

CIMT 31 July 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 17 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
Duddingston Road	Provide protected cycling infrastructure on an arterial route to the city. Improve Active travel access to Figgate Burn path, Treverlen Park, St. John's Primary School and general connection from Portobello to the west.	<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.

Feedback

Comment from	Comment	Response
Northfield Willowbrae Community Council	This looks like a good proposal to me, it is important that active travel routes are protected as traffic levels have increased and that it is done by the time schools reopen given how it can assist pupils getting to school.	Noted.
Edinburgh Access Panel	Please protect pedestrians from cyclists with as much segregation as possible.	This project does indeed take care of this. Currently, the pavements are often used to cycle on, which will change with the new segregation.
Edinburgh Access Panel	We note that the photo provided by you shows a Rediweld bus pad mounted on the footway while the map shows them spanning the	This is currently being looked into as part of a separate survey for all SfP schemes.

CIMT 31 July 2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

	<p>cycle lane - as proposed for Minto Street. If they will in fact span the cycle lane, they entail the same risks to pedestrians as floating bus stops. In fact bus pads are probably even higher risk than floating bus stops in that they are less conspicuous than floating bus stops. It's therefore essential to put measures in place to slow cyclists right down as they approach, eg zebra crossings, rumble strips, chicane (as s, signage.</p>	
Edinburgh Access Panel	<p>Please ensure the bus pads do not cause a trip hazard and are easily and safely usable by people with mobility difficulties or a vision impairment. This is especially important as the bus pads deteriorate with wear and tear, weather conditions and vandalism. They will need to be checked and maintained regularly.</p>	See above.
Edinburgh Access Panel	<p>Please ensure that parking provision for blue badge holders after the emergency measures have been put in place is equivalent to the current provision.</p>	Parking and access for blue badge holders will be retained wherever possible.
Spokes	<p>Spokes Party welcomes the creation of temporary segregated cycle lanes on Duddingston Road. This is an important route for active travel with two primary schools on the road itself, and links to multiple residential, shopping and recreational areas. There are also two high schools and a nursery in the vicinity.</p> <p>While some residents are parking private cars and business vehicles on Duddingston Road, the majority of houses have driveways. Safe active travel must take priority over the parking of private vehicles on a public road on such an important route. This prioritisation aligns with Transport Scotland's Sustainable Travel Hierarchy in the National Transport Strategy (2020).</p>	Noted.
Spokes	<p>We support the proposal and recommend the following</p>	For financial reasons, red screed

CIMT 31 July 2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

	<p>improvements:</p> <p>Cycle lanes should be accessed by entry tapers (TSRGD Diag. 1009). Red screed should also be used at the cycleway access to discourage drivers from accessing them.</p>	<p>will only be used at critical, busy junctions (in this case for instance the junction with Mountcastle Drive North)</p>
Spokes	<p>Red screeding should be applied across the entrance to Durham Road and would also be welcome across minor junctions.</p>	<p>For financial reasons, red screed will only be used at critical, busy junctions (in this case for instance the junction with Mountcastle Drive North)</p>
Spokes	<p>There is a risk at some wider junctions, e.g. Hamilton Terrace and Durham Road, that drivers will cut obliquely across the cycle lane, risking 'left hooks' when turning in, and reducing visibility of oncoming cyclists when pulling out. This could be reduced by closing up and marking the opening to the junction with further orcas and/or larger bollards.</p>	<p>We have tried to reduce radii where possible and have carried out vehicle tracking. Unfortunately, not much can be improved on Duddingston Road.</p>
Spokes	<p>The angles on the buildout pinch point near Duddingston Avenue are harsh and should be more forgiving. Taper at 1:10.</p>	<p>This will be done.</p>
Spokes	<p>There should be give way markings instead of stop lines at the rediweld bus pad. The bus shelter (outside Number 49 Duddingston Road) is the wrong way around for the proposed bus pad.</p>	<p>Drawings have been corrected.</p>
Spokes	<p>There are surface issues on some parts of the road that could prove dangerous for cyclists that will need to be checked. These should be resolved as quickly as possible.</p>	<p>The condition of the road is likely to be improved by work necessary to facilitate the implementation of the proposals.</p>

CIMT 31 July 2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

Spokes	There are some inaccuracies on the map re the location of driveways to houses. This needs to be addressed.	This will be addressed when we are on-site, installing the segregation elements.
Spokes	Would it be possible to provide a bus shelter opposite 73, Duddingston Road if there is enough space? This would enhance the experience of current bus users as well as encouraging some drivers to switch to bus as lockdown conditions loosen on public transport.	This is unfortunately not possible as part of this programme. Issues relating to public transport and improving associated infrastructure will be considered in other programmes.
Spokes	The cycle lane widths appear mostly to be 1.5m wide. However, a few sections look like they have been narrowed down to 1.4m. If you take into account the width of the segregation (orca wands) then these lanes could end up being less than 1.2m wide. While we understand these measures are temporary, they are likely to be in use for a considerable time. We would welcome efforts to create lanes that have minimum 1.5m clear width in accordance with design guidance.	Since this is a bus route, we need a minimum road width of 6.5m. If possible, we will widen the cycle lane.
Spokes	The note on the drawing states that the minimum road width is 6.5m. However, there are several sections where this is not achieved (pinch points). To avoid encroachment into the cycle lanes, traffic calming, such as 'priority over oncoming vehicles' systems, should be considered in these situations.	These specific areas have been changed to create a road width of 6.5m. Segregation will prevent encroachment into the cycle lanes.
Spokes	<p>Next steps</p> <p>The proposals for temporary segregated cycle lanes on Duddingston Road would provide even more benefits for safe active travel if followed up by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Segregated cycle infrastructure on Duddingston Road West (to provide a safe through route to Holy Rood RC High School, the 	We have noted these points and they may be taken forward in a next phase.

	<p>Innocent Path, Holyrood Park, and locations in the south, west and centre of Edinburgh).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking management, speed management, traffic reduction and traffic calming on Southfield Place and Brighton Place (to provide a safe through route to Portobello, the High St shops, and the beach). • Safety improvements and pavement widening at the Baileyfield Road junction with Duddingston Road. This junction is particularly dangerous during the school term. There is not enough room for social distancing on the pavements while people wait to cross at the traffic lights. In addition, many people walking, scooting, wheeling and cycling to schools and nurseries are encountering heavy traffic, dangerous driving, and inconsiderate and dangerous parking on and in the vicinity of the junction. <p>We urge the Council to take forward these improvements which, if implemented together, would provide a vital safe active travel corridor from Portobello to many destinations, enabling many more people (particularly those without cars who have limited choices) to cycle on a safe, comfortable and direct route.</p>	
<p>Living Streets</p>	<p>Gilmerton, Duddingston Road and Craigmillar Park.</p> <p>These all appear to include a design where bus passengers boarding or alighting <u>have to cross the cycleway directly onto the bus</u> - this looks like a concept with even more pedestrian/cyclist conflict built in than the 'floating' bus stops.</p> <p>We note that the intention appears to be to put a "stop" sign for cyclists before the bus stops. However, we are very sceptical that</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</p>

	<p>many cyclists will come to a halt. We urge the council *not to introduce untested infrastructure which may disadvantage pedestrians* - especially those who are old, frail or have poor eyesight. An Equality Impact Assessment is also needed before this kind of thing can be installed.</p> <p>We are sorry to see apparently more proposals to remove bus stops and bus lanes.</p> <p>We note that it is planned to remove a number of guardrails which we support; but will other street clutter be removed? Or only 'clutter' like guard rails which affect cyclists??</p>	<p>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>Living Streets</p>	<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 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</p>	<p>Currently, the pavements are often used to cycle on, which will change with the new segregation. The scheme also includes the removal of guardrails at various locations.</p>

	<p>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 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</p>	<p>See response above regarding bus stop bypasses.</p>
--	--	--

CIMT 31 July 2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

	<p>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>Public</p>	<p>Over 50 responses from the public were received with a high proportion in favour of the proposal.</p> <p>Those in favour commented:</p> <p>Duddingston Road forms part of an important school route to and from Holy Rood RC High and Portobello High Schools, as well as Duddingston and St John's RC Primary Schools.</p> <p>Providing safe segregated cycle infrastructure will enable many more children, parents and staff to cycle to the schools.</p> <p>Providing safe cycling infrastructure on this route should enable many more people to switch from car/public transport to bike, particularly for the school run, which should help with space for distancing and relieve pressure on the road network, making it safer for everyone.</p> <p>Duddingston Road also forms part of an active travel commuting and leisure route between Portobello and its surrounding areas through to Holyrood Park, the National Cycle Network, and the south and centre of Edinburgh. Many people using bikes avoid the route because they are afraid of speeding drivers, close-passing, etc. The alternative (the Innocent Path), while pleasant during the daytime, is indirect, and is off-putting for many people, particularly at night because of anti-social behaviour, and its isolation.</p> <p>Those against the proposal raised the following concerns:</p> <p>Removal of on street parking will cause parking problems and</p>	<p>All noted.</p> <p>Virtually all houses have driveways.</p>

	<p>congestion. Surrounding streets are already crowded, and much narrower than Duddingston Road.</p> <p>There needs to be full and proper consultation.</p> <p>Cars parked in driveways will be reversing out of driveways onto cyclepaths</p> <p>Other comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for two way cycle lane on the same side of the street. If a two way cycle lane was put on the same side of the street (both cycle lanes on one side of the street) as Duddingston Primary, St. John’s Primary, and the park, this would help access to these facilities, but there are also less houses, and therefore currently less parked cars on this side. • Support for further extension of cycle lanes and links to a proper network • Will there be sufficient space for two buses to pass? • Will there be access for emergency services? • How do the proposals fit in with the safe route to school proposals? 	<p>The few that haven’t have parking opportunities around the back of the house or in nearby side streets.</p> <p>We need to put temporary measures in quickly as our priority is to protect the health and wellbeing of our residents and support businesses. This means we are not able to follow a full engagement process.</p> <p>Drivers should act with due diligence and apply the same precautions whether a segregated cycleway is in place or not.</p> <p>Uni-directional cycle path generally work better than bi-directional ones, especially near junctions.</p> <p>Yes, 6.5m Yes, there are two lanes. It supports the proposals.</p> <p>These routes do not work for</p>
--	--	---

CIMT 31 July 2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative safe cycle routes such as Figgate Park already exist. 	<p>everyone and generally don't follow people's desire line.</p>
<p>Public (Commonplace)</p>	<p>Reduce speed and volume of traffic.</p> <p>Create segregated cycle lane.</p> <p>Add cycle parking.</p> <p>Improve crossings.</p> <p>Restrict/suspend parking.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Duddingston Road has a 20mph speed limit. - We are creating segregated cycle lanes. - We are restricting parking.