

CIMT 29 March 2021 – Spaces for People Project Approval

From: **Rurigdh McMeddes** <Rurigdh.McMeddes@edinburgh.gov.uk>

Date: Mon, 29 Mar 2021 at 21:43

Subject: RE: Covid 19 Emergency Measures - Proposed Temporary Cycle Segregation – Slateford Road

Dear Cllrs and Stakeholders,

I hope that this email finds you well.

I am getting in touch to let you know that the above project has been approved for delivery at CIMT earlier today.

The project is due commence construction tomorrow, within lining and markings commencing at the junction of Angle Park Terrace and Henderson Terrace. Work will continue from the west in the coming weeks.

Please find attached the Assessment Feedback Form and updated project designs.

Please let me know if you have any questions or comments. Please also accept my apologies for the late notice for construction starting.

Kind regards,

Rurigdh McMeddes

Rurigdh Ahluwalia-McMeddes

Project Officer – Active Travel | Road Safety & Active Travel|The City of Edinburgh Council |Planning & Transport|Place|Level C2
Waverley Court|4East Market Street| Edinburgh, EH8 8BG Tel 0131 469 3606 |Rurigdh.McMeddes@edinburgh.gov.uk |
www.edinburgh.gov.uk/CCWEL

Notification sent to all ward councillors, transport spokespeople, emergency services, Living Streets, Spokes, RNIB, Edinburgh Access Panel and relevant Community Councils on 17/02/2021. 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
Slateford Road	<p>As part of overall emergency measures we are proposing to implement segregated and advisory cycleways on Slateford Road to help pedestrians and cyclists travel safely while meeting physical distancing requirements.</p> <p>This scheme proposes to connect existing projects on Lanark and Longstone Road, with those on Dundee Street and Fountainbridge to create a safe cycling route between the south west of the city and the city centre, as well as providing an alternative to the busy and congested Water of Leith path and Canal towpath.</p> <p>The proposed measures are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Introduction of segregated cycleways where possible/required ● Introduction of advisory cycle lanes where the geometry of the street does not allow for segregation ● Removal of parking and loading from existing bus lanes to ensure these can be used effectively by bikes, as well as buses ● Relocation of loading into side streets where required ● Consideration of extending bus lane hours of operation. 	Proceed with project delivery on basis of Amended designs without delay.

Feedback

Comment from	Comment	Response
Cllr Johnston	I have serious concerns regarding the safety aspect of these designs, especially at Slateford Bridge. The acknowledgment by the Council that cycle lanes cannot fit the available space under the bridge and that 'advisory lanes' are to installed, is a tacit acknowledgement that the proposals do not work due to the physical infrastructure. As planned, cyclists would have to	<p>The proposals will improve safety for people cycling along the route, though – as with all road layouts – there will be some residual risks.</p> <p>Many Spaces for People schemes include transitions from Segregated to Advisory cycle lanes where there is limited road with – for example, the northbound cycleway on Comiston Road approaching Greenbank</p>

	<p>leave a dedicated cycle lane and merge with traffic under the bridge. The argument that this is somehow better than what is already there, is patently false. A cyclist informed that the Council has installed a new dedicated route through the South West of the city, with dedicated cycle lanes, will have a legitimate expectation that there will be dedicated cycle lanes. Not 'advisory lanes' under a narrow and busy bridge. This gives the appearance that these plans are being rushed instated of being properly considered and then consulted upon.</p>	<p>Crossroads. Cyclists are not forced to leave the cycleway and merge with traffic, instead the advisory lane clearly indicates that traffic should stay outside the cycle lane where possible, including when queuing, making it easier for cyclists to continue past traffic.</p> <p>The designs have been amended so as retain standard carriageway lane widths. Westbound cyclists will remain in the general running lane between Hutchison Terrace and Meggetgate.</p>
<p>Cllr Webber</p>	<p>The cycle lanes under the bridge at Meggetgate This is by far the most significant limiting factor of the entire scheme. Advisory lanes as they are described within the scheme provide no improvements for anyone and if anything, make the entire scheme more dangerous for everyone. The admission that the scheme can only accommodate advisory Lanes is admitting the very limitation and flaws in the entire development. As such the scheme should not proceed any further. The width of the space under the bridge and the schematics provided lead me to believe that space will be compromised and benefit no one. Traffic, of all sorts, regularly finds that it is queuing here in both directions as it passes under the rail bridge. Often with public transport. Having only 2.7m width on each carriageway will lead to increase conflicts, and to suggest this is an improvement is beyond all reasonable considerations, the council is introducing more danger. The angle which large vehicles need to approach the bridge (due</p>	<p>The proposals will improve safety for people cycling along the route, though – as with all road layouts – there will be some residual risks.</p> <p>Many Spaces for People schemes include transitions from Segregated to Advisory cycle lanes where there is limited road with – for example, the northbound cycleway on Comiston Road approaching Greenbank Crossroads. Cyclists are not forced to leave the cycleway and merge with traffic, instead the advisory lane clearly indicates that traffic should stay outside the cycle lane where possible, including when queuing, making it easier for cyclists to continue past traffic.</p> <p>The designs have been amended so as retain standard carriageway lane widths. Westbound cyclists will remain in the general running lane between Hutchison Terrace and Meggetgate.</p>

CIMT 29 March 2021 – Spaces for People Project Approval

	to width, height and the bend) adds a further dimension but again, this appears to be unknown to those developing these designs. I continue to be surprised at the lack of local understanding when these various schemes make it as far as the selected stakeholder comments.	
Cllr Johnston	I am aware that in the past a new Longstone foot and cycle bridge was being investigated to surmount the physical problem that Slateford Bridge presents– why has this not been further explored? And if it has what were the results in terms of cost, implementation and practicalities?	The construction of foot and cycle bridges or similar is not within the scope of Spaces for People interventions.
Cllr Johnston	The complete lack of genuine consultation as regards these proposals is cast-iron evidence that the Council has learnt nothing from the controversies of past Spaces for People schemes. I am dismayed to find that the Council no longer even puts the designs on the Council website, only doing so when there is a 'high level of interest'.	<p>On 14 May, the Policy and Sustainability Committee approved a package of suggested interventions to make it easier and safer for pedestrians and cyclists to move around the Capital. As well as providing extra space, the proposals recognise a rise in active travel since lockdown began and aim to facilitate this as the phased lifting of lockdown continues. These changes are being delivered as part of the Council's Spaces for People programme. In line with guidance from the Scottish Government normal consultation procedures are not being carried out due to the need for expedient delivery.</p> <p>SfP proposals have not generally been hosted on the Council's website. The Lanark Road scheme proposals were hosted on the website due to the very large file sizes, and the very high level of interest.</p>
Cllr Johnston	No efforts have been made to explain these proposals in the context of what has already taken place on Lanark Road and in Fountainbridge and locals who have got in touch with me feel ignored.	While the lack of explanation in the way these three projects interact is a reasonable criticism of the notification process for this project, the majority of the stakeholders included in the notification process will already have been aware of the other two related schemes and how they interact, having been included

		in the notification procedures for the other schemes also.
	Many businesses along Slateford Road have raised concerns with me as how these plans will affect their business, both in terms of deliveries and customers visiting their premises. Has any attempt been made to engage with them?	No direct engagement has taken place with businesses along the route. Engagement to date has been in line with the agreed procedures for all SfP projects as outlined above.
Cllr Webber	This new scheme is being presented for comment concurrently with a city-wide consultation on making the scheme permanent is duplicitous. All new schemes should be halted, if for no other reason as to ensure we do not waste any tax payer's money, waste officer time or cause undue stress and anxiety to local residents. All of whom could rightly claim to be confused by the dual processes taking place and their feelings of exclusion in the primary process specifically for Slateford Road	While it is regrettable that the Slateford Road scheme was not in place sooner, this is due to the very high workload involved in delivering the Spaces for People measures across the city. The consultation is clearly structured to allow people to comment on the Slateford Road scheme within the section for project currently underway or due to start. The consultation for SfP schemes to be made permanent will not represent that last opportunity for people to be heard on this scheme were it to be made permanent. There would still need to be statutory consultations associated with the TRO procedures.
Cllr Webber	Floating Bus Stops “Proposed 1.9m wide bus boarder with zebra crossing and bus stop bay relocated outside of segregated cycle lane” Alarmed to see these included in these schemes. I was under the impression that these were to be set aside as options given all the evidence presented to us by groups representing people with mobility or sensory impairments. Please can you provide me with the safety audit and risk assessments that have resulted in the determination that these are appropriate at these locations. This is stretch of road that has many bus services, running at a high frequency and in normal times a very high passenger patronage	There are no Floating Bus Stops proposed. A floating bus stop was considered at this location but was removed – as shown in the lining designs. Unfortunately a comment related to this remained on the drawings in error.
Cllr Webber	Floating parking The installation of floating	There is only one location where ‘floating’ parking bays

	<p>parking bays with no direct kerbside access is particularly dangerous, particularly for parents loading / unloading children, and for elderly or disabled drivers and passengers.</p>	<p>are proposed. Parking at this location is currently off-peak only and demand is observed to be low.</p> <p>Loading across the cycleway will be permitted at some locations during off-peak, but loading will also be provided in side roads for any users for whom the cycleway presents an issue.</p>
<p>Cllr Webber</p>	<p>Accessibility of the plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● These plans have been released with a level of detail that makes them difficult to read and interpret without a large screen. They are not accessible to individuals with sight problems. There is no narrative document available that could mitigate this ● There is no web page providing a link to the plans. This ensures that the plans are only available to a very select group of individuals, which does not promote visibility or enable public engagement with the proposals. ● Yet again this excludes those with sensory impairments but also at a more fundamental level, excludes all the residents that have no online access 	<p>There is not sufficient time to carry out full consultation as part of the Spaces for People programme and the Council has instead carried out a notification process with key stakeholders. For this purpose we have been primarily using the construction drawings, which are aimed at a technical audience. Many people have responded with input demonstrating that they were able to understand what was proposed and have been able to make comments.</p>
<p>Cllr Webber</p>	<p>The minimal timeframe to respond with comments Although the deadline for submission of feedback has indeed been extended beyond the original 7 days the scale and complexity of these schemes does put into serious doubt the genuine consideration for open and transparent public engagement and biases comments in favour of those with inside knowledge. The plans are dated July 2020 and the council should take its democratic responsibilities a lot more seriously</p>	<p>On 14 May, the Policy and Sustainability Committee approved a package of suggested interventions to make it easier and safer for pedestrians and cyclists to move around the Capital. As well as providing extra space, the proposals recognise a rise in active travel since lockdown began and aim to facilitate this as the phased lifting of lockdown continues. These changes are being delivered as part of the Council's Spaces for People programme. In line with guidance from the Scottish Government normal consultation procedures</p>

	<p>than this.</p>	<p>are not being carried out due to the need for expedient delivery.</p> <p>The timeframe for response for the Slateford Road project is greater than most SfP projects.</p> <p>The date on the plans reflects the first draft, the proposals have taken many months to develop due to the challenging streetscape that they move through, and the challenge of delivering multiple projects throughout the last few months making simultaneous demand on officer and designer time.</p>
<p>Cllr Webber</p>	<p>Some Specific assurances and questions I would like answered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The introduction at of Double Yellow Lines at Merchiston Grove – can you explain what purpose they are serving please as this is unclear. • The diverse range of businesses from St Michael’s church west bound – can you provide me with written confirmation and evidence that they have ALL been contacted as part of the design process and are all aware of either the direct or indirect inability for customers to park on Slateford Road or the adjacent streets. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The introduction of DYs at Merchiston Grove is in order to provide Loading/Unloading space for the adjacent businesses in order that they can send and receive deliveries, and so that customers can collect sizeable items, without stopping on the main road. ● We have not directly made contact with all affected businesses.
<p>Cllr Webber</p>	<p>The council promotes its “try and modify” approach but I am yet to have any assurance or confidence that this is being adopted and implemented elsewhere. Despite asking for detail formally in Full Council (Question and a supplementary) of the modifications made for the schemes across this city, this is yet to be provide to me. The scale of the schemes and the speed</p>	<p>There have, and continue to be, numerous modifications to existing schemes in response to issues and suggestions.</p> <p>The process being followed for all schemes is as per that agreed by committee.</p>

	<p>of introduction is leading to mistakes and increasing the risk to many more residents, those that live along the routes and use them every day. I would far rather see a halt to ALL further schemes being progressed, the schemes installed IMPROVED and a measure of awareness recognised in terms of the magnitude of the task that is being asked of here. And frankly the fact that this new scheme is being presented for comment concurrently with a city-wide consultation on making the scheme permanent is duplicitous. All new schemes should be halted, if for no other reason as to ensure we do not waste any tax payer's money, waste officer time or cause undue stress and anxiety to local residents who are confused by the dual processes taking place and their feelings of exclusion in the primary process for Slateford Road</p>	
<p>Cllr Corbett</p>	<p>I cycle this stretch very frequently so I have quite a lot of comments below. However, that is in the context of being very supportive overall of the scheme, especially so given that it completes the link between the Lanark Road / Longstone schemes and the Dundee Street scheme. Even colleagues who have been sceptical of those other schemes will surely welcome the link being completed.</p> <p>GENERAL COMMENTS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Given the extent to which this scheme makes use of the existing bus lanes, it is important that these bus lane times are extended. Where the bus lanes are free just now they feel safe for cycling but there 	<p>The general context of support for the following comments is noted.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All parking and loading will be removed from the bus lanes, however the time of the bus lanes will not change. This was considered during the design development stage but has not been taken forward for specific technical reasons. More information can be provided if required.

	<p>is too much misuse of loading bays at the moment, which are parked long term, and this undermines the lanes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Below I have noted some of the worst examples of poor surfaces which need addressed as part of the project. But in general, loose debris, holes and raised surfaces need sorted 3. The inclusion of ALL of Slateford Road as 20mph is welcome. The current half and half is confusing 4. Although just outside this scheme, the junction from Dundee Street onto the WAR is a disgrace. No-one is this safe. I crossed it again today. What happened to the raised table / super speed bumps? 5. Alternative routes. I'd like us to keep in mind that there are aspects of these routes which are still difficult. It is right to develop them to provide a direct route especially for commuting or faster/confident cyclists. However, I do think it will be more attractive for less confident or family cyclists to also have quiet options. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Shandon – Dundee Terrace via the railway path to miss the Angle Park Terrace / WAR problems highlighted below. b) Water of Leith Centre to Gorgie Park Road, via river path, New Mart Road, Sidings Way, Hutchison cycle way. However, work needs to happen to fit non slip surface to the wooden walkway outside the WOLCT centre. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. We are aware that there are problems with poor surfacing on this stretch of carriageway and will investigate improving this. However there is limited budget available for resurfacing so only those issues which are considered to pose immediate risk are likely to be resurfaced. 3. Noted. 4. The Dundee Street/ Fountainbridge scheme will be subject to review in the coming weeks and consideration of this junction will be included. The current layout is considered an improvement as westbound traffic speeds appear to be noticeably lower, reducing the likelihood and severity of any collisions, though it is accepted that the current layout comes with a level of residual risk and we will consider ways to improve this. 5. We have considered various options for connecting to/from the canal and Water of Leith paths and will look to develop these further as required following implementation of the core route.
--	--	--

	<p>SPECIFIC COMMENTS</p> <p>Starting from the West</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the purpose of the loading bays just at the bridge over the river on the other side of the road to the WOL trust building? 2. The junction with Craiglockhart Avenue is the first big test. The surface is poor here and dangerous. Coming from the west, most people will cycle straight through so stay in the left side which is fine. Coming from the city side, however, the phasing of the lights means going out onto the right lane which feels very exposed. Can't we change the light configuration to allow cyclists in the left lane to go straight through? 3. Can we make sure the loading bays outside 201 Slateford Road etc are enforced and not parked in? 4. The railway bridge is a challenge, I acknowledge. It is one we may have to revisit in light of experience: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Why aren't we removing the railings straight away? - Can we remove or at least block off the false footway that leads from the Slateford Station steps to the bridge. It is dangerous and misleading. - I am glad to see Meggetgate no right turn in place. However, it is still too often breached. - The way the bridge interacts with the junction to Chesser Ave is important. When I am coming from Lanark Road side I move out into the middle of the road before the 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We will review this location with a presumption to remove the loading. 2. It is not simple to change the signals at this junction and is not realistically within the scope of a SfP temporary intervention. 3. We will work with the enforcement team to ensure enforcement takes place if issues arise. 4. Noted <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. These designs are based on an OS base map which may differ from exact proportions on site. If the railings are removed there is a risk of pedestrians walking east stepping off the kerb without checking and coming into conflict with an eastbound bicycle. Officers will review the layout on site before considering the removal of the railings to ensure this can be considered safe. ii. We can look into this. iii. Noted iv. Agreed. It is not the intention that dismounting will be the default option. Cycle logos are added to the approach lanes to indicate that cyclists should be expected on the carriageway. The cycle lanes should make it easier to filter past queuing traffic. 5. We are confident that this is an appropriate arrangement, though there is the potential for conflict between people cycling and vehicles using the loading bay, this conflict exists now, and should be mitigated by the clear presence of people cycling. 6. Correct. There is an erroneous comment related to cycleway. 7. Generally Loading and Parking will be restricted on the mane road. 8. We will consider resurfacing requirements where these can be met within budget. 9. Noted. As above.
--	---	--

	<p>bridge so that I am positioned in the right lane to go through to Slateford Road. However, that is being a confident and quite fast cyclist. It is not an easy move for a less confident cyclist, so I can see the logic of lane, orcas and then dismount to cross on foot at Chesser Avenue. However, that's not what faster or more confident cyclists will do. They will continue to do as I outline above. As long as the design allows for both options to be equally legitimate that is okay. I don't want cyclists getting off to walk to be seen as the only option.</p> <p>5. Just checking that the loading at Dominos Pizza etc is okay. That part can get busy and chaotic at times.</p> <p>6. Coming from the city side going west, I am assuming that it is just use of the bus lane after St Cuthberts Church to Chesser Ave. The plan seems to indicate a segregation too.</p> <p>7. There are 4 or 5 loading bays at Appin Place on the main road that are just permanently parked in</p> <p>8. There is a bad hole in the road just at the junction with Hutchison Crossway</p> <p>9. The surface on the road at the bus stop outside 167 Slateford Road is in very poor condition</p> <p>10. I am not sure I understand how loading etc at the shops where the chemist, Malones etc is going to work. It tends to get busy here. Maybe one to discuss.</p> <p>11. The quality of surface outside the old Waddies building is really poor</p> <p>12. Some patching work is needing done</p>	<p>10. Loading will be permitted from across the cycle lane during off-peak times. Loading vehicles will stop in the westbound lane. Passing vehicles will need to cross the centreline, however at these times eastbound vehicles will be able to stray into the Bus Lane. This arrangement has been carefully discussed and agree with Lothian Buses.</p> <p>11. Noted. As above re surfacing.</p> <p>12. Noted. As above.</p> <p>13. Parking will be removed. Bus lane operational hours will remain as current.</p> <p>14. Agreed.</p> <p>ii. Noted</p> <p>iii. The south end of Stewart Terrace is very narrow and blocking it off would require the introduction of a turning head. While possible this would be a more significant imposition of local journeys. We will look to revise the drawings to maximise the availability of pedestrian space and fully block the banned right turn. If issues persist officers could consider a more significant intervention such as a closure during project review.</p> <p>iv. We have increased the size of the ASL and cycle logos will be added to the two lanes indicated correct positioning, and for motorists to expect cycles in both lanes.</p> <p>v. We will increase the size of the AS here also.</p> <p>vi. Yes the railings will be removed.</p> <p>vii. Noted. As above re surfacing.</p> <p>15. Noted. As above re surfacing.</p> <p>16. Noted.</p> <p>i. Noted. As above re surfacing.</p> <p>ii. Noted.</p> <p>iii. Angle Park Terrace does present a challenge. The intention is to install segregated cycleways on the approach to each of the signalised junctions. It appears</p>
--	--	--

	<p>around the junction with Hermand Crescent along as far as the Freewheelin' bike shop.</p> <p>13. The bus lane between Slateford Gait and Robertson Ave needs to be 7 days and longer hours as it is parked most of the time.</p> <p>14. The stretch from Robertson Ave junction to Shandon Place junction isn't easy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Going out of town is not so bad especially with the change of lights from Slateford Road to Shandon Place meaning that cyclists can stay in the left lane to go straight on. - Have we considered blocking Stewart Terrace off? Despite the prohibition on Right turn down there and Robertson Ave it is breached constantly. - Coming into town, approaching the Robertson Ave lights requires cyclists to move across into the right lane which feels vulnerable. - Then you have a choice, either go into the segregated lane to go straight on or right to Shandon Place in which case you don't go into segregated lane. That needs to have equal weight, especially if cyclists want to avoid going through Angle Park Terrace etc and prefer (as many will) to go up Shandon Place and along the railway path from Harrison Place to Dundee Terrace. - Are we removing the railings here? I think they should be. - The surface needs work at the junction with Shandon Place: a couple of big holes or uneven raised surfaces 	<p>that the OS base map presents APT as being narrower than it actually is, so it is difficult to present exactly the form this design will take without further investigation. However, it is assumed that the existing advisory lane will be largely removed.</p> <p>iv. We will consider the placement of the Loading and Parking on APT to minimise the impact on the proposals.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>15. Along the next stretch there are a couple of really bad surfaces on the Caley Brewery side. The surface is also awful outside St Michaels Church</p> <p>16. The hardest bit of all is Angle Park Terrace:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Again surface issues: outside 73 APT and at the Henderson Terrace junction - The junction at Henderson Terrace is not attractive and will remain so until the problem of cars coming far too fast out of the WAR through red lights is sorted. Personally I would not advise anyone who is apprehensive to avoid this part. Instead I'd advise them to come off at Shandon Place and access the railway path at Harrison Place or come off at Primrose Terrace and go through the gate to access the railway path. Coming from town to the WAR / Henderson junction is also horribly exposed - I am assuming that the barely visible painted lane on APT is going. I can't see it on the plans - There are still a lot of loading bays on APT. How do we avoid them being parking bays? 	
<p>Edinburgh Access Panel</p>	<p>We are concerned that your proposals will drastically reduce the availability of blue badge parking - ie blue badge parking in places where loading is not currently prohibited by double-blips. What alternative parking facilities do you propose to make available for people whose only option for getting about is to use their car and blue badge? One option you should consider is to create disabled bays round the corner from the main road in each side street.</p>	<p>We will be creating Loading areas on side streets at each location where Loading is removed from the main road, which will also provide for Blue Badge holders.</p>

CIMT 29 March 2021 – Spaces for People Project Approval


Edinburgh Access Panel	According to the latest version of your City Mobility Plan (CMP), "the use of private cars is lowest in the hierarchy." However, the IIA says, "Policies also take account of ensuring parking is provided for people with mobility difficulties". Please outline what these policies are and how they are evidenced by the Slateford Road proposals.	As above, loading facilities (available as Blue Badge parking) will be provided on side roads.
Edinburgh Access Panel	We support your proposal to tighten radii by creating build-outs provided the surfaces are suitable for wheelchair users and others with mobility difficulties. If you install Sheffield stands on these build-outs, it's important to ensure they're not an obstruction to pedestrians. You should ensure a clear footway width of at least 2m, taking into account the length of a full-size parked bike.	Minimum footway clearance will be provided.
Edinburgh Access Panel	We are pleased to see you propose to erect a sign telling cyclists to dismount when the cycle lane issues on to the footway. You should make this sign as prescriptive as possible. Otherwise it will be regarded as merely advisory and therefore ignored - like the "cyclists dismount" signs on the canal tow-path.	The exact wording of the sign is yet to be finalised but the input is noted.
Edinburgh Access Panel	Note incidentally that we would like to see similar signs at other places where cycle lanes issue on to the footway - notably at Greenside Place and Holyrood Park Road.	This is not within the scope of this scheme, however it is possible for people cycling to safely share areas of paving with people walking and depending on the context of the site in question.
Edinburgh Living Streets	We are disappointed at the apparent failure to make any significant improvement to the walking space in this scheme, which in many places is	Street clutter – including Guardrail where appropriate – will be removed.

	<p>inadequate and certainly does not permit social/physical distancing. Many of the pavements on Slateford Road are far too narrow - barely a metre in places - this must be addressed. We assume that redundant and unnecessary street furniture/clutter will be removed as a matter of course</p>	
<p>Edinburgh Living Streets</p>	<p>Comments on specific locations: Slateford Road / Craiglockhart road - pedestrian crossings only on 2 of 3 arms. Slateford underbridge Bridge at Slateford station / Asda - inadequate pedestrian space; it also looks like plans have removed part of the existing pavement?? Slateford / Chesser Junction - why are cyclists apparently being given access to the pavement? Slateford railway overbridge - very narrow pavement on the south side of the bridge remains. Slateford Road / Robertson Ave - a hazardous junction with only a pedestrian crossing on 1 of the 5 arms. Stewart Terrace entrance should be blocked to vehicle traffic completely. Slateford Road / Ashley junction - pedestrian crossing only on 2 of the 3 arms. Slateford Road at the Slateford Colonies - very narrow pavement remains on the south side Slateford Road between Ashley and Harrison - no pedestrian crossing facilities Angle Park / WAR / Henderson Terrace - Pedestrian crossing only on one arm of 4 way junction Shandon Place / Hermand Crescent / Robertson Ave - there seem to be no plans to remove the guardrail we highlighted in our pavement clutter survey, at the overbridge. The south side</p>	<p>Change to traffic signalised junctions are beyond the scope of this temporary intervention.</p> <p>No pavement is being removed.</p> <p>Some cyclists may find the need to continue East from the offside lane at this junction daunting and may prefer to leave the carriageway and cross on foot, before re-embarking on the East side of the junction. This facility is to enable this.</p> <p>There is no pavement on the south side under the railway bridge. The narrow pavement on the North side is retained. We will seek to remove the guardrail following on-site assessments once the scheme has been implemented.</p> <p>The south end of Stewart Terrace is very narrow and blocking it off would require the introduction of a turning head. While possible this would be a more significant imposition of local journeys. We will look to revise the drawings to maximise the availability of pedestrian space and fully block the banned right turn. If issues persist officers could consider a more significant intervention such as a closure during project review.</p> <p>Change to traffic signalised junctions are beyond the scope of this temporary intervention.</p>

	<p>pavement there is substandard in width and social distancing by stepping into the carriageway is made impossible by the guardrail which must be removed.</p>	<p>There is very little scope for pavement widening at this point. However the presence of the cycleway will make it easier for people to step off the kerb when passing.</p> <p>Change to traffic signalised junctions are beyond the scope of this temporary intervention.</p> <p>This guardrail will be removed – Site Clearance drawings include removal of all guardrail.</p>
<p>Spokes</p>	<p>Spokes strongly welcomes this project as a way to connect the Spaces for People schemes on Lanark Road, Longstone Road and Dundee Street/Fountainbridge. This provides an enhanced cycle route from the city bypass to the centre of Edinburgh. Slateford Road can be a hostile route to cycle on and the improvements detailed are welcomed.</p> <p>General Comments: As cyclists will need to use bus lanes for large stretches, operating hours should be extended to 7-7-7 to protect them further. This is in-line with future CEC plans and those being delivered by the Bus Priority Rapid Deployment Fund.</p> <p>Markings and symbols should be applied across the several busy junctions on this route to highlight the presence of cyclists. Particularly at the Chesser Avenue, Craiglockhart Avenue and Robertson Avenue junctions where cyclists in certain directions are starting from the centre lanes.</p> <p>Significant patching or resurfacing will be</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>General Bus lanes hours of operation will remain as present.</p> <p>We will look at update junction designs with more clear markings for cycles through junctions.</p> <p>We are aware that there are problems with poor surfacing on this stretch of carriageway and will investigate improving this. However there is limited budget available for resurfacing so only those issues which are considered to pose immediate risk are likely to be resurfaced.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

	<p>required across the entirety of this scheme to address the often very poor surface quality. This includes where previous patching is now resulting in a danger to cyclists.</p> <p>The speed limit reduction on the western side of the route is welcomed, however it should be noted that there is a current issue with lack of compliance in the existing sections of 20MPH in this scheme. Compliance is likely to be even poorer in the four lane section west of Hutchison Crossway.</p>	
<p>Spokes</p>	<p>SLA-12727-1100-10: Should the entrance signs to the 20MPH zone not be Diagram 674 (20 Zone) as opposed to Diagram 670 (20 Limit)? The middle sheet mentions “Proposed extension of bus lane” but there is no bus lane on the drawing. This is presumably a mistake.</p> <p>The middle defenders opposite Allan Park Road appear to be in an awkward position for those joining the cycle lane. Could these defenders be moved forward/back respectively to allow a greater clear area for cyclists to join/leave?</p> <p>The railway bridge here is a difficult challenge. We feel that large, full lane cycle logos, similar to what is proposed on Angle Park Terrace and what is in place at the west of Dundee Street, may be more suitable. The proposed advisory lanes will need to be driven in by vehicles, potentially reducing their effectiveness across the city. It appears that one defender may need to be removed westbound at the bridge to allow larger vehicles to move to the left.</p>	<p>Yes. This will be revised before work commences.</p> <p>The bus lane comment is from a previous version of the designs.</p> <p>The location of defenders will ensure right turning manoeuvres are not hindered.</p> <p>The designs have been amended so as retain standard carriageway lane widths. Westbound cyclists will remain in the general running lane between Hutchison Terrace and Meggetgate.</p> <p>Cycle logos would likely be ineffective as most cyclists would continue to adopt Secondary position through the bridge between segregation on one side and on the other. However the lack of a cycle lane would likely mean that filtering would remain difficult as queueing traffic would be more likely to block.</p>

<p>Spokes</p>	<p>SLA-12727-1100-11 Signage to show the option of the crossing, such as the “Crossing Available” signage on Quiet Route 12 may be useful. It should be clear that any dismount signage only applies to those using the dropped kerb as opposed to those continuing on the carriageway. For example, “Dismount if using crossing” below the suggested sign. Signage or markings should be added after the crossings to indicate to those that have used it that they should rejoin the carriageway.</p> <p>The bottom sheet mentions “Proposed 1.7m light segregation cycle lane with Wand Orca kerbs” in the bus lane. This is presumably a mistake.</p>	<p>Noted – signage design is still being finalised.</p> <p>This was from a previous version of the designs.</p>
	<p>SLA-12727-1100-11B On Hutchison Crossway there is a ten-metre section of double yellow line provided. This is presumably to maintain space for loading but there does not appear to be any commercial premises in the near vicinity that would require loading space. This may serve to annoy residents. Revoking part of the loading prohibition on the existing single yellow lines may be more useful if loading is in fact needed.</p> <p>There appears to have been a gap left to allow cyclists to turn right into Hutchison Crossway however it may be too long and inadvertently allow people to park in the cycle lane.</p>	<p>Noted. This is to make up for the loading bay in front of the church, however a different solution may be appropriate.</p> <p>Noted. Spacing of defenders will be considered to allow right turns without creating the risk of inappropriate parking.</p>
	<p>SLA-12727-1100-12 The introduction of segregated cycle lanes in this area is very welcome. Where floating parking/loading bays have been provided, tapering akin to Lanark Road and Comiston Road should be provided</p>	<p>Noted. Parking/loading bays in this area are off-peak only so Tapers may be unnecessary.</p>

	<p>wherever possible.</p> <p>DYs have been introduced on Moat Street, Moat Drive and Hermand Street, presumably to act as a loading area. Signage should be investigated to direct drivers to these loading areas and help prevent illegal parking in bus or cycle lanes. An example that has previously been suggested for the Dundee Street/Fountainbridge project:</p> <p>It is not clear what “cycling provision” is being added to the bus lanes in the middle sheet. Is this referring to expanded operating hours? The lane widths also appear to be incorrect here.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>There is no additional provision. Apologies for confusion.</p>
	<p>SLA-12727-1100-13</p> <p>Another defender may be required to reduce the ease of illegally turning right here from Slateford Road to Stewart Terrace. There is also the potential to formalise cyclists being able to turn right. For example:</p>  <p>As previously mentioned, where loading areas are provided (Merchiston Grove), signage should be investigated to make people aware of them and reduce illegal parking in unprotected bus/cycle lanes.</p>	<p>Noted. We will consider placement of defenders and formalisation of cycle movements.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
	<p>SLA-12727-1100-14</p> <p>It is disappointing that more is not being</p>	<p>Angle Park Terrace does present a challenge. The intention is to install segregated cycleways on the</p>

CIMT 29 March 2021 – Spaces for People Project Approval

	<p>proposed here for cycling but we appreciate the spatial constraints. Additional large cycle symbols should be added on Angle Park Terrace to highlight the presence of cyclists.</p> <p>It would be useful if the eastbound ASL lead-in was segregated from the end of the greenway bay to the Henderson Terrace junction.</p>	<p>approach to each of the signalised junctions. It appears that the OS base map presents APT as being narrower than it actually is, so it is difficult to present exactly the form this design will take without further investigation.</p>
<p>Gorgie/Dalry Community Council</p>	<p>This is Gorgie Dalry Community Councils response to the proposed Slateford Road spaces for people cycle scheme. Thank you for extending the time given for responses to this and sorry for responding only today, we only had our meeting last night.</p> <p>Firstly we will not be commenting on measures that are not close to our boundary however some of our comments will be applicable to the whole scheme.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Gorgie/Dalry Community Council</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We feel that the addition of light segregation on Slateford road straight after the junction with Robertson Avenue should potentially have the first block (which is currently shown) removed to make it easier for right turning cyclists from Robertson Avenue to get into these lanes. The junction is very large which does not make this easy. 2. We are glad to see measures to enforce the banned right turn onto Stewart Terrace, however reducing the size of this junction with footway build outs would be a better long term solution if this trial does work. 3. The left side of the road on this section of 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. We will ensure that the placement of defenders does not inhibit right turning cyclists. 2. The south end of Stewart Terrace is very narrow and blocking it off would require the introduction of a turning head. While possible this would be a more significant imposition of local journeys. We will look to revise the drawings to maximise the availability of pedestrian space and fully block the banned right turn. If issues persist officers could consider a more significant intervention such as a closure during project review. 3. We are aware that there are problems with poor surfacing on this stretch of carriageway and will investigate improving this. However there is limited

	<p>Slateford road near Robertson Avenue has been particularly full of potholes in recent history so we hope the council will take great care in patching these up before cyclists are encouraged on this route.</p> <p>4. As before we hope the potholes often found on Slateford Road and Angle Park Terrace are patched up.</p> <p>5. We question the addition of bike road marking symbols which have been justified with, "Proposed cycle marking to encourage Westbound cyclists to take primary position". We feel having these symbols at the mouth of the junctions may be confusing to other road users and will not aid cyclists. We understand the general encouragement to have cyclists position in the centre of the road however a major reason for this not happening is that cyclists will pull in to the side when not feeling safe while a vehicle overtakes. When the side of the road is so full of potholes this evasive action is not possible to do safely.</p>	<p>budget available for resurfacing so only those issues which are considered to pose immediate risk are likely to be resurfaced.</p> <p>4. Noted. As above.</p> <p>5. Noted. We will consider revising to move these further from junctions to avoid confusion.</p>
<p>Gorgie/Dalry Community Council</p>	<p>6.The light segregation on Angle Park Terrace just before the Slateford/Ardmillan junction would be improved by moving the centre road line North to balance against the reduction in the South side lane being reduced in size.</p> <p>7.Moving the bins on Angle Park Terrace seems like a good idea as it does create a lot more space for pedestrians especially at the bus stop, where it can be often hard to get past people waiting for the bus. It is however important that these measures work for the local shop being</p>	<p>6. Noted. The centre line will be revised to fit this in.</p> <p>7. We will carefully consider the detailed design at APT to ensure appropriate loading/ pedestrian and bin facilities.</p> <p>8. We will not be able to deliver residential secure cycle storage as part of a temporary scheme.</p> <p>9. Noted. This will be considered.</p> <p>10.This will be considered during the detailed design.</p> <p>11. Noted. We will consider whether footway widening can be delivered at this location.</p>

	<p>able to use the loading bays and dont impact on the operation of the bus stop. The single bin positioned between the bus stop and the parking could potentially just be moved to join the other bin to the West.</p> <p>8.We welcome the idea of cycle storage, as bikes are often locked to the railings, we would prefer this to be a cycle storage unit for residents not just Sheffield stands.</p> <p>9.A crossing to cover the desired line to the steps is a good idea, as it is often very hard to cross the road at peak times, this may also slow down speeding traffic.</p> <p>10.If bins are to be in the road on Angle Park Tr all the time, is there a plan to remove the Greenway parking restrictions? Has the impact on the operation of the Greenway been evaluated?</p> <p>11.The junction of Angle Park Tr/Henderson Tr/Dundee St is incredibly dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists. For such a major junction one arm has no signalised crossing and is an uncontrolled crossing with a small central island. This is especially bad as there is a blind spot between Henderson Tr and Angle Park Tr. We feel no effort has been put into improving this junction and if this route is to be successful problematic areas like this need to be improved otherwise these measures will not impact to their full potential. Reducing the size of this junction may be an answer that would improve</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>the experience for pedestrians and also slow down fast drivers coming from the approach road. Replacing the cycle symbols or just adding extra 20mph road marking symbols would also be welcomed.</p>	
	<p>12.GDCC also ask the Spaces for People team to review the junction on Dundee St onto the WAR (West Approach Road); in the applications previously consulted on, measures were shown which would slow vehicles turning onto the WAR, using planters. These have been removed following another consultee's comments; in the council's response we were told that there would be bollards and a raised table on the crossing. This junction has always been horrible for pedestrians waiting to cross, as accelerating vehicles approach without signalling meaning pedestrians have to wait a long time to cross. The lighting in this area is also not good, waiting pedestrians cant be seen in the dark by approaching vehicles. All this would be even worse for people with disabilities. With the measures as they are currently, this junction is still dangerous for pedestrians and is now dangerous for cyclists who may have cars joining the WAR at some speed in front or behind them. We want to see measures that will slow vehicles on this section of Dundee St, and improvements to the lighting in this area.</p> <p>13.On Henderson Terrace the 'cycle lane' section (which isn't painted or denoted in any</p>	<p>12. This junction is subject to ongoing review as part of the Dundee Street/ Fountainbridge project.</p> <p>13. Noted re Henderson Terrace. Cyclists are entitle to position themselves in the centre of the lane, this is 'Primary Position' and should be the default position for cycling in the absence of a cycle lane. If there is no cycle lane, there is no 'cycle lane section'. The area on Dundee Street is under regular review as part of the Dundee Street and Fountainbridge section.</p>

CIMT 29 March 2021 – Spaces for People Project Approval

	<p>way) has a road surface that is so bad that cyclists are forced into the centre of the lane causing frustration for cyclists and drivers alike. There is also a dangerous section when exiting the light segregation cycle lane on Dundee St across from the bathroom shop. Just where the bollards end, the lane becomes really narrow. If you're heading to Gorgie, you need to cut across the lane very shortly after.</p>	
<p>Gorgie/Dalry Community Council</p>	<p>Overall we feel that although well intentioned and appropriate in focussing on improving the streets of the local area, some of these proposed (and already implemented) measures fail on account of the bad design of the current junctions and roads. Until these issues and the massive potholes in roads in and around our community are fixed with total resurfacing, then most measures will be a stop gap which won't make walking and cycling safer; very dangerous conditions will remain present at regular intervals on this route. This is true on Gorgie and Dalry roads too.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Public in Favour (8)</p>	<p>I cycle under the bridge regularly and have found it dangerous (cars trying to overtake and/or honking at you) so the cycle path would be a big improvement.</p> <p>Although there is the canal parallel for much of the route, providing a pleasant and quiet cycling and walking route, the necessarily narrow paths mean frequent congestion and competition for</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

	<p>space. Having this as mixed use for pedestrians and cyclists can mean that pedestrians feel in danger or that their walk is continually disrupted by passing cyclists (or runners).</p> <p>We commute regularly through the Slateford Corridor and the plans are most welcome to make it a bit easier and safer.</p> <p>The possible idea to extend the cycle lanes and bollards on to Slateford Road, Dundee Street and Fountainbridge is excellent as the more people who feel safe cycling the better!</p> <p>In favour of this (and every other) move to reduce traffic, clean the air, and provide more space for people.</p> <p>Great to see speed limits being reduced to 20 now that we know the positive impact they have had across Edinburgh</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<p>Public Against (47)</p>	<p>Meggetgate Railway bridge: Addition of cycle lanes is likely to endanger cyclists particularly at the railway bridge. Oncoming HGVs and buses will need more space than is available and vehicles will find themselves forced into the cycle lane, in what is already a confined space. This is also an area which regularly floods.</p> <p>The cycle lane will have red surfacing, but there will be no protection, and vehicles will regularly overhang the cycle lane or the opposing lane to complete their manoeuvre bringing them into conflict with cyclists and opposing vehicles.</p> <p>Cyclists may think the cycle lane is entirely for them and may not appreciate the issue, compared to the current situation where they</p>	<p>The designs have been amended so as retain standard carriageway lane widths. Westbound cyclists will remain in the general running lane between Hutchison Terrace and Meggetgate.</p>

	<p>would be more aware.</p>	
	<p>Roads are already congested, traffic flow will be impacted leading to congestion, frustration and emissions. There is no allowance for waste collections other than by blocking the main carriageway. This will effectively be a rolling road block, again affecting buses as well. "Existing wheelie bins to be relocated from footway to carriageway to increase effective footway width and slow down traffic when cars are not parked at existing loading bay" What evidence is there that shows that the effective footway width needs to be widened? Has there been an exercise - particularly during peak times when most congestion is likely to occur - in counting the number of pedestrians on the footway, and when, to gauge the busyness of the footways?</p>	<p>There will be minimal impact on traffic flow as a result of these proposals which make very few modifications to the number of operational lanes, etc.</p> <p>Waste services have been included in design development discussions and are content with the designs.</p> <p>There have been no exercises of this description. However the aspiration to increase effective footway width is a core part of Spaces for People interventions and broad transport policy.</p>
	<p>Removal of parking along the route will affect both residents and have a huge impact on businesses eg Jashans and McGills the bakers, as well as those queuing for the car wash near the BP garage. Business has already been significantly impacted by Covid</p> <p>The neighbouring side streets are full of cars all day. There appears to be no consideration for disabled customers</p> <p>There appears to be no consideration for deliveries or loading - we have regular deliveries and collections throughout the day.</p>	<p>Parking on the main road is only available off-peak at present. Loading for businesses will be retained, though in several areas this will be provided on adjacent side roads rather than on the main road.</p> <p>Current Parking/Loading provision on the South side of Slateford Road between Hermand Terrace and Hermand Street will be retained. The advisory cycleway will be removed, footway build outs will be installed and cyclists will be encouraged to adopt primary position.</p> <p>Parking restrictions will be introduced on short sections of side roads adjacent to the main roads to provide space for loading, and blue badge parking.</p>

	<p>The majority of our customers is passing trade where they can stop, pop in and then leave the area.</p> <p>What about people who have to move house / get deliveries in these areas?</p> <p>The installation of floating parking on such a narrow corridor presents problems for parents with young families, the disabled, those with mobility problems and the elderly. Cars parked in at night in the middle of the road without lights also dangerous.</p> <p>Emergency vehicles: with these proposals it is highly unlikely that cars will be able to pull over and let them past until well beyond the bridge.</p>	<p>As above. Loading will be provided on side roads.</p> <p>Where extended access to kerbside is required for specific uses Parking Dispensation, or similar, can be applied for from the council.</p> <p>There is very limited provision of floating parking on this stretch. Where it is provided the parking is off-peak only and is not subject to especially high demand.</p> <p>The emergency services have been notified and have not raised any concerns.</p>
	<p>Lack of engagement and consultation with businesses and residents, plans have been released only to a Council nominated group of stakeholders with very short timeframe to respond</p> <p>Plans are inaccurate and only accessible to a select few. The plans are very detailed and difficult to read and interpret without a large screen.</p> <p>Unacceptable to use Covid 19 as an excuse for failing to notify impacted businesses and residents about these schemes.</p> <p>Pandemic is receding and likely that we may not need Spaces for People in the medium to longer term. We are well on the way to recovery following Covid - wrong to push these schemes through.</p>	<p>On 14 May, the Policy and Sustainability Committee approved a package of suggested interventions to make it easier and safer for pedestrians and cyclists to move around the Capital. As well as providing extra space, the proposals recognise a rise in active travel since lockdown began and aim to facilitate this as the phased lifting of lockdown continues. These changes are being delivered as part of the Council's Spaces for People programme. In line with guidance from the Scottish Government normal consultation procedures are not being carried out due to the need for expedient delivery.</p> <p>The Spaces for People – Travelling Safely initiatives are also designed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Enable the large number of people who have taken up cycling during Covid-19 to continue to do so safely, and;

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To provide a sustainable alternative to public transport while physical distancing is required – especially for those who do not have access to a car, and; ● Where possible, to relieve pressure on existing pressure points on the network of shared use paths to make it easier for users to maintain physical distancing on these routes. <p>Each of these aims will remain relevant as we transition out of Lockdown.</p>
	<p>Keeping the limit at 30mph actually makes it a realistic number that people might actually stick to.</p> <p>The local part of Slateford/Lanark Road is not needed since most cyclists use Colinton Dell or the towpath of the Union Canal rather than the road. There is already the water of leith walkway for cyclists which is much safer and healthier especially for family cycling.</p> <p>Allan Park : With regards to the outbound section where turning left out of Allan Park, the blocking of an absolutely crucial traffic lane by the proposed cycle lane is unnecessary.</p> <p>The termination of the bike lane citybound occurs exactly where cars will be moving left to turn towards Asda. The cyclist is suddenly exposed to this when the lane ends, rather like the Comiston Road issue where a cyclist had a near miss with an HGV.</p> <p>Section of Slateford Road between Chesser Avenue and Allan Park Road: The design is inherently dangerous as it will tend to force</p>	<p>It is propose to reduce the speed limit to 20mph. This is likely to reduce average speeds resulting in a reduced level of risk to all road users, even if not all road users comply.</p> <p>This specific route, alongside other interventions on Slateford Road and Dundee Street/Fountainbridge, has been designed as part of an alternative route to the Water of Leith (WoL) and the Union Canal in order to relieve congestion and conflict on these shared-use paths – especially the narrower parts of the canal towpath – in order to enable physical distancing for people walking and cycling.</p> <p>The designs have been amended so as retain standard carriageway lane widths. Westbound cyclists will remain in the general running lane between Hutchison Terrace and Meggetgate.</p>

CIMT 29 March 2021 – Spaces for People Project Approval

	<p>vehicles towards the centre line creating a very real risk of head-on collision. Larger vehicles, including especially buses, need all of the available road space at present to be able to negotiate safely what is a restricted width of carriageway. The sight lines offer extremely limited advance view of oncoming traffic which makes it essential not to encroach on the centre line if such a serious collision is to be avoided.</p>	
<p>Public suggestions</p>	<p>The pinch point under the railway bridge is always going to be problematic, but cyclists have to take their chances there without any sort of protections currently so even a painted surface and good signage to alert drivers to the dangers posed to cyclists coming through here will be welcome. It also highlights the need for a new, alternative bridge crossing joining up Longstone to the Hutchison/Chesser quiet road network and completing that active travel route. The opportunity is there to do that as part of whatever planning application is submitted for the old Booker site in Longstone. It would provide an alternative that less confident cyclist could divert to and would be hugely popular with pedestrians on both sides of the river.</p> <p>I think the ideas for Spaces for People in this area are a good start, but do not go far enough to genuinely give space to people. If this is all that can be done at the moment with the limited budget, then it is important to enforce any rules and punish motor vehicle drivers for selfish behaviour.</p> <p>Like to see the junction with Stewart Terrace</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The south end of Stewart Terrace is very narrow and blocking it off would require the introduction of a turning head. While possible this would be a more significant imposition of local journeys. We will look to revise the</p>

	<p>blocked off completely. It's a bad junction for pedestrians to cross, especially as you can't see the westbound lane of Slateford road where vehicles turn right.</p> <p>Please arrange for enforcement of the parking regulations to be undertaken. Cars abandoned or parked dangerously have a serious impact on the effectiveness of schemes locally.</p> <p>The plans do not seem to have taken into account the Caledonian Brewery – the entrance to which is on Slateford Road opposite the Flower Colonies. Many large lorries need to use Slateford Road to take supplies to and from the Brewery.</p> <p>Lorries cannot turn left into the Brewery as the turn is too tight for long vehicles and lorries often have to make a right turn from Slateford Road into the Brewery. These lorries take up more than one side of the road having to use the whole extent of the road to manoeuvre and often cause chaos as car drivers who do not know the road do not appreciate why the lorry has stopped and often try to overtake the lorry at speed unaware that the lorry is about to cross into the other side of the road.</p>	<p>drawings to maximise the availability of pedestrian space and fully block the banned right turn. If issues persist officers could consider a more significant intervention such as a closure during project review.</p> <p>Noted. Enforcement can be increased where issues appear.</p> <p>We will review this manoeuvre and consider whether any changes are required.</p>
--	---	--