

From: **Martin McDonnell** <mcdbristol116@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Nov 11, 2018 at 5:44 PM
Subject: Spokes Response to the Trams to Newhaven second consultation.
To: <newhaven.tram@edinburgh.gov.uk>
Cc: Rory Garriock <RoryGarriock@anturasconsulting.com>, Rob Leech
<Robleech@anturasconsulting.com>, Darren Wraight <Darren.Wraight@edinburgh.gov.uk>

Please note that Spokes responded to the online survey and I enclose a pdf copy of our response.

The survey did not seem to accommodate responses from organisations, unlike the "Connecting Our City" survey that I completed earlier and assumed that this would be the same.

Spokes looks forward to working with you on the design details and *the route options beyond the Foot of the Walk, about which we have many more detailed comments to make.*

Please would you notify us as to when the 2 active travel group meetings will commence and confirm the situation with regards funding source and implementation timescales for the route options.

regards,
Martin

Response ID ANON-UUJK-4NXQ-A
Submitted to **Trams to Newhaven**
Submitted on **2018-11-11 17:27:34**

Introduction

1 What is your email address?

Email:

mcdbristol116@gmail.com

We Asked / You Said / We Did

Feedback on the revised plans

2 To what extent do you agree or disagree that the updated plans have given better consideration to active travel provision?:

Agree

Please use the space below to make any comments about active travel:

1. Leith Walk

The updated plans are a great improvement for cycling on Leith Walk, however the cycleways should conform to the "Edinburgh Street Design Guidance" (ESDG) with..

- a) the "desirable" width of 1.75m and 2m for high flows (which would be expected on this route) and
- b) grade separation between the footway and cycleway.

We recognise that space is limited at some bus stops and alternative arrangements must be sought. Widths can vary (eg for overtaking) to take advantage of available space elsewhere ("Even small increases in cycle track width are beneficial. So in constrained situations a 2-way path 2.1m or 2.2m wide can create better riding experience for cyclists than 2.0m. " (ESDG)). Furthermore, the segregation style should be consistent along the whole of Leith Walk, including the existing unsatisfactory section from Pilrig Street to McDonald Rd.

2. Newhaven to Foot of the Walk:

2a) Clear and direct cycleways should be provided between Newhaven, Ocean Terminal, Gentings Casino, Scottish Government buildings, and Foot of the Walk with cycling access to properties and businesses in between. Cycling access must be provided to and from locations on Constitution Street. Good provision is not easy, given the width of some roads which will have tramlines. These cycleways must connect seamlessly to the Leith Walk cycleways.

We understand that a separate package of cycling provision is intended, but has not yet been designed, and it is not even clear if the funding will come from the tram project (as it should). It is vital that these routes are provided no later than the laying of the tramlines, or the Council risks another rash of cyclist crashes, injuries and potential compensation claims as happened with the initial tram layout - as well as deterring a whole group of existing and potential cyclists who are unwilling to risk tramlined roads.

2b) We welcome the Ocean Road links to Sandpiper Lane and the North Edinburgh Path Network (Hawthornevale Path) and the widening of the pavements from Lindsay Road to Ocean Terminal to accommodate shared footway/cycleway, but the cycleway must be clearly differentiated from the footway and both should be continuous across the side roads/drop-off area.

2c) The project should work with developers along Ocean Drive to ensure that high quality cycleways are provided up to Ocean Way, which may include bridge works/building.

3. During Construction

Provision for 2-way safe cycling must be made in Leith Walk during the 1½ years of construction – as was done during the 9-month closure of Leith Street for roadworks. This is not mentioned in the consultation, but it was earlier announced that there would be a complete closure (including bikes) southbound, and northbound a single traffic lane without even a cycle lane – this would be disastrous for safe cycling, given the hopeless alternative detours – and would also be bad for shop trade during the 1½ years. Diversionary cycleways must also be provided during works on the other roads along the route.

3 To what extent do you agree or disagree that the new updated design for Elm Row has created a better public space for all?

Strongly agree

Please use the space below to make any comments about the updated design for Elm Row:

We support the planned traffic restrictions in the retail area here, and the general improvements. However, the 2-way cyclist route on the east side should continue as 2-way along Elm Row as far as Montgomery Street for those people cycling from Picardy Place to Montgomery Street and beyond.

The CCWEL and the Leith Street cycleways will make this a key link for people cycling to the North East of the City. We would support further restrictions on vehicular access to the area to make it a better space for people.

4 To what extent do you agree or disagree that the updated designs allows improved access to and from side streets as compared to the previous designs?

Agree

Please use the space below to make any comments about access to and from side streets:

The revised plans for improved access to and from side streets on Leith Walk are welcomed. However, concerns remain about access to and from streets between the Foot of the Walk and the Newhaven Terminus.

5 One of the key themes that emerged from the consultation was public transport, provision for pedestrians, road safety and local access requirements on Constitution Street. Considering the two proposed solutions (Option A and Option B), overall, what is your preferred option for the design of the southern end of Constitution Street?

Preferred option for Constitution Street: Option A

Please use the space below for any comments on the design options for Constitution Street

Two alternatives are shown, but neither is good for cycling safety, particularly at and near the tram stop. It is therefore essential that alternative routes are provided that are easily accessible from properties on Constitution Street and that the tramway does not form an impenetrable barrier to people who wish to travel by bike across Constitution Street. This emphasises the importance of 2a) above, where safe alternatives must be provided at the same time as the tramlines are laid.

6 To what extent do you agree or disagree that crossing points and permeability across Leith Walk has been improved compared to the previous designs?

Strongly agree

Please use the space below to make any comments about crossing points and permeability across Leith Walk:

We welcome the additional crossing points and the additional signalised junctions. It is good to see that the cycleways have priority across the unsignalised junctions, however the design must ensure that this does not compromise cycling safety. Pedestrians and cyclists must have separate crossing areas, albeit these can be in parallel and share the same signal phasing where it is not suitable for cyclists to have their own phase. The cycleways must not disintegrate into shared cycleway/footway at crossings. At signalised junctions, advance cyclist release and 2-stage right turns should be considered at the detail design stage, including potential redesign of the current McDonald Road 2-stage turn, where improvements are needed.

7 Concerns were raised that the original position of the tram stop opposite the entrance to Balfour Street would make this junction difficult to get in and out of the street. As a result of this feedback we propose moving the tram stop 60m south and away from the Balfour Street junction. To what extent do you agree or disagree that remedies previous concerns?

Strongly agree

Please use the space below to make any comments about the Balfour Street stop:

12 What is your post code?

post code:

EH11 2JG

13 The Council would like to contact you in future about the results of this survey and with news about the extension of the Tram to Newhaven. If you would like us to contact you for these reasons, please provide your email address in the box below.

14 To what extent would you agree or disagree with the following statements about the online survey for Trams to Newhaven?

Feedback about consultation process - I was given all the information that I needed.:

Agree

Feedback about consultation process - The consultation was clear and easy to understand.:

Strongly agree

Feedback about consultation process - I was allowed the opportunity to have my say.:

Agree

Please provide any other comments or suggestions you may have about the consultation process.:

This response is sent on behalf of Spokes - the Lothian Cycle Campaign
Martin McDonnell