

CIMT 4 September 2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

From: **spacesforpeople** <spacesforpeople@edinburgh.gov.uk>

Date: Fri, 4 Sep 2020 at 16:25

Subject: Proposed segregated cycle infrastructure – Pennywell Road

Dear Councillors and Stakeholders

Covid-19 Cycling and Walking Emergency Response Measures

Proposed segregated cycle infrastructure – Pennywell Road

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 14 September 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) | Road Safety and 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
Pennywell Road	This route will provide better cycling infrastructure in one of the most deprived areas of Edinburgh. It will create links between various communities and between the North Edinburgh Path Network and the coast (Marine Drive and Silverknowes Road). Muirhouse and West Pilton	<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

CIMT 4 September 2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

	<p>are home to three Primary schools, a Special Needs school, a High school and two shopping centres, all close to the proposed intervention. The current dual carriage ways will be changed into single lanes with segregated cycle paths. Pennywell roundabout may be improved in a second phase of the Spaces for People scheme. The scheme will not cause any detriment to public transport.</p>	<p>cyclists travel safely while meeting physical distancing requirements.</p>
--	--	---

Feedback

Comment from	Comment	Response
<p>Cllr Campbell</p>	<p>Thank you for sharing these proposals.</p> <p>I am sympathetic to the rational set out in the summary contained in the email below. I can't, however, support the scheme based on a "Proposed bus boarder (details to be finalised)," as detailed in the supporting drawings.</p> <p>Public transport provided by bus is a vital infrastructure for this part of the city. It serves citizens with varying degrees of mobility.</p> <p>Can you provide finalised drawings of the "bus boarder" and supporting evidence from bus operators, passenger groups and groups representing citizens with mobility impairments that the finalised design is a safe and reasonable approach, and fully compliment with all legislation.</p>	<p>Following the comments from various groups, it was decided to remove all bus boarders from this scheme. Buses will continue to stop at kerbside. 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. There will be one floating bus stop in the scheme: at Silverknowes Place. A floating bus stop provides a safe place for bus users to access and leave the bus before crossing the cycle lane.</p>
<p>Cllr Hutchison</p>	<p>I agree entirely with the comments of my colleague Councillor Campbell. While I am sympathetic to the broad aims of the scheme, I am extremely sceptical on the merits of promoting active travel at this location where there is a clear detriment to existing public transport.</p>	<p>See answer to Cllr Campbell's comment. The scheme will not cause any detriment to public transport.</p>
<p>Cllr Gordon</p>	<p>I would also like to see more information on this proposal and am concerned about the bus service in the area as they are vital services for the community who have seen a reduction to bus services in recent years.</p>	<p>See answer to Cllr Campbell's and Hutchison's comments.</p>

CIMT 4 September 2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

Cllr Work	I'm broadly in agreement with the proposals but like the councillors who have responded so far would like more details of how the bus services would be impacted.	See previous answers.
Cllr Miller	I am fully supportive of this scheme and would like to ask that the bus stop issues that local ward representatives have raised are resolved in collaboration jointly with the Edinburgh Bus User Group and Spokes so that a design can be created which meets the needs of people in alignment with the transport hierarchy.	See previous answers: the situation at the bus stops will not change. To improve the situation for cyclists that have to merge in with the traffic at bus stops we will add road markings to make cars aware.
Cllrs Lang and Young	<p>Like other councillors, we have concerns about being asked to provide comments on plans which are not complete. The proposals look to have significant impacts on bus stops and bus services yet the proposed bus boarder details are, according to the plans, still "to be finalised". We would expect this to be provided and for councillors to be given another opportunity to comment before any final decisions are taken.</p> <p>We also have concerns about the impact of the proposals for those living on Silverknowes Parkway. The westbound dual carriageway is used extensively for on-street parking by local residents. Introducing cycle lanes and reducing the carriageway to a single lane would, we presume, require parking restrictions along this route. Where would residents be expected to park their vehicles?</p> <p>Equally, the eastbound carriageway is traditionally used for parking at weekends for popular community football training and events. Again where would visitors be expected to park their cars?</p> <p>As part of the 2017 Silverknowes roundabout redevelopment project, a cycleway was established on the north side of Silverknowes Parkway running behind the bus stops. What consideration was given to extending this along Silverknowes Parkway / Muirhouse Parkway using part of the grass land. We feel this would provide the same solution but avoid the knock on problems we have highlighted above.</p>	<p>See previous answers regarding the bus stops.</p> <p>All houses along Silverknowes Parkway have driveways.</p> <p>This point is noted and provision will be made for the introduction of an extended bus stance (length to be confirmed) at this location.</p> <p>This is a good idea which may be pursued in the future.</p>

CIMT 4 September 2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

Cllr Barrie	Can you describe what provision is being made to facilitate loading/unloading for instance, a removal vehicle on Pennywell Road for the modern tenement flats at numbers 11, 13, 19 and 21 who do not have an appropriate other entry to their properties. Stopping such a vehicle will see the entire road closed if the nearside lane is completely dedicated to a cycle lane	We have decided to reduce the cycle lane width to 1.5m to leave space for these situations.
Edinburgh Living Streets	We have no objection to the cycleways in principle. However, 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.	The bus boarders from the original design will not be implemented, so buses will continue to stop at kerbside.
Edinburgh Living Streets	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'.	Virtually all guard rails along the route will be removed as part of this programme
Edinburgh Access Panel	Please ensure there's plenty of blue badge parking available along this route outside any residences, shops and other businesses.	Parking and access for blue badge holders will be retained wherever possible.
Edinburgh Access Panel	We note your proposal to change the current dual carriageways to single lanes. As others have already remarked, bus transport is an essential element of this area's infrastructure. Please don't make using the bus unattractive by slowing buses down. Using a bus is already a challenge for many disabled people. It's essential to guard against the risk that disabled people will stay at home and become isolated unless the bus service is efficient and easy to use.	Bus services should not be impacted by the new design. Segregating cyclists from the general traffic may actually speed up the traffic in some instances.

CIMT 4 September 2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

Edinburgh Access Panel	Bus-boarders will also run the risk of deterring disabled people from using the bus. Moreover, 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.	As mentioned before, bus boarders will not be implemented in this scheme.
Edinburgh Access Panel	We are concerned about the area of Pennywell Road at the Robertson site. It's essential to provide effective segregation of pedestrians and cyclists during the construction work as well as after it's finished.	Pedestrians and cyclists will have segregated paths in this area.
Edinburgh Access Panel	As part of this project please address the lack of wheelchair accessible road crossings. There is an impassable kerb to both sides of the Craigoyston Health Centre entryway which needs to be dropped to allow access for wheelchair users along this footway. The plans to place a segregated cycle lane make it even more challenging to circumvent this problem area as it will require negotiation of the new cycle lane also.	Thank you for your comments. We will create dropped kerbs as part of this scheme.
Edinburgh Access Panel	There is similarly a pressing requirement to give wheelchair users a proper crossing point on the lower end of Muirhouse Parkway near the roundabout with West Granton Road, Marine Drive and Pennywell Road. Despite nearly 20 years of complaint, there has been no action, with the latest update that this crossing will 'hopefully' be resolved in 2023. It is depressing that there is such a substantial budget to make improvements in this area for cyclists, yet it does not extend to provision of urgently needed road crossings, which are continually refused owing to budget constraints.	There are plans for a second phase to this project in which the roundabout will be made walking and cycling friendly. If this goes ahead, we will create pedestrian crossings on all sides of the roundabout. If this does not go ahead, we will create dropped kerbs at the lower end of Muirhouse Parkway as part of this scheme.
Edinburgh Access	Please encourage Police Scotland to prevent the use of the new	Point noted.

Panel	cycleway by motorbikes. Motorbike speeding is already a very significant problem specific to the area, including fatal accidents.	
Spokes	<p>Spokes is pleased to welcome these proposals, particularly the significant lengths of segregated cycle infrastructure. We have a number of comments and recommendations:</p> <p>1. Proposed Bus Boarder - Details To Be Finalised The bus stop design is problematic, as it involves bus passengers having to board and disembark directly from or onto the cycle lane, without any pedestrian zone being provided. We recommend the use of the design used in George IV Bridge with a 1.5 metre bus access strip alongside the narrowed 1.5 cycle lane lane. The recent Council and Napier TRI reports on the Leith Walk floating bus stop suggest that bus boarders <i>with an access area for pedestrians</i> are likely to perform well. This would mean that at bus stops the inside lane is mostly given over to cycles and bus passengers. Buses will stop partly in the remaining other lane. The Council has in recent years created many bus boarder build-outs which cause traffic to wait in the carriageway, and has justified this in terms of the travel hierarchy. It is of course also the case in many narrower single-carriageway roads. Our proposal here is no different, and again respects the travel hierarchy, placing cars behind bus, cycle and walking.</p> <p>We recommend that you consider having zebra crossing style stripes on the cycle lane area for better visibility and to reinforce pedestrian crossing priority, but beware of introducing any surfaces with skid danger - in particular, tramline slabs parallel to the direction of travel must not be placed within the cyclerooute. Skidding near a bus stop is clearly a danger to walkers as well as the cyclist themselves.</p>	<p>See answers above. All bus boarders will be removed from the scheme and we will have one floating bus stop as described here by Spokes (at Silverknowes Place).</p>
Spokes	<p>2. Proposed Red Surfacing Required To Highlight Presence Of Cyclists We welcome that red lane surfaces are proposed at several places to make it clear to traffic that there is a cycle lane with priority over the side road or access. However, we would like to see</p>	<p>For financial reasons, red screed will only be used at critical, busy junctions.</p>

	<p>this principle extended to all junctions and also to where parking has been retained (if it really has to be?) inside the cycle lane . In addition, experience from elsewhere indicates a danger from traffic approaching from side streets, in a manner which causes cyclists to fear that it will either not stop or will straddle the cycle lane, causing the cyclist to veer to the right. To help counter this, we strongly recommend that, as well as the red coloured surface, cycle lanes are widened across junctions to the left, in the direction of travel, to discourage encroachment.</p>	<p>Widening the cycle lane across junctions may indicate to cyclists that they can move right, whilst cars behind them may want to turn left which may cause conflict. Widening the cycle lane could also mean that cars could more easily access the segregated lane beyond the junction.</p>
Spokes	<p>3. Proposed 2.5m Kerb Units At 10m Spacing With Continuous White Line On Same Alignment Throughout We welcome the use of these kerb units, but they need to be closer together and have double yellow lines. Unfortunately, a mandatory segregated cycleway that can be legally parked on is not fully segregated and will be parked on. Whereas Pennywell Road has double yellow lines throughout, no such protection exists at Silverhouse Parkway and Muirhouse Parkway. In addition, whereas the kerb unit spacing is mostly at 5 meters at Pennywell Road it is a very wide 10 metres apart on Silverhouse Parkway and Muirhouse Parkway. We recommend that it is essential that double yellow lines are included wherever there are segregated cycle lanes and that all 10 metre kerb unit spacing is reduced to 5 metre.</p>	<p>10 m spacing is used on long cycle lane stretches without frontages. The road provides clear sight lines and is level so longer distances between segregators is regarded as a safe solution This reduces the cost of the scheme meaning more schemes can be realised. We will introduce waiting and loading restrictions throughout the scheme so parking is not allowed.</p>
Spokes	<p>4. Proposed Temporary Footway On Carriageway As Part Of The Robertson Site Traffic Management This appears to require a short section of the cycle lane beside this building site to be shared use and, if so, we recommend that the signage should be very clear.</p>	<p>In this area, there will be segregation between vehicles and cycles and between cycles and pedestrians.</p>
Spokes	<p>5. Pennywell Roundabout We note that the Pennywell roundabout may be improved in a second phase of the Spaces for People scheme and we recommend that it is.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Spokes	<p>6. Proposals at West Granton Access Junction</p>	

	<p>Although presented almost as an addendum to the Pennywell Road proposals and as geographically separate, these are potentially very important.</p> <p><i>Looked at for eastbound cyclists:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Our interpretation is that these are partly intended as an aid to those eastbound cyclists choosing to use the Ferry Road service road to get from Pennywell Road to here. As such, we recommend that the design be extended to include new physical connections and signage to and from the service road, especially at the western end from Pennywell Road. 2. The Eastbound ASL box remains very hard to get into with the unsatisfactory <i>cycle-lane sandwiched- between-traffic-lanes</i> format retained. This is daunting enough for experienced cyclists and is a major deterrent for new cyclists. Improvement of this junction has the potential to be a significantly bigger win for cycling safety than some of the other proposals contained herein. We recommend that the eastbound lane-count is reduced by one lane, thereby permitting there to be a segregated cyclelane connecting into the ASL box, all the way from the path linking to the service road. This would have the further benefit that it would simplify the links from the service road, which could be further east on better alignments. We question why is there a need for a dedicated lane for West Granton Access (WGA), plus the two lanes towards Crewe Toll? How much traffic for WGA can be travelling eastbound along Ferry Road and where does it originate? 3. We recommend that the proposed curved section of protected cycleway at the junction with West Granton Access Road be redesigned, as the current design looks like it will be hard for eastbound cyclists from Ferry Road going towards Crewe Toll to get into the segregated cycle lane. <i>Looked at for westbound cyclists:</i> 4. New ASL box westbound is welcome. 5. We note the single disabled bay, within the junction, on south side and that Google Maps satellite view shows 3 cars in it and blocking the cycle lane. <p>We recommend that consideration be given to relocating this bay</p>	<p>There will be signage at the 'Red bridge' junction as well as the Pennywell Road end.</p> <p>This area has a shared use path beside the carriageway that can be used for less experienced cyclists. These cyclists can either <i>enter</i> West Granton Access at the pedestrian crossing or <i>cross</i> West Granton Access at this point.</p> <p>This is a good idea and we will take this forward as part of the current scheme.</p> <p>In our final design, we have removed the segregation from this area.</p> <p>We will retain the disabled persons' parking place at this location, and we will introduce double yellow lines on either side.</p>
--	---	---

CIMT 4 September 2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

	<p>close-by into Easter Drylaw Drive, where a larger capacity bay could be provided.</p> <p>6. We recommend that consideration be given to closing Easter Drylaw Drive at its north end, thereby reducing the complexity at this big junction.</p>	<p>Closing Easter Dryaw Drive would mean diverting traffic to other, narrower roads in the area which is not desirable.</p>
Spokes	<p>7. Ferry Road</p> <p>Although these proposals are valuable, we are concerned that they do not address the difficulty and danger to cyclists, especially new cyclist of the adjacent part of Ferry Road and we recommend that early consideration be given to the creating segregated cyclelanes there.</p>	<p>The permanent ‘NEAT Connections’ project takes this into consideration. As part of this project, we intend to create a bi-directional, segregated cycle lane on the green verge along Ferry Road.</p>
West Pilton/West Granton Community Council	<p>The West Pilton West Granton Community Council agrees with some of the concerns expressed by elected officials requesting more information before any decision is made. Additionally, we do not believe that 4 days is sufficient to allow any meaningful dialogue with constituents to gain their views. We would support a public consultation on the matter.</p>	<p>We have followed the notification process which was approved at the Policy and Sustainability Committee. 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>
Public (Commonplace)	<p>Reduce speed and volume of traffic</p> <p>Add protected cycle lane to main road</p>	<p>Creating segregated cycling infrastructure will protect cyclists and will hopefully encourage people to use the bike instead of the car. Pennywell Road is a 20mph road and reducing the width of the carriageway has proven to slow down traffic.</p>