

*If replying by email, please use...* [davedufeu@gmail.com](mailto:davedufeu@gmail.com)

To: TEC councillors

## CEC TEC 20 June 2018

### [Item 7.1 – CCWEL project, Objections to TRO and RSO](#)

We are writing to express our continuing strong support for this, the Council's flagship active travel project. We strongly support the recommendations in the paper, possibly enhanced with minor amendments if the Committee so decides.

We were delighted at the all-party agreement achieved, after much heartsearching and local consultation, in late 2016. After the delays at that stage, then further delay when the main project officer moved away, any further delay would be very disappointing. In particular, we urge councillors not to support the amendment which could delay the project by not setting aside those objections which can be set aside.

*We make the following points in support of the above...*

- ◆ It was clear at the time of the all-party agreement that objections to the draft Orders were to be expected, as the plans cannot fully satisfy everybody. In respect of route alignment and widths, as far as we are aware the plans have not changed since the all-party agreement - therefore to uphold objections which are on those grounds would not reflect the spirit of the all-party agreement. As regards parking and loading objections, as explained in the report, in response to representations to the draft Orders, the council officers have even found ways to somewhat enhance parking and loading provision as compared to what was proposed at the time of the all-party agreement.
- ◆ The Committee has plenty precedents for the setting aside of objections. For example, to the great disappointment of ourselves and Living Streets, the Committee in 2015 set aside [over 150 formal objections](#), from individuals and community organisations, to the TRO which scrapped Saturday bus lanes and weekday off-peak lanes. It should also be noted that on that occasion there were very few representations in support of the draft Order. Draft Orders are of course advertised for objection or comment rather than for support, but nonetheless for the CCWEL draft Orders now under consideration there were almost as many letters of support (43) as objections (47).
- ◆ Furthermore, there is also precedent for the report's imaginative and welcome proposal to make the Order to the fullest extent possible given those unwithdrawn objections which legally have to be referred to the Scottish Government. The Committee took a similar decision in March 2014 at the time of [the Order](#) for active travel improvements on Leith Walk between Pilrig Street and Duke Street, where there were unresolved objections. Thus work on the project was able to continue to the maximum extent possible pending the Scottish Government decision, which could otherwise have meant a delay of unknown and potentially inordinate duration.