

On behalf of Aberdeen Cycle Forum, I wish to object to this scheme.

We welcomed the opportunity to meet with officers from the Beryden CIS team in November 2019 and hear details of the proposed scheme. In addition to those points captured in the minutes of that meeting we wanted to make the following additional points.

Firstly, we must start by saying that we think any new road scheme which facilitates an increase in motorised traffic coming into the city is fundamentally misconceived. Therefore although some walking and cycling provision along the new corridor is to be welcomed, and is a significant improvement on the designs which we commented on around 10 years ago, we are still opposed to the scheme overall and hence OBJECT to the scheme as now set out in planning application 200366/DPP.

In view of the climate crises, illegal levels of air pollution and all the other dis-benefits of motorised vehicular traffic, it makes no sense to be building more road capacity into the city. Instead we would prefer to see the investment directed to active travel, public transport and in particular Park & Ride schemes which Aberdeen has so far failed to make work in any meaningful way. The supporting information attached to this application concedes that you anticipate a deterioration of air quality along the corridor. We note that the route passes Skene Square Primary School, and in addition the increased volume of traffic will presumably pass St Machar Academy. Children's health is recognised as being at particular risk from air pollution generated by traffic.

In our meeting we noted that for them to be of practical use, cycle routes need to be convenient and continuous. We cited Tillydrone Avenue as an example of a segregated cycle scheme where poor design details have resulted in a route where cyclists have a quicker and far less interrupted route if they remain on the carriageway with traffic.

Design details need further thought. We would also refer you to *Designing for Cycle Traffic: International principles and practice*<sup>1</sup> a copy of which was gifted to ACC by ACF last year.

We understand that the Council's argument for proceeding with such a scheme - at a time when most other cities are reducing capacity for private motor vehicles - is that the capacity is needed to facilitate some of the improvements proposed in the City Centre Masterplan, and to accommodate the displaced traffic. This seems to us flawed at a basic level. If the CCMP requires a reduction in traffic volumes of 20%, then the aim should not be simply to displace that onto streets surrounding the city centre area. If the city as a whole is to benefit from the CCMP then the ambition must be to reduce traffic and promote modal shift towards more sustainable means of travel. Building a new urban dual-carriageway such as proposed here will simply make it easier for motorists to continue to use their private cars and so offer zero incentive for sustainable travel. On the contrary, it is likely to create new induced demand. If it is to do anything other than re-locate the pinch point, it also implies that yet more schemes of new road capacity are needed - South College St being a case in point.

Even if it were the case that this new capacity is essential to allow the traffic-reducing measures within the CCMP area, surely those measures should be brought forward (by which we mean designed, approved and fully funded) before this scheme is proposed. Otherwise we believe there is a real risk

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.icebookshop.com/Products/Designing-for-Cycle-Traffic.aspx>

that the extra traffic capacity will be built, but the beneficial CCMP schemes not taken forward, either through lack of funding or lack of political will or for other unforeseen reasons.

If this scheme does go ahead, we would advocate that the extra road lane capacity be made exclusively available to public transport (and cyclists).