

Both the emails below were again copied to the entire consultation list.

It is not worth replying further to the SWEM response below, as our point was well made in our initial email, and powerfully supported by Currie Community Council. The SWEM response below contains a justification which looks as if it has been developed post-facto and no apology. This will hopefully be obvious to the consultation list, especially given the CCC comment. A further Spokes response could easily develop into an ongoing correspondence would also be unfair and annoying to the 65 or so people on the consultation list.

---

From: **Currie Council** <[curriecouncil@gmail.com](mailto:curriecouncil@gmail.com)>

Date: Wed, 31 Mar 2021 at 22:19

Subject: Re: Formal Complaint: Spaces for People Consultation survey - asking respondents about schemes where no public information is available.

To: South West Edinburgh in Motion

As chair of CCC as well as an avid cyclist I am saddened that you specified SPOKES in such an inaccurate manner. This does not help the perfectly valid arguments and points you raised and indeed were supported by my CC.

I am becoming increasingly concerned at the direction SWEM is apparently taking in essence creating a them and us situation. I trust you consider my concerns before issuing further unhelpful and divisive comments

Allister McKillop  
Chair  
CCC

---

From: **South West Edinburgh in Motion** <[southwestedinburghinmotion@gmail.com](mailto:southwestedinburghinmotion@gmail.com)>

Date: Thu, 1 Apr 2021 at 12:24

Subject: Re: Formal Complaint: Spaces for People Consultation survey - asking respondents about schemes where no public information is available.

To: South West Edinburgh In Motion <[southwestedinburghinmotion@gmail.com](mailto:southwestedinburghinmotion@gmail.com)>

Thank you to Spokes for highlighting that other stakeholder groups were not referred to in our email complaint. Also we acknowledge the response from Currie Community Council.

The submitted complaint concerns access to information for residents and businesses to be able to complete the survey in a meaningful way.

Therefore, it was relevant to include all stakeholders for the Lanark Road and Longstone scheme as for the majority of the consultation period, the streets in this scheme were not or, are still not, complete. A link to plans was only provided to householders and businesses directly on the route. This was not advertised to people on side streets or those in the wider community, such as in the area covered by Currie Community Council. Additionally, a complaint to the council has been upheld that those plans are technical drawings and are not accessible so were of minimal use to the general public.

The simple answer for not referring to other stakeholders within the complaint itself is because the installed infrastructure is, by any measure, predominantly cycling related. Therefore, of all the stakeholders, the primary beneficiaries are the individuals represented by Spokes. Conversely, it is a matter of record that a number of the other stakeholders, such as Living Streets, the Edinburgh Access Panel and RNIB, have registered substantial concerns with the schemes which remain unaddressed by the council.

We recognise that not all of Spokes's input has been accepted in the Assessment Feedback documents either. However, other stakeholders' feedback has been ignored almost completely - often referring to removal of access, or the introduction of new safety risks for whole groups of the population that did not previously exist. This is a concern in projects where the stated aim is safety and where pre-implementation Stage 2 safety audits have been refused, and is of particular relevance to the Lanark Road and Longstone schemes.

Our complaint is neither with Spokes nor its members, but is rather with the way in which the council has deliberately excluded other stakeholders, principally businesses and residents. This approach is now propagating into the way the survey is being conducted.

This isn't about the right of one group over another to be consulted. Instead, there needs to be an acknowledgement that consulting widely with the community wins hearts and minds, rather than creating resentment and division. Furthermore, broader consultation builds better solutions.

Like Spokes, SWEM represents a broad demographic. Many of us are cyclists, and sympathetic with the longer-term goals of active travel. But there is a real danger, in the way the council is handling Spaces for People, that the active travel agenda will be set back in the long term rather than advanced.

Finally, thank you to those councillors who have made contact since our original email. We have supplied name and address details of the complainant to Customer Care, but at this stage the individual does not wish to enter wider discussions with councillors. We did however feel it was important to make councillors aware of issues presented by the consultation.

Prof. Derryck Reid  
South West Edinburgh in Motion