that there would be two right turn lanes available; however, the site access road only appears to have one exit lane shown. **We would request clarity as to what the proposed arrangement is.**
- 7.4 The TA identifies that access to the site would be controlled by stewards, however, it is not clear what the arrangement for this would be. **It would be appreciated if information can be provided as to these arrangements so as to avoid queuing traffic back on to the main A944. Additionally, it would be appreciated if further information can be provided as to what provision would be in place to allow drivers to safely access the A944 again if they accessed the car park without a suitable pass.**
- 7.5 The TA identifies that extensive traffic signage would be in place on the A944. **The design and location of this signage would form a condition of any consent for the proposed development, should it be granted.**
- 7.6 To provide sufficient comfort as to the operation of the access arrangements, an independent Stage 1 Road Safety Audit would be required **which should be carried out at this stage in advance of the application being determined. This should assess the safety merits of the access arrangements for all modes for an event, paying particular attention to the main access proposals, as well as the normal day to day operation.**

## **8 Traffic Impact Assessment**

- 8.1 Traffic modelling does not appear to have been undertaken at the three site access junctions. **We would request that this is undertaken so as to provide confidence that the proposed junction forms are suitable from an operational and a safety perspective both on a day to day basis and on match days.**
- 8.2 Notwithstanding this, the TA incorporates traffic modelling of five junctions on the surrounding road network. As only three of these junctions fall within

Aberdeen City Council jurisdiction, we have at this stage focussed attention on these junctions. We would, however, raise concerns regarding the queue predicted on the A944 approaches to the grade separated AWPR junction blocking back and impacting upon the performance of ACC junctions.

- 8.3 We would agree with the notion that events typically generate very high intense traffic levels over a short period and on that basis, it is not unreasonable to expect an element of queuing and delay before and after events.
- 8.4 It is understood that base traffic flows have been sourced for a 2023 future year from the Aberdeenshire Paramics model for junctions to the west of the AWPR junction. The baseline traffic flows for the three ACC junctions have been derived from baseline flows contained within a recent Transport Assessment for the proposed Prime 4 Phase 5 retail development which remains undetermined.
- 8.5 It is acknowledged that the prediction of baseline traffic is challenging due to the presence of the AWPR, however, the difference between the two baseline traffic methodologies is concerning. Some of the flow diagrams show a notable disparity in baseline flows between those entering and exiting the AWPR junction and those entering and exiting the A944 to the east of this. The flows appear to have relied on ASAM flows from the various committed developments in the vicinity as opposed to the flows from the respective Transport Assessments. **In this regard, we would request that flows derived from the respective Transport Assessments are used as opposed to flows from ASAM considering it has been widely accepted that the ASAM methodology underestimates demand to and from committed developments.**
- 8.6 The traffic modelling appears to have incorporated flows from the current live planning application for Prime 4 Phase 5 which is welcome to provide a sensitivity test of traffic impact on the A944; particularly during Saturday afternoons.
- 8.7 It is noted that ATC surveys have been used to appropriately factor likely traffic turning counts to represent movements during match times. Whilst the principle of this method is considered to be broadly acceptable, as we have previously identified these surveys were undertaken during a period when there was a diversionary route in place which may have impacted upon flows on the A944. It was previously requested that confirmatory surveys be conducted however it appears that these have not been included within the TA submission. **As such, further ATC surveys when no diversionary route is in place should be undertaken so as to provide confidence that the factors applied are appropriate.**
- 8.8 The traffic modelling appears to have informed its trip distribution for match days based upon the proposed bus routing as well as from the season ticket supporter distribution information provided by AFC. This is an acceptable methodology.
- 8.9 No information appears to have been provided within the TA as to how the

trip distribution for everyday use has been derived and **further information is therefore requested in this regard.**

- 8.10 Through subsequent correspondence with the applicant, it has been confirmed that PCU factors of 1.0 and 2.0 have been applied to cars and buses respectively within the modelling. This is considered to be an acceptable approach.
- 8.11 We would agree with the notion in Section 7.11.1 of the TA that *“there could potentially be a spike during the last 30 minutes of the arrivals period”* and *“when the game is finished, there could be higher proportion of fans seeking to leave the stadium within the first 30 minutes.”*
- 8.12 On this basis, the use of this Gaussian profile is not considered to be appropriate for traffic modelling at the ACC junctions in this instance. **We would therefore request that the ‘sensitivity’ modelling that has already been undertaken at the A944 / B9119 junction is also undertaken at the site access junctions (as previously identified) as well as at the two ACC junctions analysed.**
- 8.13 The assessment has included the committed development at the Arnhall junction. In the event that consent is granted, it will be a requirement that this junction improvement be delivered in advance of opening.
- 8.14 The extent of queuing predicted at the AWPR Kingswells South junction is noted and is a cause for concern, particularly in terms of safety with vehicles queuing into the mainline of the AWPR. However I do not consider that drivers are likely to sit in the length of queues predicted, and that rather they will seek alternative routes, using other AWPR junctions and local routes, which are likely to include roads through and around Westhill, Kingswells, Bucksburn, Cults and Peterculter as well as the A944. I have concern in respect to the impact and congestion on these junctions and routes. The re-routing of traffic will affect flows through and performance of the network. The TA has not therefore presented the vehicular impact of the proposals.
- 8.15 While concerns are highlighted in respect of the impact of the development, this is being considered by the Council in the context that the facility will be used relatively infrequently.

## **9 Travel Plan**

- 9.1 We note that no Travel Plan has been provided as part of the TA. A Travel Plan is therefore required to be produced as part of the Transport Assessment to identify measures that AFC could adopt to promote the use of sustainable modes of transport.

## **10 Construction Consent**

- 10.1 The (access junction layout/local road improvements/internal road layout/etc) are to be designed to Aberdeen City Council standards. The

development will require to be subject to a (Section 56/Section 21 Roads Construction Consent procedure) and I would urge the applicant to contact Colin Burnet on 01224 522409 to discuss this matter in further detail.

## **11 Conclusion**

11.1 There are outstanding issues in respect of this planning application. We will be in a position to make further comment on receipt of the requested information.

## **Roads Development Management**