

CIMT 25 March 2021 – Spaces for People Project Approval

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

Date: Mon, 12 Apr 2021 at 15:34

Subject: Covid 19 Emergency Measures - **Proposed segregated cycle infrastructure – Mayfield Road**

Dear Councillors and Stakeholders

Thank you for your comments regarding the proposed emergency road measures. Comments have been reviewed and a summary of comments is included in the attached assessment feedback form to the Council Incident Management Team (CIMT). Following consideration by the CIMT 25 March 2021 the proposals have been approved for implementation.

Officers will be monitoring all the temporary measures and will make adjustments as necessary to mitigate any impacts.

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](http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/spacesforpeople)

Kind regards

On behalf of the Spaces for People Team

*Gert Rijdsdijk*

[Gert.Rijdsdijk@edinburgh.gov.uk](mailto:Gert.Rijdsdijk@edinburgh.gov.uk)

---

Notification sent to all ward councillors, transport spokespeople, emergency services, Living Streets, Spokes, Edinburgh Access Panel and relevant Community Councils on 12 March 2021. Recipients were given five days to respond with comments. The measures would be implemented under emergency delegated decision-making powers using a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order.

## Project Proposal

Location	Justification	Recommendation
Mayfield Road	<p>As part of overall emergency measures we are proposing to create segregated cycle infrastructure to re-designate key parts of the road network to help pedestrians and cyclists travel safely while meeting physical distancing requirements.</p> <p>Following on from Spaces for People's Buccleuch Street and the Causewayside schemes, Mayfield Road is the final link between Edinburgh University's King's Buildings and Potterrow. In the south the scheme provides options to link with the Gilmerton Road and Craigmillar Park schemes. The route is very well used by students and commuters.</p> <p>Where possible, we will upgrade the current advisory lanes to light segregation. This will provide a much safer active travel provision, with no impact on bus services.</p>	

## Feedback

Comment from	Comment	Response
Cllr Burgess	<p>I strongly support this scheme because as you say 'Mayfield Road is the final link between Edinburgh University's King's Buildings and Potterrow, <b>the route is very well used by students and commuters</b>, and this will provide a much safer active travel provision.</p> <p>I would encourage the use of segregation wherever possible.</p>	We will indeed use segregation wherever possible, In cases where we needed to choose one side of the road because of limited road width, we chose to implement segregation on uphill sections.
Cllr Rose	<p>General:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The Quality Bike Corridor (QBC) between George</li> </ol>	b. We are in the process of procuring the resurfacing of parts of Causewayside: the

	<p>Square and King's Buildings was opened in 2012 at the cost of just under £0.5m. This project covers part of that route.</p> <p>b. Since shortly after inception sections have suffered from particular issues. The most serious, impeding its suitability as a quality cycle route has been the uneven road surface, particularly at the Salisbury Place junction and on the east side of Causewayside between the Salisbury junction and West Preston Street. It should also be noted that the junction with West Savile Terrace has been the scene of notably serious collision cycle casualties, both before and subsequent to the 2012 opening.</p> <p>c. It is both an arterial commuting route (including cyclists) and a link for students between campuses. It's relationship with the Minto Street/Mayfield Gardens/Craigmillar Park corridor needs some strategic consideration in relation to traffic flows and active travel. Attempting to create two uprated cycle routes may result in neither being achieved satisfactorily.</p>	<p>eastern side between East Sciennes Place and the junction with Salisbury Place, and the cycle lane areas on the junction with Salisbury Place.</p> <p>We will remove the 'pinchpoint' of the current northbound cycle lane at the junction with West Savile Terrace and widen the cycle path to 2m (road width &gt; 5.5m) so cyclists can take a more prominent position when approaching the junction</p> <p>c. The road is relatively wide and the implementation of segregation will not reduce the number of lanes, so should not have an effect on the traffic flows.</p>
<p>Cllr Rose</p>	<p><b>Mayfield Road comment:</b></p> <p>a. The proposals introduce cycle lanes between parking spaces and the pedestrian pavement. I am concerned how satisfactory and safe this will be.</p> <p>b. As far as I can see the on street parking opportunities reduce particularly between West Savile Terrace and Fountainhall Road. That will put additional pressure on limited available parking in surrounding streets.</p> <p>c. The measures are entirely for cycling. They add</p>	<p>a. This has been successfully implemented elsewhere in the city (eg. Buccleuch Street and Comiston Road) and is commonly used in other European cities. Cycling between the pavement and parked cars is generally safer than between moving traffic and parked cars. There is a buffer from 0.5 to 0.75m between the cycle path and the parking spaces to prevent 'dooring'.</p>

	<p>nothing to social distancing or to aid pedestrians. Indeed, at some points the measures result in pedestrians being closer to cyclists. That is a result of the defenders limiting the freedom of cyclists to choose the best course.</p> <p>d. The impact on businesses is not clear. There are shops, B&amp;B and other businesses, most notably Edinburgh Roofing Services at No 58. I am not clear if all these have been visited but it is essential that this is done to prevent undue conflict – both from the physical measures and in relation to how they are received. Deliveries and work practices need to be integrated.</p> <p>e. View 1: I am not clear that the part of Mayfield Road near Mentone Terrace will work with the changing width of available road, combined with a refuge island, junction, parking outside Edinburgh Roofing – along with the inside cycle lane.</p> <p>f. View 2: (West Savile Terrace is wrongly labelled.) It is difficult to judge how changes will work at the Savile Terrace junction. There has been a longstanding difficulty with traffic signals operation here (triggering the phases). Currently, the signals are inefficient, restricting the flow of traffic unnecessarily and hence adding to pollution. The lanes south of this junction seem similar to previous arrangements but it should be noted that here, the parking places are next to the kerb, in contrast with elsewhere in this project. I cannot say how the lane next to the shops south of Mentone Terrace will work. It is certainly a busy stopping point.</p> <p>g. View 3: No comment</p> <p>h. View 4: The route southbound, especially south of Esslemont Road, where the cycle lane discontinues,</p>	<p>b. The southern part of this area has very limited frontages. Parking spaces are available on the west side of the road between Relugas Road and Fountainhall Road. Virtually all residences on the east side of the road have driveways and parking is possible in side streets.</p> <p>c. The cycle lanes along the kerbside mean that pedestrians are further away from buses and other traffic. This provides a more pleasant walking environment with less direct fumes. This is especially important for <a href="#">children</a> since -because of their height- they are closer to the vehicle's exhaust fumes.</p> <p>d. We have actually created parking spaces at Edinburgh Roofing Services (currently parking is not allowed between 7:30am and 6:30pm)</p> <p>e. We expect that moving cyclists to the kerbside will make cycling in this busy area safer. We also expect that the reduced road width will reduce vehicle speeds. We will however monitor this area since it is close to the junction where various accidents have happened (as Councillor Rose mentioned above-).</p> <p>f. I will contact Councillor Rose regarding</p>
--	--	--

	<p>may well cause modal conflict, given the lack of southbound space.</p> <p>i. View 5: i) It is not clear to me what happens to the lane (northbound) at Braefoot Terrace ii) I could not see what the red 'H' represents. lii) The area north of the junction with Liberton Brae loses a cycle lane near the junction southbound. I think that is no change.</p>	<p>the traffic signals to find out what could be improved.</p> <p>As mentioned above, we will widen the northbound cycle lane on approach to the junction to give cyclists a more prominent position (this is where a cyclists was hit by a left turning vehicle).</p> <p>Since the northbound cycle lane is at the end of a downhill section, we thought it would be better to guide the cyclists outside the parked cars in this instance.</p> <p>h. The northbound left filter unfortunately means that there is not enough space for cycle lanes in this area.</p> <p>We have however requested and received approval from Transport Scotland to create a split ASL. This should help cyclists to be out of the way of left turning traffic and will push them to take primary position on approach to the junction.</p> <p>Following your comments, we will start an advisory cycle lane north of Hallhead Road, where the carriageway widens.</p> <p>i. Coming from Braefoot Terrace, we created a tapered entry to an advisory cycle lane. Swept path analysis showed that a mandatory lane is not possible here.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>The red H marks represent 20mph signs (we have introduced a 20mph speed limit between Esslemont Road and Braefoot Terrace)</p> <p>We learnt from 'Traffic Signals' that -on approach to the junction- 2 vehicle lanes southbound are required. Since it is quite a steep downhill slope, we felt that it would be safest to start with a wide mandatory lane (rather than segregation) and end the cycle lane where the space is required for 2 vehicle lanes</p>
Cllr Rose	<p><b>Overall comment:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Apart from the comments above the changes are relatively benign in what is already a 20mph zone.</li> <li>b. Much more beneficial than this scheme for the Quality Bike Corridor would be resurfacing the highly degraded parts of the route referred to above.</li> <li>c. This project represents less bizarre interventions than the parallel Minto Street/Mayfield Gardens/Craigmillar Park corridor, and the question now arises if the present project could be the preferred (and thus appropriately signed route) in place of the other corridor. I have already called for the wholly inappropriate interventions in the Minto Street/Mayfield Gardens/Craigmillar Park corridor to be reversed.</li> <li>d. Nonetheless, this project should not be imposed without consultations with residents and the various businesses on the route.</li> </ul>	<p>Most comments have been discussed above.</p>

CIMT 25 March 2021 – Spaces for People Project Approval

<p>Cllr Rose</p>	<p>The scheme is an emergency response to the public health threat of the virus. Given that the measures have nothing to do with social distancing and that in this country the immediate danger of the risk of the transmission of infection and the need to mitigate that risk as a matter of urgency has subsided, the justification for the TTRO has evaporated. I doubt any changes to Mayfield Road by TTRO under this justification would stand up to legal examination and the scheme should not proceed as a TTRO – which supports my fundamental objection to proceeding without proper local consultation.</p>	<p>Safe cycleways provide an alternative way of getting around to walking and buses which again helps to aid physical distancing on these modes as less people have to use them. It is still very unclear if the risk of COVID and potential variants has indeed subsided. Like all SfP schemes, this scheme is temporary and will be reviewed every 2 months. Consultation will be carried out before any scheme is made permanent.</p>
<p>Cllr Webber</p>	<p>My overarching comment however is that the day after the timeline for easing lockdown restrictions was presented at Holyrood by the FM and as we are deploying the most amazing vaccination programme, that we as a council are still seeking to press on regardless with installing TEMPORARY MEASURES to aid social distancing some 12 months after lockdown began. What a waste of time, money and resources.</p>	<p>A timeline for the easing of lockdown restrictions has indeed been presented, but -as mentioned above- it is still very unclear if the risk of COVID and potential variants has indeed subsided. See also Edinburgh University’s response below regarding the use of this route by students in the absence of the Lothian Bus shuttle.</p>
<p>Cllr Webber</p>	<p>Further one of the most limiting factors with schemes preventing them from being a suitable quality cycle route is the shocking state of the road surfaces, and especially at the Salisbury Place junction and on the east side of Causewayside between the Salisbury junction and West Preston Street. It’s relationship with the Minto Street/Mayfield Gardens/Craigmillar Park corridor needs some strategic consideration in relation to traffic flows and active travel. Attempting to create two uprated cycle routes may result in neither being achieved satisfactorily.</p>	<p>See the reply above to these concerns.</p>

Cllr Webber	The proposals introduce cycle lanes between parking spaces and the pedestrian pavement. I am concerned how satisfactory and safe this will be and I know the alarm and feedback this has caused elsewhere in the city. I would have hoped lessons might be learned and this scheme put additional pressure on limited available parking in surrounding streets.	See the reply above to these concerns.
Cllr Webber	The measures are entirely for cycling. They add nothing to social distancing or to aid pedestrians. Indeed, at some points the measures result in pedestrians being closer to cyclists. That is a result of the defenders limiting the freedom of cyclists to choose the best course. Again, to my initial point, this hardly points to aiding Social Distancing which is the entire justification of using the Emergency Covid Legislation.	See the reply above to these concerns.
Cllr Webber	I need confirmation, in writing and evidence of contact with the many shops, B&Bs and other businesses that they are aware of what is about to be done to them. Evidence from elsewhere in the city tends to suggest that yet again these businesses will have been forgotten	Businesses are not part of the Notification process, but -as in other schemes- we will work with businesses when issues arise.
Edinburgh Access Panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We note your proposal to use a mixture of advisory and mandatory cycle lanes. Our strong preference is for advisory lanes throughout because they allow parking. If you insist on creating mandatory lanes, please ensure there are plenty of opportunities for blue badge holders to park within easy reach of their destinations.</li> <li>We note you propose both kerbside parking and floating parking, depending on the placement of the</li> </ul>	<p>Using advisory lanes on which people can park would not support safe cycling on this route. There are various areas where parking is possible and many areas have double yellow lines with single blips, so parking will be possible outside peak times for blue badge holders.</p> <p>Floating parking is generally safer for</p>



	<p>cycle lane. As you know, we object to floating parking because of its risks to pedestrians. The existing layout in certain areas of Mayfield Rd , with kerbside parking and a cycle lane outside the parking area, appears to function well. Please keep this layout and roll it out wherever parking areas are required along the length of Mayfield Road - especially outside shops and hotels but also outside those blocks of residences where there are few driveways. Note that we recommend the kind of layout you have installed on Chesser Avenue.</p>	<p>cyclists. Having cycle lanes along the kerbside rather than motorised vehicles mean that pedestrians are further away from buses and other motorised traffic. This provides a more pleasant walking environment with less direct fumes. This is especially important for <a href="#">children</a> since -because of their height- they are closer to the vehicle's exhaust fumes.</p>
<p>Edinburgh Access Panel</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• You propose single blips on the kerbs next to mandatory cycle lanes. Please confirm that loading/unloading will be allowed (at permitted times) ON the cycle lane. Or do you mean OUTSIDE the cycle lane? For example on the southbound stretch near the junction with Rankin Rd.</li> <li>• Please ensure you put an end to the (currently permitted) use by cyclists of areas of the footway near King's Buildings.</li> <li>• If cycling facilities are improved in Mayfield Rd it's likely that even more students will cycle the wrong way down Duncan Street to reach Mayfield Rd from Pollock Halls. Please take steps either to re-affirm and emphasise Duncan Street's status as a one-way street or to introduce a contraflow for cyclists. Westbound cyclists are definitely at risk here at the moment, especially at the crossroads with Upper/South Gray St.</li> </ul>	<p>Loading and unloading is allowed outside mandatory cycle lanes (at permitted times). Parking is possible outside shops. If residents have a blue badge but no opportunity for off-street parking, we will not apply blips in front of their house.</p> <p>These are very useful shared-use paths that offer the many cyclists in this area a safe way to cross the junction The Active Travel team is currently working on a scheme with contraflow-for-cyclists on Duncan Street</p>
<p>Edinburgh Living Streets</p>	<p>Mayfield Road is also, of course, a busy pedestrian route, including to Kings Buildings. Pavements suffer from a</p>	<p>Thank you for this comment. We will do another evaluation of the route with a</p>

	<p>significant amount of unnecessary signage and poles, in particular loading and cycle signs.</p> <p>Where there is no time limit, the "No loading" signs (and poles) should be removed (eg outside BP petrol station). In many cases, where there are loading restrictions at certain times, time plates can be relocated to lighting columns and the poles removed.</p> <p>The numerous blue "cycle" signs are very often mounted on a pole with no other signage (eg 36 Mayfield); poles should be removed and any necessary signs relocated onto lighting columns or any other appropriate existing structure.</p>	<p>special view to remove unnecessary street clutter</p>
Spokes	<p>Spokes welcome proposals to make cycling on Mayfield Road safer. We have a few comments and suggestions which we think would improve the scheme, and we hope these can be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a serious need to reduce the amount of general traffic on the Mayfield RoadPotterrow corridor. The existing Causewayside and Buccleuch Street schemes are compromised by the parking bays which mean that the cycle lane protection is intermittent. Making these sections safe to cycle on therefore requires a reduction in through traffic, which might be achieved by adding a bus gate on Mayfield Road</li> </ul>	<p>After the scheme reviews of Buccleuch Street and Causewayside, we are now making further improvements to the cycle lanes on these roads.</p> <p>A bus gate would be a major change that would require further investigation and modelling.</p>
Spokes	<p>The southbound cycle lane should extend all the way to the Liberton Brae junction, so that cyclists are able to safely reach the ASL at this junction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Northbound cyclists going straight on at the King's Buildings</li> </ul>	<p>Traffic Signals have told us that 2 lanes are required on the approach to this junction.</p> <p>We will add a cycle symbol on the road at</p>

	<p>junction need to move into the right hand lane, a manoeuvre which is often dangerous. We appreciate that the temporary nature of the scheme makes it difficult, but if there is anything which can be done to make this safer, please do so.</p>	<p>the end of the segregated cycle lane.</p>
Spokes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The vast majority of crashes on Mayfield Road involving cyclists occur at the junctions – often when drivers are pulling out of a side street. Often drivers stop with the nose of their car in the cycle lane, forcing cyclists to veer into the main traffic lane to avoid them. The layout of the kerbs near these junctions (particularly Rankin Road and Lussielaw Road and Ross Gardens, where cyclists are going downhill) therefore needs to be very carefully considered. Red screed at these junctions should also be applied, and we wonder if the junctions could be changed from “Give Way” to “Stop”.</li> </ul>	<p>We have widened cycle lanes at junctions and will refresh give way markings. Due to the cost, we will unfortunately not be able to use red screed at side streets.</p>
	<p>It's not obvious why the parking bays are between the cycle lane and the footway at Margiotta's, near the West Savile Terrace junction, when all the others are used to create parking-protected cycle lanes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drivers parking at the ends of the parking-protected cycle lane on Potterrow block the cycle lane, and we worry that the same will happen at the end of the southbound parking-protected lane north of Savile Terrace.</li> </ul>	<p>We have done this because cyclists have just come down the hill and may still have quite a high speed. We felt it would be safer to keep cyclists outside cars in this area.</p> <p>The segregators and double yellow- double blips in this area should prevent this.</p>
Spokes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There appears to be something odd going on with the speed limit signs on the side streets at the south end (Ross Road and parallel streets). The plans show additional 20mph signs here despite the speed limit on both Mayfield Road and the side streets being the same. This is inconsistent with the way speed limit signs are used on side streets on the existing 20mph section of Mayfield Road.</li> </ul>	<p>We are aware of the issue and will ask the designer to fix this.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The cycle lanes at the traffic island near the junction with Max Born Crescent should be made widened, as was done at the traffic islands at the north end of Gilmerton Road.</li> </ul>	<p>This island will actually be removed so there will be space for cycle lanes to continue</p>
<p>The University of Edinburgh, Estates Department</p>	<p>I am writing on behalf of the University to offer our strong support for the segregated cycle infrastructure proposals for Mayfield Road. We fully supported the implementation of the Spaces for People’s Buccleuch Street and the Causewayside schemes, and welcome the proposal for Mayfield Road which will provide the final link between the University of Edinburgh’s King’s Buildings and Potterrow.</p> <p>The University is keen to make getting between our campuses as easy as possible for staff and students. For those travelling to the King’s Buildings, our most recent student travel survey in autumn 2019 showed almost half travelling by bike or foot. This is despite the route offering several challenges, including an absence of protected cycleways, narrow roads due to parked cars, and narrow footways. It is important to note that travel to and from King’s Buildings occurs throughout the day reflecting the high degree of inter-campus travel undertaken by our students and staff.</p> <p>Due to the impact of social distancing measures on the capacity of bus services and the implications of this for their fleet, Lothian Buses advised the University they are unable to provide buses for the shuttle bus service that normally operates between Potterrow and King’s Buildings. The service has been suspended throughout academic year 2020-21. The latest Scottish Government roadmap for moving out of lockdown measures indicates that social distancing measures on public transport are to continue for many more months,</p>	

	<p>potentially well beyond the new academic year commencing September 2021. During this period we will be welcoming more students and staff back to campus. In line with Scottish Government guidance we are communicating to our students and staff to walk, wheel or cycle wherever possible. We anticipate there will be more novice cyclists travelling to and from King’s Buildings who would greatly benefit from more protected cycleways. The University is preparing for an increase in cycling to the campus by investing in cycle parking. This is why we strongly support the proposal under consideration.</p>	
<p>The University of Edinburgh, Estates Department</p>	<p>We are pleased that it is proposed that protected cycle lanes are provided along much of the route. We have some comments and queries for consideration:</p> <p><b>View 1:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• why is it necessary that the cycle lane on the east side of the carriageway is advisory? The single yellow line means this will be parked on outside of the morning and evening peak, and as stressed above our students and staff are travelling all day.</li> </ul> <p><b>View 3:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good to see segregation on both sides of the carriageway, however this is not the case on the section north of Rankin Rd. On the west side the cycle lane is advisory for this section and it is not clear why?</li> </ul>	<p>Since Mayfield Road is on a bus route, the carriageway width needs to be at least 3.25m. In areas where this cannot be achieved we have had to use advisory lanes</p> <p>It may be hard to see on the drawings, but the vast majority of the scheme has double yellow lining (zoom in to 150%). There are some (downhill) areas with single yellow lines between Rankin Road and Lussielaw Road and between West Mains Road and Rankin Drive because residents in these areas don’t have driveways/ cannot easily</p>

		park in side streets. Daytime parking is not allowed in these areas (same as currently).
The University of Edinburgh, Estates Department	<p><b>View 4:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Junction of Mayfield Rd / Esslemont Rd / West Mains – it is unclear from the proposal that the existing markings guiding cyclists onto the footway in order to use the toucan to cross the junction will be retained. This is the primary route into the King’s Buildings for cyclists and pedestrians.</li> <li>Junction of Mayfield Road and Max Born Crescent: this is another entry point into the King’s Buildings to access the south of the campus. At the moment there is a marked area in front of the traffic island to assist with the right turn from Mayfield Rd into campus. This is important for cyclists in particular and is well used. The drawing does not show this feature. It is assumed this has been removed for the cycle lane in both directions. Is any further compromise possible that might retain more of this right-turn feature for cyclists?</li> </ul> <p><b>View 5:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is not apparent why the cycle lane on the east side does not continue to the junction?</li> </ul> <p>We are in general very supportive of the proposed measures which will provide essential improvements to the cycling infrastructure in the southside of the city.</p>	<p>The existing markings will indeed be retained.</p> <p>We intend to remove the island to create space for cycle lanes beside north and southbound carriageways. An alternative could be to keep the island and central area in place and locally widen the cycle lane.</p> <p>This has been done because the Traffic Signals team has advised that the approach to the junction needs 2 car lanes.</p>
Member of the	As a cyclist I am supportive of these measures. However, I	In general Spaces for people schemes

<p>public (one response)</p>	<p>noticed that in a few places (mainly bus stops and junctions) there are (possibly unavoidable) gaps in the proposed segregation measures. Some have double yellow lines, but not all of them. In my experience this will undoubtedly lead to cars parking in the cycle lanes - probably parking right next to the bollards (as can be observed already on Craigmillar Park). This will create a very dangerous situation for cyclists as with the segregation measures it is not straightforward (and potentially quite dangerous) to just switch back on to the main carriageway to cycle past the cars.</p> <p>I would urge the council (and this applies to all of these measures citywide):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- where possible provide car parking on the roadside side of the cycle lane (well done on Comiston Road!)</li><li>- otherwise have double yellow lanes in place and enforce them (at all times, even for people "just popping to the shop" - this is a real danger point).</li><li>- publish guidance for cyclists what to do if the lane is blocked by parked cars (likely the advice would be to join the main carriageway as soon as a parked car is seen) and make sure that motorists are aware of that guidance (otherwise cyclists on the main carriageway will likely be subject to verbal abuse).</li></ul>	<p>have a 15m segregator-free space before and after a bus stop to give buses space to pull in and out of the bus stop. Following your comment, we will make sure that areas before and after segregators have double yellow lines to prevent parked cars blocking the segregated cycle lane.</p>
------------------------------	---	---