

CIMT 17/07/2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

Notification sent to all ward councillors, transport spokespeople, emergency services, Living Streets, Spokes, RNIB, Edinburgh Access Panel and relevant Community Councils on 7 July 2020. Recipients were given five days to respond with comments. The measures would be implemented under emergency delegated decision-making powers using a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order. Given the urgent nature of these works, normal expectations about community consultations cannot be fulfilled.

Project Proposal

Location	Justification	Recommendation
Dundee St - Fountainbridge	<p>The Council has had a long-standing aspiration to provide quality cycling infrastructure on Fountainbridge/ Dundee Street in order to provide an alternative to the narrow Union Canal Towpath, as well as provide access to the various services and facilities on this high density corridor, and connect existing routes such as the Telfer Subway, the Canal and the Meadows.</p> <p>These aspirations are even more important in light of the Covi-19 pandemic and the need to enable social distancing, as well as providing protected cycling infrastructure on a key arterial route to the city to enable communities in the South West of the city to travel safely by bike as lockdown eases..</p>	<p><u>Progress with cycle project</u> as part of overall emergency measures to re-designate key parts of the road network to help pedestrians and cyclists travel safely while meeting physical distancing requirements.</p>

Feedback

Comment from	Comment	Response
Cllr Corbett	<p>The proposals are warmly welcomed and much-needed. If well-designed they will provide a much needed alternative to a busy and unsuitable canal towpath and serve a high density neighbourhood where use of foot, bike and public transport is high. Road conditions are very poor in this stretch, and, at times dangerous especially in dark or wet conditions. These need remedied at the same time</p>	

CIMT 17/07/2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

	as setting out the route. Equally, footway conditions are often poor, with lots of clutter, abandoned signs etc.	
Cllr Corbett	<p>The slipway access to the WAR is a major hazard for both pedestrians and cyclists and I'm not convinced the build-out will address that. Options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take away this deeply unhelpful sign (attached) which implies that to cut off to the WAR is the default option. • Close it as a relic of the days when the WAR was conceived as an urban mototrway (no longer the view of the WAR) • If closing it is not possible, put in major humps at the mouth so that any vehicle has to slow to less than 10mph to access it. OR signal the junction for ped phase 	<p>We will look into replacing or removing this sign.</p> <p>Closing this slip road is not recommended as it is likely this would result in increased traffic on Fountainbridge itself which would have a greater impact on people walking, cycling, accessing shops and services and using public transport than the same traffic remaining on WAR.</p> <p>It is proposed to include speed humps at the mouth of this junction to slow turning traffic.</p>
Cllr Corbett	Bolt down kerbs will have to be very assertively enforced.	These will be maintained as per our maintenance regime.
Cllr Corbett	Both at the Vastint site in Fountainbridge and at the high school site the construction work has removed footway space and cycle space. How has this been factored in?	Unfortunately, it is not possible to factor this into the designs. It is proposed to deliver these designs in part with any sections falling with TM for adjacent construction sites to be delivered thereafter.
Cllr Corbett	Useful to know how the scheme links to adjacent areas	See enclosed 'Alternative Routes to Canal and Water of Leith' summary document.
Cllr Corbett	There are existing proposals to include a ped crossing at the foot of Yeaman Place, could they be brought forward to align with this scheme	The installation of a temporary crossing could be considered, but would be very costly. We will investigate whether the proposed permanent crossing could be fast tracked.

CIMT 17/07/2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

<p>Cllr Corbett</p>	<p>Currently the advisory cycle lane outside the high school is poorly designed, can the proposals address this and why is why is the cycle lane only advisory at Tesco etc</p>	<p>Existing cycleway will be segregated where possible.</p> <p>The section of road between Grove Street and Tesco Express is too narrow for two vehicles to pass without straying into cycleway, hence it is not possible to segregate this section and advisory cycle lanes are proposed. The centre line will be removed to encourage low speeds (as per Gogar Station Road) and we are proposing a 'give-and-take' arrangement to encourage platooning through this section to minimise the extent of vehicles straying into the cycleway.</p>
<p>Cllr Key</p>	<p>These proposals are very warmly welcomed. Like my ward colleague Gavin Corbett, I have a huge issue with the WAR junction and am in favour of closing the WAR.</p> <p>The slipway access to the WAR is a major hazard for both pedestrians and cyclists and I'm not convinced the build-out will address that. Options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take away the unhelpful sign which implies that to cut off to the WAR is the default option. • Close it as a relic of the days when the WAR was conceived as an urban motorway (no longer the view of the WAR) • If closing it is not possible, put in major humps at the mouth so that any vehicle has to slow to less than 10mph to access it. OR signal the junction for ped phase 	<p>We will look into replacing or removing this sign.</p> <p>Closing this slip road is not recommended as it is likely this would result in increased traffic on Fountainbridge itself which would have a greater impact on people walking, cycling, accessing shops and services and using public transport than the same traffic remaining on WAR.</p> <p>It is proposed to include speed humps at the mouth of this junction to slow turning traffic.</p>
<p>Cllr Key</p>	<p>Need to advance the plan for the signalling at the foot of Yeaman Place.</p>	<p>We will investigate whether the proposed permanent crossing could be fast tracked.</p>

CIMT 17/07/2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

Cllr Mowat	A safe alternative to a route along the Union Canal is to be welcomed given the problems created by the overcrowding on the canal towpath. It is unclear how much parking will be lost and whether this will create problems for local residents.	A small amount of parking on side streets will be lost in order to accommodate the removal of loading space required on the main road.
Cllr Mowat	It is unclear where this route will link into which makes the requirement for an overarching map of plans essential. It has long been a criticism that Edinburgh specialises in cycle routes to nowhere which peter out into heavily trafficked areas. Given the funding here and the uptake in cycling it is more important that ever that this does connect onwards to safe routes rather than being a safe piece of infrastructure in itself. Without the total plan it is unclear to me whether a journey on this path can be continued safely	<p>See enclosed 'Alternative Routes to Canal and Water of Leith' summary document.</p> <p>This route will connect with the Slateford/Lanark/Longstone Road SfP scheme which is currently under development to the West. Together these routes provide an alternative to the canal and the Water of Leith as far as Sighthill and Spylaw.</p> <p>This route will connect to existing infrastructure at Gardners Crescent in the East including the link North to Exchange Quay and Rutland Square, and the route East to the North Meadow Walk.</p>
Cllr Webber	Yet again the concept of floating bus stops is included which is not suitable. We have what appears to be a city wide approach that will see pedestrians reduced in the much referenced Transport Hierarchy and they will now have to give way and cross over a cycle path when boarding and disembarking from buses. Many of whom may have limited mobility / sensory impairments. I think this is inappropriate that this is even considered a solution.	The principle of Bus Stop Bypasses is generally accepted and applied across the UK and Europe. Though there are few examples in Edinburgh, Bus Stop Bypasses are included in Transport Scotland design guidance (Cycling by Design 2010) and CEC's Edinburgh Street Design Guidance. The design of Bus Stop Bypasses on this scheme will be subject to a Road Safety Audit prior to delivery and will include clear markings to cyclists to give way to people embarking/ alighting buses.
Spokes	We know that the Active Travel team have had plans for segregated cycleways along this stretch for some time, so we very much welcome the proposals	

CIMT 17/07/2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

	<p>brought forward by the Spaces for People programme. This stretch is well used by cyclists as an alternative to the narrow, and often congested canal towpath. Moreover, it provides direct access to Fountainpark, Napier student accommodation, and the large offices on and around Lochrin Basin – all key places that people should be able to cycle to/from.</p>	
	<p>We're generally pleased by the proposals put forward, but some of the changes risk making conditions worse if not implemented carefully and we urge the council to review these safety concerns carefully :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reconsider West Approach Road junction 2. Carefully consider stud spacing and gaps to facilitate safe right turns <p>Additionally, we have several further suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Ensure continuity of Gilmore Park / Melvin Walk through route 4. Widen cycle lane outside Boroughmuir High School 5. Ensure that guardrail removal does not reduce cycle parking 	<p>We have revisited the WAR junction and are no longer proposing planters here. IN addition to the bollards to enhance the turn a raised table will be placed over the crossing.</p> <p>Gaps between wands will be between 4-5m. We will ensure there are gaps in the wands here.</p> <p>If it is possible to widen this cycle lane without changing the kerb arrangements we will seek to do this.</p> <p>Generally the guardrail which is proposed for removal is not used for cycle parking.</p>
Edinburgh Access Panel	<p>Please protect pedestrians from cyclists with as much segregation as possible.</p>	<p>Cycleways will be fully segregated from footways.</p>
Edinburgh Access Panel	<p>At floating bus stops where segregation isn't possible, it's essential you take effective measures to slow cyclists right down as they approach - eg with chicanes, zebra crossings, rumble strips and signage. In your email you mention "changes to bus</p>	<p>Cycleways are fully segregated from footways.</p>

CIMT 17/07/2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

	stops..... to improve cycle safety". Please remember that any such improvement to cycle safety is likely to be negated by an equivalent reduction in pedestrian safety.	
Edinburgh Access Panel	Please make sure that parking provision for blue badge holders is at least equivalent to the current provision	There will be clear markings that cyclists should reduce speed on the approach to bus stop bypasses, and should give way to people embarking/ alighting buses. Careful consideration will be given to the materials to be used for floating bus stops.
Edinburgh Access Panel	Please ensure surfaces are safe and well maintained	Parking and access for blue badge holders will be retained wherever possible.
Living Streets	<p>We support improvements to cycling infrastructure which encourages cycling and reduces motor traffic, so long as it is not detrimental to the actual and potential walking environment. Organisations like Spokes have rightly been very clear that new space for cycling must come from space for motor vehicles, rather than for walking. We therefore wish to record our support for the overall programme. However, we have two significant qualifications.</p> <p>Pedestrian improvements</p> <p>It is hard to see *any* improvements for people walking in these schemes? While general pavement widening may be difficult to achieve simultaneously with installation of cycle lanes, this should be a priority where pavements are especially narrow (eg south side of Ferry Road). We would expect to see at least significant efforts to remove pavement clutter</p>	

	<p>such as signage poles and guard rails and simple measures such as cutting back hedges, sweeps of roadworks debris (traffic cones, sandbags, etc.) We also want to priority for pedestrians increased at all signalled junctions. Given that almost everyone is a pedestrian in their own neighbourhood, such measures are also likely to increase local support for these schemes, including among people who don't cycle.</p> <p>Floating Bus stops</p> <p>We note that there are dozens of 'bus stop bypasses' or 'floating bus stops' proposed in these cycle schemes, which route cyclists between the bus stop and the pavement, rather than on the road. There appear to be at least: 13 on Comiston Road, 10 on Ferry Road, 9 in Wester Hailes, 7 on Meadow Place Road and 5 on Fountainbridge.</p> <p>As the Council's Active Travel team is well aware, the Living Streets Edinburgh Group has never been happy with this design concept which means that bus passengers boarding - and especially alighting from - buses have to cross a cycle way and may therefore unexpectedly encounter a cyclist, possibly travelling at considerable speed. While we recognise the benefits for cyclists, this design can only disadvantage bus users and pedestrians, especially older people and blind people, many of whose representative organisations have objected to the design concept.</p> <p>Living Streets Edinburgh did not object to the first</p>	<p>These proposals include the removal of Guardrail at various locations.</p> <p>The principle of Bus Stop Bypasses is generally accepted and applied across the UK and Europe. Though there are few examples in Edinburgh, Bus Stop Bypasses are included in Transport Scotland design guidance (Cycling by Design 2010) and CEC's Edinburgh Street Design Guidance. The design of Bus Stop Bypasses on this scheme will be subject to a Road Safety Audit prior to delivery and will include clear markings to cyclists to give way to people embarking/ alighting buses.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>Leith Walk examples, on the understanding that a full monitoring and evaluation was carried out. The Council eventually agreed to this in 2017 but although we understand that this exercise has long been completed, it has never been published. It is wholly inappropriate to use the Covid19 pandemic and 'spaces for everyone' programme as the means for the sudden mass installation of these controversial bus stop designs at virtually no notice and with minimal consultation.</p> <p>We therefore strongly oppose their inclusion in the Council's current proposals. We suggest that instead, a much wider review exercise is taken at a later date, to consider the use of floating bus stops in the city strategically, once evaluation evidence is in the public domain. This should involve all relevant interests - walking, cycling, bus passengers, disability groups, etc.</p>	<p>The results of the monitoring carried out on the Leith Walk Bus Stop Bypasses has been shared in summary with Living Streets, detailing that both the number and severity of interactions between cyclists and pedestrians at these locations are very low.</p>
<p>Public</p>	<p>Need to ensure the WAR junction is safe or closed.</p> <p>Mixed reaction to floating bus stops with those against highlighting the importance of taking account of the needs of visually impaired or use a wheelchair.</p> <p>Support for more pedestrian crossings.</p>	<p>These designs will improve cycle and ped safety at this junction</p> <p>The principle of Bus Stop Bypasses is generally accepted and applied across the UK and Europe. Though there are few examples in Edinburgh, Bus Stop Bypasses are included in Transport Scotland design guidance (Cycling by Design 2010) and CEC's Edinburgh Street Design Guidance. The design of Bus Stop Bypasses on this scheme will be subject to a Road Safety Audit prior to delivery and will include clear markings to cyclists to give way to</p>

		<p>people embarking/ alighting buses.</p> <p>It is difficult to provide additional pedestrian crossings under a temporary scenario due to cost.</p>
<p>Public (Commonplace)</p>	<p>Pavements too narrow and cluttered, need to be extended. Marked waiting areas needed outside bus stops and shops.</p> <p>Restrict/suspend vehicle parking.</p> <p>Separate cycle / pedestrian paths – cycle segregation needed.</p> <p>Reduce speed and volume of traffic.</p> <p>Need more safe crossing points.</p> <p>Road surface needs to be improved to encourage more on-road cycling.</p> <p><i>Specific comments:</i> Restrict dropping off area outside Hampton by Hilton Hotel.</p> <p>No pedestrian crossings at Yeamen Place junction.</p>	<p>Pavement widening and de-cluttering is included. Marked waiting areas are not included, though the bus stop boarders will provide additional width at these points.</p> <p>There is minimal vehicle parking permitted on Fountainbridge/ Dundee Street. These restrictions will be further enhanced to allow for the introduction of the cycleway and loading will be moved onto side streets.</p> <p>The street is already 20mph. It is hoped that the SfP interventions will help limit the demand on vehicular traffic throughout the city.</p> <p>It is difficult to provide additional pedestrian crossings under a temporary scenario due to cost. We will pass any surface issues to Edinburgh Road Services to include in their package of rolling maintenance.</p> <p>Parking and loading will be prohibited here.</p> <p>We will investigate whether the proposed permanent crossing could be fast tracked.</p>