

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**

<b>Location</b>	<b>Justification</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
Minto Street, Craigmillar Park, Mayfield Gardens	Provide safer cycle conditions on a main road into the City, connecting various communities. Links in with other Spaces for People projects (eg. Gilmerton Road and Causewayside) and contains a part of the future Cameron Toll to Bioquarter Active Travel route.	<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**

<b>Comment from</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Cllr Rose	<p>It is not clear if there has been any contact with those who run businesses or residents along this route. The mosque If there has not been such notification and opportunity to respond then the proposal should not proceed.</p> <p>There are significant parking issues in East Suffolk Park on Fridays when the 500-600 worshippers attend the mosque in East Suffolk Road. Many of these worshippers, often attending from elsewhere in the city, have been persuaded to park on Craigmillar Park. It is not clear how the proposals will impact this.</p> <p>The proposals should not proceed until these issues have been dealt with.</p>	<p>This scheme has followed the Spaces for People (SfP) process of notification.</p> <p>Parking is generally possible in side streets.</p>
Councillor Webber	Can you provide me with assurances that the businesses and residents along with route have all been involved and asked to	We have followed the engagement process which was approved by

	<p>comment. I can see no sign of this from the distribution list. It looks like the same contributors (excluding of course the various ward specific ward cllrs) as it has been for EVERY other consultation. Without involvement of the actual community then the exercise is nothing more than an exercise in completing consultation rather than being meaningful and relevant to the area. I also notice that the Mosque is also not in the distribution list for contributing to the process, are they even aware this is happening. I am aware via the experience and knowledge of my Conservative colleague that represents this Ward, that there are significant parking issues in East Suffolk Park on Fridays when the 500-600 worshippers attend the mosque in East Suffolk Road. Many of these worshippers, often attending from elsewhere in the city, have been persuaded to park on Craigmillar Park. It is not clear how the proposals will impact this.</p>	<p>Councillors at the Policy and Sustainability Committee. We have contacted the Federation of Small Businesses and Edinburgh City Commerce asking that they direct their members to the spaces for people website and added a link on the council business page to the spaces for people webpage. It is important that we 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 but we have encouraged communities to submit their views on the Spaces for People initiative on the Commonplace website which brought in more than 4000 responses.</p> <p>..</p>
Edinburgh Access Panel	Please protect pedestrians from cyclists with as much segregation as possible.	This project does indeed take care of this
Edinburgh Access Panel	Since the Rediweld bus pads will 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, chicanes, signage.	This is currently being looked into as part of a separate survey for all SfP schemes.

Edinburgh Access Panel	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.	See above.
Edinburgh Access Panel	Please ensure that parking provision for blue badge holders after the emergency measures have been put in place is equivalent to the current provision.	Parking and access for blue badge holders will be retained wherever possible.
Edinburgh Access Panel	We note your proposal to remove the bus stop on Craigmillar Park (southbound) near Lady Road. Since buses that are stopped here create a dangerous obstruction to traffic turning left on to Lady Road, we are supportive of this proposal. But our caveat is that you take into account the consequent increase in the number of passengers using the next bus stop - ie on Liberton Road. Both of these bus stops are currently busy with shoppers using Cameron Toll Shopping Centre.	Point noted.
Spokes	SPOKES welcomes these proposals as part of the short term measures to encourage people to take up cycling for traveling around within Edinburgh. We endorse this objective which, if realised, should help to reduce air pollution, provide a beneficial form of exercise and, most importantly, contribute to a radical shift from transport based on cars and other motor vehicles to more sustainable options that are necessary to achieve CO2 targets. However, it is not yet clear whether temporary measures based on orcas and wands will provide sufficient protection to reassure those who would like to travel by bicycle but are deterred by current road conditions. Meeting this objective is likely to require a seamless transition from short term	Point noted.

	measures to long term protected cycleways which form an integrated network.	
Spokes	The proposed cycleway will be particularly valuable for cyclists travelling south to north which is largely uphill and cyclists will be travelling relatively slowly.	Point noted.
	It will be important that the spacing of the orcas allows cyclists to move out of the cycleway to make right turns at junctions whilst deterring cars and vans from parking and loading on the cycleway itself.	We will make sure that there are openings in the segregation at the proper locations.
Spokes	The Minto St corridor is extensively used by buses. The plans indicate that “bus stop boarders” are to be used. We are unsure how these will work in practice and ideally it would have been better to try them out on a less pressured route. We suggest that their use should be seen as experimental and monitored carefully with changes made quickly if there are safety issues for cyclists or pedestrians. We imagine that many experienced cyclists may prefer to simply overtake buses at bus stops if the road conditions permit and again the spacing of the orcas should allow for this.	The various bus stop solutions are currently subject of a survey and the final situation will indeed be monitored carefully.
Spokes	We are pleased to see that red screeding is to be used to designate advisory cycle lanes at the East/ West Mayfield junction and again, for cyclists crossing the Lady Rd junction from north to south and vice versa after leaving or before joining the cycleway. However, for reasons of safety it is vital that temporary cycle lanes crossing all junction mouths are as prominent as possible and they should also be red-screeded (as is already planned in some but not all schemes) and where possible they should also be widened. In addition, the stop line for traffic should be set back before the cycle lane, to reduce the danger of cars edging forward into the cycle lane whilst waiting.	For financial reasons, red screed will only be used at critical, busy junctions
Spokes	Although this short term cycleway would link in well with the longer term proposals for a cycle route from Cameron Toll to the RIE/Bio	This is an option which could be considered as part of a future SfP

	<p>Quarter, it does not link in well with the current short term proposals that have been applied to the Old Dalkeith Rd and start and finish on the road itself. We suggest that there is a case for drawing up short term measures for linking the Minto St corridor to Old Dalkeith Rd possibly in part 2.</p> <p>Duncan St is currently 1 way for all traffic including cyclists. Although this may eventually be rectified by the proposals for a cycle route from Holyrood Park to Mayfield Rd, this will not happen for some time, if at all. As Duncan St is a major desire line for cyclists from Pollock Halls wishing to go east to west (against the 1-way street) we suggest that Duncan St should be made 2 way for cyclists with some physical protection for cyclists crossing from Blacket Avenue at the entrance to Duncan St to ensure that they do not conflict with west to east traffic wishing to turn right.</p>	<p>phase or under a permanent scheme, if one was taken forward.</p>
<p>Spokes</p>	<p>There is a gap between the proposals for the Minto St corridor and the parallel short term proposals which have been circulated for consultation on Gilmerton Rd. Measures required for this stretch of road are required, especially to protect cyclists travelling south on Liberton Rd from motor traffic turning left on to Gilmerton Rd.</p>	<p>We are working on this stretch as part of SfP as well.</p>
<p>Spokes</p>	<p>The cycleway on the eastern side of Craigmillar Park stops short of the junction with Lady Rd and it is not clear why this is the case. We suggest that it should mirror the length of the cycleway on the opposite side starts closer to the junction.</p>	<p>To let the junction function properly we require two lanes at this point.</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</p>	<p>The principle of Bus Stop Bypasses is generally accepted and applied across the UK and Europe. Though</p>

	<p>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 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>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>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><b>Pedestrian improvements</b></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</p>	<p>Please note that segregated cycle lanes will prevent people from cycling on the pavement. These proposals include the removal of</p>

	<p>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 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><b>Floating Bus stops</b></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>guardrails at various locations.</p> <p>See response above regarding bus stop bypasses.</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>	
Public	<p>Concerns re removal of bus stops. The northbound bus stop on Craigmillar Park is heavily used and there are a lot of older people living in the area who rely on public transport.</p> <p>Concerns re safety of cyclists at the Craigmillar Park/Liberton Road Junction.</p>	<p>We have spoken with Lothian buses and the Public Transport team about these bus stops and because of the close proximity of alternative bus stops and the fact that they are so close to a busy junction, these parties are happy to remove the bus stops as part of the Cameron Toll to BioQuarter Active Travel project.</p>
Public (Commonplace)	<p>Reduce speed and volume of traffic.</p> <p>Create segregated cycle lane.</p> <p>Restrict/suspend parking.</p> <p>Improve condition of road (potholes).</p> <p><i>Specific comments:</i> Object to the following road closures; Minto Street/S Bridge - key route for bus lanes N/S.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This is an arterial route so reducing the speed limit may not be feasible.</li> <li>- The segregated cycle lane will improve safety for cyclists.</li> <li>- Parking will be restricted.</li> <li>- The condition of the road is likely to be improved by work necessary to facilitate the implementation of the proposals.</li> </ul>