

Date 19/08/16
Dave du Feu
SPOKES
Edinburgh.

Dear Mr du Feu,

City Centre West to East Cycle Link and Street Improvements

As you are aware The City of Edinburgh Council has developed proposal for the City Centre West to East Cycle Link and Street Improvements scheme.

As part of the process of developing the scheme the Council, with the assistance of Atkins Ltd has undertaken extensive consultation with stakeholders, local businesses and members of the public. I thank you for your participation in this process and your contribution to the scheme development is appreciated.

In total, we received nearly 2800 responses to the consultation from six sources, namely:

- Online Questionnaire;
- Leaflets;
- Public Exhibitions;
- E-mail;
- Facebook; and
- Stakeholder Responses

All responses received have been captured in a consultation report which can be found under the 'Results' heading at <https://consultationhub.edinburgh.gov.uk/sfc/roseburntoleith>. This report provides a general overview of the responses received. All these responses have been considered and a number of changes have been made to the proposed scheme as result.

I will now take the opportunity on the following pages to respond in more detail to the points that you raised in your letter dated 3 December 2015 and subsequent letter dated 7 July 2016. We hope that the below covers all issues raised in the correspondence.

I would again like to take this opportunity to thank you for your response to the consultation and assistance with this project.

Yours sincerely,
Adrian O'Neill

Adrian O' Neill
Professional Officer
Active Travel & Road Safety

Adrian O' Neill, Professional Officer, Road Safety and Active Travel, Place,
Planning and Transport, C2, Waverley Court, 4 East Market Street, Edinburgh EH8 8BG
Tel 0131 469 3191 Fax 0131 529 6200, cyclingprojects.consultation@edinburgh.gov.uk

SPOKES

1. General

SPOKES compliments the council on their ambition in producing these proposals, which we warmly welcome. The number of queries simply reflects the importance which SPOKES attaches to making sure that we get this scheme right.

1.1 What are the council's assumptions on the number of cyclists likely to use this scheme and the age and cycling ability of the users?

1.2 One-way, segregated/protected cycle lanes are, in general, preferable to two combined lanes on one side of the road, as they go with the flow of the traffic and facilitate access and exit. These avoid the problem of motorists moving out from a side road having to look for cyclists in both directions and perhaps failing to do so. They also avoid possible problems with dazzle from car headlights for cyclists travelling against the flow of traffic and, indeed, possible problems of dazzle for cars from bike lights. We understand that the two-lane option may be necessary where tram lines are also present, but there may be opportunities for changing the double lanes into single lanes where this constraint is not present.

1.3 The junctions of the proposed cycle lane with side roads and other necessary crossings are clearly central to the success of the scheme as a whole. The plans make extensive use of "Copenhagen style junctions". As this term is not generally understood, even by cyclists, it would be helpful to clarify what precisely the council has in mind for these junctions and what measures will be used at other junctions to prevent motor traffic from crossing the cycle lane in a dangerous manner.

1.4 The phasing of lights at junctions needs to ensure that cyclists can make all the necessary turns along the route without interference from traffic. However, we are not sure if this is possible in all cases and would welcome clarification of their proposed operation.

1.5 Cyclists will want to get on and off the route at intermediate points. It is not always clear from the plans how the design of the junctions allows for this or whether the optimum solution has been identified.

1.6 The route links with many roads which are used by many cyclists, for example, Dalry Road, the North Bridge, Leith Street and Leith Walk, Waterloo Place. It is not clear in all cases how this will work in a satisfactory way.

1.7 We note the extensive use of "tramline" paving. If it is a statutory necessity, we would like to discuss how various practical problems with it can be mitigated. Some cyclists find it unsettling and there have been reports of it causing slipping accidents. There are also related concerns about so called "dropped kerbs".

1.8 What are the design widths for the cycle lanes?

1.9 Are there any future maintenance issues (such as leaf clearing and winter gritting) that should be considered in the design process?

1.10 We would like to better understand how the cycle

1.1 The whole concept of the route is to provide pedestrians and cyclists of all abilities with a higher quality, safer route to encourage the adoption of active travel. A cycle demand model developed for this project estimates an increase in one-way commuter cycle trips of 85%.

1.2 The idea of 2 x 1 way protected track was explored earlier in the project. These take more space, both in terms of track width and require two protection strips, given the overall road width available this was assessed as having too large an impact on general traffic, particularly buses.

1.3 We take on board your comments regarding educating society on new proposals, and it is intended that there will be a programme of cyclists / pedestrian / driver education and information associated with the new route. We intend to have stop lines prior to the cycle track and line of tactile paving to clearly outline pedestrians and cyclists have priority at side road junctions. Additionally the level of the carriageway will be raised to the level of the footway/cycle track. These 'raised table' also act as a traffic calming measure. Your comments have been noted and will be considered as the detailed design phase is progressed.

1.4 As we are at preliminary design stage, the detailed phasing of the lights at junctions has not yet been confirmed. Your comments have been noted and will be considered as the detailed design phase progresses.

1.5 As we are at preliminary design stage, the detailed design of the junctions has not yet been confirmed; however, your comments have been noted and will be taken into account as the detailed design phase is progressed.

1.6 There are a number of separate studies underway and proposed which are looking into linking the route with other roads/routes. Your comments have been noted and will be considered as the detailed design phase is progressed.

1.7 Yes, a further discussion re the paving specification and dropped kerbs would be useful during the next stage of the project. Your comments have been noted and will be considered as the detailed design phase is progressed.

1.8 It is generally 2.5m for the two-way sections of the route; however this varies slightly in certain areas due to competing needs and available widths.

1.9 A maintenance plan will be implemented, similar to other routes throughout the city.

1.10 Pedestrian will have designated crossing points to the floating bus stops. These will take the form of 'zebra' type crossings outlining priority to pedestrians at this point. The level of the cycle track will be raised to the level of the footway, which will also act as a measure to reduce cyclist speed at these points. Contrasting material will be used at

<p>lanes will interact with bus stops.</p> <p>1.11 Is there a related plan for improvements to cycle parking along the route?</p>	<p>these crossing points.</p> <p>1.11 Cycle parking along the route will be reviewed during the detailed design stage. There is a separate project underway at the moment reviewing cycle parking city wide.</p>
<p>2. Roseburn Terrace</p> <p>2.1 We anticipate that cyclists arriving at Roseburn Terrace from the Corstorphine Road and travelling eastwards will want to access the two-way protected cycle lane directly, rather than via the planned deviation starting at Murrayfield Gardens and cutting across Murrayfield Avenue, Coltbridge Avenue and the small bridge over the Water of Leith. Will this be possible and if so where exactly?</p> <p>2.2 Could you clarify the precise purpose of this deviation - although we agree that the start of the route should be designed to allow for easy access to the roads mentioned above and the access to the Water of Leith path.</p> <p>2.3 Cyclists travelling westwards towards Corstorphine Road, or intending to travel south-westwards through Roseburn Park and associated paths, will need to use the planned toucan crossing facilities linking into Roseburn Gardens and the southern side of Roseburn Terrace. We think that the crossing may need to be slightly diagonal to avoid cyclists having to move into the “wrong” lane in Roseburn Gardens, with possible conflict with cars.</p> <p>2.4 There is also a “no right turn” sign shown on the plan for the exit from Roseburn Gardens into Roseburn Terrace. Is this just for cars, as a “no right turn” for cyclists would prevent them from joining the cycle lane?</p> <p>2.5 How is it intended that cyclists access Roseburn Street from the new route? Is there scope for a toucan crossing here linked to the proposed pedestrian crossing?</p> <p>2.6 There might be a danger than the road closure on Roseburn Place could encourage 3-point turns in Roseburn Crescent. It might be possible to avoid the need for a road blockage by making Roseburn Gardens 1 way southwards (except for cycles) with no access from the A8 eastbound.</p>	<p>2.1 This section of the cycle route has been dropped from the designs. Depending on which option (A or B) to be taken forward following the Committee meeting, this will be reviewed at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>2.2 As 2.1 above, this section of the track is no longer included in the revised design</p> <p>2.3 Your comment has been noted and will be reviewed in the detail design of the junction layout.</p> <p>2.4 Within the proposed designs, this sign relates to vehicles. Within Option A, cyclist would need to cross the Toucan crossing before joining the cycle track. This is an existing sign and there are currently no proposed alterations to existing traffic restrictions at this location.</p> <p>2.5 A further review of this junction will be looked at depending on the option taken forward for the Roseburn area. Within Option A, currently the only dedicated toucan crossing is on Roseburn Terrace, adjacent to Roseburn Gardens, however, this can be reviewed at detailed design stage. Within Option B, the route travels on Roseburn Street anyway with a dedicated toucan crossing west of Wester Coates Terrace. Your comment is noted and will be considered at detail design stage.</p> <p>2.6 This has been considered, however if Roseburn Gardens is made one-way south bound with no access from the A8, this will create an access issue, particularly for residents on Roseburn Gardens. Your point is noted and we will review this again at detailed design stage to investigate a possible solution to prevent three-point turning in Roseburn Crescent.</p>
<p>3. West Coates</p> <p>3.1 At Wester Coates Terrace would it be possible to smooth out the angle of the west-side of the “offset” linked to the Copenhagen style junction to improve sight lines for cyclists? There is plenty of space.</p> <p>3.2 At Wester Coates Road, would it be possible to consider closing this road at the junction with Wester Coates as this junction will be the main access route to the busy Roseburn Path?</p> <p>3.3 There is a Copenhagen style junction proposed for Balbirnie Place and a gap to allow cyclists to get access to or exit from the protected cycle lane. A similar design solution has been adopted for the junction with Stanhope St. However, in both cases, there is no protection for cyclists having to cross the main road. At Stanhope Street the clear straight-across route is partially obstructed by parking opposite. Is there a case for a controlled crossing at, at least, one of these junctions?</p>	<p>3.1 Smoothing out the angle as you suggest may eat into the footway space and leave more dead space on the opposite side, but there does seem to be scope for movement here.. However, the change in direction also has a speed calming effect on cyclists approaching the junction. Your comment has been noted and will be reviewed in the detailed design of the junctions.</p> <p>3.2 Closing off this access would result in only one access /egress for vehicles into the whole of Wester Coates Terrace, Avenue, Road, Place and Gardens.</p> <p>3.3 There is a controlled crossing located between these two streets. Due to the reduction in carriageway width it is no longer required to be a staggered crossing and increased red times will likely result in increased gaps in the traffic flows Also, as these are entrances/exits for motor vehicles travelling in both directions, it is unsuitable to put formal/informal crossing points at these locations. A number of informal crossing points with refuge</p>

	<p>islands have been included in the revised proposals and there is no parking partially obstructing the crossing at Stanhope Street.</p>
<p>4. Haymarket Terrace</p> <p>4.1 Both Coates Gardens and Roseberry Crescent are to become one-way for motor traffic with contra-flow cycle lanes. Roseberry Crescent is part of the E/W route itself. It is not clear what the contra-flow cycle facilities will amount to since parking and loading will be allowed on both sides of the road. Whilst recognising that access to the relocated loading bays for the Haymarket Terrace shops will be required, we are concerned that vehicles will queue across the cycle lanes when exiting. Both these roads are used as rat runs by traffic seeking to bypass the main Haymarket junction and this is likely to continue. We suggest the use of “Gateway Entrance Treatment” in Coates Gardens, as already proposed for Roseberry Crescent.</p> <p>4.2 It would greatly help cyclists approaching from Dalry Road to reach the route safely if the entrance into Grosvenor Street from Haymarket Terrace were blocked for entering motor traffic. . This would also solve the current problem where cyclists travelling from Dalry Road towards West Maitland Street are cut across by traffic entering Grosvenor Street and would also remove the Dalry Road to Palmerston Place rat-run.</p> <p>4.3 It is not clear how cyclists exiting and entering the cycle lane to and from Haymarket Yards will be able to make this manoeuvre safely and how it will phase in with the pedestrian crossings. It seems as if cyclists exiting and entering Haymarket Yards may have to cross pedestrian crossings in the pedestrian phase of the traffic lights .Is this the case and if so would it be better to have toucan crossings?</p> <p>4.4 The relatively new cycle lane that leaves from outside the Haymarket Station drop-off point, suffers from a sudden change of width near where it meets the pedestrian crossing. It looks as though this width change could and should be achieved more gradually.</p>	<p>4.1 Agreed, this will be considered further at detailed design stage.</p> <p>4.2 Haymarket junction is a challenge due to the competing needs of all road users plus the tram. The closure of Grosvenor Street may add to congestion travelling eastbound on the A8. Also, it is proposed to relocate the taxi rank to Clifton Terrace to provide space to route the cycle track along Haymarket Terrace. Taxi’s travelling north or west bound may need to travel left onto Grosvenor Street. Your comment is noted and this area as a whole will be looked at and modelled in more detail within the detailed design stage.</p> <p>4.3 The signals and phasing of this junction are yet to be confirmed. Your comment has been noted and will be reviewed in the junction analysis as part of the detailed design.</p> <p>4.4 Agreed; a separate study is underway that aims to improve the crossing of the tram tracks for westbound cyclists approaching Haymarket from Morrison Street including improving this section of cycle route.</p>
<p>5. Palmerston Place to Melville Street</p> <p>5.1 We feel that it would be better to have a Copenhagen-style junction at the junction between the two Crescents and Palmerston Place? This would give the safety benefit that traffic turning into the Crescents from Palmerston Place would have to “Give Way” to cyclists and maintain continuity.</p> <p>5.2 At the Manor Place/ Melville Street junction for cyclists travelling west, there is a danger that cars coming along Melville Street in the same direction will turn into the cycle crossing “facility” (what exactly is proposed for this?) without cyclists seeing them because of the blind corner. It might be better to have the one-way protected cycle lanes continue into Manor Place with the crossing point opposite Bishops Walk, where the sight lines are better. The existing proposal also envisages turning across the “tramline” paving which could be dangerous.</p> <p>5.3 How are the Melville Street and Melville Crescent public realm improvements going to be used here to protect cyclists from crossing and turning motor traffic at</p>	<p>5.1 A Copenhagen style junction has been included in the revised design. The whole area forms a raised shared space. Vehicles turning into the Crescents from Palmerstone Place will give way to cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>5.2 The whole area forms a raised shared space so vehicle speeds will already be reduced. Your comment has been noted and will be reviewed in the junction analysis as part of the detailed design. Further measures to clearly outline cycle priority at this point will be assessed during detailed design.</p> <p>5.3 This area is subject to a separate design brief; however the cycle track will form an integral part of the design to ensure it ties in appropriately with the rest of the route on Melville Street. Details of the separate study have yet to be confirmed.</p> <p>5.4 Given that cyclists travel both ways on this street, we feel relocating the parking on the north side would create a similar issue regarding parking manoeuvres, particularly as cyclists travelling eastbound will likely be on the north side of Coates</p>

<p>the junction with Walker Street?</p> <p>5.4 The proposed contra flow cycle lane on Coates Crescent looks potentially dangerous for cyclists, given the narrowness of the road and that the car parking is on the south side. If the parking was on the north side it would avoid parking manoeuvres across the line of contra-flowing cyclists. It is also not clear how cyclists will cross Shandwick Place safely on a good alignment with the Canning Street whilst recognising that a lot of Coates Crescent traffic turns into Atholl Crescent. Note that there is also a cycling desire-line from Canning Street to Stafford Street that could be considered as part of this design process.</p>	<p>Crescent. Having the parking in the proposed position means that cyclists and car drivers are facing each other and therefore aware of each other, particularly when travelling westbound. Your comment has been noted and will be reviewed part of the detailed design.</p>
<p>6. Melville Street to Charlotte Square</p> <p>6.1 We would welcome details of the “advanced cycle crossing facilities” proposed here. For example, will they ensure that cyclists crossing over this junction have priority over cars turning into Queensferry Street or Drumsheugh Place?</p> <p>6.2 It is essential that the public realm improvements on Randolph Place include relaying with flat-top setts to produce a smooth surface? The current sets are badly worn and uneven.</p> <p>6.3 End-in parking in Randolph Place is dangerous for cyclists and feels incompatible with making public realm improvements to this street.</p> <p>6.4 The proposed route around Charlotte Square is unclear. What crossing facilities will be provided on the western side and what is a “subtle delineated cycleway”? More detail on the proposed cycle crossing facilities on the eastern side of the Square into both George Street and Rose Street would also be helpful.</p> <p>6.5 We emphasise the importance of the proposed West End Crossing from Hope Street to Lothian Road and see it as vital to the success of this route.</p>	<p>6.1 Formal crossings will be incorporated into the design of this junction. A revised design will include a formal crossing for cyclists and pedestrians from Melville Street to Randolph Place. Details of the specific signals have not yet been finalised. , This whole area is under design review and will significantly upgrade the route and surrounding area.</p> <p>6.2 An innovative solution will be incorporated to retain the aesthetic quality of the cobbles while ensuring a smooth surface for cyclists. It is proposed either purchase an innovative product or to lift the cobbles, cut them in half and for them to be re-laid providing a smooth cycling surface.</p> <p>6.3 Noted; this area is currently still under design.</p> <p>6.4 The cycle route will tie in with a public realm scheme and amendments include a new pedestrian/cycle zone around the central gardens area. There are aspirations to undertake major public realm enhancements but these are dependent on private sector funding. Accordingly, an interim solution is proposed which aligns with future aspirations. This includes a significant reduction of on street parking within the square as already approved by the Council. The type of crossing on the western and eastern sides is subject to further review. This will be undertaken at detailed design stage.</p> <p>6.5 Noted, the Hope Street/Lothian Road link is subject to a separate proposed study.</p>
<p>7. St Andrews Square to York Place</p> <p>7.1 Could you clarify why a two-way cycle lane is proposed for North St David’s Street?</p> <p>7.2 Is it possible to reduce the amount of “tramline” paving used around St Andrews Square? Of particular concern is the extensive area of it on the corner of North St David Street and Queen Street. Is this also on a slope?</p> <p>7.3 Would it be possible to use this opportunity to make the existing toucan crossing of Queen Street into Dublin Street into a single stage?</p> <p>7.4 Improved cycle parking outside the Portrait Gallery at Queen Street would be helpful as there is nothing at the front and many more cyclists can be expected in future.</p> <p>7.5 Junction with Elder Street. This proposed junction will be very difficult for cyclists and could undermine the value of this part of the route – see separate objection to the recent planning application. Could a Copenhagen</p>	<p>7.1 The idea of 2 x 1 way protected track was explored earlier in the project. These take more space, both in terms of track width and require two protection strips, given the overall road width available this was assessed as having too large an impact on general traffic, particularly buses.</p> <p>7.2 Currently it is proposed to use an informal ‘raised pedestrian cycle way crossing’ rather than ‘tramline paving’ at the corner of North St David Street and Queen Street. Given the topography of the street, there may be a slight slope at this location. As the materials to be used are not yet confirmed, your comment is noted and will be considered further at detailed design stage.</p> <p>7.3 As the junctions and signals have yet to be confirmed, your comment has been noted and will be reviewed in the junction modelling as part of the detailed design</p> <p>7.4 As part of a separate project, new cycle parking</p>

<p>style junction be used here or at least an arrangement to allow cyclists to cross in a single manoeuvre, separate from pedestrians at the same time as the general traffic on York Place?</p> <p>7.6 The cycle lane stops abruptly. How will cyclists progress onto the normal roads given that this junction is very complex and dangerous? Eventually it should be designed to link into proposed improvements to Leith Walk but some satisfactory temporary arrangements will be required. For example, would it be possible to have toucan crossings to the top of Broughton Street and Picardy Place?</p>	<p>facilities (6 racks) have been installed at the Portrait Gallery on Queen Street.</p> <p>7.5 The layout of this junction will be subject to further review in line with the St James Redevelopment. This has been noted and your comments will be taken into account in this junction design at detailed design stage.</p> <p>7.6 The section of the route from Elder Street forms part of the St James Centre redevelopment and the Picardy Junction redesign. The cycle lane will link to the proposed improvement on Leith Walk.</p>
<p>8. St Andrews Square to Princes Street</p> <p>8.1 It is not clear how cyclists would get on the proposed two-way protected cycle lane if they arrived from Princes Street travelling east or how they would cross over if they wanted to continue along Princes travelling west.</p> <p>8.2 We would also welcome advice on how cyclists move off and onto the lane if they were travelling to and from Waverley Bridge and the station.</p> <p>8.3 We have noted the short stretch of two-way protected cycle lane on Waterloo Place. How do cyclists travelling east on Waterloo Place get into this lane?</p> <p>8.4 How is it envisaged that cyclist travelling to and from the North Bridge access to route?</p> <p>8.5 What arrangements are being made to ensure compatibility with future plans to allow cycling along James Craig Walk (JCW) and any future improvement in cycle provision on Leith Street? In particular, how will JCW connect into Leith Street, to allow entry for cyclists coming from the top of Leith Street and exit for cyclists then heading down Leith Street (and ideally in the opposite directions)?</p> <p>8.6 Can the Council assist the ambition of the St James Developers (which requires negotiation with other owners) to have a pedestrian/cycle connection from St Andrews Square to JCW, thus forming a direct cycle link from St Andrews Square to Leith Street?</p> <p>8.7 A segregated cycle lane is promised in the Leith Walk plans, continuing up Leith Street as far as Calton Road. Can there be a segregated cycle lane continuing up from there to Princes Street, either bi-directional, or at least a one-way uphill lane?</p>	<p>8.1 The concept of a link between St Andrew Square and North Bridge is at a very early stage and will be subject to further design development and consultation.</p> <p>A review of the potential traffic impacts of the connection has also identified a potentially significant delay to buses on South St David Street towards Princes Street. Addressing this would require other traffic management changes in the surrounding area.</p> <p>As such, it is proposed to defer implementation of this route section and consider it further with other city centre projects; however your points are noted.</p> <p>8.2 As 8.1 above, the concept of a link between St Andrew Square and North Bridge is at a very early stage and will be subject to further design development and consultation.</p> <p>A review of the potential traffic impacts of the connection has also identified a potentially significant delay to buses on South St David Street towards Princes Street. Addressing this would require other traffic management changes in the surrounding area.</p> <p>As such, it is proposed to defer implementation of this route section and consider it further with other city centre projects; however your points are noted.</p> <p>8.3 As 8.2 above, the concept of a link between St Andrew Square and North Bridge is at a very early stage and will be subject to further design development and consultation.</p> <p>A review of the potential traffic impacts of the connection has also identified a potentially significant delay to buses on South St David Street towards Princes Street. Addressing this would require other traffic management changes in the surrounding area.</p> <p>As such, it is proposed to defer implementation of this route section and consider it further with other city centre projects; however your points are noted.</p> <p>8.4 As 8.3 above, the concept of a link between St Andrew Square and North Bridge is at a very early stage and will be subject to further design development and consultation.</p> <p>A review of the potential traffic impacts of the connection has also identified a potentially significant delay to buses on South St David Street towards Princes Street. Addressing this would require other traffic management changes in the surrounding area.</p>

	<p>As such, it is proposed to defer implementation of this route section and consider it further with other city centre projects; however your points are noted.</p> <p>8.5 This is currently outwith the scope of the project and falls under the St James redevelopment; however the Council will be in discussed with the St James development team during the detailed design stage.</p> <p>8.6 This is currently outwith the scope of the project and falls under the St James redevelopment; however the Council will be in discussed with the St James development team during the detailed design stage.</p> <p>8.7 This is currently outwith the scope of the project and falls under the St James redevelopment; however the Council will be in discussed with the St James development team during the detailed design stage.</p>
--	---

Letter dated 7 July 2016 – outstanding points from above

Roseburn:

We would be grateful for reassurance that the new, proposed off peak loading bay on the north side of Roseburn Terrace will be on the road space and that the cycle path will continue to be protected.

Yes, the proposed off peak loading bay on the north side of Roseburn Terrace will be on the road space.

In addition, this proposed off peak loading bay needs to be designed and managed to avoid potentially dangerous conflicts with cyclists. The design should make it difficult for delivery vehicles and cars to attempt to park on the cycle path itself and there should be sufficient clearance to avoid the risk of van doors being opened into passing cyclists. It may be desirable for the loading bay to be moved closer to the centre of the road. The “off peak” nature of this loading bay and its use for genuine loading should be properly enforced as this is clearly not the case at present.

Noted, we will be reviewing the design of this area further in the detailed design stage and your comments will be considered.

Wester Coates:

We are strongly opposed to the proposal to reduce the width of the cycle lane. No details are given of the new proposed width, but the original plans showed the width as only 2.5m i.e. the minimum specified in Government guidance for a 2 way, segregated cycle path. Any reduction would make the width “substandard” and, it is unlikely that any practical reduction in this width could contribute a significant space towards an extra lane for motor traffic. We suggest that the Council should revert to its earlier proposal to remove the middle bus stop on West Coates since 3 bus stops in this relatively short distance inevitably adds to delay.

Due to competing needs, it is proposed to reduce the width of the cycle way on a section of West Coates. This is to enable a small van or car to pass a stationary bus on the south side carriageway. It was initially proposed to remove the bus stop adjacent to Stanhope Street, however there was strong opposition due to the large number of elderly resident in the area.