



04 May 2024

Aberdeen City Council

By email: ASHlinkroad@aberdeencity.gov.uk

Cc RStevenson@aberdeencity.gov.uk

Dear Sirs,

Aberdeen South Harbour Link Road – STAG 3

We previously commented on the STAG 2 proposal in November 2023 [south-harbour-link-road-november-2023.pdf \(aberdeencycleforum.org.uk\)](#)

In terms of the development of the design, our further comments at this stage are:

1. The cycle track as currently shown, especially on Hareness Rd, appears to stop at side-road crossings. We are not sure if this is the intended final design detail but if so it would be unacceptable. This design would create ambiguity over who has priority at the junction. The Highway Code is clear that the cyclist should have priority over turning traffic and a design which can be interpreted as suggesting otherwise could lead to confusion and place cyclists in danger. Design options are discussed in detail in *Cycling by Design* (2021). We note that on the scheme currently under construction in Craigshaw Drive the design used appears to be that shown in fig 5.7 (p170) “*cycle lane over side road layout*”. This provides a lower level of service than a continuous cycle lane, and would not be our first choice. We note the requirements discussed on p170 as well as the key points set out on p171, for visual cues, tightened radii etc if this junction type is to operate safely. As the Craigshaw Drive scheme has not yet opened we have not yet had the opportunity to see how it operates in practice.
2. The crossing points at the two roundabouts have a significant degree of set-back which also contribute to making the route slower, less convenient and will effectively force the cyclist to stop and cede priority. It is important to avoid

frequent stop-start interruptions for active travel which then risk encouraging cyclists to remain on the carriageway where interruptions are fewer.

3. We still consider that a controlled crossing point on Coast Rd at the northern extent of the scheme (where pedestrians and cyclists are required to cross the main carriageway to use the existing shared-use path on the east side) is essential. The speed and volume of traffic on this road (both of which are likely to increase after the new road is in place) mean that an uncontrolled crossing point is unacceptable. Although some cyclists and/or pedestrians may be comfortable crossing the road without the protection of a controlled crossing, the design should seek to accommodate *all users* including children and less-able adults. A controlled crossing point close to the new junction between Hareness Rd and Coast Rd would also be highly beneficial to allow safe access to the coastal path.
4. Given the industrial setting of Hareness Rd, we suspect that rogue parking on the cycle track and/or pavement would be likely unless firm measures are in place to prevent that, such as a Clearway restriction. As well as causing a temporary obstruction, rogue parking by large vehicles will be liable to damage the surface which will presumably not be designed to carry vehicle weight.
5. We note that the width of the cycle track has been reduced to the minimum provided in Cycle by Design, and that this has been done on the basis of anticipated flows being relatively low. We would make two observations in that regard; firstly that the design should be adequate to allow for the *significant future growth* in active travel which all local and national transport policies anticipate and encourage. Secondly, it is already the case that large groups of cruise ship tourists (apparently up to 80 or 100 at a time) are visiting the city by bike, meaning that there may be irregular and unanticipated peak flows for which a 2m track could be inadequate.

I trust you will find these comments useful.

Yours faithfully,

Gavin Clark

Chair – Aberdeen Cycle Forum