

CIMT 4 September 2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

From: **spacesforpeople** <spacesforpeople@edinburgh.gov.uk>
Date: Fri, 4 Sep 2020 at 16:30
Subject: Proposed segregated cycle infrastructure – Buccleuch Street

Dear Councillors and Stakeholders

Covid-19 Cycling and Walking Emergency Response Measures

Proposed segregated cycle infrastructure – Buccleuch Street

Thank you for your comments regarding the proposed emergency road measures. Comments have been reviewed and a summary of comments is included in the attached assessment feedback form to the Council Incident Management Team (CIMT). Following consideration by the CIMT on 4 September the proposals have been approved for implementation.

Officers will be monitoring all the temporary measures and will make adjustments as necessary to mitigate any impacts.

We expect that these measures will be implemented from 9 November with temporary traffic management equipment, such as cones. Where deemed suitable, this equipment will then be replaced with more robust, semi-permanent materials once available.

Further information about how the Council is implementing temporary road measures to support safe walking, wheeling and cycling is available at www.edinburgh.gov.uk/spacesforpeople

Regards

Spaces for People Team

Eileen Hewitt | Transport Officer (Active Travel)

Notification sent to all ward councillors, transport spokespeople, emergency services, Living Streets, Spokes, RNIB, Edinburgh Access Panel and relevant Community Councils on 17 August 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
Buccleuch Street	Upgrading of the advisory lanes to light segregation on Buccleuch Street to provide a much safer active travel provision on this route that is well used by commuters and students. The route will link in with the	Progress with <u>cycle project</u> as part of overall emergency measures to re-designate key parts of the road

	'Spaces for People' route on Causewayside, providing an improved route to Kings Buildings.	network to help pedestrians and cyclists travel safely while meeting physical distancing requirements.
--	--	--

Feedback

Comment from	Comment	Response
Cllr Burgess	I'm pleased to support these proposals to facilitate active travel	Noted.
Cllr Miller	<p>I've attached a couple of marked up comments on this scheme, and in addition to these I'd like to express complete support for this set of measures.</p> <p>Cycle stop line Potterrow- Can I ask what this design feature is? Does this mean that cyclists are to stop for any pedestrians who are crossing at the traffic island? Will all vehicles be expected to stop? Unless all vehicles are expected to stop for pedestrians looking to cross here, there is no benefit to the feature. I feel I must have misunderstood this, I'd like to get clarity please.</p>	<p>The stop lines were a mistake in the drawings and have now been removed.</p>
Cllr Miller	Cyclist stop line Chapel St - Should the cycle lanes not be widened at all the traffic islands in the same way as done here? I would strongly suggest that this design element is used at all the traffic islands.	See above regarding the stop line. Widening of the advisory lane is only applied in areas where the road width is less than 3.25m (suitable for a bus) + 1.5m (cycle lane)
Edinburgh Access Panel	Please ensure that there's plenty of blue badge parking available along this route.	Parking and access for blue badge holders will be retained wherever possible.
Edinburgh Access Panel	Our panel is uncomfortable about the safety of the proposed bus-boarders - more so now that we've examined the one installed on George IV Bridge. We would welcome a moratorium on bus-boarders so that proper consultation can be carried out. While we acknowledge the Council's need to act quickly, that's not a valid excuse for cutting corners when there are widespread doubts about the safety of proposed measures	Following the comments from various groups, it was decided to remove all bus boarders from this scheme. In the new situation the bus will stop at kerbside as it currently does. Cyclists will pass the bus on the carriageway side. We intend to add road markings to make cars aware of cyclists merging into the traffic.

CIMT 4 September 2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

<p>Living Streets Edinburgh</p>	<p>We have no objection to the cycleways in principle. However,</p> <p>1) we strongly object to the bus boarder/pad concept (details not yet even confirmed) that forces bus passengers to board and alight directly from a cycle way. This will significantly disadvantage disabled and older people.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>
<p>Living Streets Edinburgh</p>	<p>2) pavements on several parts of these roads are substandard - we want to see simple improvements to them also, most obviously an assurance that unnecessary pavement clutter - signage poles, bins, guard rails, unused phone kiosks, Royal Mail boxes etc - will be removed. These streets suffer a lot from clutter and a major programme to remove it must be part of the programme if the aim is to promote 'safe social distancing'.</p>	<p>Wherever possible, guard rails will be removed along the route.</p>
<p>Spokes</p>	<p>We support the objective of these proposals to make cycling safer and, therefore, more attractive to those who are currently deterred by traffic conditions on the Causewayside/Buccleuch Street corridor. This corridor is an incredibly important route for cyclists heading to/from the city centre, as well as to both the central and King's Buildings campuses of the University of Edinburgh. It also, of course, contains several local shopping centres. With the right infrastructure, cycling could play a significant role in commuting, shopping, leisure and other journeys along Causewayside and Buccleuch Street. Causewayside and Buccleuch Street are part of the "Quality Bike Corridor" which, whilst an improvement on what came before it, is severely lacking in some respects and the Spaces for People project should aim to remedy these flaws. Whilst some are addressed in the proposals, we have suggestions for further improvements which we hope can be incorporated.</p>	
<p>Spokes</p>	<p>Buccleuch Street proposals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The existing southbound advisory cycle lane between Gifford 	<p>This advisory lane will be retained.</p>

	<p>Park and Buccleuch Terrace is not marked on the plans. Since the protected cycleway is awkward to use if cycling north to south along Buccleuch St, the advisory lane should be retained.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Protection of the southbound cycle lane on Potterrow/Chapel Street should be extended to join up with the small proposed section just north of the pedestrian crossing. The section outside the mosque is often parked in, even where there are double yellow no loading markings, and measures to prevent this are therefore necessary. Gaps should, of course, be left for private access points and side streets. ● The plans show the southbound advisory cycle lane being moved to the inside of the parking spaces on Potterrow, but the plans do not seem to include any measures to prevent drivers parking in the cycle lane. Such measures should obviously be included. ● We believe that there is space to replace the proposed bus boarder on Potterrow with a floating bus stop, as is being done in the Comiston Road project. This would be safer for pedestrians, if it can be done. ● Double parking blocking the existing cycle lane on Lothian Street is often a problem, and consideration should be given to using a parking-protected cycle lane here as well. ● The proposed protected cycle lane on Teviot Place should be extended to meet Middle Meadow Walk. This would make it easier for cyclists approaching from Potterrow to proceed to Forrest Road by using the toucan crossing at the top of Middle Meadow Walk, and design of the layout should make it as clear as possible That such a manoeuvre is possible. At present, the southernmost temporary kerbs on Forrest Road make the normal route tricky. Relocation of the taxi rank may be 	<p>Side streets, bus stops and pedestrian crossings make it hard to add any more segregation in this area, but we will add it wherever feasible.</p> <p>The drawings have now been updated and show a segregation kerb on the edge of the 2.5m wide parking space, then a 0.5m hatched buffer and then the 1.5m cycle path. As mentioned above, all bus boarders will be removed from this scheme.</p> <p>Unfortunately, there is not enough width on Lothian Street to create a parking-protected cycle lane.</p> <p>We will continue segregation from the exit of the Old Medical School to Middle Meadow Walk. Unfortunately, it is not possible to relocate the taxi rank as part of this programme.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>necessary to accomplish this.</p>	
<p>Director of Place - Edinburgh University</p>	<p>I am writing on behalf of the University to offer our strong support for the segregated cycle infrastructure proposals for Buccleuch Street (and proposals for Causewayside, to which we will respond separately).</p> <p>The University is keen to make getting between our campuses as easy as possible for staff and students. For those travelling to the King’s Buildings, student surveys show almost half travelling by bike or foot. This is despite the current route offering several challenges, including an absence of protected cycleways, narrow roads due to parked cars, and narrow footways.</p> <p>Due to the impact of social distancing measures on the capacity of bus services and the implications of this for their fleet, Lothian Buses have advised the University they are unable to provide buses for the shuttle bus service that normally operates between the city centre and King’s Buildings. This service will therefore be suspended. In line with Scottish Government guidance we are communicating to our students and staff to walk, wheel or cycle wherever possible. We anticipate there will be more novice cyclists travelling to and from King’s Buildings who would greatly benefit from more protected cycleways. That is why we strongly support the proposal under consideration, together with proposals for Causewayside.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Director of Place Edinburgh University</p>	<p>We would like to highlight some concerns as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East side of Potterrow - proposal to move existing parking/loading bays into the carriageway to implement an advisory cycle lane between parked vehicles and the footway: it is unclear how vehicles will be physically prevented from parking in the advisory cycle lane. Is there scope to incorporate physical infrastructure here? 	<p>As mentioned above: segregation kerbs will prevent cars from parking in the cycle lane. There will be a buffer between the kerbs and the cycle lane to further protect cyclists.</p>

CIMT 4 September 2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Query the use of “Slow” and “Cyclist stop lines” at pedestrian crossings and bus stops <p>We are otherwise very supportive of the proposed measures which will provide essential improvements to the cycling infrastructure in the southside of the city.</p>	These markings were added mistakenly and have now been removed.
Public (Commonplace)	<p>Pavements too narrow</p> <p>Reduce speed and volume of traffic</p>	Introducing segregated cycle lanes and reducing carriageway width will reduce speeds and remove any potential cycling on the footway.
Southside CC Gordon Drummond	<p>Thanks for sending these draft proposals</p> <p>As a frequent cyclist in Causewayside, I strongly approve of these proposals.</p> <p>The draft plans didn't seem to provide section 3 of the northerly proposals (CS/12727/1100/00), that is the dreaded Potterrow whizz way, but as far as I can see on the small scale plan this is suggested to receive a cycle lane as well.</p> <p>The provision of segregated cycle lanes, that will prevent the frequent dangerous illegal parking of vehicles in the advisory cycle lanes, would be a valuable improvement in safety, for example in Buccleuch Street on the East side of the road opposite Archers' Hall. The movement of the loading bays onto the carriageway side of the cycle lane between Marshall Street and the Mosque will be helpful, but loading and unloading could cause a hazard to cyclists: perhaps loading and unloading could be conducted from Marshall Street?</p> <p>The narrowing of the north fork of West Crosscauseway, where it meets Chapel street, could be more substantial than illustrated: this carries little vehicular traffic.</p>	<p>There will be segregation between the cycle lane and the parking bays and a hatched buffer on the cycle lane side.</p> <p>The radii of the corners were determined by vehicle tracking.</p>
Southside CC Philip McDowell	<p>I have looked at the proposals and wish to comment on the possible conflict between pedestrians and cyclists at bus stops. I recently got off a bus on George IV Bridge with a small child, and found to my surprise that we were stepping off the bus into a cycle lane. The safety of this arrangement is highly questionable. It relies on cyclists being aware that pedestrians</p>	As mentioned above, the scheme will now not have any bus boarders.

	<p>have priority at these points. If there is a bus at the stop, cyclists must stop to allow people to alight from and board the bus. With only a white line to hold the cyclists back, I'm sure there will be accidents. It would be much better, in my opinion, to allow the bus to pull in to the kerb, blocking the cycle lane. Any cyclist is going to have to stop anyway, so it is of no further inconvenience to the cyclist to be stopped by a bus rather than a white line. Bus drivers are already skilful at 'negotiating' with cyclists at bus stops, and it seems to me this would be a much safer arrangement.</p>	
<p>Southside CC Robert Hodgart (extracts)</p>	<p>I would like to comment on the above proposed segregated cycle infrastructure for the stretch of road from Teviot Place and Potterrow to Buccleuch Street and Hope Park Crescent. I'm doing that as a member of Southside Community Council and as someone who has been active in the Causey Project for West Crosscauseway for many years.</p> <p>... Some specific points. At present much of the stretch of Potterrow involved is marked as a bus lane. It's not clear from the drawings whether the road markings there will be redone so that the road lane adjacent to the protected cycle lane will be re-marked as a bus lane or if this stretch will no longer have a bus lane. Whichever it is, I think the creation of a well protected cycle lane should have priority. On a small point of detail, in West Crosscauseway it seems a little strange how the short stretch of protected cycle lane on the south side at the western end of the street seems on the drawing to taper in to the pavement. I assume that this won't be a problem in practice as this lane will be marked so that a cyclist coming through into this space from Nicolson St and the eastern part of West Crosscauseway will see the lane gradually widening out from the pavement and any wands will be placed safely further on to avoid them being a hazard.</p> <p>In a 2nd email Mr Hodgart points us at the debate around bus</p>	<p>This short stretch will no longer have a bus lane. This has been discussed with Lothian Buses and the Council's Public Transport team.</p> <p>This is actually not a cycle lane, but we are widening the pavement and reducing the radii of the corners in this area to reduce vehicle speeds. Road markings (hatching) will be added to make this clear.</p>

	<p>boarders and the fact that they are an accepted and safe solution in areas of London and in Denmark. Since the bus boarders are now not part of this scheme anymore, we have left out the text of this letter.</p>	
<p>Southside CC Nicholas Oddy</p>	<p>My own response is similar to Robert’s an approval of schemes like this. In general Orca strips are good, they provide enough of a deterrent for drivers of motor vehicles to not stray across them, while not being a serious hazard in themselves. This sort of designation tool is fine.</p> <p>The wands are a different matter. These are extremely unsightly and therefore likely to cause a negative response. While they might not damage a vehicle hitting one, woe betide cyclists finding one knocked across their path, or catching on one. Moreover they are a red-rag to motoring bulls. In other parts of town some people wage war on them, continually uprooting them and leaving them heaped on pavements. They are far more trouble than they are worth.</p> <p>In terms of the layout, there should be no more than two lanes of motor traffic on the section of dual carriage way in Potterrow and there would be a good case for a proper cycle path to be built on the outer lanes of each side. It would be good to see the removal of the ‘guard rail’ in the central reservation at the West end of the carriageway to allow those who wish to cross the road to do so at this point. This would be the first step to normalising road conditions here, as I suspect it will be many years before there are resources to remove this bit of obsolete infrastructure and replace it with a more foot and cycle friendly street plan, which I understand is the long term intention.</p> <p>Mr Oddy also sent a 2nd email regarding bus boarders. We have left this out because bus boarders are now not part of this scheme anymore.</p>	<p>The current red-white cylinders are a temporary solution and the segregators and wands that will replace these are of much better quality, both visually and mechanically.</p> <p>Potterrow will become single lane and the guard rail on the central reservation will be removed.</p>