

## Paths Consultation

Strategic Leadership, Planning and Infrastructure, 8th Floor St. Nicholas House,  
Broad Street, Aberdeen, AB10 1BW  
Phone: 01224 522756 Fax: 01224 636181 Email: paths@aberdeencity.gov.uk



## Results of Kingswells to Bucksburn Link Questionnaires

Thank you very much indeed to all those who took the time to fill out the questionnaires. The results for each question are available below. The results highlighted in red are the most popular answers that were picked.

### Q1 - Are walk/ cycle routes between Kingswells and Bucksburn sufficient?

|   | Option 1 | Option 2 | Unchosen | Total |
|---|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| People that thought that facilities were sufficient | 2        | 3        | 0        | 5     |
| People that thought that more needed to be done     | 27       | 46       | 3        | 76    |

**Summary** - 94% believed that facilities were not sufficient

### Q2 - Would an improved cycle/ walking route be a welcome addition?

|   | Option 1 | Option 2 | Unchosen | Total |
|---|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| People that did not think that upgrading would be of value                        | 1        | 2        | 1        | 4     |
| People that did not comment   | 1        | 0        | 0        | 1     |
| People that thought that upgraded facilities would be of benefit to the community | 27       | 47       | 2        | 76    |

**Summary** - 94% would welcome improved facilities

### Q3 -What would you use the route for?

|                        | Option 1 | Option 2 | Unchosen | Total |
|------------------------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| Walk to work           | 4        | 4        | 0        | 8     |
| Cycle to work          | 12       | 23       | 0        | 35    |
| Walk to school         | 3        | 10       | 1        | 14    |
| Cycle to school        | 3        | 11       | 1        | 15    |
| Walk for recreation    | 15       | 27       | 0        | 42    |
| Cycle for recreation   | 17       | 31       | 2        | 50    |
| Wouldn't use the route | 1        | 1        | 1        | 3     |

**Summary** - The most popular use was cycling for recreation, followed by walking for recreation, followed by cycling to work. This pattern appeared for both route options, with Option 2 being more popular than Option 1 in all but the walking to work option. For walking and cycling to school more than 3 times the number of people picked Option 2 over Option 1.

### Q4 - How important is the directness of the route?

|                      | Option 1 | Option 2 | Unchosen | Total |
|----------------------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| Very important       | 7        | 16       | 2        | 25    |
| Important            | 6        | 21       | 0        | 27    |
| Slightly important   | 10       | 8        | 1        | 19    |
| Not important at all | 5        | 4        | 0        | 9     |
| No response          | 1        | 0        | 0        | 1     |

**Summary** - Directness was seen mainly to be slightly important by Option 1 respondents, with very important the next choice. For those who preferred Option 2 it was important followed by very important. Overall, directness was seen as important or very important for 64% of the respondents.

**Q5 - How important is the steepness of the route?**

|                      | Option 1 | Option 2 | Unchosen | Total |
|----------------------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| Very important       | 4        | 11       | 0        | 15    |
| Important            | 5        | 16       | 1        | 22    |
| Slightly important   | 9        | 11       | 1        | 21    |
| Not important at all | 10       | 10       | 1        | 21    |
| No response          | 1        | 1        | 0        | 2     |

**Summary** - Steepness was mainly seen as less important to those who preferred Option 1. The majority of respondents who preferred Option 2 felt that steepness was important.

**Q6 - What should the surface be?**

|                         | Option 1 | Option 2 | Unchosen | Total |
|-------------------------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| Tarmac                  | 19       | 32       | 1        | 52    |
| Compacted grit          | 9        | 15       | 1        | 25    |
| Other response - Either | 0        | 1        | 1        | 2     |
| No response             | 1        | 1        | 0        | 2     |

**Summary** - Tarmac was the most popular surface for both routes.

**Q7 - Should the route be lit?**

|  | Option 1 | Option 2 | Unchosen | Total |
|--|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| Yes  | 8        | 12       | 2        | 22    |
| Yes but only part time (early morning and evening) | 19       | 34       | 0        | 53    |
| No   | 1        | 2        | 1        | 4     |
| No response  | 1        | 1        | 0        | 2     |

**Summary** - Only 5% of respondents overall did not want to see the route lit. Part time lighting was the most popular choice for both routes over standard lighting, with the percentage split even larger for Option 2. Overall 65% of respondents felt that the route should be lit part time.

**Q8 - if the route was to be lit, which would you prefer?**

|   | Option 1 | Option 2 | Unchosen | Total |
|---|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| Standard lamp posts                       | 12       | 18       | 1        | 31    |
| Low level lighting                        | 13       | 25       | 0        | 38    |
| Other - either                            | 2        | 2        | 1        | 5     |
| Other - both                              | 0        | 1        | 0        | 1     |
| Other -none                               | 1        | 1        | 1        | 3     |
| Other - unsure, worried about energy cost | 0        | 1        | 0        | 1     |
| No response                               | 1        | 1        | 0        | 2     |

**Summary** - Low level lighting was the most popular type, especially with those who preferred Option 2.

**Q9 - Which route option do you prefer?**

|             | Option 1 | Option 2 | Unchosen | Total |
|-------------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| Option 1    | 29       | 0        | 0        | 29    |
| Option 2    | 0        | 49       | 0        | 49    |
| No response | 0        | 0        | 2        | 2     |
| Neither     | 0        | 0        | 1        | 1     |

**Summary** - Overall, 60% preferred Option 2 and 36% chose Option 1.

**Q10 - Reasons for choosing Option 1**

|  | <b>Out of 29</b> |
|--|------------------|
| Close to road for safety                                       | 17               |
| Suits pupils travelling to school                              | 8                |
| Better connections to Newhills                                 | 4                |
| Keeps cyclists and walkers apart                               | 4                |
| Small amount of work to upgrade existing bits                  | 4                |
| Uses existing infrastructure                                   | 3                |
| Work links to Dyce are better                                  | 3                |
| Caters to larger audience                                      | 3                |
| Suits commuters  | 2                |
| Already has lighting   | 2                |
| More accessible  | 1                |
| No real preference   | 1                |
| More walker friendly   | 1                |
| People stuck in jams can see what they are missing more easily | 1                |
| Would use for recreation                                       | 1                |
| Less expensive   | 1                |
| Less gradient  | 1                |
| More direct  | 1                |
| Easier access to build path                                    | 1                |

**Summary** - The most common reasons people gave for choosing Option 1 were its proximity to the road for safety/visibility and its likelihood to suit pupils travelling to school.

**Reasons for choosing Option 2**

|  | <b>out of 49</b> |
|--|------------------|
| Least gradient                                 | 18               |
| More direct                                    | 17               |
| Away from busy roads                           | 17               |
| Shorter  | 14               |
| More pleasant                                  | 14               |
| Good for recreation                            | 7                |
| Less traffic noise                             | 7                |
| Less fumes                                     | 5                |
| Uses mainly existing paths                     | 4                |
| More central to population centres             | 4                |
| Easier access                                  | 4                |
| Situation of path will encourage use           | 4                |
| School pupils would use it                     | 3                |
| Better protected from weather                  | 3                |
| Better for commuting                           | 3                |
| Safer  | 3                |
| Either would be a massive improvement          | 2                |
| Compliments Bucksburn Valley Paths             | 1                |
| Shorter time to construct                      | 1                |
| Good linkage for pedestrians                   | 1                |
| Less disruption to traffic during construction | 1                |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Less farm access crossings  | 1 |
| Gives message that cycle/ walking routes do not have to follow road | 1 |
| Neither   | 1 |

**Summary** - The main reasons for picking Option 2 were the lesser gradients, directness and distance from busy roads.

**Interestingly**, 17 people voted for Option 1 because it was close to a busy road, while 17 people voted for Option 2 because it was away from one. More people who preferred Option 1 commented that it would suit pupils travelling to school, than those who selected Option 2, although back at Q3, more of the people who said they would use the route to travel to and from school preferred Option 2. Some people also said they would see either route as an improvement.

**Q11 - Reasons against picking Option 1**  
(Comments by those who preferred Option 2)

|  | out of 49 |
|--|-----------|
| Too close to road                              | 11        |
| Too long/ indirect                             | 10        |
| Too steep                                      | 8         |
| Traffic fumes                                  | 6         |
| Noise  | 5         |
| No major concerns                              | 4         |
| Safety   | 3         |
| Proximity to busy traffic                      | 3         |
| Too far from population centre                 | 3         |
| Crosses farm access                            | 2         |
| Unlikely to be used                            | 2         |
| Will discourage school pupils                  | 2         |
| Not as visually attractive                     | 2         |
| Security                                       | 1         |
| No incentive to use over existing road         | 1         |
| Either would be an improvement                 | 1         |
| Wrong side of river                            | 1         |
| Construction has environmental impact          | 1         |
| Little protection from elements                | 1         |
| Would discourage cyclists                      | 1         |
| Does not open up to nature                     | 1         |
| Dazzled by lights from cars at night           | 1         |
| Junctions to negotiate                         | 1         |
| Access from Kingswells Bypass                  | 1         |
| Discourages recreation                         | 1         |
| Puts cyclists on to busy road at Bucksburn end | 1         |
| Not dog friendly                               | 1         |

**Summary** - Option 2 voters were mainly put off choosing option 1 due to its proximity to the road (22%), its length (20%) and its gradient (16%).

**Reasons against picking Option 2**

(Comments by those who preferred Option 1)

|   | <b>out of 29</b> |
|---|------------------|
| Too out of the way/ isolated              | 12               |
| Conflict between cyclists and walkers     | 4                |
| Goes directly through farmers fields      | 3                |
| Not environmentally friendly route        | 3                |
| Some steep sections                       | 3                |
| Not as safe                               | 3                |
| Darkness will be a hazard due to location | 2                |
| Good only for a leisure route             | 2                |
| No objections                             | 2                |
| Would take too long to build              | 1                |
| Would cost too much to build              | 1                |
| Marshy                                    | 1                |
| Would need to light whole route           | 1                |
| Not as direct for commuting to work       | 1                |
| Inconvenient position                     | 1                |
| Would use either                          | 1                |
| Good option for summer months             | 1                |

**Summary** -The most popular concern about Option 2 by those who preferred Option 1 was that it was too out of the way/ isolated (41%). Various other comments were made in much lower numbers, with the next most common concern being conflict between walkers and cyclists, which was raised by four respondents.

More people felt that Option 2 was too out of the way, than felt that Option 1 was too close to the road, although there was only one vote in it. Again, in both cases, there were people who had no objections to the other route and said they would use either.

**Q12/13/14 - Where were respondents from?**

|                            | <b>Option 1</b> | <b>Option 2</b> | <b>Unchosen</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Kingswells                 | 15              | 30              | 1               | <b>46</b>    |
| Bucksburn                  | 5               | 5               | 1               | <b>11</b>    |
| Westhill                   | 3               | 2               | 0               | <b>5</b>     |
| Aberdeen City central area | 1               | 2               | 0               | <b>3</b>     |
| Bridge of Don              | 0               | 2               | 0               | <b>2</b>     |
| Milltimber                 | 0               | 2               | 0               | <b>2</b>     |
| Newhills                   | 1               | 0               | 0               | <b>1</b>     |
| Dyce                       | 1               | 0               | 0               | <b>1</b>     |
| Banchory                   | 0               | 1               | 0               | <b>1</b>     |
| Newmachar                  | 1               | 0               | 0               | <b>1</b>     |
| Northfield                 | 1               | 0               | 0               | <b>1</b>     |
| Peterculter                | 0               | 1               | 0               | <b>1</b>     |
| Auchindoun                 | 0               | 1               | 0               | <b>1</b>     |
| No response                | 0               | 2               | 1               | <b>3</b>     |

**Summary** – The majority of respondents were from Kingswells. 65% of the Kingswells respondents preferred Option 2, compared with 33% for Option 1.

**Q15 - Which age bracket did respondents fall into?**

|             | Option 1 | Option 2 | Unchosen | Total |
|-------------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| 11 to 18    | 0        | 0        | 1        | 1     |
| 18 to 30    | 4        | 6        | 0        | 10    |
| 30 to 50    | 19       | 37       | 1        | 57    |
| 50 plus     | 6        | 6        | 0        | 12    |
| No response | 0        | 0        | 1        | 1     |

**Summary** - The largest number of respondents came from the 30-50 age group, making up 70% of the total. Many claimed to be answering from a family perspective though.

**Where were questionnaires received from ?**

|                                    | Option 1 | Option 2 | Unchosen | Total |
|------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| Webmaster (online questionnaire)   | 19       | 34       | 1        | 54    |
| Kingswells Community Centre        | 5        | 11       | 2        | 18    |
| Beacon Community Centre, Bucksburn | 5        | 4        | 0        | 9     |

**Summary** - Most questionnaires (67%) were received through the Council website, then Kingswells Community Centre, then the Beacon Community Centre at Bucksburn.

**Additional comments supplied:**

By those who preferred Option 1:

The presentation of the case seems to be against option 1. It may have been better to present some of the arguments for and against each of the routes. If route 2 did not cut up the countryside so much then the route would be longer and may be less desirable.

The presentation of the case seems to be against option 1. It may have been better to present some of the arguments for and against each of the routes. If route 2 did not cut up the countryside so much then the route would be longer and may be less desirable.

The presentation of the case seems to be against option 1. It may have been better to present some of the arguments for and against each of the routes. If route 2 did not cut up the countryside so much then the route would be longer and may be less desirable.

The presentation of the case seems to be against option 1. It may have been better to present some of the arguments for and against each of the routes. If route 2 did not cut up the countryside so much then the route would be longer and may be less desirable.

Don't use option 2 because it's a cheaper option, as in the long term it's a false economy. It doesn't serve the purpose of a practical and useful route for workers and pupils

Well done for getting on with this route - option 1

ACC has a drive to encourage use of public transport and reduce the use of the car. Many people from Kingswells and Westhill and the surrounding area do not cycle to work places because there is no safe cycle route. Going cross-country on the existing paths is not an option.

It would be good if this route could link to the Westhill Cycle Path at one end and to the Stoneywood Cycle Path at the other end. Certainly it should link directly and safely (or it will not be used!) to the new academy. Dyce transport groups should be involved as Kingswells to Dyce for workers would be possible.

I believe that the route would complete the gap in a safe cycling route between Westhill/Kingswells and Bucksburn/Dyce.

The existing link between Newhills Church and Bucksburn is completely unsuitable for pedestrians. The narrow path adjacent to a narrow and busy road is a combination which makes pedestrians feel very exposed, as well as being dangerous. A new pedestrian and cycle route which takes in Newhills Church is essential for the local community.

As a frequent cyclist for both work and pleasure I am please to see increased cycle provision as the Aberdeen has very poor provisions at present. The provisions need to be end to end and meet the needs to people and not bottleneck as with the majority of systems across Aberdeen. This will ensure a safe system for users and minimise drivers frustration of cyclists on roads

This should form part of a wider network of improved alternative forms of transport. The current level of cycling networks in and around Aberdeen are pretty non existent and this would certainly form as a 2 fold exercise to help people get out of their cars and remain fitter. However this can only be encouraged by businesses improving facilities for people wanting to use this form of transport e.g. showering facilities, lockers, cycle stands

This is a great initiative for the local community and will encourage a lot of people onto their bikes and off the congested roads. The sooner this is done the better. If I can be of any support please get in touch.

This would be a great boost. I know of several people who live in Westhill and Kingswells that would use this route.

It's very encouraging to hear that this link is being investigated further.

This consultation is deeply flawed as it does not give the public all the facts or even truthful information. For example I cannot submit email response without voting for some sort of surfacing choice in Q6. I do not want a countryside path therefore I do not want to have to choose a surface.

Please make the path safe from traffic if it follows the main road.

Route 1 will provide more people with a safer route towards the church as well as to Kingswells. As it runs along the road it will be much easier to fit in lighting, drainage and access points. Will take cyclists and pedestrians off a very busy route and make it more pleasant.

Route 1 could be of benefit to all cyclists, walkers, disabled people with mobility vehicles etc as it follows the main road and people will be able to access the church, nursing home and grave yards etc.

My 3 girls will be attending the new Bucksburn Academy from Kingswells and I would like them to have a safe and healthy way to get to school.

Option 1 looks most attractive but its entrance location NEEDS to be re-located, suggestion Webster Park. It will also impact on all houses with back gardens in Derbeth Grange looking towards Bucksburn. Option 2 is a very isolated route and in my opinion unsafe for school children to use. I would not use it on my own either.

By those who preferred Option 2:

I welcome this consultation and these proposals from the council. Improved cycling links are badly needed fit with the wider core paths proposal and national transport strategies.

There should be a wider review of the footpath network in Kingswells and in particularly the connectivity of that network. There are already footpaths, which do not join up, or where they do there is gaps in the provision of streetlighting.

I think this would be a good step in addressing the dire congestion problems in Aberdeen and making it a safer place for cyclists. We need more schemes like this around town!!

I think this is an excellent idea; but it would not be wise to make it next to the current road.

A clear straight off road route totally segregated from traffic gives a clear message ACC is committed to providing fit for purpose commuter and recreational cycle routes

I very strongly feel that this proposed off road path is urgently needed as soon as possible.

I believe that this is a very important development which I hope will go ahead in the very near future.

A great idea but please do not ruin it by lighting it & tarmacing it. Its such a great area

Great idea ...get on with it.

A cycle path over from Cults to Kingwells would also be good.

If a safe & suitable walkway is introduced will school transport be withdrawn because if so I feel this would have a detrimental impact on Bucksburn Academy roll.

This will be a massive improvement and join both communities. It is absolutely vital that it gets completed as soon as possible.

Cycling is on the increase and ticks every box in terms of a healthy population, reduced cost and reduced traffic congestion. At BP we benefit hugely from having a critical mass of cyclists who bike to work. Anything that can be done to boost that volume for the city in general must be a good thing.

This path would be an excellent addition to sustainable travel round Aberdeen.

Paths like this will in the long-term help meet climate change commitments as well as benefit the health of the nation. We need more initiatives of this kind.

I couldn't find a way of removing any response which I would have liked to do for Question 7 I wanted no response to any of the 3 options-see my comment

The current pathway has made a big difference to me, often persuading me out of the car in the summer months for journeys to work. A properly surfaced and lighted route would more than halve my current car journeys to work.

This submission made on behalf of Dyce Transportation Management Organisation to encourage park and cycle by car commuters from Kingswells P&R to Stoneywood, Dyce and Pitmedden employment areas

In this day and age with a focus on "green" issues and health education a cycle path to school is not much to ask.

It would be nice to commute on a traffic free road

I would encourage my children to use the path during good weather. However I will resort to the car at other times and I believe most people will be the same. In which case neither route may turn out to be cost-effective. (Apologies for being lazy!)

Very good idea. Done properly could be very useful and great for recreation. Went to Bankhead so used the route to reach friends and come home from school. Unsatisfactory before and needs this work done on it.

I feel more people would go out for a walk or cycle on route 2 rather than 1 because it would be more relaxing instead of cars zooming past you every 2 minutes. It would also be safer for kids and dogs so the whole family could use it.

By those who selected neither route option:

A bus route would be nice too. I can't drive yet.

At last, somebody is building the route