20 April 2026

Stuart Andrew

Aberdeen City Council

By email: StAndrew@aberdeencity.gov.uk

Dear Stuart,

Ashgrove Connects

We take this opportunity to provide feedback on the Stage 4 design of the Ashgrove Connects project. This note builds on the individual contributions made by Forum members in the Q1 2026 in-person and online event.

We should first say that we are excited to see a plan for almost 2.3km of protected cycling (and walking/wheeling) infrastructure connecting residential neighbourhoods with health and retail destinations. We strongly support the scheme in principle.

Our overall impression is that this is a quality design with many excellent features e.g.

1. Re-allocation of space from carriageway/on-street parking bays to bus stops, footways and cycleways is aligned with Scotland/Aberdeen's climate-related goals for changing travel behaviours.
2. The elevated through-going footway and cycleway across side-roads prioritises people-powered travellers on the main route, in line with the hierarchies in the 2023 revisions to the highway code.
3. Since Ashgrove Rd West/Ashgrove Rd has been re-classified as a "C" road, the reduced speed limit of 20 mph makes perfect sense.
4. The incorporation of low-growing vegetation is a visually appealing mitigation against flooding during storms that doesn't obstruct visibility (particularly important on a street with so much driveway parking).

Referencing the General Arrangement drawings helpfully shared on the Commonplace website, the attached tables have comments on specific locations. These are listed from west to east with a particular focus on safety-related issues and their potential mitigations, e.g.

1. conflicts in desire lines/vehicle movements,
2. ambiguous priorities
3. entry to /exit from the scheme.

We have a couple of requests for future consultations. Firstly, please could road sign designs be included on infrastructure drawings to fully communicate the plan? Secondly, we'd suggest including traffic modelling information. This would help to paint the picture of

1) the current status and how traffic is likely to develop in the "do nothing" case
2) the benefits and risks of the proposed scheme, and why it was favoured over alternative solutions

Finally, Aberdeen Cycle Forum would encourage the council to monitor travel patterns (counts, speeds) before/after implementation and seek feedback from the public once the infrastructure has been in-place for 12 months. As well as capturing data for evidence-based decision making elsewhere in Aberdeen, it could reveal if the resistance to the scheme voiced in the design phase persists post-delivery.

We hope these comments are useful, and wish you success with your bid for Transport Scotland Active Travel Infrastructure Funding to move into the Construction phase.

Yours sincerely,

Gavin Clark

Chair, Aberdeen Cycle Forum

1. **40217-IFL-XX-GR-C-00-008 Consultation GA Sheet 1**

Observation	Comment	Mitigation
Anderson Drive	Wonderful to see a signal-controlled junction with pedestrian and cyclist on-demand lights. A much-overdue promise from "locking in the benefits of the AWPR".	Note tree removal shown on W side of Anderson Drive however new gap does not align with cycle crossing, forcing a sharp turn and potential conflict with pedestrians (assuming the paths on the W side to be shared-use, which would be logical if a parallel crossing is to be used)

2. **40217-IFL-XX-GR-C-00-008 Consultation GA Sheet 2**

Observation	Comment	Mitigation
Cycleways narrow as they pass bus stops and pedestrian crossings	Most cyclists naturally slow down as they approach a constriction, so this helps prevent potential pedestrian/cyclist conflict.	If pedestrians have priority at these crossings, consider marking as zebras as on sheet 3.
Many driveways on the north side of the road	Potential conflict, especially for those reversing vehicles.	Driver education?
Castleton Drive	Potential conflict: cars turning onto Ashgrove Rd West may need to straddle footway and cycle way to be sure their path is clear.	Ensure trees do not obscure the view of eastbound cyclists, so they can see the hazard well in advance.
Ambulance depot on south side of road	Yellow box junction makes priorities clear.	N/A
Location of uncontrolled pedestrian crossing point between two bus stops	Cars attempting to overtake stationary bus will have reduced visibility and may be accelerating	

3. **40217-IFL-XX-GR-C-00-008 Consultation GA Sheet 3**

Observation	Comment	Mitigation
Cycleways narrow through Foresterhill "chicane"	Most cyclists naturally slow down as they approach a constriction, so this helps prevent potential pedestrian/cyclist conflict. However, limited space at the demand-controlled crossings could mean risk of queue spillback.	On-demand signals have fast response times/coordinated changes.
Blunt end to northbound cycleway on Foresterhill Rd (N).	Potential conflict as cyclists rejoin carriageway from protected cycleway at a point where carriageway width is reducing.	Cyclists travelling up a moderately steep incline will be reluctant to stop and give-way as they would have to do to look over their shoulder before safely rejoining. An awkward re-start which a change to the layout might improve.

4. **40217-IFL-XX-GR-C-00-008 Consultation GA Sheet 4**

Observation	Comment	Mitigation
Cornhill Rd	Vehicles entering Ashgrove Rd West from Cornhill Rd have been given priority at this junction.	The layout seems to show vehicles have priority over the footway, but the cycleway is continuous across the junction so must still have priority? (If so it would benefit from clearer marking i.e. coloured surface not just red chips)

5. **40127-IFL-XX-GR-C-00-008 Consultation GA Sheet 5**

Observation	Comment	Mitigation
Continuous footway and cycleway across Braefoot Rd and Grove Crescent	Well-aligned with hierarchy of road/public space users. However set-back of give-way line on Braefoot Rd could mean limited visibility, as per our comment for Castleton Dr on sheet 2	Improve visibility for drivers on Braefoot.

6. **40127-IFL-XX-GR-C-00-008 Consultation GA Sheet 6**

Observation	Comment	Mitigation
Westburn Roundabout	The design team's modelling showed a light-controlled junction at Foresterhill would retard circulation more than a roundabout, so that's why the dutch roundabout was selected. Given Aberdeen's culture of aggressive acceleration onto roundabouts, a light-controlled junction is likely the safer option. Most Aberdeen drivers will never have encountered a dutch-style roundabout before, and experiences elsewhere in the UK are mixed.	A signal-controlled junction is the intermediate design before the roundabout would be installed. Ensure good data collection during this time - it may be that data shows there isn't excessive congestion. Given the steepness of the junction, an advance phase for cyclists travelling up Westburn Drive might be helpful.

7. 40127-IFL-XX-GR-C-00-008 Consultation GA Sheet 7

Observation	Comment	Mitigation
Transition to bi-directional path on southern side of Ashgrove Road at the children's playpark.	The cycle crossing does not appear to have demand-controlled lights. Are drivers on the carriageway expected to give way, as they would for pedestrians crossing on the zebra?	Clarify priorities/consider adding demand-controlled lights. Sharp turn for cyclists going on to the crossing – more space would be beneficial, especially for non-conventional cycles, and bearing in mind cyclists need to approach the crossing at an angle which allows them to comfortably look at traffic coming from the rear.
	The bi-directional path has the same width as the uni-directional path further west. This seems a necessary compromise, given the space available	2.5m width is the absolute minimum per Cycling by Design, and assumes cycle traffic less than 300 per hour. Width constraints on the footway (especially adjacent to bins) may mean pedestrians are inclined to encroach on the cycle track.

8. 40127-IFL-XX-GR-C-00-008 Consultation GA Sheet 8

Observation	Comment	Mitigation
Westbound transition from bi-directional path on southern side of Ashgrove Road to northern side of cyclestreet via raised table junction with Laurelwood.	Ambiguous priorities: is a westbound cyclist at the junction expected to yield to all traffic from all directions? If so, where are they supposed to wait? Note: drivers of vehicles may not anticipate people on bikes needing to cross the junction diagonally.	Without any defined priorities, the scheme here relies on the raised table to act as a 'caution' device for all users if there are no express priorities but interactions are expected to take place at walking pace? Enhanced street lighting?
Use of red chips in asphalt on Ashgrove Rd to designate cyclestreet.	Cyclists and drivers may read this differently: cyclists may think they are on	Add "Cyclestreet" sign to posts at Laurelwood and Back Hilton Rd ends.

	a protected cycleway (they are not), drivers may not understand it's meaning at all.	Do not use the same surfacing for segregated cycle lane and cyclestreet.
Bi-directional cycle track in Laurelwood	2.0m width is below the absolute minimum specified in Cycling by Design	
Transition from bi-directional path on west side of Laurelwood: turning left into Elm Place via raised table junction.	Give Way line is set far back from the junction – limited visibility of traffic from right on Elm Place.	
Transition from eastbound on Elm Place onto Laurelwood Avenue via contraflow northbound cyclepath.	Drivers exiting Laurelwood turning right into Elm Place may not expect cyclists "going the wrong way" on Laurelwood.	Retain give-way markings at end of dead-end section of Elm Pl, and signage such as 'beware cyclists crossing'