

From: **Neil Salmond**
Date: 27 March 2014 22:35
Subject: Draft TRO/14/13/ADY George Street Experimental
To: trafficorders@edinburgh.gov.uk
Cc: spokes@spokes.org.uk

Dear Mr Young,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed George Street redesign. As an administrative point, I would first note that it was not immediately clear that I was supposed to email you with the commentary: I assumed that would be too direct and, and so spent some time looking for a feedback form on the website.

I was Edinburgh born and raised but now live in Vancouver, Canada, where I have become very much involved in this similarly sized city of ~0.5m and its street redesigns, especially cycle tracks. I work for SgurrEnergy out here, a very successful Scottish renewable energy consultancy, and my passion is in emission reductions, hence my interest in street designs that incent non-emitting transport modes.

Vancouver has built several on-street two-way cycle tracks, including one that switches side at a junction as proposed here. **I would very strongly advise against such two-way tracks**, and instead encourage Edinburgh to emulate designs found in northern Europe: Germany, Denmark etc. Specifically that cyclists travel in the direction of traffic - a separated lane on each side of the street - **in order to avoid dangerous confusion at junctions**.

As Spokes notes in their letter, the specifics of the design are not clear. Your staff (or Spokes, or other volunteers) may consider using Streetmix (streetmix.org) to better communicate the intended street cross-section.

The problem with on-street two-way paths are the confusion at junctions which, as Spokes notes, are the most dangerous parts of any street network. **This has been precisely the experience in Vancouver.**

Here are the relevant junctions

1. <https://www.google.ca/maps/place/Dunsmuir+St+%26+Hornby+St/@49.284861,-123.118326,3a,90y,96.25h,68.86t/data=!3m4!1e1!3m2!1syWs256MlvIjLiTXyISjluA!2e0!4m2!3m1!1s0x54867181f7c1b083:0xa15279b6abbcf4ac!6m1!1e1>
2. https://www.google.ca/maps/@49.279936,-123.110774,3a,75y,144.15h,71.99t/data=!3m4!1e1!3m2!1s4BeuBK_-S2HDQEJPyz-3TA!2e0
3. <http://www.flickr.com/photos/pwkrueger/9102830589/>

Far better is to have the two directions on two sides of the street. This allows the use of the protected dutch islands design, or at the very least copenhagen-style paint, on the junction.

It is not at all clear what the proposed junction design is for this project, which is odd as this is the key safety point.

As Spokes also notes, it is understood the designers of this street segment are under pressure from various other city departments, so that the design may inevitably be a compromise that pleases few. This would be a real shame. I would almost suggest generally slowing the whole street, with pedestrian-textured surface and narrowing, before separating a two-way cycle path.

I would second Spokes' concern that the project's designers are conceiving of a flow-first through-route, east to west, as opposed to a place-first, section of a broader network, which will be dipped into and and out of by people headed to many different destinations.

I would also add that it will help public acceptance hugely the more any cycle facility is framed as a pavement-extension, not a car-space detraction. Design is especially important in this, i.e. adding a kerb to the bikelane and raising it to half-height or pavement height.

I also second Spokes' concern about armadillos, noting the same negative reports in London.

Thanks for the consultation, and best of luck in the trial redesign.

Neil

Reference: Spokes' Letter <http://www.spokes.org.uk/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/1403-Spokes-George-St-TRO1.pdf>