

## **Aberdeen Cycle Forum**

### **Minutes of meeting 25 September 2018**

#### **Ma Cameron's**

#### **Attending :**

Gavin Clark, Liz Lindsey, Dave Shannon, Colin Wright, Alan Irving, Mike Nieman

#### **Welcome and Apologies**

GC welcomed members, particularly Alan, a returning member.

Rachel Martin sent apologies.

#### **Minutes of last meeting (July) and matters arising**

There was further discussion of cycling on the Beach Esplanade. Although ACC had now clarified the position there were no signs and most cyclists would be unaware of what the authorised cycle routes were.

RM had attended the Science Centre event and had made a presentation.

#### **Office-bearers: election of new Chair (subject to quorum)**

Since there were just sufficient members to be quorate, GC was proposed, seconded and approved unanimously as the new chairman. MN indicated that he would take minutes whenever he was able to attend. It was felt that for the moment on other occasions other members could fulfil this role. GC had been in discussion with Rachel Martin who would be happy to work with the Forum as Campaigns and Communications Secretary (which she has in effect been doing for some time). It was unanimously agreed that this new post should be created and that RM should hold it.

#### **Correspondence**

GC led discussion of an email from Jon Barron (Nestrans Cycling Development Officer). Since starting to attend ACF meetings towards the end of last year JB had been helpful in a number of matters, but the email was rather critical of the Cycle Forum and also of GC's role in one of the planning submissions .

Although it was true that attendance at recent meetings had been sparse, until quite recently this had not been the case. It was unfortunate that several very active members had moved away from the city. Communications had been going out to members although it was possible that some users' firewalls had prevented them from being received. Those present felt that some of the comments in the email were based on only a partial or incomplete knowledge of events. GC had already replied

in brief to JB on behalf of the forum. It was agreed that no further response was required.

Events : Reflections on 9<sup>th</sup> September demo and ITWMC 16<sup>th</sup> Sept;  
Nestrans event 26<sup>th</sup> September, We Walk We Cycle We Vote  
campaigners day 29<sup>th</sup> September.

GC spoke to this item, saying that the demo had been very successful in raising the concerns of cyclists concerning the AWPR development. In fact the demo was the lead story on STV evening news and got more “air time” than the official event. It was very disappointing that the event organisers had decided to cancel the In Town Without My Car event due to adverse weather concerns, but did not communicate this to ACF (who were due to be manning a stand) so that 3 of our volunteers had arrived on Belmont St ready to set up at 09:30 only to discover the cancellation.

There was discussion of the Nestrans event to be held on the 26<sup>th</sup> September, billed as Cycling in the NE – moving forward together. It was disappointing that ACF, as a long established champion of cycling in Aberdeen City, had not been invited to be part of the development of this idea. However GC and RM were to attend the meeting on behalf of the forum.

## **Campaigns**

RM had suggested to GC that we should campaign for segregated cycle lanes on King Street. While there was clearly merit in this because of many students using this route there was a danger that we might dilute our efforts too much, and that it would perhaps be better to just concentrate on Union Street? It was agreed this needed further thought. It was pointed out that ACF had already been asked for, and had provided to ACC, suggestions for cycle routes (“Quality Cycle Corridors”), including King St, and this had sunk without trace. There was also the Westhill Cycle Route petition. This was supposed to be discussed again by ACC, but the committee structure had now changed, and it was thought it would have to be brought back to another committee. CW would attempt to find out how ACF could reactivate this.

## **Consultations :**

Aberdeen South Harbour transport connections (deadline 28<sup>th</sup> September)

GC indicated that this was about how the new development would connect to the city and the AWPR. It was still at an early, strategic level, dealing with the pro’s and

con's of alternative roads. A cycle "hub" was included in the proposals, which might be of more use for the crew of cruise ships to get to the city than for the passengers. There appeared to be little recognition of cyclists' needs, or of the potential benefits of a route through Torry which could be of use not just to harbour users but to residents or those who already work in the areas of the city south of the river . GC would try and send a general response about the requirements about the facilities needed.

### **Dualling of the A96 Huntly to AWPR**

Public events were being held in the near future on the proposals which were at a very early stage, but as far as we were aware none were being held in the city, making it harder for many ACF members to attend.

### **A.O.Bs**

GC indicated that a AECOM, consultants appointed by ACC to consider Aberdeen's "roads hierarchy" once the AWPR is opened, wished to send a speaker to talk about this project at the next forum meeting.

The subject of whether ACF could lodge a participation request under Community Empowerment legislation was discussed, e.g. the Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan (SUMP). This might only be possible if we could identify enough members as residents of Aberdeen City to qualify, and we are currently are not able to do this from membership information we hold. Once again, this needs further consideration. MN raised the subject of lane changes on St Machar Drive, and said he would try to raise these and other items from our discussions with Councillor J Laing, as he was in her ward.

### **Date and venue for next meeting – (provisionally Tues 30<sup>th</sup> October)**

There was discussion of whether we might increase the attendance at meetings if we alternated meetings between evenings and possibly a day time meeting on a weekend, as suggested by Rachel. GC would email the members to seek out views. Alternative venues were also discussed, as if we had better attended meetings Ma Cameron's would not be large enough. One possibility suggested by DS might be at the Aberdeen Trades Union Council premises which it was believed provides meeting venues for campaigning groups.