



ABERDEEN CYCLE FORUM RESPONSE TO SDPA TRANSPORT SUPPLEMENTARY GUIDANCE

1. ACF supports the principle of the fee charges, but we have a number of concerns about the proposed guidance.
2. The proposed infrastructure requirements are heavily weighted towards road schemes, and it is road capacity increases that look like they will secure the majority of the funds. We believe that the strategic transport fund should be aligned explicitly to the sustainable development and carbon reduction aims of the Strategic Development Plan. Tackling the transport and wider issues associated with the cumulative impacts of development require transport investments that support modal shift and encourage sustainable options.
3. The guidance assumes current patterns of transport choice persist into the future and the proposed infrastructure requirements appear to be based on a 'predict and provide' approach. But the challenge for an SDP that has sustainable development and carbon reduction at its heart should be to shift current patterns to less car dependency. This will require the bulk of the strategic transport fund to be on sustainable modes.
4. We believe that cycle infrastructure must be included as a strategic transport investment. The developments within each corridor should all be linked by quality cycle infrastructure, together with links to neighbouring settlements. The aim should be an integrated strategic cycle network, of consistent quality. It should offer safe and direct cycle provision, to ensure cycling is an attractive choice for short distance travel between sites and between sites and settlements along all the corridors. This will require both a strategic approach and significant investment and it is not acceptable to ACF that this crucial sustainable and healthy mode is not being allowed to benefit from a share of the proposed transport fund.
5. It is crucial to avoid a repeat of the strategic failure we have witnessed with the large business park development in Westhill. A major employment centre has developed here in recent years without cycle links being integrated into the planning. The recent upgrade of the cycle route along the A944 ends at the city boundary for example. Key cycle provision has to be seen as strategic otherwise the recent experience of Westhill will be repeated. Without a strategic and 'joined up' approach, the development corridors risk ending up with fragmented or non existent cycle provision, undermining a key

aim of the Regional Transport Strategy and conflicting with the sustainable development and carbon reduction aims of the SDP. It is crucial that cycle infrastructure along the corridors is included as part of the guidance.

6. There is an opportunity for the fee structure to reinforce the sustainable development and carbon reduction aims of the SDP, and alternative fee structure options should be investigated. For example, the fee structure for commercial development could have two components; one, as proposed, per sqm; and a second per car parking space provided. This will incentivise green travel planning and modal shift. If the concern is that car parking overflows into surrounding areas, then this should be tackled by traffic management.
7. Overall, ACF is concerned that this guidance is too heavily weighted towards funding road schemes which will lock in car dependence. We would prefer to see a best practice approach that aligns the fund with the carbon reduction and sustainable development aims of the SDP. This suggests that the available funds should in large measure be allocated to sustainable transport schemes that encourage modal shift. This should include strategic investments in quality cycle provision to ensure an integrated network in all the development corridors. We believe there is scope to investigate fee structure options that incentivise green travel planning .

November 2011