



30 June 2024

Aberdeen City Council

By email: [transportstrategy@aberdeencity.gov.uk](mailto:transportstrategy@aberdeencity.gov.uk)

Cc [jamie.graham@aecom.com](mailto:jamie.graham@aecom.com); [Andrew.robb@aecom.com](mailto:Andrew.robb@aecom.com)

Dear Sirs,

### **A947 multi-modal study consultation**

Thank you for the invitation to respond to this recent consultation, which closed on 14 June. We were unable to respond within the deadline, and are not providing a full or detailed response.

As regards the consultation itself, we found the amount of material presented to be overwhelming – there were 18 documents to download and review. Also as only one date was offered for the public exhibition, we were unable to make use of that opportunity.

Rather than providing no comment at all, we are providing a limited response on a few mostly general points.

1. We welcome the stated Objectives to increase active travel (walking, wheeling and cycling).
2. Under 'other options being considered' we note that a bike hire scheme within Dyce is listed. This seems ambitious in a relatively small community and we are unsure how a scheme might operate or be financially viable.
3. **A947 West package:** we welcome the majority of measures. We question whether resurfacing and widening of paths around TECA would represent value for money and would rather see resources directed to improvements to provide separation from traffic. If existing paths at TECA are below the usual standard width, it is also unlikely that levels of useage are particularly high or capacity is an issue.

4. **Riverside Drive package:** we welcome the proposed measures to *increase* (should that be decrease?) kerb radii at certain junctions to better serve pedestrians and change priority in favour of active travel at others.
5. **Victoria Street package:** we note the proposal for a mixed traffic street (in combination with shared-use at either end). Significant reductions in the speed and volume of traffic would be required to make this a suitable location for a mixed traffic street. Also while two different solutions are offered (mixed traffic street in the centre changing to shared-use at either end), consistency of approach would be ideal.
6. **Targeted local improvements package:** Stoneywood (M&S, Co-op) junction. We previously raised safety concerns about the road layout here and would welcome improvements, keeping in mind that some cyclists will remain on the carriageway here even if an off-road alternative is provided, and so pinch-points should be avoided.
7. **Strategic corridor improvements package:** we welcome most of what is presented, except to note that someone cycling the full length of the corridor as shown here would transition between shared-use and cycle-track nine times.

Yours faithfully

Gavin Clark

Chair – Aberdeen Cycle Forum

Yours faithfully,

Gavin Clark

Chair – Aberdeen Cycle Forum