

[Cllr McLellan reply to the Duddingston Rd West decision – copied to the entire consultation list, 60 or so addresses]

From: **John McLellan** <[John.McLellan@edinburgh.gov.uk](mailto:John.McLellan@edinburgh.gov.uk)>

Date: Tue, 30 Mar 2021 at 16:14

Subject: Re: Covid 19 Emergency Measures - Proposed segregated cycleways Duddingston Road West

To: spacesforpeople <[spacesforpeople@edinburgh.gov.uk](mailto:spacesforpeople@edinburgh.gov.uk)>

Dear Martin,

Thank you for sharing the feedback, but as you might expect those residents who responded will very disappointed that their clear wishes seem to have been overlooked in favour of those from the cycling pressure group.

I too am disappointed that having gathered some information there has been no opportunity for elected members to comment once local opinion has been obtained, but before a final decision was taken. As we do not see every submission, we have no way of knowing the final outcome of the consultation process, or see the officer response, and it is unfair for us to be expected to fairly reflect local opinion before it has been concluded, or come to a considered view without full possession of the facts.

This is a very different situation to that at Smokey Brae, where there was a clear and obvious risk to a process in which the Council had invested a considerable amount of time and effort and local people had already expressed views.

DRW residents are rightly very proud of their area and will find it hard to understand how the council can impose such a radical change to their environment with such short notice, and very little by way of advance explanation, when they know there very strict procedures for making alterations in a conservation area.

As the two minor accidents at one location in five years is not being used as a justification, in the absence of evidence to the contrary the primary reason for this particular scheme appears to be recreational cycling, so the question then is whether that is sufficient to over-ride the wishes of local people.

Clearly, officers believe it is, and I don't think it is asking too much for them to explain to local people why their objections have been overlooked as the advance of the vaccination programme means the urgency of a year ago, when these schemes were first being devised, is passing.

I note that you say the implemented layout may vary from the drawings and again residents will be confused if what is introduced is not what they were expecting, which risks undermining whatever residual confidence is left in the consultation process.

For all the above reasons, I would strongly request that before any work starts on the ground a full communication programme is undertaken to explain the decision, to detail the timescale for implementation, and to detail how the review process will work.

I'd be grateful for your views.

Yours,

John McLellan.