

QUALITY BIKE CORRIDOR – KEY POINTS FROM DISCUSSION WITH ANDREW EASSON AND CHRIS BRACE OF EDINBURGH COUNCIL: 28 APRIL

Timescale for Implementation of QBC

It seems unlikely that the QBC will be implemented and operating on the ground before spring 2012 – possibly later depending on weather and the extent and nature of any objections.

This is the best current estimate of the process:

- Completion of informal discussions on revised proposals – May 2011
- Formal consultation on TROs – 2 weeks for adverts, 4 weeks for objections – mid July (NB separate procedures required changes to bus lanes, banned turns, controls over parking and waiting from those relating to shared surfaces; objections on latter require to go to a inquiry reporter)
- Discussions with persons making formal objections/ preparation of report to Committee – early autumn
- Report to Council with recommendations – November 2011
- Implementation on ground 3 to 4 months (may be delayed by bad weather)

Response to SPOKES Response to Consultation - Submitted December 2010

| SPOKES POINTS | COUNCIL RESPONSE | COMMENTS from RG |
|---|---|--|
| All advisory cycle lanes should be provided with red surfacing throughout the entirety of route | Council have limited red surfacing to specified areas – lanes within bus stops, at side-road junctions, lanes leading into advanced stop areas, lanes on outside of parking bays. | This is very unsatisfactory, particularly since many of the existing red surfaced lanes along the route are in very poor condition. Opposition to the use of red surfacing comes from the Planning Department (visual amenity) and SfC who dislike the maintenance implications. It is not clear whether the QBC budget would stretch to red surfaces throughout. I was told that there is continuing discussion on this in the Council. |
| There should be a cycle or bus lane throughout the entirety of the route | No change from earlier plans – no cycle lane is provided on the southbound side of road from West Preston St to West Mayfield. | The Council view is that parking is required for local businesses and that there is insufficient space for parking and cycle lanes on both sides of the road. |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | | <p>I would agree that a northbound cycle way is the priority if there has to be a choice. A cycle lane on the southbound stretch between Duncan St and West Mayfield could easily be added, however, as there is only 1 parking bay, most businesses .e.g. Earthy, have their own parking, the bay is not available for resident parking and there is parking on the opposite side of the road.</p> |
| <p>The route should be included in the 20 mph proposals</p> | <p>The Council are proposing a 20 mph from West Preston St to West Mayfield</p> | <p>I think that this should be welcomed as a first start. It is within the proposed 20 mph zone and creates a clear precedent that 20 mph controls should be applied to QBCs if the zones are extended.</p> |
| <p>Care should be taken in the design of cycle lanes planned for the outside of parking bays.</p> | <p>Cycle lanes used in this situation will be 2 m wide i.e the 1.5m normally used plus an extra 0.5m (this is minimum standard in Cycling by Design)</p> | <p>This type of cycle lane is potentially more dangerous but is much better than nothing at all. The proposed spec is as good as could be expected in the space available</p> |
| <p>Access to Kings Buildings – provision for access at the main entrance</p> | <p>The Council are now proposing to ban right turns into West Mains Rd and create an expanded shared pedestrian/cyclist space with toucan crossings in both directions</p> | <p>In my view this is an excellent proposal to rectify a serious problem in the original design.</p> <p>My only concern is that the Council have not yet discussed the detail of this proposal with the University and it would be a shame if there were objections from this body which might delay or undermine the proposal.</p> |
| <p>Access to KB to the south of the main junction</p> | <p>No change to earlier proposals</p> | <p>Our response asked for a clearly marked cycle lane for right turning cyclists, but I do not think this is essential given the proposals for the main entrance.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| Access to KB – absence of an advanced stop area for the left, west/northbound lane at the W. Mains Rd traffic lights | No change | Council officials are concerned that a full width advanced stop area would encourage cyclists to use the left lane filter and then switch to the right hand lane in the stop area which could be dangerous. In fact, this is exactly what the current arrangement encourages. There may be no satisfactory provision for cyclists here without banning left hand turns by motor traffic which officials consider would lead to congestion. |
| Duncan St junction – install protective bollards | Accepted | A very welcome improvement. |
| Melville Drive/ Summerhall Cres/HP Cresc junction – double yellow line needed to protect access to N Meadows cycle path | Accepted | I argued for extending the double yellow line to prevent parking on the northbound approach to the turn. Council officials will consider this although it is illegal to park on the single yellow during controlled hours but this is poorly enforced at present. |
| Melville Drive/ Summerhall Cres/HP Cresc junction – protective bollards and redesign of road markings at Gifford Park entrance to facilitate use of Sustrans NR1 | Not accepted but this will be reviewed as part of a wider look at NRI in the area. Sight lines restrict options for changing road markings. | Our proposals were limited. A safer crossing point is needed here together with a bike crossing over the Newington Rd |
| Melville Drive/ Summerhall Cres/HP Cresc junction - straighten southbound cycle lane to West Preston St advance stop lane | Agreed | This and the original proposal to improve the alignment of the northbound lane are both very welcome. |
| Melville Drive – proposed bus lane should operate throughout the day | Not accepted. As the bus lane will replace the existing cycle lane, this will mean that there is no provision for cyclists outside of the peak periods. | This is not part of the QBC but an add -on to improve the bus service. My view is that a bus lane (even if not actually in force) does provide a degree of protection for cyclists at least equivalent to the white lane only cycle lane that exists at present |
| Potterrow – need for | Accepted in part. Revised | Better than nothing, but |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| protection for cyclists on the western side travelling north – best achieved via a new route through Marshall St and Charlesfield. | plans have a cycle lane on the western side/ northbound lane of Potterow | disappointing that Council officials have not discussed our alternative proposal with the University. It seems to have been put in the “too difficult” box. |
| Teviot PI/Forrest Rd/ Bristo PI gyratory – radical redesign | Not accepted | Definitely seen as too difficult for the QBC |
| Teviot PI/Forrest Rd/ Bristo PI gyratory – extend cycle lane in Bristo Place back to the pedestrian crossing | Accepted in part with cycle lane taken further back than originally proposed. | Council officials argue that it would be unsafe to take the lane back to the crossing as cyclists might get caught by traffic turning from Forrest Rd. Since this is a light controlled junction, I have difficulty with this argument. The current proposal is better than the provision at present but is still challenging for cyclists turning right |
| Teviot PI/Forrest Rd/ Bristo PI gyratory – improved access to MMW cycle path required. | Accepted | A very welcome improvement. |
| Cycle lane in front of Missoni Hotel – need for redesign | Accepted – propose to improve cycle lane by cutting corner off pavement and straightening the lane | It is not clear how much improvement this will make in practice. Council clearly unwilling to move to one lane for motor traffic and install a 2m cycle lane (our alternative proposal). Success of improvement will need to be monitored carefully. |
| Foot of Princes St – reintroduce left hand turn for cyclists. | Agreed in principle but implementation tied up with trams project. | |

Other Changes/Comments

- In response to a suggestion by a cyclist in KB, the Council are proposing to install bollards to facilitate a right hand turn into Lussielaw Rd which would then link into a toucan crossing already in existence crossing West Mains Rd. I was not aware of this toucan crossing, but it looks like an excellent suggestion which SPOKES should welcome.
- Crossing Princes St safely at the foot of the Mound. I was told that options are being considered and that SPOKES is represented in the discussions.
- I was told that the Council are considering making improvements to the Argyll place access to the MM cycle path and painting a white line to demarcate a cycling on the shared path between Argyll Place and Marchmont Rd.

Overall Assessment of Revised Proposals

High Points

- New, proposed access at main entrance to KB
- New protective bollards at Duncan St
- New protective bollards at Lussielaw Rd (though not suggested by SPOKES we should welcome this)
- New 20 mph zone from W Preston St to W. Mayfield
- Improved access to MMW at Forrest Rd
- New cycle lane on west side of Potterrow
- Improvements to detailed design of cycle lanes at West Preston St, outside Missoni Hotel and Bristo Pl.

Low Points

- Failure to commit to red surfacing for all cycle lanes
- No real consideration of ambitious proposals for Teviot Row/Forrest Road/ Bristo Place gyratory or alternative route to Potterrow
- Gap in provision of cycle lanes