

CIMT4 September 2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

From: **spacesforpeople** <spacesforpeople@edinburgh.gov.uk>
Date: Fri, 4 Sep 2020 at 16:28
Subject: Proposed segregated cycle infrastructure – Causewayside

Dear Councillors and Stakeholders

Covid-19 Cycling and Walking Emergency Response Measures

Proposed segregated cycle infrastructure – Causewayside

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 16 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

Notification sent to all ward councillors, transport spokespeople, emergency services, Living Streets, Spokes, RNIB, Edinburgh Access Panel and relevant Community Councils on 17 August. 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
Causewayside	Causewayside is a busy road and is part of a cycle route that is well-used by commuters and students. The road has advisory cycle lanes that are very often used for parking. Upgrading the uphill advisory lanes to light segregation will provide a	<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

	much safer active travel provision, with no impact on bus services.	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'm completely supportive of this scheme with a couple of comments below.</p> <p>South of Salisbury Place - Why is this an advisory lane and not a segregated lane - I would like to comment that all of the cycle lanes should be segregated where possible.</p>	Causewayside has a lot of tenements and shops and removing all parking would be detrimental to residents and traders. It is considered that an advisory lane at this location achieves Spaces for People objectives and still meets the needs of other road users/stakeholders. We have implemented segregation in all uphill sections and wherever feasible in other areas
Cllr Miller	<p>Stop markings close to junction with Duncan Street - As with the scheme to the north, I'm unclear how the stop marking in the cycle lane would work unless there is a stop for all vehicles to enable a pedestrian crossing at the traffic island. Please could you clarify if I have interpreted the design correctly and explain how this would work. Otherwise I would like to call for this design element to be removed throughout the scheme</p>	The stop lines were a mistake in the drawings and have now been removed.
Edinburgh Access Panel	It's essential to provide plenty of blue badge parking outside the numerous residences, shops and other businesses on Causewayside.	Parking and access for blue badge holders will be retained wherever possible.
Edinburgh Access Panel	There is a risk that improved cycling facilities on Causewayside will tempt even more cyclists to cycle the	Noted. Duncan Street's one-way system will be subject contraflow cycling provision in the near future.

CIMT4 September 2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

	<p>wrong way down Duncan Street from Minto Street rather than staying on Minto Street and using Salisbury Place. Please mitigate this risk by beefing up the "One Way" signage on Duncan Street - eg "NO ENTRY" painted on the surface of Duncan Street near the junction with Minto Street and again near the junction with Upper (and South) Gray Street.</p>	
<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>Following the comments from various groups, it was decided to remove all bus boarders from this scheme. Buses will stop at kerbside and 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.</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>Where possible, guard rails will be removed from this 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</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

	<p>infrastructure, cycling could play a significant role in commuting, shopping, leisure and other journeys along Causewayside and Buccleuch Street.</p> <p>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>Corridor-wide points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The entire corridor is generally too busy for advisory cycle lanes to be a safe solution. It would be made much safer for cyclists and pedestrians by removing through traffic, which could be accomplished by installing a bus gate somewhere along the route. Access for deliveries would therefore be maintained, whilst removing through traffic (except for pedestrians, cyclists and buses). ● In both sets of plans, there are “SLOW” and “STOP” markings in the cycle lanes before traffic islands and bus stops. These should be removed, as they wrongly suggest that cyclists using the cycle lanes do not have priority at these points. ● In several places, pedestrian guardrail which is proposed for removal is currently well used as bike parking. Examples include outside Summerhall and opposite Buccleuch Place. Replacement bike racks should therefore be provided near these locations. 	<p>Causewayside has a lot of tenements and shops and removing all parking would be detrimental to residents and traders. It is considered that advisory lanes at some locations achieves Spaces for People objectives and still meets the needs of other road users/stakeholders. We have implemented segregation in all uphill sections and wherever feasible in other areas.</p> <p>These markings were added mistakenly and have now been removed.</p> <p>We are currently discussing the option to</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The southbound cycle lane is mostly to be left as it is at present - some stretches of advisory cycle lane, interspersed with stretches of no cycling infrastructure at all. This continues the mistake made when the Quality Bike Corridor was introduced. We fear that without more ambitious proposals for the southbound lane, the scheme as a whole will fail in its key objective to promote cycling since cyclists generally wish to travel in both directions from their home or wherever their journey starts. <p>We therefore recommend that the proposals for the southbound lane should be reviewed with the aim of introducing protected and separate cycle lanes on both sides of the road. Whilst this may require a reduction in the number of parking spaces on the east side of the road, the customers for the large majority of the shops in this area serve the nearby locality and should be easily accessible on foot or by bike. If a more continuous cycle southbound lane is not considered feasible, we believe this only strengthens the need for removing motorised through traffic from the route by installing a bus gate.</p>	<p>replace the guard rails with bike parking with Edinburgh University.</p> <p>Causewayside has a lot of tenements and shops and removing all parking would be detrimental to residents and traders. It is considered that advisory lanes at some locations achieves Spaces for People objectives and still meets the needs of other road users/stakeholders. We have implemented segregation in all uphill sections and wherever feasible in other areas.</p>
Spokes	<p>The northbound advisory cycle lane on Ratcliffe Terrace has been a continual source of difficulty for cyclists since it was built, but the current proposals will not address the existing problems here. The cycle lane is frequently blocked by parked vehicles, which forces cyclists to move out into the flow of the traffic. Consideration should be given to replacing it with a parking-protected cycleway which would then run into the proposed, protected cycle lane just south of Grange Loan.</p>	<p>Unfortunately, there is not enough width for a parking-protected cycle lane.</p>
Spokes	<p>The northbound cycle lane on Causewayside is frequently blocked by parked vehicles outside the Aviator pub. Advisory lanes do not work here, and stronger measures should be incorporated.</p>	<p>A segregated cycle lane is proposed at this location.</p>

<p>Spokes</p>	<p>The existing central feeder lanes at the Melville Drive and West Preston Street junctions feel dangerous to many cyclists. Banning left turns onto Melville Drive and West Preston Street would solve this (turning the filter lanes into segregated cycling lanes). The alternative route for motor traffic (via Nicolson Street) is a very short detour.</p>	<p>Whilst the feeder lanes are not ideal, alternative routes would actually mean quite a detour and would guide vehicle traffic through more quiet residential streets</p>
<p>Spokes</p>	<p>Connections to other routes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Gifford Park: An important connection from this project will obviously be along Gifford Park towards the Nicolson Street corridor and the Innocent Railway path. Whilst we think that the layout on Gifford Park operates satisfactorily at present, there is potential for increased conflict between cyclists and pedestrians at the Nicolson Street crossing if increasing numbers of cyclists use it. We hope that this is being taken into consideration, and that any necessary improvements will be included in the forthcoming Nicolson Street corridor Spaces for People proposals. Such improvements could include increasing the length of the pedestrian/cyclist phase at the crossing. ● Mayfield Road: We also suggest that the scheme be extended to include the remainder of the former Quality Bike corridor up to King’s Buildings. This should be possible simply by converting the existing advisory cycle lanes into mandatory cycle lanes with orca wand protection. This would also provide the opportunity to redesign the northbound cycle lane which currently takes cyclists on the outside of the car parking provided from Relugas Rd to Fountainhall Rd on the south to north lane of the road and is potentially dangerous. Consideration should be given to changing this to a parking-protected arrangement, which could feed into a similar arrangement on Ratcliffe Terrace, as we have suggested above. The southbound advisory cycle lane between Mentone Terrace and Savile Terrace is another 	<p>This point is noted and may be followed up in a next phase of the programme.</p> <p>Mayfield Road has been added to the Spaces for People programme and will run all the way to the junction with Liberton Road.</p> <p>As in the area mentioned above: parking protected cycle lanes will unfortunately not be possible because of the limited width. The road is not wide enough to create a carriageway that is suitable for passing buses, two segregated cycle lanes as well as parking.</p>

CIMT4 September 2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

	<p>location which may benefit from becoming parking-protected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Bristo Place: Bristo Place is not covered by the existing Forrest Road/George IV Bridge project, and the current proposals unfortunately do not include it either. This is unfortunate as the existing layout leaves much to be desired, particularly for cyclists turning right onto Teviot Place, and it would remain a weak point in the route from Princes Street to the Meadows. Consideration should therefore be given to including proposals for Bristo Place in the Buccleuch Street project 	<p>Bristo Place is part of the second phase of the Forrest Road/George IV Bridge project and segregation is planned for the cycle path on the east. We are also looking into options to make the entry to the feeder lanes safer.</p>
<p>Director of Place Edinburgh University</p>	<p>I am writing on behalf of the University to offer our strong support for segregated cycle infrastructure proposals for Causewayside (and proposals for Buccleuch Street, 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</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

	<p>is why we strongly support the proposal under consideration, together with proposals for Buccleuch Street.</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"> • We strongly support the provision of significant sections of segregated cycleway on the northbound carriageway. We are concerned that the proposals for a cycle lane in the southbound direction are almost entirely for an advisory cycle lane. The lane appears to go through existing sections of P&D parking bays. There appears to be no attempt to remove these parking bays or divert the cycle lane around them. We are concerned that the cycle lane will be consistently blocked by parked vehicles. • The absence of proposals south of Ratcliffe Terrace to provide continuous infrastructure improvements to King’s Buildings. We understand that proposals are under development and urge that these are also implemented for the start of the academic year – 14th September. • Query the use of “Slow” and “Cyclist stop lines” at pedestrian crossings and bus stops • Highlight that the removal of the guardrail outside Summerhall will remove a significant area of cycle parking. <p>Furthermore, we are aware of, and welcome plans to bring forward the implementation of Quiet Route 30, which would help link Pollock Halls – the University’s largest concentration of student accommodation – with the King’s Buildings. However, if possible, we would like to see the Duncan Street contraflow cycle lane incorporated into the Spaces for People projects. This would provide benefit to cyclists travelling between campuses and Pollock Halls.</p>	<p>Causewayside has a lot of tenements and shops and removing all parking would be detrimental to residents and traders. It is considered that advisory lanes at some locations achieves Spaces for People objectives and still meets the needs of other road users/stakeholders. We have implemented segregation in all uphill sections and wherever feasible in other areas.</p> <p>Mayfield Road been added to the Spaces for People programme and will run all the way to the junction with Liberton Road. Implementation for the start of the academic year will unfortunately not be possible, but the scheme is high on the priority list. These markings were added mistakenly and have now been removed. It may be possible to replace the guard rails with proper cycle parking and we will contact you about this directly.</p> <p>Point noted.</p>

CIMT4 September 2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

	<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>	
<p>Public (one response)</p>	<p>The temporary cycle / social distancing lane from Cameron Toll to Little France is a case in point.</p> <p>1/ No signage to indicate what it is. Been like this for two months and nothing to say what the lane is for.</p> <p>2/ The road is now too narrow making it difficult for large vehicles to pass. Note this proposal has the road space as narrow as 5.38m when a bus is 2.55m. This leaves less than a foot leeway.</p> <p>3/ Limited passing for emergency vehicles and difficulties for local businesses to get deliveries.</p> <p>4/ The wands are continually knocked over due to the narrow road and will cause a hazard for cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>5/ As it ceases to be solely a cycle lane, pedestrians, prams and wheelchairs will now become an added hazard which wasn't the case when simply a cycle lane.</p> <p>6/ Makes it impossible for disabled and elderly people with Blue Badges to access some places they need to get to.</p> <p>Not sure given our climate, with over 200 days when it rains, that the Council think residents will all be cycling. What will actually happen is that we will see more car and taxi traffic, being the safest and warmest mode of transport during the winter months, and most of the summer too.</p>	<p>We will consider how the communication of the overall Spaces for People programme and of the use of the actual interventions can be improved.</p> <p>Most points mentioned here are specific to the Old Dalkeith road scheme and will be used as feedback for that scheme.</p>
<p>Public (Commonplace)</p>	<p>Pavement too narrow, limited space to queue outside shop/bus stops</p> <p>Add cycle parking</p>	<p>Where possible, we will remove guard rails along the route.</p>

	<p>Improve crossings Reduce speed volume of traffic Add protected cycle lane to main road</p> <p>Comment: Turning right at Drouthy Neebors very dangerous. Turning right at this junction (heading north) is dangerous as it requires waiting in the middle of the junction while a long queue of traffic goes by on both sides. Adding a right turn signal or a separate green lights bike system would make turning here a lot safer.</p>	<p>Additional cycle parking will be looked at separately.</p> <p>Segregated cycle lanes and reducing the number of parked cars near crossings will improve the safety of crossings.</p> <p>Introducing segregated cycle lanes and reducing carriageway width will reduce speeds and potentially also the 'busy feel' of this area.</p> <p>We are creating segregated cycle lanes.</p> <p>Adding signals is unfortunately not possible as part of this programme.</p>
<p>Southside CC Robert Hodgart (extract)</p>	<p>Following on from a response to the Buccleuch Street proposals:</p> <p>I've also had a look at the proposals for Causewayside and Ratcliffe Terrace and support these too. As above, the use of 'Orca Wands' will be quite novel so considering how to inform the public about these in advance may mitigate some opposition especially if the implementation is close in time to the above plans. I hope you find some of these comments helpful.</p> <p>Thanks for letting us know about them in some detail. Good luck with seeing them through to completion.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Southside CC Philip McDowell</p>	<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</p>	<p>As mentioned above, the scheme will now not have any bus boarders.</p>

CIMT4 September 2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

	<p>being aware that pedestrians 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 Gordon Drummond</p>	<p>Thanks for sending these draft proposals As a frequent cyclist in Causewayside, I strongly approve of these proposals. ... Further south, vehicles in Summerhall Crescent and Summerhall Place frequently exceed the limit of 20 mph: additional roundels would be a good idea: or even, if possible, an advisory sign indicating the vehicle speeds! I hope these comments are helpful.</p>	<p>We will add 20mph roundels in this area.</p>