



06 December 2018

By email to

[RoadsProjects@aberdeencitycouncil.co.uk](mailto:RoadsProjects@aberdeencitycouncil.co.uk)

Dear Sirs

**Craigshaw Drive – cycle measures consultation – ACF comments – December 2018**

We are pleased to see this new proposal for fully segregated cycle lanes. We have the following comments on the detail of the proposals as currently displayed in the consultation.

1. At side roads we would prefer to see the cycle lane level maintained rather than drop to road level as this could lead to confusion over who has priority.
2. Some thought should be given to the kerb height between the road surface and cycle lane, to discourage vehicles from mounting the kerb. Or alternately another form of physical edge treatment.
3. Particularly at entrance to premises, some protection will be needed to prevent vehicles using the dropped kerb as a means of mounting the pavement or cycle lane.
4. Enforcement of the restrictions on parking and loading will be key to ensuring that the cycle lane does not become blocked by illegal stationary vehicles. Notably, short term parking or loading is difficult for Community Wardens to prevent, and yet if recurring (as it often is) still has the effect of making the cycle lane unavailable. Is there another way of providing more effective enforcement? Hence why we think some physical protection at the kerb is essential if the actual benefits of this scheme are to be realised. NB physical protection should be something which does not itself present a hazard to cyclists i.e. not pillar bollards
5. We note a “20mm upstand” in the drawing “access detail” and would welcome clarification of what this means.
6. In the drawing labelled “general cross section” there appears to be a slight height difference between the footway and cycle path. Perhaps this is only indicative in the drawing but we would welcome clarification of this design detail. A small linear height difference as indicated could be hazardous to cyclists.
7. There are implications of the gradient on sections of this street. Uphill, cycles will be travelling slowly and the segregated lane helps to accommodate this. Downhill, cycles may be travelling quickly and design details will be important to ensure that they are not

vulnerable to traffic crossing their path: even if they have priority – cyclists are still vulnerable and drivers are not necessarily accustomed to ceding to cyclists.

8. One of our most frequent criticisms of cycle infrastructure in Aberdeen is that it is not 'joined up'. It is good to see this as an extension of the Shell path which can in turn be reached via Duthie Park and the Deeside Way, offering a meaningful and continuous traffic-free cycle route. The connections beyond the junction of Craigshaw Drive and Wellington Road are non-existent however, which limits the benefits of this particular route in the short term, unless further improvements are planned to onward connecting routes in due course.
9. Although we welcome this improvement, we can also think of many other locations within the city where a high quality segregated cycle route would have higher levels of use and are therefore arguably more needed and would provide better value. We are unclear why this location has been selected for improvement.

We hope these comments are of use and reiterate that in general we welcome the proposal for continuous (more or less) segregated routes which are a significant improvement on the advisory cycle lanes found in many other city locations, and which are increasingly not favoured by our members as having meaningful benefit.

Yours faithfully,

Gavin Clark

Chair, Aberdeen Cycle Forum

Cc Cllr Ross Grant