

27 April 2021 – Spaces for People Project Approval

Notification sent to all ward councillors, transport spokespeople, emergency services, Living Streets, Spokes, RNIB, Edinburgh Access Panel and relevant Community Councils on 21 October 2020. Recipients were given 10 days to respond with comments. The measures would be implemented under emergency delegated decision-making powers using a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order. Given the urgent nature of these works, normal expectations about community consultations cannot be fulfilled.

Project Proposal

Location	Justification	Recommendation
Sections of the A90 corridor from the Dean Bridge to Cramond Brig	Introduction of new pedestrian and cycle improvements in conjunction with bus priority measures on sections of the A90 corridor to enhance existing provisions for people walking, cycling and using public transport, with the principal aim of providing additional space for physical distancing while also prioritising public transport on one of the city's strategic transport corridors.	The notification feedback provided herein was considered and design amendments were made prior to the approval of the A90 Spaces for People (SfP) and Bus Priority Rapid Deployment Fund (BPRDF) scheme being sought at the Transport and Environment Committee meeting on the 12 November 2020. The responses provided herein are accurate as of the 27 April 2021.

Feedback

Comment from	Comment	Response
Cllr Mitchell	<p>Focussing on the part that has proved most controversial for residents is the arrangement where Dean Park Crescent meets Oxford Terrace/Clarendon Crescent.</p> <p>The most popular response from residents in Oxford /Clarendon / Eton/ Lennox is to maintain access in/out of Oxford Terr and Queensferry Road, but make the slip road one way into Dean Park Crescent. The biggest safety point is vehicles queuing to</p>	<p>This location is a busy multi-modal area that can be difficult to navigate for pedestrians due to current road layout. As such, the measures proposed at this location have been designed to make the area safer for people choosing to walk and cycle for essential journeys by providing additional space. This approach directly accords with the Scottish Governments COVID-19 Transport Hierarchy and the measures brought forward in this area have been deemed to be reasonable and pragmatic in response to the current pandemic.</p>

	<p>access the main road but fly up the slip road across the Oxford Terr access and onto the main road. If this is made one way that eliminates the main issue. Moving all vehicular pressure to the junction nearest the Dean Bridge concerns residents and I can understand why. There is no footway on the south side of Eton nor on the west side of Clarendon. It's a large section to traverse as a pedestrian or residents. Pedestrians crossing from Dean Bridge continuing along the main road, any vehicles must use this entrance/exit. If you proceed as designed, which seems likely, keep clear signage should be marked on the carriageway at this junction in both lanes. Any flashing speed-triggered flashing signs may be helpful as vehicles (esp the coaches) hurtle along this road.</p> <p>The lane coming up (south westwards) on Dean Park Crescent to join Queensferry Road - there needs to be a clear designation of space that two vehicles can fit. This will hopefully reduce the likelihood of vehicles peeling off along Learmonth Terrace at speed to try their luck at the Orchard Brae lights.</p> <p>In summary and to highlight a flaw in your approach to this part of the scheme...</p>	<p>In direct response to the feedback provided herein, a new temporary footway (with ramped access for accessibility) will be introduced, by the reallocation of road space on Eton Terrace to provide a safe pedestrian link between Dean Bridge and Clarendon Crescent.</p> <p>Lane markings amendments at the mouth of Dean Park Crescent to split the left and right turners was considered, however, due to width constraints they cannot be installed at this location as they would be non-compliant with regulations governing road markings.</p> <p>During the development of the measures being brought forward at this location the previous 2017 study and findings were considered. However, the aims and objectives of the both projects are different with the SfP measures being strongly focussed on providing additional space for walking and cycling during the pandemic.</p> <p>All SfP and BPRDF measures are temporary in nature, will be subject to on-going safety monitoring and a performance review every two months during the implementation period. As part of the on-going monitoring and review process, alterations will be considered and made where necessary, with safety critical issues being addressed at the earliest opportunity.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>Firstly, views being expressed to me by residents immediately impacted are in favour of maintaining their access in/out of Oxford Terr, but making the slip onto Dean Park Crescent one way. This, as I've said and as they say, removes the most significant conflict at the junction, which is vehicles of all sorts who, instead of waiting to turn left at the main road, fly up the slip road and continue onto the main road.</p> <p>Secondly, making the slip road one way (onto Dean Park Crescent) as desired by residents but still closing access from Oxford Terr onto the main road to keep the segregated cycleway going (which they don't want as it moves vehicular pressure onto the Eton/Clarendon corner) is still what came back as most favoured in the public consultation from 2017 and was due to be implemented until halted.</p> <p>So. This scheme, as designed by SfP, ignores residents' 2020 views and the 2017 consultation. Perhaps it would be worth considering one of them, which could then be backed up by a proper consultation response and a permanent project that, although shelved, is technically in the offing.</p>	
--	---	--

<p>Cllr Mitchell</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On a completely separate, but related note, if you open up the left turn on North Charlotte Street into St Colme Street that would undoubtedly ease traffic in Stockbridge (some of which then uses Dean Park Crescent to get back to the main road) as well as easing pressure at the popular bus change in Queensferry Street. 2. The closure of the middle section at Buckingham Terrace is welcome and should help improve pedestrian safety. Is the new TRO for this progressing? 3. I am pleased to have been told that more space is being created to accommodate SMC's coaches. It seems logical to ensure the school's coaches and the children using them (which reduce car journeys) are accommodated. I do, however, have some anxiety about the inability to stop anywhere outside the front of SMC. There is concern from residents in surrounding streets that these vehicles will simply move there instead. Bearing in mind there is a huge number of pupils attending this site and the junior and senior school finish at different times each day as well as some year group variation. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Opening up the left turn from North Charlotte Street into St Colm is outwith the scope and extents of the SfP A90 scheme. 2. A public consultation on the future of SfP has recently been opened for feedback and was closed on the 5 April 2021, further details can be found here: https://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/streetschemes. Depending on various criteria, which include (but are not limited by) the performance and consultation feedback of this temporary junction closure, bringing forward a permanent order will be considered. 3. Stewart's Melville Collage (SMC) have been directly consulted with throughout the development of the scheme in order to ensure that their requirements were being met. Hopefully the phase return to school plan continues and if additional pressures are felt on streets surrounding the school due to the measures being brought forward on the A90, additional mitigation measures and scheme alterations will be considered and implemented where necessary. 4. In direct response to the feedback provided herein, the proposal to install a 'parklet' outside Orchard House has been revisited and a blue badge and loading/unloading area will be installed in its place to minimise the impact on local businesses. 5. Protected footway buildouts were considered at the junction of Orchard Drive and Queensferry Road during the early design development stage. However, due to the
----------------------	--	---

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The 'parklet' outside Orchard Brae House is certainly one way to fill that space. 5. Orchard Drive / Queensferry Road – I remain hopeful that pavement build outs will be installed to make it easier for pedestrians to cross. I was told a wee while ago a safety audit for this was being done. Alas, here we are two years later. I notice build outs have are proposed at Craigleith Crescent. Perhaps they could feature here as well? 6. Craigleith Crescent / Queensferry Road – Most of the proposal is in Murrayfield/Corstorphine. As long as there is no issue with getting the bus through the narrowed carriageways? And keep those yellows boxes painted! 7. The left turn only into Holiday Inn looks problematic. Busy in both lanes esp at rush hour plus the pressure of the Craigleith Retail Park lane. 8. The section of bus lane opposite Craigleith Crescent could cause traffic 	<p>location of a number of driveways at this location and the temporary measures available to the SfP programme we were unable to bring forward improvements at this location. We are currently investigating if an un-protected hatched solution can be delivered that would help to visually narrow the junction and slow traffic which would improve this junction for pedestrians and cyclists. It should be noted that a permanent scheme for reducing the corner radii at this location is being considered/developed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. All carriageway widths have been designed in accordance with the relevant regulations and will be able to accommodate large vehicles (i.e. buses, waste and recycling vehicles, etc.). No yellow box or KEEP CLEAR markings will be removed as part of the project. There are a number of locations where KEEP CLEAR markings will be introduced or refreshed which are generally for the benefit of local residents or strategic safety reasons. 7. During the development stage the hotel was directly engaged with and the stopping up of their Queensferry Road access was requested. Notwithstanding this is a secondary access, they were not amenable to the request even if only for the period of their recent refurbishment works, when this access was not being used. Therefore, the final road markings at this location has to accommodate the hotel access being maintained along with the access into the petrol station which is just downstream. 8. Due to the potential implications of installing this section of bus lane, traffic modelling was undertaken during the
--	---	---

	build up in the 'other lane' going back towards the Blackhall dip.	design development stage. The outcomes of the traffic modelling were considered and deemed to be acceptable.
Cllr Hutchison	In relation to the above proposals, the section from Barnton to the A90 Cramond Brig is a complete waste of time and money. Public transport in the area is extremely poor and offers no connectivity to facilities nearby such as the Gyle Centre. Residents, many of whom are elderly often have no choice but to use their cars to go about their daily business. Removing one lane of general traffic will create a significant backlog of traffic in the remaining lane, traffic turning right into Maybury Road at the Barnton Junction often blocks the outside lane and this could result in no cars getting through in an Eastbound direction when the lights change. Regardless of the merits or otherwise of the rest of the scheme, this element should be scrapped.	<p>The temporary proposals on the A90 form part of Transport Scotland's BPRDF and have been carefully considered and developed in close partnership with bus operators and Fife Council, with further technical input from Jacobs (the Council's traffic modelling consultants) and relevant officers within the City of Edinburgh Council.</p> <p>The new short section of bus lane will augment and optimise the existing bus lane infrastructure, ensuring bus service reliability will be improved. The proposals have been developed alongside improvements to the existing queue management system, with ongoing calibration taking place to optimise performance. A monitoring plan is being provided as part of the fund and the bus lane and queue management system will be covered by this.</p> <p>The temporary interventions be delivered under the promotion of a TTRO, therefore, in the unlikely situation that amendments are required to optimise the performance of measures, the Council will have the ability to swiftly and flexibility adapt measures to respond to any required change and/or to manage any unforeseen impacts.</p>
Cllr Osler	In general I am supportive of the introduction of a (segregated) cycle lane on the A90 from Dean Bridge through to Blackhall. This is definitely an improvement and it will allow for safer passage for cyclists on this at times very dangerous stretch of road it will also reduce conflict between pedestrians and	The SfP and BPRDF A90 measures have been in development and are being delivery in conjunction. It was deemed appropriate to focus on providing additional space for people walking and cycling between the city centre and the connection to National Cycle Network route 1 (NCN1) at Craighleith Crescent. A pragmatic approach has been adopted on the A90 approaches to

	<p>cyclists as there will be a safe alternative to cycling on the pavement. I am also supportive of some of the road narrowing aspects which will help to reduce the speed of traffic exiting the city, this is also much needed.</p> <p>I am however surprised by the limited bus lane proposed heading West as I thought there was supposed to be a link through the Craigleith area? Perhaps to support bus usage (for the future) it would be possible to consider resurfacing existing bus lanes on the Queensferry Road especially around bus stops as this would also benefit other users like cyclists.</p>	<p>the Craigleith junction and the benefits and disbenefits of delivering cycle or bus focused measures were considered.</p> <p>An outbound bus lane between the Craigleith junction and Blackhall dip was considered, however, typically bus lanes are most effective on approaches to junctions rather than downstream of them. Therefore, a protected cycle lane was delivered to afford people cycling access to NCN1 (via Craigleith Crescent) and Ravelston Woods.</p>
<p>Cllr Osler</p>	<p>Sheet 2: Any signage proposed must NOT be on the pavement but above head height affixed to a lamppost or equivalent</p>	<p>Acknowledged and considered during development.</p> <p>The locations of new poles shown on the plans are indicative and were set out by the site supervisor in the best locations to minimise their impact on existing pedestrian provisions. Wherever possible new signs were mounted on existing infrastructure (e.g. poles, lighting columns, walls, etc.).</p>
<p>Cllr Osler</p>	<p>Sheet 3: KEEP CLEAR to be added to road outside Buckingham Terrace opening to match the carriageway opposite as traffic can get backed up at the pedestrian crossing</p>	<p>In direct response to the feedback provided herein, KEEP CLEAR markings will be introduced at the Belgrave Crescent and Eton Terrace junctions at Dean Bridge, to support residents' ability to exit these side roads.</p> <p>In direct response to the feedback provided herein, a new temporary footway (with ramped access for accessibility) will be introduced, by reallocating road space, on Eton Terrace to</p>

	<p>Any signage proposed must NOT be on the pavement but above head height affixed to a lamppost or equivalent</p> <p>Eton Terrace entrance – concern about this being the only entrance to this quadrangle several reasons, sightlines exiting right not easy as traffic fast flowing over the bridge, more possible traffic exiting/entering Buckingham Terrace as middle opening closed so right of way problems, idling traffic reaching back down Eton Terrace & similar issues occurring with what is being changed at Learmonth Terrace junction.</p> <p>For pedestrians the lack of a pavement along the Dean Gardens side and the fact that this is the only entrance/exit to this quadrangle makes it not very safe. With the increased pressure on this junction area and the proximity to the bridge it will make it even harder to navigate across</p>	<p>provide a safe pedestrian link between Dean Bridge and Clarendon Crescent.</p>
<p>Cllr Osler</p>	<p>Sheet 4 closure of Clarendon Crescent – there is concern regarding this as it puts huge pressure on the Eton Terrace end (see above) what is the justification for this closure?</p>	<p>Please refer to the response to Cllr Mitchell’s comment above regarding the measures being brought forward at this location.</p> <p>In direct response to the feedback provided herein, a KEEP CLEAR marking will be introduced on Dean Park Crescent adjacent to the Learmonth Terrace to support resident’s ability to exit at this location.</p>

	<p>Support the prevention of vehicular traffic in the slip road between Learmonth and Oxford, think it should be completed closed as concerned it will be breached by leaving it permeable to cyclists. Alternatively if it is to remain permeable residents on Oxford/Lennox have asked for it to be exit only (from Clarendon) as was discussed in the original consultation</p> <p>Residents on Learmonth Terrace and South Learmonth Gardens have expressed concerns about increased rat running as there will be restricted access at the junction which is already very busy can this be monitored. – why was the Terrace (at number 5) not considered to be exit only to prevent this (as considered in the consultation)?</p> <p>Concern too about markings on the top of the junction and whether there is space for left and right turning traffic adjacent and it being marked as such as there is also difficulty for drivers turning left at the junction to see over cars exiting right.</p> <p>Residents very supportive of the closure of the middle opening of Buckingham Terrace</p>	<p>In direct response to the feedback provided herein, additional LOCAL ACCESS ONLY signage will be installed to discourage non-residential traffic utilising Learmonth Terrace and South Learmonth Avenue (leading to South Learmonth Gardens).</p>
--	--	--

<p>Cllr Osler</p>	<p>Sheet 5 KEEP CLEAR at the Learmonth Ave South on both sides of the Queensferry Road carriageway. This is a frequently used opening which is also very wide crossing pedestrians are often trapped in the middle because of fast moving traffic exiting/entering. If the space was clear this would help</p> <p>Refresh the KEEP CLEAR signs by Buckingham Terrace</p>	<p>Due to the proximity of South Learmonth Avenue to Orchard Brae junction and KEEP CLEAR markings adjacent to (west) Buckingham Terrace, it has been deemed not appropriate to install KEEP CLEAR markings in this location as mitigation for the SfP measures. However, LOCAL ACCESS ONLY signage has been introduced at several locations, including Learmonth Avenue South, to discourage non-residential traffic from entering/exiting this area.</p> <p>Following visual inspections, the KEEP CLEAR markings on Queensferry Road adjacent to (west) Buckingham Terrace were clearly visible and refreshing was deemed no necessary.</p>
<p>Cllr Osler</p>	<p>Sheet 6 to 11 Any signage proposed must NOT be on the pavement but above head height affixed to a lamppost or equivalent</p>	<p>Acknowledged and considered during development.</p> <p>The locations of new poles shown on the plans are indicative and were set out by the site supervisor in the best locations to minimise their impact on existing pedestrian provisions. Wherever possible new signs were mounted on existing infrastructure (e.g. poles, lighting columns, walls, etc.).</p>
<p>Cllr Osler</p>	<p>Sheet 12 At the lights no need for hotel only as the Hotel already has another entrance and it is little used maybe make this just for the Bus?</p> <p>Signage needed to tell cyclists wanting to go North rather than West to continue over and use NCN1 rather than going along South Groathill Rd.</p>	<p>During the development stage the hotel was directly engaged with and the stopping up of their Queensferry Road access was requested. Notwithstanding this is a secondary access, they were not amenable to the request even if only for the period of their recent refurbishment works, when this access was not being used. Therefore, the final road markings at this location has to accommodate the hotel access being maintained along with the access into the petrol station which is just downstream.</p> <p>Signage was developed and introduced to encourage non-confident cyclist that a safer route to access NCN1 can be made</p>

	<p>Any signage proposed must NOT be on the pavement but above head height affixed to a lamppost or equivalent.</p> <p>Is there a possibility to close the access to the hotel as there is another one entrance on Craigleith Crescent?</p>	<p>by continuing along Queensferry Road and using Craigleith Crescent rather taking the right turn at the Craigleith junction.</p> <p>The locations of new poles shown on the plans are indicative and were set out by the site supervisor in the best locations to minimise their impact on existing pedestrian provisions. Wherever possible new signs were mounted on existing infrastructure (e.g. poles, lighting columns, walls, etc.).</p>
Cllr Osler	<p>Sheets 13 & 14 Was thought given (west bound) instead of having the segregated cycle lane in parts changing it to a bus lane as this is two lanes (matching the inbound)?</p> <p>Any signage proposed must NOT be on the pavement but above head height affixed to a lamppost or equivalent.</p>	<p>During the development of the proposals, traffic modelling was undertaken to evidence and identify the sections of the Queensferry Road where new sections of bus lanes would be most effective. The outbound section of Queensferry Road between the Craigleith junction and Maidencraig Crescent (east) was considered for a new section of bus lane, however, the effectiveness of this was deemed to be low and outweighed by the benefits of introducing a segregated cycle lane linking into the Ravelston Woods path network.</p> <p>The locations of new poles shown on the plans are indicative and were set out by the site supervisor in the best locations to minimise their impact on existing pedestrian provisions. Wherever possible new signs were mounted on existing infrastructure (e.g. poles, lighting columns, walls, etc.).</p>
Cllr Osler	<p>Sheets 13 to 18 Any signage proposed must NOT be on the pavement but above head height affixed to a lamppost or equivalent</p>	<p>Acknowledged and considered during development.</p> <p>The locations of new poles shown on the plans are indicative and were set out by the site supervisor in the best locations to minimise their impact on existing pedestrian provisions. Wherever possible new signs were mounted on existing infrastructure (e.g. poles, lighting columns, walls, etc.).</p>
Cllr Webber	<p><u>Section Barnton to the A90 Cramond Brig</u></p>	<p>The new section of bus lane introduced between Cramond Brig and the Barnton junction were delivered by the A90 scheme on</p>

	<p>I would have every right to challenge the disproportionate nature of this section of the scheme and ask what the issue it is attempting to address. How many commuters would choose to cycle this route versus the negative impact and new challenges it would introduce to the majority of those using this route and living in the direct vicinity.</p> <p>Public transport options are limited, and I am uncertain of the connectivity even exists permitting easy access to the Gyle Centre and access to other essential services where connection is made at this point</p> <p>You will be discriminating against those that rely heavily on private vehicles whom cycling is not an option when no public transport option is genuinely available. This will impact severely the elderly and other vulnerable groups living in this area here.</p> <p>By reducing this to one lane of general traffic there will be significant congestion, especially with those cars turning right into Maybury Road at the Barnton Junction, which if you have any understanding of the current traffic flow you will be ware this often blocks the outside lane as it is. This outside lane will be the ONLY lane and as such gridlock will ensue. I get no sense that this has been considered in junction with other schemes</p>	<p>behalf, and funded by, the BPRDF. They were developed in accordance with the aims and objectives of the BPRDF to prioritise public transport. No SfP measures were introduced in this section.</p> <p>During the development of the proposals, traffic modelling was undertaken to evidence and identify the sections of the A90 where new sections of bus lanes would be most effective. The traffic modelling undertaken included considerations of potential queue lengths due to the reduction in lanes (during bus lanes operational times), with the impacts been deemed as acceptable. The operation of the Barnton junction and the termination point of the new bus lane on approach to it were closely considered during development.</p> <p>The temporary proposals on the A90 form part of Transport Scotland's BPRDF and have been carefully considered and developed in close partnership with bus operators and Fife Council, with further technical input from Jacobs (the Council's traffic modelling consultants) and relevant officers within the City of Edinburgh Council.</p> <p>The new short section of bus lane will augment and optimise the existing bus lane infrastructure, ensuring bus service reliability will be improved. The proposals have been developed alongside improvements to the existing queue management system, with ongoing calibration taking place to optimise performance. A monitoring plan is being provided as part of the fund and the bus lane and queue management system will be covered by this.</p> <p>The temporary interventions be delivered under the promotion of a TTRO, therefore, in the unlikely situation that amendments are</p>
--	--	---

	<p>and existing schemes and frankly the scheme will disproportionately impact those using this route to access jobs, medical care and essential retail.</p> <p>And as traffic has generally returned to 70% of pre-covid levels then suggesting this level of intervention without due consideration of the reality of the current position is cavalier and reckless.</p>	<p>required to optimise the performance of measures, the Council will have the ability to swiftly and flexibility adapt measures to respond to any required change and/or to manage any unforeseen impacts.</p>
<p>Cllr Webber</p>	<p>Where Dean Park Crescent meets Oxford Terrace/Clarendon Crescent.</p> <p>This has proved most controversial for residents but they would prefer to maintain access in and out of Oxford Terr and Queensferry Road, but make the slip road one way into Dean Park Crescent. This would resolve the long standing issue residents raise at this junction & removes the most significant conflict currently faced at the junction</p>	<p>Please refer to the response to Cllr Mitchell’s comment above regarding the measures being brought forward at this location.</p>
<p>Cllr Webber</p>	<p>Dean Bridge Area</p> <p>Moving all vehicular pressure to the junction nearest the Dean Bridge should be revisited as there is no footway on the south side of Eton nor on the west side of Clarendon. There is a large section for pedestrians to cross, increasing their risk. Who are we seeking to support and create safe spaces for?</p> <p>I gather there was a 2017 consultation carried out and I am bemused as to why the outcomes and recommendations from this</p>	<p>In direct response to the feedback provided herein, a new temporary footway (with ramped access for accessibility) will be introduced, by reallocating road space, on Eton Terrace to provide a safe pedestrian link between Dean Bridge and Clarendon Crescent.</p> <p>During the development of the measures being brought forward at this location the previous 2017 study and findings were considered. However, the aims and objectives of the both projects are different with the SfP measures being strongly focussed on best addressing the and responding to the current</p>

	<p>are not being considered, given they have support from the community.</p>	<p>pandemic by providing additional space for pedestrians and cyclists.</p>
<p>Cllr Webber</p>	<p>Other Miscellaneous Comments</p> <p>It is good to see space being allocated for SMC school buses however there is still no space outside the school directly and will no doubt, as experienced elsewhere, result in traffic displacement and angry residents in the adjoining streets and with the diverse nature of the education offered here this will not be limited to standard school drop off hours.</p> <p>The ‘parklet’ outside Orchard Brae House a welcomed way to use this space.</p> <p>Craigeith Crescent / Queensferry Road: can you please ensure and confirm the carriageway is wide enough to allow two large vehicles to pass side by side and that the same issues that are currently being addressed in Churchill (Morningside) are not replicated.</p> <p>Has any traffic modelling been done in relation to the left turn only into Holiday Inn? This is a complex junction linking into the retail park.</p>	<p>SMC were directly engaged with during the development of the proposals and we worked with them to meet their requirements. The section footway between the school and the new loading/unloading location has been made safer by the introduction of the protected cycle lane that will offset vehicular traffic by approximately 2m. Since installation further scheme alterations have been made and the existing 20mph zone is being extended westward on Queensferry Road to encompass SMC.</p> <p>Residents local to SMC have been encouraged to provide feedback on traffic displacement, especially during school drop-off and pick-up times. If deemed necessary, further measures or scheme alterations will be made during the implementation period to mitigate traffic displacement.</p> <p>In response to separate feedback received herein the proposals outside Orchard Bare House were revisited and a blue badge parking and loading/unloading facility has been introduced, while retaining the protected cycle lane past this location.</p> <p>All carriageway widths have been designed in accordance with best practice and the relevant design standards to accommodate the various vehicle types that navigate this arterial corridor and adjoining side roads.</p> <p>During the development of the proposals, traffic modelling was undertaken to evidence and identify the sections of the A90 where new sections of bus lanes would be most effective, this</p>

		included the proposals on both approaches to the Craigleith junction.
Spokes	<p>Spokes is pleased to support the extensive use of segregated cycle lanes contained in this proposal.</p> <p>We are however disappointed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • these lanes do not extend all the way west to Barnton. • the several major junctions are excluded. <p>We welcome the preparedness to stop-up a number of side junctions, which makes the cycle route safer and we encourage you to go further with this as there are benefits not just to cyclists but to local residents, by the reduction in rat-running traffic. We highlight several junctions along the Queensferry Road where junctions serving residential streets are busy because they are being used by traffic seeking to drive round signalled junctions.</p> <p>We would like to reiterate our comments made in previous responses about the important safety benefit from the use of red road surfacing across side roads. There are many many such examples, where red surfacing would be a valuable addition to safety.</p>	<p>Additional space has been provided by the SfP programme aimed to link into the existing network. As such, it was deemed appropriate to terminate the SfP measures at the tie ins with NCN1 and the Ravelston Woods path network to provide appropriate route for onward journeys.</p> <p>Other comments acknowledged and considered during development.</p>
Spokes	We see examples on the A90 corridor of a historical design style, which both increases the danger to cyclists at junctions and also	Acknowledge Spokes' commentary regarding the impacts of retaining turning lanes at junctions on the ability to provide a more continuous provision. The SfP programme is constrained

	<p>impedes the bringing of segregated cycle routes right up to junctions. This is the practise of marking out separate straight ahead and turn lanes at signalled junctions, despite the approaching traffic running in single file. Historically, this was to improve traffic flow at junctions, but is now an impediment to the application of the travel hierarchy and requires to be addressed, because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it prevents the installation of continuous segregated cycle lanes and • there is additional danger because motorists are having to choose a lane on approach, placing them under additional observational and cognitive load, which reduces their capacity to consider more vulnerable road users - all of this is at the location where there is most likely to be conflict. A simplified junction style allows drivers more capacity to think! 	<p>by the measures available and in various locations a pragmatic position has had to be adopted following feedback with respect to reducing turning lanes. Wherever feasible we have introduced continuous measures to protect road users.</p> <p>It should also be noted that during the implementation period when feedback has been received that highlights safety and other concerns, these have been considered and appropriate alterations have been made.</p>
<p>Spokes</p>	<p>Sheet 1 – Lynedoch Place and Randolph Cliff Westbound – Lynedoch Place</p> <p>It is good to see that the existing lane lines are to be removed to reduce outbound to one lane, as approaching westbound traffic can already only be in one lane.</p> <p>Building on that, we would like to see the westbound cycle lane start back at the</p>	<p>Westbound – Lynedoch Place In direct response to feedback the provided herein the westbound road marking have been revisited and the cycle lane has been upstream to the junction with Drumsheugh Gardens.</p> <p>The closure of Bells Brae at Queensferry Road was considered and discounted during development due to the impacts on local residents.</p> <p>Eastbound – Randolph Cliff</p>

	<p>Drumsheugh Gardens junction and be segregated to the start of the Dean Bridge. This will address the current problem where vehicles encroach into the existing marked cycle lane. Currently, experienced cyclists generally stay in primary position from Drumsheugh Gardens to the bridge, fearing that the existing cycle lane simply seems to invite a close pass at the pinch point. This requires to be made safer for the SfP target audience of new, less experienced, cyclists. Also, some drivers may assume that a cyclist keeping left in the cycle lane will be heading for Belford Road or Bells Brae.</p> <p>Given that all traffic from the Dean Village exiting Bells Brae must turn left across the Dean Bridge, we recommend that it be closed at this point, thereby reducing traffic at both this pinch point and on the Dean Bridge. Local Dean Village traffic would be able to join the same route at the Dean Path/Orchard Brae junction – with the benefit of traffic signals</p> <p>Eastbound – Randolph Cliff</p> <p>We are very surprised that nothing is proposed here, because the staggered junctions with Randolph Crescent and Drumsheugh Gardens are already very difficult for town-bound cyclists. The left lane</p>	<p>Due to the measures available to the SfP programme we were unable to address and improve the Randolph Crescent / Lynedoch Place junction beyond the refreshing of the existing ASL markings. It should be noted that this junction bound by the extents of a forthcoming carriage and footway resurfacing scheme and permanent improvements for people walking and cycling will be forthcoming.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>is a separately signalled left turn – which goes to green later than the straight on lane. So, cyclists heading into town have to either use the outside lane – uphill ahead of impatient traffic or attempt a crossover from the inside lane into the outside lane’s ASL, which is staggered but not connected.</p> <p>Until such time as this junction can be fully reviewed, we recommend that the inside and outside lane’s ASL boxes be aligned, with appropriate subdivision markings to show left turn and straight ahead.</p>	
Spokes	<p>Sheet 2 The signage stating "NARROW LANES DO NOT OVERTAKE CYCLISTS ON THE BRIDGE" appears to be positioned so as to block the pavement.</p>	<p>The locations of new poles shown on the plans are indicative and will be set out by the site supervisor in the best locations to minimise their impact on existing pedestrian provisions. Wherever possible new signs will be mounted on existing infrastructure (e.g. poles, lighting columns, walls, etc.).</p>
Spokes	<p>Sheet 3 Westbound We recommend red surfacing of the cycle lane across the mouth of the Belgrave Crescent junction.</p> <p>Eastbound It appears that the only reason that the proposed segregated westbound cycle lane is not mirrored on the eastbound side is because the median hatching has been retained. Please review this, with a view to installing segregated cycle lane on both</p>	<p>Westbound The use of red screed surfacing has been considered widely at various locations throughout the project extents. However, it has only been deemed appropriate in specific locations to better highlight areas where there is a greater likelihood of conflict. The indiscriminate use of this measure would reduce its effectiveness at these more critical locations. Due to the nature of road layout at this location it was not deemed appropriate to introduce red screed surfacing at this location.</p> <p>Eastbound The A90 scheme is primarily a combined (SfP) providing additional space for physically distancing and (BPRDF) bus priority scheme, which now includes pedestrian improvements.</p>

	<p>sides. Removing median hatching may also help slow motor traffic.</p>	<p>One of the primary aims of the scheme was to provide additional space for physical distancing and bus infrastructure along the corridor rather than replacing infrastructure for the benefit of one mode or the other. As such, the existing eastbound bus lane on approach to the Dean Bridge was retained which prohibited the continuation of the protected cycle lane through this section.</p>
<p>Spokes</p>	<p>Sheet 4 We recommend red surfacing of the cycle lane across the mouth of the Learmonth Terrace junction. How do cyclists get from Queensferry Road (eastbound) into Oxford Terrace? Why can't they turn left through the new closure? The only way seems to be to turn left Learmonth Terrace/ Dean Park Crescent and then an awkward right turn on sloping setts. There should be a gap in the segregation units to allow eastbound cyclists the opportunity to enter the new pedestrian/cycle area at Oxford Terrace, similar to the gap for exiting cyclists.</p>	<p>During development red screed surfacing was considered and discounted at this location. Principally this was due to the commentary above regarding conspicuous messaging for drivers and also that the existing advisory cycle lane that the SfP provisions tie into already is red chipped across the mouth of Learmonth Terrace.</p> <p>As per the original design, eastbound cyclists turning into Oxford Terrace from Queensferry Road have been catered for by an entry slip and are then able to continue onto Oxford Terrace or Clarendon Crescent as desired. Similarly, to the entry slip, an exit slip has been provided at this junction to permit cyclists to turn left from Oxford Terrace and travel eastbound on Queensferry Road.</p>
<p>Spokes</p>	<p>Sheet 5 We recommend the stopping up to motor traffic of the south end of South Learmonth Avenue at Queensferry Road, because Learmonth Terrace is used as a rat-run used by traffic from the Stockbridge area intending to go west on the Queensferry Road, to bypass the junction Learmonth Terrace/Queensferry Road junction. Beneficially, this would eliminate turns across the cycle lane at the South Learmonth Avenue junction and allow full segregation.</p>	<p>In order to discourage non-residential traffic from utilising the various residential roads when traveling to and from Queensferry Road and the Stockbridge/Comely bank area, several LOCAL ACCESS ONLY barriers/signs have been introduced.</p> <p>The effectiveness of these measures will be monitored during the implementation phase and where necessary further measure and alterations may be considered and introduced.</p>

<p>Spokes</p>	<p>Sheet 6 Westbound Given that only one lane of traffic can proceed west from the Orchard Brae junction, we recommend that the segregated cycle lane starts immediately west of the junction, rather than reserving this space for school buses, which could be accommodated in Queensferry Terrace.</p> <p>Eastbound Nothing in these proposals makes navigating the approach to the Orchard Brae junction easier, which is already difficult when cycling straight on, because of the left turn lane. Are further proposals to follow? We don't consider that there is merit in creating a parklet in front of Orchard Brae House. There appears to be no active frontage on that section of the A90, except for the offices at Orchard Brae House, where nearly all the staff there will be working from home. We feel a city centre/town centre location would be a better use of the budget.</p>	<p>Westbound Following early scheme consultation with SMC a pragmatic approach had to be adopted and it was deemed necessary that a loading/unloading provision to be included in the plans. The SMC coaches will have already departed during the outbound PM commuting peak and due to the introduction of double yellow lines the new advisory lane should remain clear of obstructions for cyclists.</p> <p>Eastbound As described above, due to the measure available to the SfP programme and site-specific constraints of this junction we were unable to reduce the number of turning lanes at this location.</p> <p>In response to separate feedback received herein the proposals outside Orchard Brae House were revisited and a blue badge parking and loading/unloading facility has been introduced, while retaining the protected cycle lane past this location.</p>
<p>Spokes</p>	<p>Sheet 8 We recommend that the roundabout at Queensferry Terrace be converted to be a an easier and safer to navigate "T" junction, with tight corner radii.</p>	<p>Due to the measures available to the SfP programme and site-specific constraints of this roundabout, we were unable to make the necessary alterations that would have been required to introduce a safe priority junction. A KEEP CLEAR marking has been introduced to better cater for westbound cyclists during busy periods to try and provide space for cyclists to proceed unobstructed when traffic backs up around the roundabout.</p>

<p>Spokes</p>	<p>Sheets 9 and 10</p> <p>We referred to Orchard Road in our SfP submission about the Orchard Brae roundabout, where we recommended that it be closed at both the Queensferry Road and Orchard Brae roundabout ends:</p> <p>We recommend the closure of the Orchard Road [roundabout] exit to simplify the roundabout to being 4-way. One of the reasons why this roundabout is problematic for pedestrians and cyclists is because of the uncertainty of driver route intention caused by there being 5 legs. With the common lack of Highway Code standard use of indicators, it is hard to determine drivers route intentions. This would also make pedestrian access to the Orchard Brae Pelican Crossing safer from the west.</p> <p>Orchard Road is entirely residential and would remain accessible via multiple other routes. A secondary benefit is to close a rat-run, as this street is used as a short-cut to the Queensferry Road. If it was also closed at its junction with Queensferry Road, an entire residential complex would be freed of through traffic, thereby encouraging more walking and cycling to school and to the local shops in Comely Bank and Blackhall. We therefore continue to recommend its stopping up at this end.</p>	<p>The impacts of introducing a modal filter at the junction of Orchard Road and Queensferry Road were deemed to be too great on the local road network and may have led to unintended consequences and traffic routing behaviours. A separate SfP scheme has been brought forward to address and improve the Orchard Brae roundabout.</p> <p>Due to the complexities of the junction arrangements and typical driver behaviours traveling between Orchard Road and Orchard Road South, this area was deemed appropriate for the installation of red screed surfacing.</p> <p>Protected footway buildouts were considered at the junction of Orchard Drive and Queensferry Road during the early design development stage. However, due to the location of a number of driveways at this location and the temporary measures available to the SfP programme we were unable to bring forward improvements at this location. We are currently investigating if an un-protected hatched solution can be delivered that would help to visual narrow the junction and slow traffic which would make this junction safer for pedestrians and cyclists. It should be noted that a permanent scheme for reducing the corner radii at this location is being considered/developed.</p> <p>The typical clear space between the segregation units is 5m which has been deemed sufficiently wide for cyclists turning right from Orchard Road South to navigate between any units as they so choose.</p> <p>The location of the DO NOT PASS CYCLISTS AT ISLANDS signage was revisited and they have been positioned on widened sections of footway on approach to the relevant islands.</p>
---------------	--	---

	<p>The Orchard Road South/Orchard Road diagonal crossroads junction is a significant hazard to cyclists on Queensferry Road because of crossing traffic, commonly using this route to avoid the major Craigleith Road signalled junction, just to the west. We therefore recommend that the introduction of a solid centreline barrier to prevent traffic to crossing over between Orchard Road South and Orchard Road.</p> <p>The radii are very large with wide crossing gaps for pedestrians. At the entrance to Orchard Drive, the radius should be tightened. (If it is considered possible to narrow the entrance to Craigleith Crescent (sheet 13), which is a bus route, this ought to be also possible here.)</p> <p>There should be a big enough gap in the orcas to allow cyclists coming out of Orchard Road (south) to enter the eastbound cycle lane easily.</p> <p>The 'Sign to be position on refuge island nose stating "DO NOT PASS CYCLISTS AT ISLANDS"' has been put ON the island, after the start of the widened cycle lane. It should be placed further back to give motorists more warning.</p>	<p>Following further engagement with local residents the proposals for Sheet 9 and measure introduced were revised and this pinch point was removed.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>On Sheet 9 the cycle lane is widened at the island, but on Sheet 10 (just west of Orchard Road) it is not, and the road lane is only 2.75m wide, so creating a really nasty pinch point</p>	
Spokes	<p>Sheet 11 The Craigleith Drive/Orchard Drive crossroads junction has similar hazards to the Orchard Road South/Orchard Road diagonal crossroads junction mentioned above. We recommend a significant tightening of the corner radii and that the ability of traffic to cross over between Craigleith Drive and Orchard Drive be cut.</p>	<p>Refer to commentary above with respect to the radii reduction of Orchard Road at Queensferry Road.</p>
Spokes	<p>Sheet 12/13 Nothing in these proposals will make it safer for cyclists to navigate the major 5-way Craigleith Road/South Groathill Avenue, despite this occupying an enormously large area of tarmac. Are further proposals to follow?</p>	<p>Due to the measures available to the SfP programme and site-specific constraints of the Craigleith junction, we were unable to introduce improvements for people cycling the most direct route to and from Queensferry Road and South Groathill Avenue (and onto NCN1). A westbound advisory and protected section of cycle lane have been introduced, and signage to encourage westbound cyclists to proceed straight ahead at the Craigleith junction and then use Craigleith Crescent to access and egress NCN1. This is not the most desirable route and requires cyclists to dismount and use the stairs linking into NCN1, however this approach does provide an additional and safer choice for people cycling when compared with making the right turn at the Craigleith junction.</p> <p>At this stage no further proposals or SfP measures are to follow.</p>
Spokes	<p>Sheet 14 There should be a big enough gap in the orcas to allow cyclists coming out of</p>	<p>Refer to comment above regarding the typical clearance between the segregation units. That said, no protected cycle lane has been installed eastbound on Sheet 14. A protected cycle lane</p>

	<p>Maidencraig Crescent to enter the eastbound cycle lane easily. Also for other similar right turns.</p>	<p>was considered for this section however it was discounted due to the benefits of the BPRDF measures outweighing them in this specific location. The first section of eastbound protected cycle lane commencing downstream of the Craigleith junction on Sheet 12.</p>
<p>Spokes</p>	<p>General Points How will the cycle lanes within orcas get swept of autumn leaves and snow?</p>	<p>The width of the protected cycle lane has been designed to accommodate a mini sweeper which will be able to clear the protected areas of leaves and snow as required.</p>
<p>Edinburgh Access Panel</p>	<p>We note from your email that you are making these proposals <i>"with the principal aims of encouraging and supporting cyclists to travel safely while also prioritising public transport on one of the city's strategic transport corridors"</i>. We support these aims provided that they do not entail unacceptable sacrifices or hazards for pedestrians or motorists - particularly blue badge holders. With this in mind:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please ensure provision of access and kerb-side parking for blue badge holders is at least equivalent to current provision, especially in areas where the road passes through built-up areas. 2. We are glad to note that you are proposing kerb-side bus stops that interrupt mandatory cycle lanes. Please use the same method to accommodate any blue badge parking spaces. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Acknowledged and considered during development. 2. Acknowledged and considered during development. 3. In direct response your and other separate feedback received herein the proposals outside Orchard Bare House were revisited and a blue badge parking and loading/unloading facility has been introduced, while retaining the protected cycle lane past this location. 4. In direct response to your feedback, clarification of this intervention has been made on the plans and followed through to the measures delivered. The (east) Buckingham Terrace junction at Queensferry Road has been closed for all vehicles including cyclists and due to the placement of the segregation units across the mouth of (east) Buckingham Terrace at Queensferry Road cyclists are unable to access and egress this now pedestrianised area.

	<p>3. We are glad to see you proposing a parklet with wheelchair access outside Orchard Brae House. Please provide some blue badge spaces nearby.</p> <p>4. We note your proposal to filter vehicles at Buckingham Terrace. If this junction is intended to be the main access point between Queensferry Road and Buckingham Terrace for cyclists, we recommend you consider establishing a zebra crossing (or similar). Cyclists tend not to give way to pedestrians unless there is a regulated crossing. We note that you are intending this junction for use by "<i>confident cyclists</i>". If it's safe only for confident cyclists, we are concerned that other cyclists who use the junction (eg novices) will endanger themselves and/or pedestrians. Please therefore make sure it's safe for all cyclists.</p>	
<p>Craigleith/Blackhall Community Council</p>	<p>From discussion with Council officials, Craigleith/Blackhall Community Council understands that there is an acknowledgement by officials that, although Queensferry Road (including Hillhouse Road) is one of the major arterial routes in Edinburgh, there has been significant under-investment in the road compared to other arterial routes in the city. This is readily apparent with potholes, worn road surface in</p>	<p>Acknowledged and considered during development.</p>

	<p>parts, the absence of adequate road markings including yellow boxes, broke road surfaces around gully drains including collapsed gully drains - most recent example was repaired only 6 months ago after 2years with metal plate; and a poor standard of both gully cleaning and footpath cleaning. We would regard addressing these major issues and problems as essential and should take priority over some of what is now being proposed.</p>	
<p>Craigleith/Blackhall Community Council</p>	<p>Many of the proposals now being put forward by the City Council we would describe as desirable rather than essential and the package as a whole ignores the major problems outlined above. Against this background we have the following comments on the proposals within the boundary of Craigleith/Blackhall Community Council area:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. without a more detailed explanation and a reasoned justification for the individual elements, it is difficult to comment in detail; 2. safety measures to improve cycling are welcome but the Queensferry Road cycle facilities seem to be disconnected from the existing Sustrans Route 1 that passes through the area; 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At high-level both the SfP and BPRDF programmes have been set up by Transport Scotland as part of the Scottish Government's COVID-19 response strategy. CEC have taken the decision to bring forward and deliver measure that meet the aims and objectives of these programmes. More details regarding the background and justification of the SfP and BPRDF measures can be found using the inks below: https://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/spaces-people-1 and https://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/news/article/12959/councils-in-south-east-scotland-welcome-1-2m-for-pop-up-bus-priority-measures 2. Due to the measures available to the SfP programme and site-specific constraints of the Craigleith junction, we were unable to introduce improvements for people cycling the most direct route to and from Queensferry Road and South Groathill Avenue (and onto NCN1). A westbound advisory and protected section of cycle lane, and signage to encourage westbound cyclists to proceed straight ahead at the Craigleith junction and then use Craigleith

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. the measures to improve cycling at Stewart Melville College appear to have no regard to the provision and parking of coaches that serve the school; the proposal will lead to the narrowing of Queensferry Road, virtually to a single lane road, when pupils are being dropped off and picked up. We assume that full discussions have taken place with the school and their coach operators; 4. while we appreciate the reasons for introducing a bus lane from Blackhall Dip to Craigleith Crescent it could lead to an increase in queueing traffic city bound on Hillhouse Road/Queensferry Road should traffic volumes return to normal; additionally delays will be aggravated by right turning traffic into Craigleith Crescent; 5. noted that no action is proposed between Strachan Road/Telford Road and Barnton - although given the pedestrian volumes linked to the Royal High School on some sections at certain times of day, the lack of action is a little surprising. 6. there is no information how the proposals will be monitored and their success or otherwise judged. 	<p>Crescent to access and egress NCN1 has been introduced. This is not the most desirable route and requires cyclists to dismount and use the stairs linking into NCN1, however this approach does provide an additional and safer choice for people cycling when compared with making the right turn at the Craigleith junction.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. SMC were directly engaged with during the development of the proposals and we worked with them to meet their requirements. The section footway between the school and the new loading/unloading location has been made safer by the introduction of the protected cycle lane that will offset vehicular traffic by approximately 2m. Since installation further scheme alterations have been made and the existing 20mph zone is being extended westward on Queensferry Road to encompass SMC. 4. Acknowledged. Traffic modelling was undertaken, which included queue length assessments, during the development of the scheme that identified the most effective sections of the A90 for bus lanes. Feedback on the performance and impacts of this intervention will be taken into account during the scheme review process and if necessary, alterations may be made. 5. This section was beyond the remit of the A90 SfP scheme. BPRDF measures were considered for this section, however they were discounted as the disbenefits outweighed the benefits. 6. With respect to the SfP measures the spacesforpeople@edinburgh.gov.uk mailbox is monitored and all scheme specific correspondence is forward on to the relevant project officers. All correspondence (which may be received through other means) is reviewed and safety related issues discussed and actioned at the
--	--	---

		<p>earliest opportunity. All other scheme specific correspondence is reviewed and actioned as part of the periodic (every two months) scheme review process.</p> <p>With respect to the BPRDF measures the transport.publictransaccess@edinburgh.gov.uk mailbox is monitored and all scheme specific correspondence is forward on to the relevant project officers.</p>
<p>Drum Brae Community Council</p>	<p>Given that this seems to be another initiative where it does not appear that the Community Councils have not been engaged, including Drum Brae Community Council as local stakeholders, perhaps someone might want to explain why our Community Councils have again not been afforded the courtesy of the appropriate engagement in this process for what appears to be a quite an extensive set of proposals where suddenly again it is stated that there is 'an urgency to have this work done'. There also isn't a 'silver bullet' for this situation which will suit everyone but hopefully we can get somewhere with the proposals that bring any polarised visions closer. However we do need to know what the statistics show to support the changes proposed, we do require a focus group, we do require to know if these proposals are consistent with the ongoing developments in Maybury Road/Cammo and what the impacts will be for our future and I believe we all had concerns recorded with the current proposals</p>	<p>An initial public consultation exercise was undertaken to between 29 May and 29 June 2020 (details can be found via the following link https://edinburghspacesforpeople.commonplace.is/) which helped to identify areas of concern to the council where</p> <p>Due to the nature of the SfP programme, the Policy and Sustainability Committee approved the process for implementing measures which included the scheme specific notification process (herein) that was directly issued to all relevant Community Councils and other stakeholders. This notification process was the forum for Community Councils to provide scheme specific feedback directly to the project team for consideration prior to final scheme approval and delivery.</p> <p>The stakeholder notification for the SfP and BPRDF A90 scheme took place from 21 October 2020 for 10 days. All feedback was considered with scheme alterations being made prior to the Transport and Environment Committee approving the proposals during the 12 November 2020 meeting. However, final approval was deferred to the full council committee which approved the proposals on the 19 November 2020.</p> <p>The SfP and BPRDF A90 proposals were developed by experienced transport engineers, both internal and external to</p>

	<p>for Queensferry Road and all of its junctions ... our local intel tells us.</p> <p>Why is this being pushed through without appropriate time for community consultation and engagement? Where are the supportive statistics for these proposals? Why and where did this 'urgency' come from? Why is this process being done under the umbrella of Covid 19 emergency measures? What were the timescales for residents being made aware of these statistics and proposals? To put it bluntly, are these proposals currently legally compliant in terms of the legislation being applied to propose them now ... are they also compliant with the criteria to be met by the DDA? Basically, and it has to be said that this appears to be another rush job with an single minded approach ... an approach of what passes as the legally required open and transparent community engagement timeously with the City of Edinburgh Council and their officers these days ... therefore we would like to be assured this time. Where this all fits in with the City of Edinburgh Council Chief Executive's recent message thanking Community Council officers for the role that they and their community councils have played during these</p>	<p>the council and have been reviewed and approved by the tailored council approval process established for pandemic response transport schemes. The aims and objectives of the schemes have been designed to best address and respond to the on-going pandemic and have taken account of site-specific considerations.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>uncertain times and where efforts to represent and serve local communities are more important now than ever as we look to support each other and build back better than before sits ... god only knows!!! This lack of open and transparent engagement on a subject which hugely impacts on our communities is testament to a process which does exactly the opposite by doing things to the communities rather than working with them.</p> <p>Again I note that Councils may use temporary traffic regulation orders (TTRO) in the event there is a danger to the public. In this case, the immediate danger is the risk of the transmission of infection and the need mitigate that risk as a matter of urgency. However and again I don't think that the 'danger to the public' test can be passed here.</p> <p>Do these proposals take into account the existing proposals for the new and extensive works on the Cammo side of Maybury Road from Maybury to Barnton junctions?</p> <p>Are these proposals consistent with the change proposals there, for the future?</p> <p>Do we have the statistical data to show how many cyclists currently use this section of Queensferry Road?</p> <p>Are there letters and associated leaflets now in the process of being issued to residents within the area of these changes explaining:</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>the statistics, the planned temporary measures, the rationale, how to find out more, the process for engagement and next steps?</p> <p>Have we checked to see how this may increase traffic by forcing more vehicles to use the alternative routes of Glasgow Road, Maybury Road, Drum Brae North/South, Clermiston Road North/South, Quality Street, is a better option than the current situation?</p> <p>Concerns have been raised that some elements of the proposal (bus filters and stops, school pupils and crossings) may cause further pause in traffic and dangers for motorists.</p> <p>Given that we know that ALL arterial roads/junctions are unpleasant places to walk/cycle. Any proposals should be considering in the context of how we will improve these crossings to ensure that they are safer and more pleasant.</p> <p>Reassurances are required that the key information that needs to come from the council is whether the interventions are temporary or permanent and the budget is available for changes.</p> <p>What commitment have we got from the Council that they will consult with local residents as to their own views?</p> <p>Has there been any attempt to get the users ... of cycles, of concerned motorists and of residents in the same room, to attempt to find</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>some common ground that we can take forward these proposals given the councils incredibly rapid timeframe?</p>	
<p>Cramond & Barnton Community Council</p>	<p>The measures proposed east of the Blackhall Junction are unlikely to have any material impact on the Cramond and Barnton area and accordingly no comment is made in relation to this part of the scheme.</p> <p>The measures west of the Barnton Junction comprise the provision of a new bus-lane from just west of the New Cramond Bridge to No 580 Queensferry Road and the loss of one of the two eastbound traffic lanes to accommodate this. We have no objections to this measure but would observe that at times of peak flow the remaining eastbound traffic lane will have to support a greater length of stationary queueing traffic and thereby create difficulties for vehicles accessing the road from Cammo Road or any of the multiplicity of private accesses along Queensferry Road. In that event joining traffic could well end up blocking either the bus-lane (for vehicles from north of the road) or the outside westbound lane (for vehicles from Cammo Road or the properties to the south of Queensferry Road). Moreover, the greater length of queue-back along Queensferry road will extend the poor air quality for the environs of the junction further westward to</p>	<p>Acknowledged and considered during development.</p> <p>During the development of the proposals, traffic modelling was undertaken to evidence and identify the sections of the A90 where new sections of bus lanes would be most effective. The traffic modelling undertaken included considerations of potential queue lengths due to the reduction in lanes (during bus lanes operational times), with the impacts been deemed as acceptable. The operation of the Barnton junction and the termination point of the new bus lane on approach to it were closely considered during development. Feedback on the performance and impacts of this intervention will be taken into account during the scheme review process and if necessary, alterations may be made.</p>

	the detriment of additional roadside dwellings.	
Cramond & Barnton Community Council	The queue relocation scheme on the rural section of the A90 which was implemented some two decades ago, and particularly the provisions at the Barnshot Junction were intended to enable bus priority along the route and the limitation of westbound traffic moving forward beyond the Barnshot Junction to queue west of the Barnton Junction traffic signals. Queuing of traffic in excess of that which could pass through the Barnton Junction could thereby be held in the rural section of the road. It could be said that the sole reason for the need for your new bus lane derives from the lack of effective control of the queue relocation signals at Barnshot, and that a more refined management of these signals could mitigate the problems with your proposed scheme which I have highlighted above.	The queue relocation system upstream of the new Cramond Brig to Barnton junction bus lane was accounted for during the traffic modelling and design development of the scheme. Feedback on the performance and impacts of this intervention will be taken into account during the scheme review process and if necessary, alterations may be made.
Cramond & Barnton Community Council	We look to you to explain how our concerns are intended to be addressed. The detrimental impact on air quality associated with such schemes was something which was commented on by a number of people who participated in the special ZOOM session hosted by the EACC on 22 October on the Spaces for People.	The A90 scheme followed all the tailored development processes and approval procedures prior to delivery. Project specific air quality assessments were not identified as an approval requirement. It should be noted that the Scottish Government's COVID-19 transport response hierarchy encourages people to walk and cycle whenever possible for essential journeys. By creating additional space on one of the city's main arterial corridors the council are enabling people to make journeys and physically distance.

<p>Public</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. High level of concern from residents regarding shutting down the exit onto Oxford Terrace from Queensferry Road. Closure is unnecessary, less safe and shifts the problem to an arguably more dangerous junction. Blocking off 2 of the 3 access points to homes in 4 streets, Oxford Terrace, Lennox Street, Eton Terrace and Clarendon Terrace is too much. Suggestion: Make the slip road from Dean Park Crescent onto Oxford Terrace one way. This will assist pedestrian crossing, vehicular access and prevent rat running. 2. Concerns raised by re removal of layby raised by agents of property landlords at Orchard Brae House. 3. Stewart Melville College: Removing ability to park coaches close to school gates will put pupil safety at risk. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please refer to the response to Cllr Mitchell's comment above regarding the measures being brought forward at this location. 2. In direct response to the feedback provided herein, the proposal to install a 'parklet' outside Orchard House has been revisited and a blue badge and loading/unloading area will be installed in its place to minimise the impact on local businesses. 3. SMC were directly engaged with during the development of the proposals and we worked with them to meet their requirements. The section footway between the school and the new loading/unloading location has been made safer by the introduction of the protected cycle lane that will offset vehicular traffic by approximately 2m. Since installation further scheme alterations have been made and the existing 20mph zone is being extended westward on Queensferry Road to encompass SMC.
<p>Public</p>	<p>Against</p> <p>Bus lanes will create congestion and increase delays.</p> <p>For</p> <p>Welcome the introduction of bus lanes and corresponding reduction of two car lanes.</p>	<p>Acknowledged and considered during development.</p>

	Massive need to improve public transport access from South Queensferry to Edinburgh.	
Public	<p>I appreciate the efforts that are going in to providing safer and more pleasant walking and cycling experiences, and I understand why these may not be as comprehensive as many of us would like. Some of the more dangerous and intimidating stretches of road are hard to make safe with temporary, 'low impact' measures, so it is really important to consider how to end stretches of cycle lane or pavement safely at these pinch points. Although I'm very pleased to hear that a cycle lane will be going in on Queensferry Road, it must be safely connected across Dean Bridge and into Lymedoch Place. Even without space for a segregated cycle lane on the bridge, I'm sure that clear, prominent road markings, red tarmac, and signage can change 'ownership' of the road.</p>	<p>Acknowledged and considered during development.</p> <p>Specific measures have been introduced on Dean Bridge to make this section safer for people to cycle through, however the road width prohibited the introduction of continuous protected cycle lanes in this section. The measures delivered included road markings to encourage people cycling to adopt the primary road position (i.e. centre of the carriageway), along with signage directed at drivers to discourage the overtaking of cyclists on the bridge. Since installation the council has been made aware that some drivers have been overtaking cyclists on the bridge and we are currently considering further measures to mitigate this and make this unprotected section safer for people cycling.</p>
Public (Commonplace)	<p>Reduce speed and volume of traffic</p> <p>Add protected cycle lanes</p> <p>Extend pavements</p> <p>Specific comments:</p> <p>This comment applies to the entire length of Queensferry Road. In order to enable people to cycle to work, shop and exercise, key</p>	<p>Acknowledged and considered during development.</p>

	<p>arterial routes need protected cycling infrastructure. This is a major artery connecting NW Edinburgh to the city centre, but has the advantage of being relatively flat compared to alternative routes. It is therefore vital to establishing a network of safe cycling routes for the city.</p> <p>Footpaths are fairly narrow and the road is dominated by vehicular traffic. There are several pinch points, specifically in relation to the Royal High end of the road, where a narrow footpath and crash railings are present. The area provides access to Corstorphine Hill, Davidson Mains Park and is a main arterial route for Edinburgh City centre. Promoting active travel at this location would be beneficial all the way from Barnton to Dean Bridge.</p>	
--	--	--