
Martin & I were there officially from Spokes, and Peter from CUK though shown on the Agenda as Spokes. There were no introductions, and Cllr Macinnes and Phil Noble both sent apologies. Cllr Doran was there for the first part and LMCI had sent somebody to report back to her.
Thomas Haddock and Martin Lings were the main presenters/chairs.

This is not attempting to be a complete report, but just picking up on points I noted or asked about, and not repeating stuff we know already.

It was probably the best forum I remember under the present Council, as we had updates on all the main projects and then the open QA which at last is on the agenda – and which they agreed to include next time, so hopefully it is now a regular feature. They didn't take questions in advance though.

Matters arising

Bike ban on trams in festival – I have raised this at all Forums under this Council, as despite the 2016 successful experiment the rules (I thought) had not been changed on their website (but see *Later*), so I raised it again. It will be raised again with Cllr Macinnes.

LATER Cllr Chas Booth raised my query by email with George Lowder of TfE, and I received an email to myself and Chas from him. To my double astonishment, GL says that (a) not only are bikes now allowed during the festival but *also during peak hours* (but subject to guard discretion, which may of course mean that there is no space at all for certain periods) (b) that the website wording has been changed to reflect that.

I have replied to say that the website wording could easily be taken to imply there is still a ban (that indeed is how I had read it), and I suggested an alternative to make it clear that bikes are allowed subject to guard discretion although space may well not always be available.

[11.12.18] I have just had a holding reply from GL to say they will look again at the wording, though it will have to go through their relevant committee(s). Hopefully this will bring a good result at last!

Lower Granton Rd Work should start late Jan, once contractor appointed. Lots of landscaping added (saves dumping it in the Harbour!) ; wild flower experimental planting etc. University doing a study of whether wellbeing improves as a result of the improved environment (though road not traffic-calmed).

Secure bike storage

Will be 180 units, each of ~6 bikes, in 90 locations. Thus approx 1080 spaces.

Bids are being assessed, winner expected to be announced in January, as will the list of streets to get units.

Each location will have a site assessment, followed by a consultation, then a TRO covering those which are onstreet. In part because of the TRO work and timescales, as many as possible will not be onstreet, but they will only go on footways where there is clearly ample width. CEC assessment criteria include..

- tenemented area
- more than 100metres from nearest
- impact on parking/bins/footway.

A map will be updated with the results: Green – OK; Amber – Maybe; Red – failed

Cycle Racks

Run out of stock but will do another approx. 90 by end January. As per secure storage, it's not Value For Money putting them on the road due to TRO costs and timescales. They will consult with Access Panel re pedestrian obstruction where planned for footway.

George St/ New Town project

The result of the consultation will go to TEC in 2019 (I forget which month; it will be in the last TEC papers) who will then decide how to proceed.

I asked who would do detailed design of the cycleroute. *Answer* – Unknown, and the current consultants (WYG) are only appointed until Spring 2019 and their task is to report on the consultation to TEC. Detailed design may be done by the council or by consultants appointed post-TEC.

Bikes on Cycleroute or Roadway?

I asked about a kerbed height change between bike & peds instead of tactiles. *Answer* – the consultants are keen for them at same level, to 'future proof' so that *if cars are banned in future* cyclists can be put on the roadway and the cycleroute turned into footway. David Hunter (Living Streets) said LS thought pedestrianisation and scrapping the cycleroute should all be done in this project, not left for a possible future – I presume the LS submission will say that, though we don't know what they mean by 'pedestrianisation.'

Martin got a slightly different impression...

I got the impression that WYG were suggesting that the roadspace could be reused but weren't actually proposing cycling in a "roadway". A lot depends on how "pedestrianisation" would be implemented and whether some vehicles would be allowed. There seemed to be some agreement that if any vehicles were allowed then a segregated cycleway would be needed. WYG stated that suggestion for full segregation had not been fully supported in consultation.

Cycleroute delineation

Assuming the cycleroute remains, we then discussed **tactiles v kerbs**. Quite a strong consensus that tactile solution is bad. Andrew Easson from the Council said forcefully that the Leith Walk cycleroute (which WYG seemed to be taking as a precedent) has never been intended as a precedent – it was a solution designed for that location at that time, to see how it went. It is currently being assessed. He also pointed out that a kerbed solution is used in part of Leith Street. Indeed, apart from at the floating bus stop and crossings, kerbed and height separation is the plan for Leith Street/Picardy - and is now built in Leith St and under construction in Picardy.

In summary, reasons why WYG prefer tactiles (& level) to kerbed (& height differentiated) seems to be...

- The supposed Leith Walk 'precedent'
- To have a "subtle" incorporated cycleway rather than anything too 'separate' visually
- To future-proof scrapping of the cycleway if the roadway is pedestrianised.

There was a lot of further GNT detail that we know already, e.g. widths. Martin will do a separate detailed report.

CCWEL

Order of work on the ground heavily dependent on when Orders/Inquiries etc allow it. Confusingly, in addition to CCWEL itself being in numbered *sections*, they referred to the work in numbered *phases*. So, for example, *phase 1* refers to work which has nothing to do with *section 1*.

Phase 1 Hope to start work Autumn 2019 on

- Elder St to Dublin St. They are keen to get this to coincide with the Picardy cycleroutes now under construction, which include from Picardy to and across Elder St.
- Bishop's Walk (beside the cathedral)
- Melville Crescent to Lothian Road (the link towards the canal). They said this depends on objections, but they don't expect any that would delay it.

Phase 2 Spring 2020

- Section 1, Roseburn-Haymkt, inquiry hearing expected mid 2019
- Charlotte Sq & St Andrews Sq – gave impression these were considered important to get done asap, Designing for status quo on George Street with connections to North and South sides, but with flexibility to widen to accommodate 2-way cycleway on South side if/when George St happens. St Andrew Square inclusion in this phase "hopeful".

Phase 3 Summer 2020

- Section 2, Haymkt to ?Randolph Place. Statutory Orders (for objection) in mid Feb 2019, then TEC in May 2019. Probable Inquiry mid 2019; if all goes ok, hope to start work on ground summer 2020.

Phase unknown

- N St David St to Dublin St. Statutory Orders in place, but a lot of technical/design work to be done because of levels. Also the N St David St section design may be changed/enhanced significantly depending on Transformation decisions in 2019, eg reduced number of traffic lanes on West side of Square and in N St David St.

General Qns

AT Champion Martin asked what's happening about this – they will take the question to Cllr Macinnes. David Hunter said he did not realise that the cycling champion had resigned, and LS had requested appointment of a ped champion.

Tram construction I asked again about need to have 2-way bike provision in LW during the 1.5 years of tram construction. They will pass this to Lesley M for a response.

Transport/Planning liaison I raised the qn of the 225 space underground car park which empties out across the Leith Walk cycleway & footway, and the more general qn of transport/planning liaison. They appear to recognise (though did not say) that the council had blundered here, and probably the Planning App did not reach the right people in Transport, whilst Planning probably didn't see any problem and tend to rely on Transport comments. However, we were told that the design now agreed will maintain continuous footway and cycleway at this exit – they said the design is on the PA website (16/03536/FUL).

Later: Martin is progressing concerns with potential vehicular conflict.

Sweeping of Leaves Martin asked, they said that there was ongoing work (initiated by Spokes!) with cycleway naming consistency and issue reporting and they would check on maintenance programmes and where they could be found by the public.

Nicholson Square Safety issues raised by parent of a child, one of 2 killed here. Edinburgh Uni students doing some research and liaising with Localities Team

Lothian Rd resurfacing/King's Theatre Kim asked whether preparations for Meadows to Canal had been incorporated in the resurfacing. We were told yes.

Cycle counter data Somebody asked about access to counter data, for the automatic counters (not the publicly visible ones). Martyn Lings said they are in the process of procuring a database to manage the data and that it should allow open access.

Next Meeting 11th March

Agenda suggestions..

- Workshops on West Edinburgh Active Travel Network and Meadows to George Street
- Possibly the City Centre Transformation, following expected report to February TEC
- Possibly Active Travel Programme for 2019/20
- Definite – QA session

DdF: I am dubious about going back to workshops at the next forum. This meeting, with presentations then questions/discussion, rather than workshops, felt much more productive to me.