

CIMT 18 November 2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

[Covering letter, pasted in here]

Covid 19 Emergency Response Measures - A1 Bus Priority and Cycle Improvement Scheme

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

Date: Thu, 14 Jan 2021 at 11:03

Subject: Covid 19 Emergency Response Measures - A1 Bus Priority and Cycle Improvement Scheme

Dear Councillors and Stakeholders

Thank you for your comments regarding the proposed emergency road measures. Comments have been reviewed and are included in the attached assessment feedback form. Following consideration by [full Council](#) on 19 November 2020 the proposals have been approved for implementation with the following changes having been agreed during the installation period:

- Retention of some uncontrolled parking and loading/unloading space on the Northfield Terrace section.

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 by Monday 8 February 2021.

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 | Place | City of Edinburgh Council | G:4 Waverley Court | 4 East Market Street | Edinburgh | EH8 8BG | Eileen.hewitt@edinburgh.gov.uk

Notification sent to all ward councillors, transport spokespeople, emergency services, Living Streets, Spokes, RNIB, Edinburgh Access Panel and relevant Community Councils on 17 September 2020. Recipients were given 12 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
Sections of the A1 corridor from close to Leith Walk to the junction with Mountcastle Drive South.	Introduction of new bus priority and cycle improvements measures to enhance existing provisions with the principal aims of encouraging and supporting cyclists to travel safely while also prioritising public transport on one of the city's strategic transport corridors.	Subject to approval at meeting of the Full Council Committee on 19 November, proceed to deliver 'SfP - A1 TEC Approval Drawings' designs which have been updated in response to notification feedback provided herein.

Feedback

Comment from	Comment	Response
Cllr Mowat	<p>I note the loss of all parking on London Road – has the cost in lost revenue been calculated? Given that these are temporary measures and there is a reduction in off street parking at the eastern end of the city with the current closure of the St James Centre car park until the works are completed next year this removes parking used to support businesses in the area and allows parking for people exercising and using local businesses.</p> <p>Whilst I appreciate the difficulty of installing cycle lanes and parking in the same place I am concerned that there is a significant loss of parking here to be replaced by a cycle lane which currently feeds into a roundabout which is actively dangerous for cyclists and there are no measures to improve the safety of the roundabout. I am concerned that we would encourage cyclists to approach this roundabout which given the temporary nature of spaces for people funding and that this roundabout will be removed as part of tram construction it would seem sensible if</p>	<p>During the development of the proposals the Service Lead of Network Management and Enforcement, who is also the Spaces for People (SfP) programme lead, was consulted on and approved the removal of the Pay & Display parking on the citybound side of London Road. During the 18-month implementation period the loss of revenue was considered and deemed to be acceptable.</p> <p>Due to the on-going tram construction on Leith Walk, at this stage the A1 proposals were unable to tie directly into the Picardy Place segregated cycling infrastructure. However, as the A1 scheme will be subject to on-going monitoring, during the 18-month implementation period and as the tram works progresses there may be an opportunity to better link the SfP temporary infrastructure into the permanent measures delivered by the tram project.</p>

CIMT 18 November 2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

	alternative routes could be sought.	
Cllr Mowat	<p>Removal of entrance to Hillside Crescent – has this been considered in a wider context – these are (as laid by Parliament) temporary measures – currently access to the streets behind this area are difficult to access because of the closure of Leith Walk which would mean a lengthy diversion if you missed the turn up Abbeyhill to access via Easter Road. What evidence of delays caused by queuing traffic necessitating this removal is there? I presume the removal is to prevent queuing traffic blocking the cyclists which have had to pull out round the bus stop into the line of traffic which seems undesirable when the road is busy.</p>	<p>Access from London Road into Hillside Crescent will be retained at the eastern entrance and egress will be permitted at both entrances. Therefore, no diversions are required due to the proposals and all of the streets linked from Hillside Crescent will be accessible directly from London Road via the eastern Hillside Crescent entrance. The only prohibition will be at the western entrance where access for traffic will be banned (except cycles).</p> <p>The principal rationale for this measure is to increase cycle safety by eliminating the potential for traffic to ‘left hook’ cyclists when turning into the western Hillside Crescent entrance from London Road. Additional benefits also include a reduction in the unprotected crossing distance and the addition of planters will help to improve the pedestrian environment.</p> <p>Once installed the measures will be subject to a Stage 3 Road Safety Audit (RSA) which will then be followed up by on-going safety and performance monitoring throughout the 18-month implementation period. Should critical safety issues be identified these will be address urgently. In addition and based on the on-going monitoring findings, if and where required: alterations, further alleviation measures or the removal of measures may take place during the 18-month implementation period.</p>
Cllr Mowat	<p>The wider route does not give a protected cycle way along its length but only in fits and starts – as such it is difficult to justify the inconvenience, loss of revenue and in places increased danger for cyclists for a</p>	<p>The A1 scheme is primarily a combined cycle improvement and bus priority scheme, which now also includes some pedestrian improvements as well. One of the key aims of the scheme was to build upon</p>

	<p>scheme which only protects in places.</p>	<p>and enhance existing cycle and bus infrastructure along the corridor rather than replacing infrastructure for the benefit of one mode or the other.</p> <p>As there is a significant amount of bus lanes (which cyclists are permitted to use) on both the city and outbound carriageways, cycle improvements were generally only feasible in the sections between these areas.</p> <p>It should be noted that the full length of the corridor was considered for cycle improvements and or bus priority measures. Wherever temporary measures are not being brought forward this is primarily due safety concerns, existing cycle/bus infrastructure or permanent projects which are either under construction or will be during the 18-month implementation period.</p> <p>As noted above the measures proposed above build upon and enhance existing infrastructure and the corridor as a whole will be safer for people choosing to cycle. Various measures were considered but discounted on safety grounds.</p>
Cllr Webber	<p>There are NO floating bus stops in these schemes and I am delighted to see that as will the many mobility groups that have expressed grave concern with their installation elsewhere in the city.</p>	<p>Floating bus stops were considered during the development of the proposals, however due to site-specific safety concerns and geometric considerations they were discounted.</p>
Cllr Webber	<p>The schemes seem to use existing cycle lanes as a basis and are using those to build upon (figuratively) and develop designs, making it safer for cyclist of all abilities. Using existing schemes will also mean the residents and communities in the areas will be familiar with and largely accepting of the schemes</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

CIMT 18 November 2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

<p>Cllr Webber</p>	<p>Welcome that parking is retained adjacent to the pavement and that this is the safest way to ensure the safety of passengers getting in and out of vehicles. This will be welcomed by all and reduces the risk to those with mobility issues either accessing their homes, services or retail. Further acknowledges and welcomes the buffers between the parking bays and cycle lanes.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Cllr Webber</p>	<p>Tile 2 : In terms of Hillside Crescent being blocked off at the west entrance, have we validated and contacted the local residents living in the DIRECT vicinity of this. It would be a relatively easy exercise to do so. What feedback have we received that resulted in this being included as part of the scheme – can this please be shared? And has this been suggested by those LIVING in this area only.</p>	<p>All correspondence for the proposed measures on the A1 followed SfP process, which included the overarching (open to the public) Commonplace consultation and this Notification process. The Notification process directly shared the proposals with all councillors and Community Councils along the corridor.</p> <p>The scheme will be monitored and reviewed with the potential to adapt the design should issues arise.</p> <p>See further response to Hillside Crescent alternations above, which also make clear that access to Hillside Crescent is maintained.</p>
<p>Cllr Webber</p>	<p>Tile 4,8,9,17,18 : Temporary Kerbs are to be installed. I am looking for assurance that any issues raised by disability and sensory impairment groups is taken seriously. Changes in the surface levels can cause trip hazards and some of the temporary infrastructure can increase the risk to those that are elderly, infirm, have mobility or sensory impairments. Please provide me with assurance that the designs will not increase risk to pedestrians or those who are not able bodied. If this has not been considered or</p>	<p>Where temporary kerbs/buildouts have been specified these have been designed to make the pedestrian environment safer and with people with protected characteristics in mind.</p> <p>They have been located to keep tactile desire lines free of obstructions while reducing the crossing distances. Additional measures included in the designs are to highlight/hatch the area confined by the kerbs and also to add contrasting markings to the</p>

	<p>designed into the plans then I will have to oppose their implementation and inclusion.</p>	<p>kerbs to make them more visible to people with visual impairments.</p> <p>Surface mounted tactiles have also been included in the designs at appropriate temporary kerbs/buildout locations.</p> <p>The access panel have been notified regarding all these changes, and their feedback has been carefully considered.</p> <p>As noted previously the measures are temporary and on-going monitoring will be undertaken during the 18-month implementation period. If concerns and safety related issues are raised with respect to the temporary kerbs/buildouts alterations to the designs will be considered and made where applicable.</p>
<p>Cllr Webber</p>	<p>Tile 16 : The bus lane is being narrowed – has this been validated and accepted by Lothian Buses and other Bus providers? (evidence please) given the challenges faced with similar narrowing on Comiston Road and feedback AFTER implementation from LB</p>	<p>As a key stakeholder Lothian Buses were directly consulted during the initial development of the proposals and again during the notification period. They have reviewed the full scheme and did not comment or propose amendment if this area.</p> <p>The road widths through this section comply with the Edinburgh Street Design Guidance.</p> <p>As noted previously the measures are temporary and on-going monitoring will be undertaken during the 18-month implementation period. If concerns and safety related issues are raised with respect to the temporary kerbs/buildouts alterations to the designs will be considered and made where applicable.</p>
<p>Cllr Webber</p>	<p>Tiles 16 & 17 : what was the issue that is trying to be</p>	<p>Due to the available road widths at these islands we</p>

CIMT 18 November 2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

	<p>resolved and what is happening where you state : “advisory lane to dia 1004 to be widened to over pedestrian refuge island. Red screed to be used over the widened area” and the subsequent “sign to be positioned on refuge island stating “DO NOT PASS CYCLISTS AT ISLANDS”. Struggling to know what is being achieved and the problem being solved. For former seems to make the latter an issue.</p>	<p>are unable to maintain the segregated cycle lane and advisory lanes have been specified instead. As such, these areas become potential conflict areas between vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians. Travelling outbound in this location the road is uphill therefore the speed differential between cyclists and drivers may be greater and the proposed measures try to increase the safety for people cycling.</p> <p>In order to highlight these areas to drivers and encourage a cautious approach is adopted, we have widened the advisory cycle lane, included red screed and introduced warning signs on approach. All of the measures proposed at these locations are consistent with measures utilised by other SfP schemes across the city.</p>
<p>Spokes Party and Spokes, the Lothian Cycle Campaign</p>	<p>We strongly support the provision of the route, and it should help many people switch from car to bike/adapted bike for regular journeys. It should also help those who do not have access to cars to cycle or use public transport in a more comfortable and efficient way. However, there are significant problems and dangers in the current proposals, notably at bus stops and junctions.</p> <p>Given the size of the scheme and the limited time for responses, we have not been able to provide a detailed analysis of the whole route in the time available. However, we hope, as the scheme progresses, that we can propose modifications should they be required, to improve the experience and safety of people walking and cycling.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Spokes Party and Spokes, the</p>	<p>Protected cycle lane width The width of a protected cycle lane must not be less</p>	<p>Throughout the full scheme the minimum clear width of segregated cycle lane will be 1.5m (i.e. from kerb to</p>

<p>Lothian Cycle Campaign</p>	<p>than 1.5 metres and must not include the space taken up by kerbs or wands. Some of the proposed cycle lanes appear to be 1.5 metres including kerbs, so they are too narrow. However, where there is adequate road width, cycle lanes should be wider, to allow ordinary bikes, trailers, cargo bikes, adapted bikes, trikes etc, to more easily pass each other. It is also important to avoid over-wide motor traffic lanes which encourage speeding. Any spare width should be allocated to wider cycle lanes and/or footways.</p>	<p>the inside of the edge of the segregation units). Wherever possible throughout the scheme extents we have aimed to exceed the minimum 1.5m width and prove a unidirectional clear width of 1.8m.</p>
	<p>Bus Stops We are very unhappy with the proposals for bus stops. For example, on the south side of London Road opposite Hillside Crescent, cyclists have to move out of the cycle lane, cross the bus/taxi lane, and enter the main traffic flow - and then return to the cycle lane across the path of the bus which may start to move at any moment. Some novice or nervous cyclists will wait till the bus has gone - but even then they have to enter the bus lane and possibly contend with approaching taxis. This design must be changed such that the cycle lane passes behind where the bus stops, with a pedestrian area between the cycle lane and the bus lane.</p> <p>If road width results in traffic having to wait behind a stopped bus, this surely is what the transport hierarchy demands - and indeed the Council has constructed bus build-outs on some Edinburgh roads in the full knowledge that they will occasionally hold up traffic. Placing cyclists in conflict with buses and other vehicles contradicts the aim of the scheme outlined on the covering letter - <i>“principal aims of encouraging and supporting cyclists to travel safely”</i></p>	<p>The interaction between various potential measures/layouts and the built-out bus stops on London Road were considered in detail during the development of the proposals. Due the various constraints in these locations we were unable to accommodate bus stop bypasses or boarders in these locations, however, the proposals brought forward comply with the bus stop treatments specifically developed for SfP schemes.</p> <p>The A1 scheme is primarily a combined cycle improvement and bus priority scheme, which now also includes some pedestrian improvements as well. One of the key aims of the scheme was to build upon and enhance existing cycle and bus infrastructure along the corridor rather than replacing infrastructure for the benefit of one mode or the other.</p> <p>As this is a temporary scheme, we are unable to make substantial changes to the kerb layouts and have brought forward proposals that increase safety for people cycling on this section of London while also reducing and mitigating risks wherever possible.</p>

CIMT 18 November 2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

	<p>Where the Council decides not to adopt the above proposals, and to use a bus boarder, it must be very carefully designed to ensure that cyclists slow right down and if necessary stop when a bus is at the bus stop. Measures should include the cycleway being raised, appropriate slow/stop signage, and prominent zebra markings on the cycleway.</p>	<p>Once installed the measures will be subject to a Stage 3 Road Safety Audit (RSA) which will then be followed up by on-going safety and performance monitoring throughout the 18-month implementation period. Should critical safety issues be identified these will be address urgently. In addition and based on the on-going monitoring findings, if and where required: alterations, further alleviation measures or the removal of measures may take place during the 18-month implementation period.</p>
<p>Spokes Porty and Spokes, the Lothian Cycle Campaign</p>	<p>Cycleways Outside Parking Lanes Placing cyclists in an unprotected lane between a parking lane and a running lane is highly undesirable. The cycle lane should be inside the parking lane - as proposed, for example, in the Buccleuch Street Spaces for People scheme. If any of the parking spaces are to be accessible spaces, then special provision can be made to ensure that cyclists travel slowly at that point, for example using non-permanent materials to raise the cycleway to footway level at that location, along with suitable road markings or signage.</p>	<p>During the development off the proposals relocating the parking to the carriageway side of the cycle lane was considered. In locations where this was potentially feasible due to various site-specific factors and constraints it was deemed not to be appropriate based on safety, usability and desirability grounds.</p>
<p>Spokes Porty and Spokes, the Lothian Cycle Campaign</p>	<p>SHEETS 1-3 London Road (Leith Walk Roundabout to Easter Road) See our general comment on bus stops above. The cycleway needs to link up with the Picardy Place cycleway, across Blenheim Place and round the roundabout to the left. Trams to Newhaven are delivering a cycleway at this point to go with the new signal controlled non-roundabout crossing. A temporary solution should be implemented along similar designs as far as practical and able to blend with intermediate works etc.</p>	<p>With respect to the bus stop treatments citybound in this section please refer to previous response.</p> <p>Due to the on-going tram construction on Leith Walk, at this stage the A1 proposals were unable to tie directly into the Picardy Place segregated cycling infrastructure. However, as the A1 scheme will be subject to on-going monitoring, during the 18-month implementation period and as the tram works progresses there may be an opportunity to better link the SfP temporary infrastructure into the permanent measures delivered by the tram project.</p>

Why is there no eastbound segregated cycleway?
There is clearly enough space.

Use advance stop lines at the pedestrian controlled crossing on sheet 2 and continue the cycleway to these ASLs.

Double yellow lines should be outside the cycleway to reinforce the edge of carriageway.

The cycleway should be extended to the Easter Road junction (see our general comment on bus stops above).

At the pedestrian crossing opposite 15 Hillside Crescent, the bus and cycle lanes merge into a bus-lane with, squeezing unwary cyclists. We propose that the bus lane and general traffic lane merge here into a single lane so that motor vehicles are squeezed rather than cyclists. We doubt there is often queuing traffic this far back from the Leith Walk roundabout so shouldn't hold up buses significantly.

Entry into the west end of Hillside Crescent. We are pleased that this is blocked off to motor traffic, but cyclists should be able to move through the barriers without having to slow down to make an awkward manoeuvre with a bus following behind.

During development segregation on the outbound section (similar to the citybound provision) was considered and discounted. Principally this was due to site-specific differences between the city and outbound carriageways in this section, such as but not limited to: the relocated bus stop due to the tram works which is between Winsor Street and Hillside Crescent; the slight downhill section between Leith Walk and Hillside Crescent which allows cyclists to travel faster and maintain primary position within the bus lane; and that the sections of segregation are shorter than the citybound provision, making them less desirable for cyclists to use.

Following consultation with colleagues in CEC's Traffic Orders team, in order to make the parking and loading restrictions introduced as part of the SfP schemes enforceable they must be installed on the kerbside rather than outwith the protected cycle lane. Clarification on this was provided after some of the early SfP schemes were installed (i.e. North Bridge) where the restrictions were installed outwith the protected cycle lane.

Due to site-specific factors and constraints we were unable to provide eastbound cycle improvements on approach to Easter Road.

The proposal to rearrange the road layout and make the traffic lanes merge opposite 15 Hillside Crescent was considered but discounted due safety, enforcement and public transport priority grounds. As highlighted cyclists are required to merge into an unprotected traffic lane at this location however there

		<p>is good inter-visibility and a stepped provision at this location to increase the safety of the merge and mitigate potential conflict.</p> <p>The designs have been amended at the western Hillside Crescent entrance to permit cyclists to enter the side street at this location with ease.</p>
<p>Spokes Porty and Spokes, the Lothian Cycle Campaign</p>	<p>SHEET 4 East Norton Place, Cadzow Place We note that there is no new provision at this tight and complex road space. A design solution is required to make it easier and safer for cycling</p> <p>Cyclists travelling to the city who want to go from Cadzow Place to East Norton Place need to manoeuvre across the lane of traffic that is flowing to Montrose Terrace and on to Regent Road. Reduce the number of traffic lanes and provide westbound segregated cycling + loading + 1nr traffic lane.</p> <p>Private vehicles using the bus lanes for parking / loading present a major hazard here that could easily be resolved by bus lane cameras and proper regular enforcement. Lane operation hours should also be extended.</p> <p>At the controlled junction at Abbey Lane, heading eastbound, vehicles swerving into the inside lane to pass vehicles waiting to turn right are a risk to cyclists. Continue the bus / cycle lane through the junction.</p>	<p>The A1 scheme is primarily a combined cycle improvement and bus priority scheme, which now also includes some pedestrian improvements as well. One of the key aims of the scheme was to build upon and enhance existing cycle and bus infrastructure along the corridor rather than replacing infrastructure for the benefit of one mode or the other.</p> <p>Improvements for cyclists were considered for this area however due to the existing bus infrastructure and other site-specific constraints in this section we were unable to bring forward any proposals.</p> <p>It should also be noted that a permanent road maintenance project is currently under development for this section, which will include improvements for cyclists and will be forthcoming in the near future.</p>
<p>Spokes Porty and Spokes, the Lothian Cycle</p>	<p>SHEET 5 Dalziel Place: Meadowbank Church to Wishaw Terrace</p>	<p>As discussed above relocating the parking and aligning the cycle lane between parked cars and the kerbside was considered for this section. However,</p>

<p>Campaign</p>	<p>There are several points on this road section travelling from the city which move cyclists into or closer to the flow of fast traffic. One of them is just before Wishaw Terrace. It is positive that a segregation is proposed there, although it looks quite short: the pressure to move out because of parked cars (including a disabled parking bay) starts earlier as shown on the map.</p> <p>Could you confirm that the disabled parking bay will still be in use or whether an alternative is being provided?</p> <p>The bus stop next to the Meadowbank Church is another point at which cycles often need to manoeuvre into the flow of traffic because of a stopped bus.</p> <p>The left turn into Lower London Road when travelling to the city, is opposite the right turn into Wishaw Terrace where traffic often has to wait to turn right. This part of the road and the section immediately before it with several entrances from the side on to the main road is challenging and dangerous for cyclists. Traffic waiting to turn right into Wishaw Terrace reduces to a single lane the space for progressing either straight ahead or into Lower London Road.</p> <p>This creates shared flow for cycles and motorised vehicles, with the risk of collision. If vehicles are also seeking to leave the entrances from the side entrances onto the main road just before this point, the number of simultaneous demands on the attention of both drivers and cyclists can be significant.</p>	<p>this option was discounted due to site-specific and other constraining factors, which included: the downhill nature of the road in this section, the built-out bus stop, the confirmed as in-use disabled parking bays and available road widths. These factors would have led to a short, undesirable and compromised section of segregation that would have introduced potential conflict areas and would more than likely not have been use by the vast majority of cyclists. As such the current outbound layout has been enhanced in this section.</p> <p>It should also be noted that a permanent road maintenance project is currently under development for this section, which will include improvements for cyclists and will be forthcoming in the near future.</p> <p>In repose to your feedback, in order to better highlight citybound cyclists travelling across the Lower London Road side road we have introduced a short section of advisory cycle lane to link the sections of bus lane. We appreciate that this only a minor enhancement, but it will hopefully help to encourage drivers to adopt more cautious driving behaviours on approach to this area. We have also introduced red screeding across the Wishaw Terrace entrance to better highlight cyclists exiting the segregation and crossing the mouth of this side road. A modal filter was considered but discounted as an option at this location. However, this may be reconsidered following the Stage 3 RSA and on-going scheme monitoring during the 18-month implementation period.</p>
-----------------	--	--

	<p>A modal filter on Wishaw Terrace would improve safety for cyclists in both directions. The junction needs to be simplified by restricting certain vehicular movements to make it safer for cycling. We know of at least once incident where a person has been knocked off their bike here.</p>	
<p>Spokes Party and Spokes, the Lothian Cycle Campaign</p>	<p>SHEET 6 London Road: Meadowbank stadium to Meadowbank Terrace</p> <p>This is a wider section of road which does not feel as constricted, and travelling away from the city there are no left turns apart from the entrance to the current Meadowbank stadium building works (is this a permanent entrance?) – so may be seen as presenting a lower level of risk requiring mitigation than other sections.</p> <p>However, with the wider road, some drivers feel free to accelerate, and the approach to the traffic lights at Meadowbank Terrace can present challenges for cyclists as vehicles move into the left lane to avoid having to wait behind traffic turning right. It is usually impossible to get to the ASL because, with two lanes of traffic, there is no room for a cyclists to move forward to gain access to it. As above with the Abbey Lane junction, you should continue the bus / cycle lane through the junction.</p> <p>In the other direction towards the city, at the traffic lights at Meadowbank Terrace, the access to the forward stop zone (there is only one for going straight ahead) also depends on whether there is a queue of traffic in the left lane turning into Meadowbank Terrace. If there is a queue of left turning traffic and therefore no room to get to this forward stop zone it</p>	<p>The A1 scheme is primarily a combined cycle improvement and bus priority scheme, which now also includes some pedestrian improvements as well. One of the key aims of the scheme was to build upon and enhance existing cycle and bus infrastructure along the corridor rather than replacing infrastructure for the benefit of one mode or the other.</p> <p>Improvements for cyclists were considered for this area however due to the existing bus infrastructure and other site-specific constraints in this section we were unable to bring forward any proposals.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the Meadowbank development will be delivering changes to the road layout in this section in the near future, which will include improvements for cyclists.</p>

	<p>can then be accessed by swerving right into it as the left lane of traffic moves first with the filter light. Depending on timing, it may be that the right lane, moving straight ahead has started to move and then cyclists going straight ahead need to manage their route between the two traffic flows. This needs to be resolved with a design solution.</p>	
<p>Spokes Party and Spokes, the Lothian Cycle Campaign</p>	<p>SHEET 7 London Road: Past St Margaret’s House on to Portobello Road There are no new provisions proposed on this sheet. This can be a challenging stretch for cyclists and indeed for drivers – in both directions.</p> <p>The traffic going towards Portobello is often backed up, partly because of the traffic lights and partly because of the bus stop at Meadowbank house (and the bus lane ending so near the traffic lights and drivers not being able to move into the bus lane during restricted times). Drivers can find it difficult to get into the correct lane – for example to go straight ahead when there is a bus lane preventing them until quite near the lights, or, being stuck behind a bus and finding a way to move out into the right hand lane to progress to Willowbrae Road. Cyclists share the space at this point and they have to survive this jostling for position with cars whose drivers are concentrating on getting into the position they need to be in. The existing advisory cycleway heading eastbound should, therefore, be reinforced with light segregation</p> <p>In the other direction towards the city, cyclists who have come through the lights either from Portobello</p>	<p>The A1 scheme is primarily a combined cycle improvement and bus priority scheme, which now also includes some pedestrian improvements as well. One of the key aims of the scheme was to build upon and enhance existing cycle and bus infrastructure along the corridor rather than replacing infrastructure for the benefit of one mode or the other.</p> <p>Improvements for cyclists were considered for this area however due to the existing bus infrastructure and other site-specific constraints in this section we were unable to bring forward any proposals.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the Capital Maintenance team are currently on-site in this section and delivering a renewal scheme that includes better provisions for people walking and cycling.</p>

CIMT 18 November 2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

	<p>(see below) or from Willowbrae Road are quickly into a narrow space because of parked cars and they have to finesse the space between parked cars and the flow of traffic. Again, enforcement of the bus lane and extended hours would help this section and improve the experience and safety of cyclists.</p>	
<p>Spokes Party and Spokes, the Lothian Cycle Campaign</p>	<p><i>This paragraph below is on Sheet 7 though not on the A1. For consideration.</i> The traffic lights at Willowbrae Parish Church present a serious challenge for cyclists going into the city from Portobello. Cyclists share the left lane with motorised vehicles. The right lane includes a right turn and therefore cars and other vehicles going straight ahead choose to be in the left lane. The forward stop zone for cyclists is placed before the pedestrian crossing on a significant slope. So when lights turn green there is a distance for a cyclist to start and then travel on the uphill slope before the road widens out and vehicles are able to pass safely. Some cyclists choose to cross the pedestrian crossing and wait beyond it so that they are able quickly push off quickly and more easily and get out of the way of the vehicles waiting behind them. A design solution is required here to improve the safety of cyclists.</p>	<p>Noted. As eluded to this section is outwith the A1 scheme extents and we are unable to consider addressing your concerns as part of this scheme. However, as mentioned above the Capital Maintenance team are currently on-site in this section and delivering a renewal scheme that includes better provisions for people walking and cycling, which will hopefully be addressing the points you raise.</p>
<p>Spokes Party and Spokes, the Lothian Cycle Campaign</p>	<p>Willowbrae Road: Jock’s Lodge to Piershill Lane/Baronscourt Road This is a tight road with two lanes approaching the traffic lights going towards the city and a single lane in the other direction after traffic has turned from London Road. Cycles travelling along Willowbrae Road towards London Road or turning right into Portobello Road</p>	<p>The A1 scheme is primarily a combined cycle improvement and bus priority scheme, which now also includes some pedestrian improvements as well. One of the key aims of the scheme was to build upon and enhance existing cycle and bus infrastructure along the corridor rather than replacing infrastructure for the benefit of one mode or the other. Improvements for cyclists were considered for this</p>

	<p>are required to share the lane with the flow of traffic.</p> <p>Cycles turning right into Willowbrae Road from London Road, if they have managed to get into the forward stop zone have a distance (50-100 yards?) when the narrowness of the road means that they are in front of traffic who are being ‘held up’ by them.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to installing a cycle priority green light at the traffic lights to give more time for cyclists to move forward.</p>	<p>area however due to the existing bus infrastructure and other site-specific constraints in this section we were unable to bring forward any proposals.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the Capital Maintenance team are currently on-site in this section and delivering a renewal scheme that includes better provisions for people walking and cycling.</p>
<p>Spokes Party and Spokes, the Lothian Cycle Campaign</p>	<p>SHEETS 8 - 10 Willowbrae Road: Baronscourt Road to Abercorn Avenue</p> <p>The narrowness of the road travelling away from the city continues until Piershill Terrace. There are no new measures proposed for this section. There is a bus stop just before Northfield Road – so if a bus is stopped, cyclists would need to move into the flow of traffic around it.</p> <p>One solution could be that the northbound left turn lane and bus lane be turned into a bidirectional cycleway from Paisley Drive to Portobello Road. This bus lane does not reduce journey times by very much. Likewise southbound, from Northfield Farm Avenue to Mountcastle Drive South, the bus lane could be turned into a bi-directional cycleway.</p> <p>The advisory, then mandatory cycle lane starts at Northfield Road, at which point the incline from Northfield Road means that cyclists tend to slow down and the effort to climb the hill coincides with managing safety and manoeuvring. We would</p>	<p>The A1 scheme is primarily a combined cycle improvement and bus priority scheme, which now also includes some pedestrian improvements as well. One of the key aims of the scheme was to build upon and enhance existing cycle and bus infrastructure along the corridor rather than replacing infrastructure for the benefit of one mode or the other.</p> <p>Improvements for cyclists were considered between Baronscourt Road and Northfield Road however due to the existing bus infrastructure and other site-specific constraints in this section we were unable to bring forward any proposals.</p> <p>Following your feedback we have relocated the ‘DO NOT PASS CYCLIST AT ISLANDS’ signs so it is on approach to the islands rather than at the islands.</p> <p>Improvements for cyclists travelling citybound were considered between Duddingston Road and Baronscourt Road however due to the existing bus infrastructure and other site-specific constraints in this section we were unable to bring forward any</p>

	<p>welcome the introduction of safety measures at this point.</p> <p>Central islands at Willowbrae Road: Signs stating ‘do not pass cyclists at islands’ should be put in earlier to give motorists more warning. Where signs are not proposed, they should be added to the scheme.</p> <p>In the other direction, travelling towards the city, the downhill from between Northfield Circus and Northfield Crescent(North entrance) reduces one risk factor for cyclists who, with less physical effort required, are freer to attend to safety. However, we note that there is no provision for a separate cycle lane at any point, and the two lanes after Ulster Drive tend to tempt drivers to accelerate (as suggested by the SLOW signs just before Abercorn Crescent). Consideration could be given to a segregated cycle lane between Ulster Drive and Abercorn Crescent.</p> <p>The uphill stretch travelling towards the city, between Paisley Drive / Northfield Farm Avenue (wrongly labelled ‘Northfield Broadway’ on Sheet 10) is not as steep as the hill in the other direction (and it is straight rather than on a bend), but we would welcome a protected cycle lane here.</p> <p>Southern exit of Northfield Crescent. Is there any reason for the high-speed exit to be retained? Why not put a kerb in to tighten the radius, as is being done at a lot of other junctions with smaller turnout radii?</p>	<p>proposals.</p> <p>During development we were keen to introduce buildouts at the eastern Northfield Crescent side road and this was considered for the reasons you outline. However, due to a requirement to maintain access to resident’s driveways and the complexities this caused to ensure appropriate and safe pedestrian provision was also afforded, we were unable to bring forward proposals using the temporary measures available to us. In order to better highlight cyclists travelling across the mouth of this side road we have introduced an advisory lane.</p>
<p>Spokes Porty and Spokes, the Lothian Cycle</p>	<p>SHEET 11 From Northfield Broadway across lights at Duddingston Road</p>	<p>Improvements for cyclists travelling city and outbound on approach to the Duddingston Road junction were considered however site-specific constraints we were</p>

<p>Campaign</p>	<p>The introduction of a segregated section after Duddingston Road, travelling away from the city, is welcome. Traffic is in a single lane going straight ahead at the lights, so cyclists and drivers are sharing that space and drivers do seem to feel pressure to get past cyclists as soon as they are through the lights.</p> <p>We note that approaching the lights in both directions, to and from the city, there is no separate space for cyclists who have to share the lanes with cars, lorries etc. A design solution is required.</p> <p>From Duddingston Road West and Willowbrae Road there are two lanes - left turn and straight on/right. There are no filtered lights, so giving the left lane to cyclists would make sense.</p> <p>From Duddingston Road & Milton Road West, there is one lane with plenty of space for segregated bike lanes (the Duddingston Road one is part of another scheme).</p>	<p>unable to bring forward any proposals to enhance the current ASL provision at the junction. This was principally due to the available road widths and the requirement to maintain separate turning lanes on these high-demand approaches.</p> <p>The approach Duddingston Road West is outwith the scope of this scheme.</p> <p>As noted, the Duddingston Road approach is being addressed by a separate scheme.</p>
<p>Spokes Party and Spokes, the Lothian Cycle Campaign</p>	<p>SHEET 12 After the Duddingston Road lights to round the bend at Duddingston Row The segregation travelling from the city continues after the lights at Duddingston Road. Over that same stretch on the other side of the road, travelling towards the city, cyclists share the bus lane with buses and motorcycles during bus lane hours, but also with all other vehicles outside those times. A solution is required, for example extending the operation times of the bus lane.</p>	<p>The citybound section of Milton Road West on approach to the Duddingston Road junction was one of few sections where public transport infrastructure was deemed feasible. Based on the site-specific constraints and its anticipated effectiveness, the proposed new section of bus lane took precedent over segregated cycle facilities for this section. As this is combined scheme with competing objectives, we have had to adopt a pragmatic approach and bring forward reasonable and effective proposals that balance these competing objectives.</p>

CIMT 18 November 2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

	<p>We welcome the cycle segregation on both sides of the road at the bend in the road at Duddingston Row.</p>	<p>As noted, cyclists using bus lanes is not the most desirable provision, however, it will afford an improved and safer environment during operational hours.</p> <p>Increasing the operational hours of the bus lane was considered but discounted as it would be difficult to enforce without the installation of bus lane cameras, which are outwith the scope of the temporary measures available for us to utilise as part of this scheme.</p>
<p>Spokes Porty and Spokes, the Lothian Cycle Campaign</p>	<p>Sheet 13 Milton Road West - after the Duddingston Row bend to Mountcastle Drive South This wide and fast section (after the bend at Duddingston Row for which segregation is proposed) has only the existing bus lanes for separating traffic. These only operate at certain times. Cyclists share with buses and motorcycles during those times and with all traffic outside those times. A solution is required, for example extending the operation times of the bus lane.</p>	<p>As mentioned previously, cyclists using bus lanes is not the most desirable provision, however, it will afford an improved and safer environment during operational hours.</p> <p>Increasing the operational hours of the bus lane was considered but discounted as it would be difficult to enforce without the installation of bus lane cameras, which are outwith the scope of the temporary measures available for us to utilise as part of this scheme.</p>
<p>Edinburgh Living Streets</p>	<p>It isn't clear if there are any improvements for people walking associated with this scheme? We would expect at the minimum for street clutter such as unnecessary signage poles to be removed (we have already identified a lot of these in the London Road-Meadowbank areas and passed them onto Roads staff).</p>	<p>Initially the principal aims of this scheme was to introduce new and improved cycle and bus priority measures on the A1 corridor. In response to you feedback and a recognition of the government's COVID-19 transport response hierarchy, we have increased the scope and tried to incorporate pedestrian improvements wherever feasible as well.</p> <p>A number of accessible to all buildouts where road space has been reallocated to reduce unprotected crossing distances have been introduced into the scheme. These buildouts will also help to reduce</p>

		<p>traffic speeds on approach and making turning movements to and from the main corridor, which will provide drivers and pedestrians more inter-visibility time and reduce the likelihood of incidents.</p> <p>It may be viewed as a more indirect benefit, however, due to offsetting traffic by 1.8-2m caused by the introduction of on-carriageway segregated cycling facilities, this significantly improves the pedestrian environment on adjacent footways. This is especially relevant on busy arterial corridors such as the A1. Buses and other large vehicles will be offset from the kerbside and the effective width of the footway is increased.</p> <p>In response to your feedback the project team contacted Living Streets to discuss this further and seek a copy of the referenced Street Clutter Assessment that covers some of the scheme extents. This was followed by a specific site walkover to review the street clutter and incorporate the removal of as much as possible where feasible and appropriate.</p> <p>As mentioned in previous responses there are a number of permanent schemes forthcoming along the A1 corridor and details of Living Streets Street Clutter Assessment have been passed directly onto the Officers/Designers developing these projects.</p>
Edinburgh Living Streets	In addition, traffic signals should be re-examined with the aim of bringing the green man phase on more quickly at any pinchpoints, and perhaps also extending the time which pedestrians have to complete the crossing.	Investigating the phasing of traffic signals is outwith the scope of this scheme. However, as part of a separate SfP scheme traffic signal sequences have been changed in areas of high demand to provide pedestrians with a dedicated green phase on each

CIMT 18 November 2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

		cycle between certain time of day.
Edinburgh Access Panel	<p>Please provide effective segregation between cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>Please ensure the devices used to delimit the cycle lanes do not create a trip hazard for pedestrians crossing the road.</p>	Noted.
Edinburgh Access Panel	<p>Please ensure the devices used to delimit the cycle lanes do not make it difficult to park or access your car (cf Pentland Terrace).</p> <p>Please ensure access and parking provision for blue badge holders are at least equivalent to current access and provision.</p>	Noted.
Edinburgh Access Panel	<p>While we are in favour of improving safety by tightening radii at junctions (eg map 10), please ensure the new kerbs are suitable for wheelchair users and others with mobility difficulties in terms of surfaces, dropped kerbs, tactiles etc.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Wherever buildouts have been proposed we have ensured that these have been designed with people with protected characteristics in mind. We have also increased the scope of the project to include the installation of surface mounted tactiles in appropriate locations.</p>
Edinburgh Access Panel	<p>Please ensure the vehicle filtering measures do not cause unacceptable congestion in the surrounding streets. It's essential to allow easy and safe access for emergency and delivery vehicles and to allow plenty of room for vehicles to turn in the restricted roads.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>During the design process the safe and swift access of emergency vehicles was considered in detail. Where we are proposing vehicle filters, we have ensured that emergency response vehicles are still able to access/egress roads in each location. For example, the inbound closure of the (west) Hillside Crescent can be bypassed by emergency vehicles in the case</p>

		<p>of a call out and would not prohibit swift access at this location.</p> <p>With respect to delivery vehicles which during this time are essential for vulnerable people, we have tried to minimise the impact on these services and none of the proposed measures will prohibit residents from being able to arrange home deliveries.</p> <p>Once installed the measures will be subject to a Stage 3 RSA which will then be followed up by on-going safety and performance monitoring throughout the 18-month implementation period. Should critical safety issues (such as emergency vehicle access) be identified these will be address urgently. In addition and based on the on-going monitoring findings, if and where required: alterations, further alleviation measures or the removal of measures may take place during the 18-month implementation period.</p>
<p>Edinburgh Access Panel</p>	<p>We are struggling to understand what's meant in map 10 by "Advisory lane to dia. 1004 to be widened to over pedestrian refuge island. Red screed to be used over the widened area." Is this a measure to deter drivers from overtaking cyclists at pedestrian refuges? In any event, please ensure the safety of such pedestrian refuges isn't compromised. If in doubt, a pedestrian crossing is called for.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The measures proposed at these specific pedestrian refuge islands are required due to the carriageway narrowing which does not then permit the segregated cycle lane to continue and an advisory lane must be introduced. The warning signs on approach, widened advisory lane and red screed are all required to better highlight this potential conflict area to drivers and encourage them to adopt cautious and safe behaviours in these locations. These measures will help to increase the safety of cyclists by reducing the likelihood of drivers 'close passing' and intimidating them.</p>

CIMT 18 November 2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

		<p>These measures have been designed not to impact the safety of pedestrians crossing at these locations and as an indirect benefit of better highlighting the uncontrolled crossing to drivers will also help to increase the safety of these uncontrolled crossings for pedestrians.</p>
Edinburgh Access Panel	<p>We assume only conventional bus stops are being proposed - ie no bus stops where pedestrians must cross a cycle lane. Is this the case?</p>	<p>During the development of the scheme bus stop bypasses and boarders were considered. However, due to safety concerns and other site-specific constraints these were discounted in all locations and only conventional bus stops (i.e. no bypasses or boarders) are being proposed with additional on-carriageway markings to improve cycle safety.</p>
New Town & Broughton Community Council	<p>We are particularly concerned that the alternative cycle route along Regent Road is considered before any final decision is made on the proposals for the easterly end of London Road.</p> <p>As we have highlighted previously, the limited time given to Stakeholders to review and comment on such proposals may impact on the quality and quantity of any feedback that you receive which will be detrimental to the overall decision making process.</p>	<p>During the inception of the SfP programme, projects were scored according to a prioritisation framework that was reported to Policy and Sustainability Committee on 20th August 2020. Workstreams were formalised, with each having a number of prioritised projects that have been or are currently being brought forward for delivery. These projects have been designed with the government’s COVID-19 transport response hierarchy (i.e. walk and cycle whenever possible) in mind and aim to address the specific risks associated with people following the guidelines when travelling in and around the city during the on-going pandemic.</p> <p>A project to install segregated cycle infrastructure on Regent Road was considered as part of the prioritisation process but it did not score as highly as the London Road corridor.</p>
New Town &	Comments are only for the section of the proposed	The justification for providing new, safer and improved

<p>Broughton Community Council</p>	<p>changes from Leopold Place to Cadzow Place (Sheets 1-3) as this most directly affects the area covered by the New Town and Broughton Community Council (NTBCC).</p> <p>The proposed changes once again focus on the needs of cyclists rather than pedestrians. No justification is provided for the increased provision of dedicated cycle lanes along this section of London Road in terms of volume of cyclists along this route.</p>	<p>infrastructure for people choosing to cycle is in direct response to the COVID-19 pandemic and the government's subsequent pandemic transport hierarchy, which encourages people to walk and cycle whenever possible to reduce transmissions pathways.</p> <p>Initially the principal aims of this scheme was to introduce new and improved cycle and bus priority measures on the A1 corridor. However, in response to your feedback and a recognition of the government's COVID-19 transport response hierarchy, we have increased the scope and tried to incorporate pedestrian improvements wherever feasible as well.</p> <p>A number of accessible to all buildouts where road space has been reallocated to reduce unprotected crossing distances have been introduced into the scheme. These buildouts will also help to reduce traffic speeds on approach and making turning movements to and from the main corridor, which will provide drivers and pedestrians more inter-visibility time and reduce the likelihood of incidents.</p> <p>It may be viewed as a more indirect benefit, however, due to offsetting traffic by 1.8-2m caused by the introduction of on-carriageway segregated cycling facilities, this significantly improves the pedestrian environment on adjacent footways. This is especially relevant on busy arterial corridors such as the A1. Buses and other large vehicles will be offset from the kerbside and the effective width of the footway is increased.</p> <p>A specific site walkover to review the street clutter and incorporate the removal of as much as possible</p>
------------------------------------	--	---

CIMT 18 November 2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

		<p>where feasible and appropriate into the scope of works.</p> <p>As mentioned in previous responses there are a number of permanent schemes forthcoming along the A1 corridor, one of which is at the Montrose Terrace/ Cadzow Place junction.</p>
New Town & Broughton Community Council	<p>The crossing at Leopold Place was identified as needing to be upgraded to provide a safe area for pedestrians to cross this road due to the very limited central island and the sequencing of lights that prevents social distancing. It is not clear why such a change that would clearly enhance pedestrian safety has been omitted from this proposal. Likewise there is significant pedestrian footfall at the bottom of Blenheim Place. Consideration should be given to providing a controlled crossing to enhance pedestrian safety</p>	<p>During development the Leopold Place pedestrian crossing and Blenheim Place side road was reviewed for potential improvements. However, due to the on-going tram construction on Leith Walk, at this stage, the A1 SfP scheme is unable to bring forward proposals to improve these areas. The tram project will be addressing these areas in the near future and the designs for this section can be viewed using the link below:</p> <p>https://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/tramstonewhaven/downloads/file/271/london-road-july-2020-pdf.</p>
New Town & Broughton Community Council	<p>It is not clear whether the proposed cycle lane is intended for only westbound traffic or is intended to be two-way. If the former, there needs to be consideration of the impact on east bound cyclists especially given the increased traffic (including buses) along this part of London Road as a result of the closure of Leith Walk and its diversion along Easter Road. If it is intended to be two way, the means of accessing this cycle lane for eastbound cyclists needs to be clarified as does the impact on cyclist safety from vehicles turning right on to Blenheim Place from Leopold Place.</p> <p>An alternative route for westbound cyclists from London Road would be turn left up Montrose Terrace</p>	<p>The citybound cycle segregated cycle lane on London Road has been designed and will be clearly marked as a uni-directional cycle lane (i.e. one-way).</p> <p>During development, segregation on the outbound section (similar to the citybound provision) was considered and discounted. Principally this was due to site-specific differences between the city and outbound carriageways in this section, such as but not limited to: the relocated bus stop due to the tram works which is between Winsor Street and Hillside Crescent; the slight downhill section between Leith Walk and Hillside Crescent which allows cyclists to travel faster and maintain primary position within the bus lane; and that the sections of segregation are</p>

	<p>and then continue along Regent Road to join up with the planned east-west and north-south cycle routes at Princes Street/George Street. Eastbound cyclists from the City Centre could also use this route.</p> <p>We strongly urge that this alternative should be assessed against the current proposals for this section of the London Road before any final decision is made. We believe that this alternative proposal would move cyclists from the already congested Picardy Place gyratory system and the streets adjacent to the tram construction work to the under-utilised Regent Road with consequent gains for cyclist safety and congestion.</p>	<p>shorter than the citybound provision, making them less desirable for cyclists to use.</p> <p>See previous response with respect to the alternative route on Regent Road.</p>
<p>New Town & Broughton Community Council</p>	<p>It is apparently proposed that all of the parking bays along the south side of London Road between Easter Road and Leopold Place will be removed to allow the cycle lane to be added. Given that these parking bays are very well utilised it will result in the displacement of this parking on to adjacent residential streets adding to traffic congestion with adverse impact on safety and the environment.</p>	<p>During the development of the proposals the Service Lead of Network Management and Enforcement, who is also the SfP programme lead, was consulted on and approved the removal of the Pay & Display parking on the citybound side of London Road.</p> <p>Once installed the measures will be subject to a Stage 3 RSA which will then be followed up by on-going safety and performance monitoring throughout the 18-month implementation period. Should critical safety issues be identified these will be address urgently. In addition and based on the on-going monitoring findings, if and where required: alterations, further alleviation measures or the removal of measures may take place during the 18-month implementation period. Mitigation and alleviation measures would also be considered and introduced where appropriate on adjacent residential streets due to currently unforeseen traffic displacement.</p>

CIMT 18 November 2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

<p>New Town & Broughton Community Council</p>	<p>With regard to bus stops, the drawings refer to AECOM STANDARD DETAIL DRAWING 60636731-SHTC-SP-DET-0901 but this drawing is not provided and so it is not possible to determine what changes have been proposed for bus stops along London Road. Clearly there is a potential conflict between pedestrians accessing and egressing buses at stops and any cyclists using the cycle lanes. Other proposals have included the addition of floating bus stops. We reiterate our concerns about floating bus stops and urge that until the risks have been fully assessed following their introduction on a trial basis elsewhere that no further floating bus stops are constructed.</p>	<p>During the development of the scheme bus stop bypasses and boarders were considered. However, due to safety concerns and other site-specific constraints these were discounted in all locations and only conventional bus stops (i.e. no bypasses or boarders) are being proposed with additional on-carriageway markings to improve cycle safety.</p> <p>The AECOM standard detail referenced is reflected and presented in the drawings, which includes a break in the segregation on approach and exiting the bus stop with additional cycle symbols on the corners of the bus stop cage. The note was included on the drawings as the standard detail had been prepared by a separate design consultancy and Jacobs (the A1 scheme designers) wanted to make this clear as all they had done was import the AECOM detail into the A1 proposals.</p>
<p>New Town & Broughton Community Council</p>	<p>We would also like to have clarification of the intent for cycle lanes at pedestrian crossings. Will cyclists be required to stop like all other traffic or will they just be required to give way to pedestrians? If the latter, this is not acceptable and creates additional hazards for pedestrians which is contrary to the stated intent of this and other similar proposals.</p>	<p>I can confirm that people cycling, whether they are in segregated, mandatory or advisory cycle lanes, will be required by law to stop at all signal-controlled crossing and junctions. The A1 scheme (and I'm confident all other SfP schemes) is not bringing forward any proposals that would permit people cycling to be exempt from these laws.</p>
<p>Edinburgh Bus Users Group</p>	<p>The scheme is described as a bus and cycle priority scheme, and the covering letter mentions 'Introduction of sections of new bus lanes'. Having looked at the plans, though, I can't see where these are. Perhaps I've missed them as there is quite a lot of documentation. Can you point me in the direction of the new bus lanes (and any other bus measures of particular note)?</p>	<p>The new bus lanes proposed as part of the A1 scheme are bound between the A1/Duddingston Road and A1/Mountcastle Drive South junctions. There are no other bus priority measures currently being proposed for the A1 corridor, however, the addition of the proposed new bus lanes to a corridor with significant lengths of bus lanes will help to further prioritise public transport on this corridor.</p>

		<p>It should also be noted that A1 scheme is primarily a combined cycle improvement and bus priority scheme. One of the key aims of the scheme was to build upon and enhance existing cycle and bus infrastructure along the corridor rather than replacing infrastructure for the benefit of one mode or the other. Due to the significant lengths of existing bus lanes on the corridor there were only certain locations where new bus infrastructure was feasible and the new sections proposed will further enhance the existing and prioritise public transport on this arterial corridor.</p>
<p>Public (1 response)</p>	<p>Do not see the need for a segregated bus lane. The reasons are: <i>- would prefer to see a full protected cycle lane on both sides of the road, inboard of two lanes used by both cars and buses. One of these lanes could become parking in the evenings and weekends. This will help create a healthier and greener route into the cycle for cyclists, and improve walking paths on each side by creating further division from the cars. The area is busy at weekends with people travelling into town and parking their cars so the removal of parking spaces will encourage these travellers to park on nearby residential streets making them more dangerous to residents.</i></p> <p>I would like to see the proposed cycle route connect with the new lanes at Greenside and Picardy Place, and also to the cycle route at Easter Road.</p> <p>The cycle lane should not stop and start at bus stops. It should be continuous with traffic being made to stop and wait behind the bus if necessary.</p>	<p>The A1 scheme is primarily a combined cycle improvement and bus priority scheme, which now also includes some pedestrian improvements as well. One of the key aims of the scheme was to build upon and enhance existing cycle and bus infrastructure along the corridor rather than replacing infrastructure for the benefit of one mode or the other.</p> <p>As there is a significant amount of bus lanes (which cyclists are permitted to use during operational periods) on both the city and outbound carriageways, cycle improvements were generally only feasible in the sections between these areas.</p> <p>Due to the on-going tram construction on Leith Walk, at this stage the A1 proposals were unable to tie directly into the Picardy Place segregated cycling infrastructure. However, as the A1 scheme will be subject to on-going monitoring, during the 18-month implementation period and as the tram works progresses there may be an opportunity to better link the SfP temporary infrastructure into the permanent measures delivered by the tram project.</p>

CIMT 18 November 2020 – Spaces for People Project Approval

	<p>What is the reason for entry into Hillside being blocked off. If it is to be blocked off, the design should be with planters to continue the green benefit of London Road park.</p>	<p>The interaction between various potential measures/layouts and bus stops along the corridor were considered in detail during the development of the proposals. Due the various site-specific constraints at each location we were unable to accommodate bus stop bypasses or boarders into the proposals. It should be noted that the measures brought forward comply with the bus stop treatments specifically developed for SfP schemes.</p> <p>The principal rationale for prohibiting vehicular access into (west) Hillside Crescent is to increase cycle safety by eliminating the potential for traffic to 'left hook' cyclists when turning into this side road from London Road. Additional benefits also include a reduction in the unprotected crossing distance for pedestrians and in response to your feedback we are also proposing to use planters at this location to improve the pedestrian environment.</p>
<p>Public (Commonplace)</p>	<p>Reduce speed and volume of traffic</p> <p>Pavement too narrow, extend pavement (Willowbrae Road)</p> <p>Add protected cycle lane to main road</p> <p>Not enough crossing place</p>	<p>Noted.</p>