

Meeting Location	Aberdeen City Council, Marischal College.	Client	Transport Scotland
Meeting Date/Time	5 August 2014, 12 noon – 2 pm	Project	A90/A96 Haudagain Improvement
Subject	Cycle Group Consultation	Project No.	B1557630
Participants	Refer to Item 1	Notes Prepared By	JUK

File

cc:

Item	Subject	Description	Action
1	Introductions and Communications		
	(i)	<p><u>Attendees</u></p> <p>Aberdeen Cycle Forum (ACF): Jyll Skinner</p> <p>Cycle Touring Club (CTC): John Tuckwood</p> <p>Aberdeen City Council (ACC): Ken Neil – Senior Engineer Louise Napier – Senior Planner</p> <p>Jacobs (JUK): David Condie – Roads Team Leader Peter Gabriel – Environmental Scientist</p>	
2	Introduction to the Scheme		
	(i)	<p>JUK tabled the current road layout plan for the preferred option which included non-motorised user (NMU) routes (Drawing number B1557630/S3/0100/001 Rev 0). JUK explained that the NMU routes included footways, footpaths, and shared footway/cycleways and highlighted the proposed cycle routes on the plan.</p> <p>JUK advised that the current proposals included the following works on the road network:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New dual carriageway linking North Anderson Drive and Auchmill Road • Realignment of Manor Avenue and Logie Avenue • Stopping up of Logie Terrace, Manor Terrace • Stopping up of Manor Drive at its junction with Auchmill Road <p>JUK explained the topography was relatively steep in some locations with the existing roads having longitudinal gradients of up to 10%.</p>	

Meeting Notes

(Continued)

Page 2 of 3

		<p>JUK advised that based on the current proposals that the proposed maximum longitudinal gradients on the proposed roads were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Link Road – 4% • Realigned Manor Avenue – 5.5% • Realigned Logie Avenue – 5.5% <p>JUK also advised that due to spatial constraints it may be necessary to increase the longitudinal gradient on the realigned Manor Avenue above 5.5%.</p> <p><u>Facilities for Cyclists</u></p> <p>JUK advised that the current proposals included the following facilities for cyclists:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Off- carriageway shared footway/cycleway adjacent to the southbound carriageway of the proposed dual carriageway link road. • Toucan crossings at crossing points located on the shared footway/cycleway. • Connections to Aberdeen Cycle Forum’s on-carriageway recommended route at Clifton Road and Logie Place. • Connection to existing off-carriageway shared footway/cycleway adjacent to Auchmill Road. <p><u>Programme</u></p> <p>JUK advised that the current key programme dates were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of preferred option design and assessment - summer 2015 • Publication of Draft Orders and Environmental Statement - summer 2015 • Preparation of construction stage tender documents - summer 2017 • Land acquisition - early 2018 • Anticipated construction start - spring 2018 	
3	Design Guidelines		
	(i)	JUK advised that all cycle routes within the proposed Scheme are being designed in accordance with Transport Scotland’s Cycling by Design.	
4	Discussion / Initial Feedback		
	(i)	CTC asked if a grade separated option (for vehicular traffic) had been considered incorporating a ‘flyover’ from North Anderson Drive to Mugiemooss Road. JUK advised that grade separated options were considered during the Stage 2 sifting process and that these were generally discounted on cost, environmental impact and engineering complexity.	
	(ii)	CTC asked if grade separation had been considered as an alternative to at-grade signalised crossing points (for cyclists). CTC suggested that grade separated crossing points for cyclists may reduce the	

Meeting Notes

(Continued)

Page 3 of 3

		amount of delay experienced by cyclists crossing the roads within the Scheme. JUK advised that based on their current understanding of desire lines there was no requirement for grade separated routes for non-motorised users (NMU). ACC explained that the gradients required on approach to grade separated NMU routes may be difficult for disabled users to negotiate and the at-grade facilities were preferred where feasible.	
	(iii)	<p>ACF advised that they were generally content with the route of the proposed footway/cycleway, however, they asked if more priority could be given to cyclists at the signalised crossing point on the realigned Logie Avenue. ACF suggested that additional priority be provided by incorporating the following measures into the design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide cyclists with priority over general traffic at the signalised crossing point on the realigned Logie Avenue, i.e. a green light for cyclists at the crossing point until a car approaches. • Provision of a raised table at the crossing point on the realigned Logie Avenue. <p>JUK to consider in development of Scheme design.</p>	JUK
	(iv)	<p>CTC advised that their preference would be for on-carriageway facilities and that this would consist of a cycle lane along the entire length of the northbound and southbound carriageways of the proposed dual carriageway link road. JUK advised that the current proposals were based on the link specification guide within Cycling by Design and that given the very high traffic flows this pointed to an off-carriageway facility being most appropriate on safety grounds. ACC also advised that their preference would be for off-carriageway facilities because they are the most appropriate for new and vulnerable users.</p>	
	(v)	<p>ACC advised that the horizontal radii on the shared cycleway/footway in the vicinity of the proposed signalised crossroads appeared to be too tight and queried whether they could be increased. JUK advised they would review against Cycling by Design and also investigate positioning to the back of the verge in order to achieve a smoother alignment (subject to other constraints and location of street furniture etc.).</p>	JUK
	(vi)	<p>All parties agreed that winter maintenance of off-carriageway facilities was important from a safety perspective.</p>	
	(vii)	<p>All parties agreed that advanced cyclists could continue to use the existing road network if they did not want to use the proposed off-carriageway facility.</p>	
	(viii)	<p>CTC and AFC confirmed that they were content that the detail of the design was being designed in accordance with Cycling by Design.</p>	
5	Any Other Business		
	(i)	None	