



Business bulletin

Transport and Environment Committee

10.00am, Thursday, 19 August 2021

Virtual Meeting, via Microsoft Teams

Transport and Environment Committee

Convener:	Members:	Contact:
<p>Councillor Lesley Macinnes (Convener)</p>  <p>Councillor Karen Doran (Vice-Convener)</p> 	<p>Councillor Maureen Child Councillor Eleanor Bird Councillor Gavin Corbett Councillor Graham Hutchinson Councillor David Key Councillor Kevin Lang Councillor Claire Miller Councillor Stephanie Smith Councillor Iain Whyte</p>	<p>Alison Coburn, Operations Manager 0131 529 3149</p> <p>Veronica MacMillan Committee Services 0131 529 4283</p>

Recent news	Further Information
<p>2021 SuDS Champion Awards</p> <p>Senior Planner Julie Waldron has been named 2021 SuDS Champion in the “Experienced SuDS Professional” category.</p> <p>Run annually by Susdrain, the awards invite the water industry to nominate someone who they believe has gone 'the extra mile' to be recognised for their achievements to inspire, inform and influence the delivery of SuDS. Julie was nominated by SEPA, Scottish Water and Atkins for the award, which also is a recognition of her collaborative approach.</p>	<p>For further information Contact: Daisy Narayanan Wards: All</p>

Earlier this year Julie led the delivery of Edinburgh's [Vision for Management of Water in the City of Edinburgh](#).

Edinburgh's Water Vision is:

To develop a long-term and sustainable approach to river, coastal and storm water management across the city and its environs, respecting our unique historic heritage. This will involve all stakeholders and address the flooding and water quality risks associated with our changing climate as a result of changes in rainfall and sea level rise.

One key aim of the vision is the need to manage the first 5mm of rainfall within every new development plot.

This is a big change for both planning, transport and building standards, and will require building more raingardens, green roofs and other sustainable urban drainage features in developments. Everyone can help, by thinking about 'holding back' their water in their own gardens using raingardens and water butts. Even a small amount will collectively, across the city, make a significant difference.

Overall this will help hold back water from the sewers and the rivers especially important in times of intense rainfall, allow more plants to grow and wildlife to thrive and create greener places for people to live, work and visit. It will also support healthier, happier and better off communities.

The City of Edinburgh Council's Response to Transport Scotland consultation on ETROs, TROs and RSOs

Transport Scotland recently ran a consultation regarding proposed changes to the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) process in Scotland, as well as gathering further opinions on the need for and nature of possible changes to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) and Redetermination (Scotland) Order (RSO) processes.

The deadline for responses was 30 July 2021. A response was therefore submitted on behalf of the City of Edinburgh Council, see Appendix 1. This response was in line with previous representations that this Council has made to the Scottish Government for changes to these regulations and processes.

Broadly, the response:

Further information available at <https://consult.gov.scot/road-policy/traffic-regulation-procedures/>

For further information contact:

[Phil Noble](#), Active Travel Team Leader: or

[Sarah Feldman](#), Transport Officer

- is supportive in principle of Transport Scotland’s proposed changes to the ETRO process.
- calls for the TRO hearing process to be discretionary for objections relating to loading.

advocates the removal of the need for RSOs, or at minimum, legal clarification on the specific situations in which an RSO is needed.

Update on Actions from the July 2021 Flooding Summary

This Business Bulletin has been written to provide members with an update on the roles and responsibilities of organisations, along with actions and measures taken since the flooding that occurred across Edinburgh on 4 July 2021. The flooding resulted in surcharging drainage systems at numerous locations across the city. It augments the all member briefing issued on 5 July 2021 by Service Director - Operational Services (see Appendix 2).

It is recognised that Edinburgh’s historic drainage system is not capable of coping with today’s intense summer storms. However, it is not feasible nor affordable to reconstruct the entire city’s drainage system.

Climate change predictions have significantly changed over the years and the intensity of rainfall is only likely to continue to increase. During flood alerts, rainfall predictions are issued but the exact intensity, duration or location are not known, making it extremely difficult to predict. The warnings from 27 to 29 July 2021 were imprecise and demonstrated the difficulty in anticipating which areas will be affected by heavy rain. Edinburgh did not receive the rainfall that was forecast for that event. Similarly, the thunderstorms forecast for 8 August 2021 did not hit the Edinburgh area until 9 August 2021 with severe road flooding experienced to the west side of the city.

Going forward it should be reinforced that the Council does not have a statutory duty or a legal requirement to take action or prevent flooding to properties during heavy rainfall events. The message should be reinforced that individuals are responsible for protecting themselves from flooding.

Responsibilities

Local Authorities have several roles relating to flooding with powers and responsibilities for flood prevention as set

For further information contact:

[Gordon McOmish](#)

Senior Engineer
Flood Prevention

07770 653 417

out in the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 and other related legislation, as the Roads Authority and as the Planning Authority.

Local Authorities are responsible for producing [Local Flood Risk Management Plans](#) and working in partnership with SEPA, Scottish Water and other responsible authorities to deliver these Plans. The Plans have been developed in parallel with the [Flood Risk Management Strategies](#) and provide more detail on how and when the actions from the strategy will be delivered locally.

During severe flooding, local authorities will work with the emergency services and co-ordinate shelter for people evacuated from their homes. There is no requirement or obligation for local authorities to provide flood protection products. However, we do provide a limited number of sandbags at fire stations across the city that the public can use.

As the **Roads Authority**, local authorities are responsible for the drainage of local roads and public highways - including maintenance of road gullies. Roads are designed to a much lower return period and therefore are more liable to flood, during a flash flood event, however, they should drain quickly once it stops raining. This was seen on 4 July 2021 event.

As the **Planning Authority**, local authorities have the role of checking the adequacy or otherwise of development proposals in terms of surface water management and flooding.

The Scottish Government is responsible for making national policy on planning, flood prevention and flood warning. **Transport Scotland** is responsible for motorway and major trunk roads drainage.

SEPA is Scotland's national flood forecasting, flood warning and strategic flood risk management authority. SEPA also has a statutory role in relation to the provision of flood risk advice to planning authorities, but it is important to note that the Council is the planning authority, not SEPA.

Scottish Water is responsible for: Operation and maintenance of public foul and combined sewers and the public waste water network; Managing problems caused by sewers either flooding or becoming restricted due to chokes or collapses; Removing foul drainage and the drainage of

rainwater from roofs and paved areas, from within the curtilage of premises, on connection to the public sewer.

The complex nature of flooding across Scotland, with many agencies responsible for different aspects of the sewerage and drainage systems in communities, means that a partnership approach is vital for reducing the risk of flooding.

Emergency Services provide emergency relief when flooding occurs and can co-ordinate evacuations.

Met Office produce UK weather forecasts, issue warnings of extreme weather and provides dedicated forecasting services to SEPA's flood warning team.

Landowners under law are primarily responsible for the maintenance of watercourses and other water bodies including repairs and clearing. Responsible for private flood defences on their land and maintenance of private drainage systems.

Homeowners are responsible for: protecting their property from flooding; acquiring home contents and buildings insurance; taking action to prepare for flooding; maintaining private drainage, including gullies and drains on shared private access roads and courtyards.

Flooding Response

We work closely with SEPA, Scottish Water and the emergency services to respond to flooding and will do our best to attend to flooding issues. However, it is necessary to prioritise where we can maximise the benefits against the costs and resources.

There is no duty on the Council to provide sandbags, however, in extreme flooding situations CEC will consider strategic locations prone to flooding from water courses for sandbag defences. It is not possible to provide individuals with sandbags due to the level of demand it places on our resources. Individual property owners can implement property level protection and resilience measures to their own property where the Council may not be able to.

Where we have constructed flood defences or have installed a culvert screen, there is a duty to maintain and operate these.

The Flood Prevention Team have recently:

- Inspected and replenished sandbag stocks at fire stations, with Roads Operations;
- Inspected and cleared debris at culvert screens with assistance from Roads Operations;
- Coordinated the removal of trees from watercourses;
- Undertaken routine inspections and operation of Water of Leith flood gates;
- Completed the installation of new flood gates in Kirkliston; and
- Appointed a new framework Consultant who will assist with the development of Surface Water Management Plans and the Flood Studies.

Longer Term Strategic Approach

The implementation of the Vision for Water Management in partnership with Scottish Water and SEPA aims to tackle the strategic approach to flood risk. This will give a clearer path for how the Council plans to tackle things going forward. A progress report on the 'Vision for Water Management' and Edinburgh's Sustainable Rainwater Management Guidance is due to be submitted to the Transport and Environment Committee in September 2021.

One of the ambitious objectives of the Water Vision is to accommodate the water above ground within developments. In particular, managing the first five millimetres (5mm) of rainfall within every development plot.

Our self-certification process for assessment of planning application requires new development to consider the flow paths for the 1:200 event plus an allowance for 40% climate change. It should be noted that summer flash thunderstorms can often exceed the 1:200 over a short period. This was seen on 4 July 2021 when more than half (35mm) the annual monthly rainfall (62mm) fell in less than an hour.

In accordance with the Flood Risk Management Act, we have started developing Surface Water Management Plans, which will identify areas of the city at particular risk of surface flooding. In time, this will allow for consideration of potential mitigation measures for the effective management of surface water, where practicable.

In the actions for the next six year cycle of the Local Flood Risk Management Plan, two further flood studies for the Gogar Burn and the Braid Burn have been identified, with the option to add more if funds and resources allow.

Working with Scottish Water in relation to the Integrated Catchment Study to develop schemes for Oxgangs and Balcarres Street that will consider options for removal of surface water from the sewers.

Kirkliston and Queensferry Traffic and Active Travel Study

See briefing note (Appendix 3)

For further information contact:

[Andrew Easson](#), Road Safety and Active Travel Manager or [Dave Sinclair](#)

Forthcoming activities:

Transport Scotland will publish a report based on the consultation findings in due course. The City of Edinburgh Council's response will be published as part of this report.

Appendices

Appendix 1 - The City of Edinburgh Council's Response to Transport Scotland consultation on ETROs, TROs and RSOs.

Appendix 2 - Members Update: Surface Water Flooding, 5 July 2021.

Appendix 3 - Kirkliston and Queensferry Traffic and Active Travel Study

Appendix 1 – TRO Consultation response

1. Are you content with current procedures for ETROs in Scotland?

Yes

No

2. Do you agree or disagree that Scottish Ministers should seek to make amendments to the procedure for making ETROs and TROs which give permanent effect to ETROs?

Agree

Disagree

3. Do you agree that before making an ETRO traffic authorities must consult with the police and any other bodies that would be required for a TRO having the same effect?

Agree

Disagree

4. Do agree or disagree that traffic authorities should publish notice of making an ETRO at least 7 days before it will have effect?

Agree

Disagree

5. Do you agree or disagree that ETROs should be capable of being amended during the first 12 months of the ETROs maximum duration?

Agree

Disagree

6. Do you agree or disagree that if an ETRO is amended during that period that there must be a further 6 month period where representations and objections can be made?

Agree

Disagree

7. Do have any comments regarding your answers to the questions above or anything else on the topic of ETROs that you wish to share as part of this consultation? If your comments are in relation to a particular question please be specific about which question you are referring to.

We found it difficult to know whether to select agree or disagree to questions 5 and 6. In principle, the proposed changes would be welcome and align with the requests that CEC have made in previous representations to the minister for a review of TROs, RSOs and ETROs. However, whilst we agree in principle with the proposed changes, due to the specific times proposed we do not feel that these specific proposals would work in practice without a further change to primary legislation.

For an ETRO to be amendable within the first 12 months and for any amendment to result in a further 6 month period during which representations must be made, there needs to be a change to the UK primary legislation. This primary legislative change would need to allow ETROs to be extended beyond their initial 18 months of operation. Such extensions could be delegated to

Councils, or require an application to Scottish Ministers. This Council supports making such a change, on this basis that legislation should allow experimental projects to be in place for a full year, with reasonable allowance for:

- Time to make comments/ objections,
- amendments based on these comments/objections
- subsequent operation of a revised experiment
- a suitable time for comments on the revised experiment
- time for consideration of the experiment, comments and objections by the Local Authority before making the relevant order permanent.

Under the scenario proposed in the consultation, if a change were made to the ETRO at the end of the 12 months and a further 6 months for representations were required, then should an objection be received on the final day of those 6 months, there is then no time to both consider the objections made and then make the Order within the 18 month period. The ETRO would therefore fall before the process (as it is outlined in this consultation) for making the order permanent could be completed.

Until a change to primary legislation is made that enables an ETRO to be extended beyond 18 months, we suggest that the window within which amendments should be allowed should be reduced to the first 9 months, rather than 12. There should also be a minimum period of 3 months in which representations can be made following any amendments to the ETRO. This would be in place of 6 months for representations in response to order amendments. Together these changes would ensure sufficient time for Council's to consider the outcome of an experimental TRO and also to consider representations on the ETRO, prior to deciding whether to make the order permanent.

In our proposed scenario, in order to avoid dubiety, regulations should make clear that, if the experimental order is amended within the first 3 months of its validity, the period of representations to the amended order cannot lapse before the initial 6 month window for representations relating to the original order.

8. What are your views in relation to the need for a PLI when objections are made in relation to a proposed TRO containing loading or unloading restrictions?

The current TRO processes are a significant barrier to the swift delivery of schemes that are required to create a safe, sustainable, accessible and well-functioning city. This includes schemes that are an integral part of shifting the balance in our transport system in order to meet climate change targets. Councils have a duty to undertake an integrated impact assessment for any scheme they wish to deliver. Given this incorporates an economic impact assessment, the specific process and focus in the existing legislature on impact on loading feels out of step with the IIA's more holistic approach. Fundamentally, we consider that the existing procedure written into the regulations 40 years ago, is too onerous and is no longer fit for purpose.

Under current legislation, the hearing process relating to loading objections is identical, regardless of:

- the length of kerblines that the proposed TRO affects,
- the degree of change to loading arrangements involved and the associated level (or lack of) impact on frontages or;

- the nature or volume of objections. For example, at present *an objector who will not be affected by a restriction can trigger a Hearing*.

The current automatic triggering of a public hearing when a single objection relating to loading is received is therefore disproportionate. The process of appointing the reporter, undertaking the hearing and the production of the report can add 9-18 months' of delay, sometimes more, to delivery of a project.

Reviewing the current legislation and replacing the current procedure with one that is more proportional would enable Councils to deliver schemes that are in line with the National Transport Strategy 2 and the transport hierarchy in a more timely fashion.

Preferred scenario

To this end, our strong preference would be that the regulations be amended so that the holding of a public hearing as a result of objection(s) relating to loading (and other matters that current trigger an automatic TRO hearing) is at the discretion of the local authority. This is currently the case for most other aspects of TROs. The City of Edinburgh Council has for example, chosen to hold a public hearing when introducing a new controlled parking zone that was proving to be controversial.

Alternative scenario

In the case that our preferred scenario is not taken forward and it is felt that the regulations should still stipulate the holding of a public hearing in some circumstances, then we request that the criteria be introduced specifying circumstances, significantly more limited than at present, in which a public hearing would be triggered by objections to a TRO.

Consideration should be given to adopting criteria that recognise the importance of measures designed to prevent loading and unloading and the role that such restrictions play in terms of accessibility, road safety, encouraging active and sustainable travel and effective traffic movement. The criteria should act to require hearings only where impacts on residents and/or businesses would be so significant as to potentially outweigh the benefits of restrictions as referred to above. The criteria could be based on factors such as:

- a) **The distance the restriction extends from a place where loading is permitted for at least a set period of the day** (perhaps 11 hours, e.g. 1900- 0600): where longer distances might trigger a Hearing. **AND**
- b) **The source of objections**: Only an objection from one of the following sources would trigger a Hearing, but only if other criteria (ie (a)) were also met:
 - a business or residence for which the proposed restriction would increase the distance to loading opportunities available for at least a set period of the day (times as for (a)), to at least a specified amount.
 - a business requiring to deliver to properties where the proposed restriction would increase the distance to loading opportunities available for at least a set period of the day (times as for (a)), to at least a specified amount.

The aim would be that Hearings could be required, but requirements would be based on a direct assessment of quantifiable and measurable criteria.

The City of Edinburgh Council would suggest that further engagement/ consultation with local authorities, and potentially other stakeholders, should be conducted in order to finalise the criteria that might lead to a Hearing

9. Are you content with the procedures regarding redetermination orders?

Yes

No

10. Do you think legislation should be reviewed in light of the need to refer a proposed order to the Scottish Ministers if there are objections to it?

Yes

No

11. Do you have any other comments in relation to the procedure for redetermination orders?

The City of Edinburgh Council questions the overall need for Redetermination Orders (RSOs) and its preferred outcome would be the clear removal altogether of the need for such a process in making amendments which areas of which streets/roads are physically designated for one or other road user. The RSO process is currently an impediment to making streetscape improvements that are aligned with the sustainable transport hierarchy, such as wider footways and footway buildouts that help people walking and wheeling to cross streets safely. RSOs do not exist in England and Wales (see Cycle Tracks Act 1984, which does not apply to changes in the right of passage over parts of a street, for further information). Given that Transport Scotland's reading of the legislation is already that RSOs are not required alongside TROs, removing the process from the regulations would be in line with their view and overcome the current dubiety about the legislative position.

Whilst CEC supports changes to the regulations that would clearly remove the need to undertake an RSO, under the current legislation CEC understands RSOs are required because of the following:

Section 1(1) of the Roads (Scotland) Act 1984 gives the roads authority – in relation to a road – the power to “determine the means by which the public right of passage over it, or over any part of it, may be exercised”.

Section 152 (2) of the same Act makes reference to the power contained in s1(1) in relation to the determination of the means of exercise of the public right of passage, and specifies that this power includes the power to redetermine such means of exercise by order under that sub-section (s152(2)) – a “Redetermination Order”.

Section 152(3) makes further provision that sections 71 (1) and 71 (2) of the Act shall apply to an order made under section 152(2) in the same way as those provisions apply to orders made under section 68 or section 69 of the Act.

Section 71 makes provisions for the various processes to be followed in the making of an order – this includes the provision that where there is an objection to a Redetermination Order, the matter must be determined by the Scottish Ministers. The Stopping Up of Roads and Private Accesses and the Redetermination of Public Rights of Passage (Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 1986 also apply.

The Council considers that a Redetermination Order is required to redetermine the means of exercise of the public right of passage, e.g. to authorise the change from a carriageway to a cycle track, or from a cycle track to a footpath. If there are wider traffic management intentions associated with the redetermination, these will generally have to be achieved by making a separate Traffic Regulation Order. The Council does not agree with the interpretation of the legislation which

suggests that a redetermination could also be achieved by using a TRO, and the suggestion that currently there is no legal need for two separate processes.

If the legislation can be interpreted such that there is no need for RSOs alongside TROs, it is not clear why the 1984 Act includes the provision at section 152(2). Section 152(2) does not appear to be simply a clarification of the intention or interpretation of the roads authority's powers in section 1(1) because it then directs the roads authority to section 71 and the process to be followed for making a Redetermination Order (with such process also to be followed in the making of orders to stop up a road). The Council cannot see an interpretation of the legislation which would suggest that Redetermination Orders could be used interchangeably with a TRO. The Council has previously received legal advice to this effect.

Furthermore, whilst Transport Scotland's position set out in this consultation is that RSOs are not required simultaneously to TROs, the Council has in recent years taken part in public hearings for objections to RSOs that have been referred up to Scottish ministers, who ultimately decided a public hearing was necessary. These RSOs were being undertaken at the same time as TROs. The decision for these objections to be referred to a public hearing despite a TRO being undertaken simultaneously would appear to run counter to Transport Scotland's position on when RSOs and the associated processes need, or do not need, to be undertaken as laid out in the current consultation.

Should Transport Scotland decide to retain RSOs within the legislation and regulations, the Council would strongly advocate an amendment to the legislation that provides clarity as to when RSOs are required. In order to effectively deliver changes to the streetscape that are in line with the transport hierarchy in the National Transport Strategy, undertaking RSOs must be the exception rather than the norm. Any amendment to the legislation should make this clear. Furthermore, the requirement to refer objections to Scottish Ministers is out of step with the TRO process where all objections are considered at a Council level. Again, should RSOs be retained, any amendment to the regulations should alter the process so that it aligns with TROs and objections do not need to be referred to Scottish ministers.

Appendix 2 – Members Update: Surface Water Flooding 05/07/2021

Update on response to the extreme rainfall on the 4th July 2021

Dear Councillors

You will no doubt be aware of the localised, but significant, surface water flooding that we experienced in a number of areas of the city yesterday afternoon and evening.

I thought it would be useful to provide you with an update on action taken to date and some background information on our operations.

The Gully Team worked throughout last night and today to respond to reports of flooding. This team has also been supported by additional resource from the Roads Operations service in order to respond to as many reports as possible, as quickly as we could.

Unfortunately, the significant rainfall intensity that we experienced was way beyond the capacity of the road drainage system. There were a number of examples across the city where road drains were surcharging due to the Scottish Water sewer network also being at capacity. As you would expect, we are working with Scottish Water to identify these locations and any potential solutions to prevent future recurrences.

Much of the flooding subsided relatively quickly after the rainfall intensity reduced, which would indicate a lack of capacity in the drainage network as opposed to blocked road drainage. At the time of writing, there is no known location where there is still standing water.

In addition to responding to the flooding and any clean ups that are required, Roads Operations have also been responding to damaged manhole covers. Where these covers are the responsibility of Scottish Water, we have been making them safe and then passing them on to Scottish Water for fuller repair or replacement.

Members will be aware that we operate a target schedule of every two years for gully emptying. In addition, we have an enhanced six monthly emptying frequency for the sensitive locations in the city where there are known hotspots for surface water flooding. I can report that the sensitive location routes had been completed in advance of the adverse weather event. In addition, over 10,500 gullies had been attended to in the last four months alone in line with our wider maintenance schedule.

I appreciate that you may be contacted by constituents who have, unfortunately, experienced water damage to residential or commercial properties. If this is the case, we recommend that these constituents are advised to contact their insurance company as a priority. If you do feel that there is a complaint that you feel warrants further investigation then please email Roads.GullyCleansing@edinburgh.gov.uk.

If you would like to discuss any of the content of this note, or any other related matter, then please feel free to contact me directly.

Kind regards.

Gareth

Kirkliston and Queensferry Traffic and Active Travel Study
Briefing Note – August 2021

Intervention Timeline	Recommendation	Action owner	Update from	Update at April 2020	Further Action	Update August 2021
Short Term	Local Active Travel improvements Signs and local infrastructure changed	Active Travel Team	Andrew Easson, Road Safety and Active Travel Manager	<p>The Active Travel team has an ongoing programme of minor improvement works across the City and has reviewed the Traffic and Active Travel Study report to consider the various local active travel improvements recommended within it.</p> <p>Minor improvements suitable for inclusion in the programme are noted as: “A low-cost/high-benefit improvement that requires minimal design work and consultation (an easy win) and that can be easily implemented in a small section of the current cycle and pedestrian network”.</p> <p>Low cost defined as small “projects” that are under £5k, or up to £12k if the following criteria is met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traffic management is required. - They are safety improvements. - They cannot be part of a bigger scheme. <p>Minor improvements could cover:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Missing (small) infrastructure such as: Dropped Kerb, Islands. - Missing or worn markings. - Missing or obsolete signage. - Removal of barriers: Chicanes - Review of local signage <p>An update on each of the minor improvements recommended within the Study is provided below:</p> <p>4.1 B8000 between South Queensferry and Kirkliston – Increasing distance between live traffic and the shared footpath/cycleway: To be considered for future inclusion in the Active Travel Investment Programme (ATINP).</p> <p>4.2 Northern Access to Kirkliston – Installation of On-Road Cycle Lanes: To be considered for future inclusion in the Active Travel Investment Programme (ATINP).</p> <p>4.3 B800/B907/Ferrymuir Roundabout – Cyclist Priority Raised Crossing (South Arm): Signage to be reviewed. Project to be considered in more detail.</p>	Update on Minor Projects, Sustrans Barriers study and local signs review.	Due to competing demands for minor improvements throughout the city, recommended actions from the study will be assessed and prioritised for inclusion in the programme during 2021.

				<p>4.4 South Queensferry Town Centre via B907 (Kirkliston Road/The Loan) – Signage/Lining and Drop kerbs. Signage to be reviewed. Project to be considered in more in detail.</p> <p>4.5 A904 Between Forth Bridge Junctions - Builyeon Road remote cycleway/footpath: This is currently being considered as part of a package of work to produce Concept Designs for prioritised Transport Actions contained within the Local Development Plan Action Programme, which is being managed by the Active Travel team.</p> <p>4.6 Cycle Link from Dalmeny to Newbridge – Infrastructure Improvements/ Surfacing/ Lighting/Improved Access points: To be considered for future inclusion in the Active Travel Investment Programme (ATINP).</p> <p>Installation of benches along the cycle Path between Dalmeny and South Queensferry. This additional minor improvement was suggested by one of the ward Councillors. After looking in detail to the location, it was deemed that this would not be undertaken as part of the minor improvements programme, as building plinths to install the benches would exceed the above criteria.</p> <p>Sustrans has provided the Active Travel team with a list of barriers (access restrictions) across the City, which includes some within the Study area, and consideration is being given to including works to remove or alter these within the minor improvements programme.</p>		
	Kirkliston Crossroads Junction efficiency assessment and Section 75 investment.	Transport Network and Enforcement Team (ITS)	Mark Love, CEC Traffic Signals Team (ITS)	<p>Original Section 75 from Cala Homes used to upgrade the junction signals and controller in 2007/8.</p> <p>Phasing changed to introduce split north/south stages: In early 2015 the controller configuration was changed and additional vehicle detectors added, as well as the footway improvements using further S75 contributions. At the time extensive traffic monitoring was carried out and additional timing changes were implemented during frequent observations.</p> <p>Junction efficiency assessment and changes to timings:</p>	No further update.	Traffic Signals team continue to monitor junction efficiency following the reopening of the Burnshot Bridge. No significant signal timing changes have been necessary.

Kirkliston and Queensferry Traffic and Active Travel Study
Briefing Note – August 2021

				<p>In 2019 further adjustment were made to the right turn timings and the right turn detector operation to improve junction efficiency.</p> <p>Further Junctions Improvements: Currently, there are no realistic physical or technical changes that would improve the efficiency of the signalised junction. Under normal circumstances the junction is vastly over capacity, only significant changes to demand or revised priorities/layout would be likely to reduce traffic volumes.</p> <p>Burnshot Bridge: When the Burnshot bridge reopens, we should expect fewer vehicles turning right from the west and turning left from the east, therefore increasing the gaps in traffic for opposing vehicles who would normally turn right.</p>		
	<p>Queensferry High Street</p> <p>Town Centre Improvement project</p> <p>Expected start date Feb/March 2020</p>	North West Locality team	Dave Sinclair, North West Locality Team	<p>Project Update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Tender issued 20th December 2019 • Tender Review meeting 27th February • Cost of tender greater than current project budget (£2m less design/supervision fees) • Currently, in discussion with the preferred contractor to negotiate rate reduction/changes to project scope. • Consideration to re-tender revised scope of work (To be agreed) • Virtual Project Steering Group Meeting to be arranged 	Project Steering Group meeting to be arranged to update on tender decisions and consider future programme in Queensferry.	<p>A contract to install the Hawes Car Park turning circle, The Loan signalised junction and Rosshill Terrace raised table is due to commence on 16 August 2021.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the contractor has not been able to start the works described above due to resource and Covid infection issues.</p> <p>The Traffic Regulation Order, Redetermination order and Stopping Up Order for the main works is currently under development.</p> <p>It is expected, subject to available funding, the main works would commence on late 2022.</p>
	<p>Queensferry – Station Road Corridor</p> <p>Installation of local traffic calming</p>	North West Locality team	Dave Sinclair, North West Locality Team	<p>Additional Traffic Calming on Rosshill Terrace:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raised Table to be installed at the Bankhead Grove/Forth Terrace junction. • Design complete • Consultation with Public transport operators to be undertaken • Installation expected Summer/Autumn 2020, depending on resource availability. 	Programme update from NW team regarding anticipated installation date.	<p>Installation of the proposed raised table on Rosshill Terrace has been included in the Queensferry High Street Town Centre works.</p> <p>This is now expected later in 2021 due to contractor availability and approval required from Network Rail.</p>
Longer Term	<p>Local Active Travel investment</p> <p>Consider projects in line with the Council's new citywide Active</p>	Active Travel Team	Andrew Easson, Road Safety and Active Travel Manager.	The Active Travel team is currently developing a new ATAP, with the aim of being able to publish this in late 2021 or early 2022.		Local active travel investment will be considered, assessed and prioritised under the context of the new ATAP.

Kirkliston and Queensferry Traffic and Active Travel Study
Briefing Note – August 2021

	Travel Action Plan (ATAP).					
	Kirkliston Town Centre Crossroads junction reconfiguration	Strategic Transport Team	N/A	No further update to offer		No update to offer.
	A90 Slip Road local access trial with Transport Scotland	Transport Network and Enforcement Team (ITS)	Graeme Paget, Roads Directorate, Transport Scotland	<p>Update from Transport Scotland – December 2019:</p> <p>The Forth Road Bridge(A9000) now forms part of the Forth Estuary Public Transport Corridor as do the Public Transport Links described in the survey report. Legislation passed through the Scottish Parliament does not allow private car use on these Public Transport Links, only buses, taxis, motorcycles under 125cc and other authorised vehicles, mainly agricultural.</p> <p>Furthermore, the use of the Forth Road Bridge as a dedicated public transport corridor, and the associated bus lane infrastructure installed as part of the Fife ITS and Junction 1A schemes, have reduced journey times for public transport users from the Fife park and ride sites. Analysis shows around a 40% saving in journey time over the driven route by using public transport between Ferrytoll and Newbridge roundabout at peak times. These benefits would not be realised if access was given to private cars during peak times.</p> <p>A review of the project will be available early next year (2020) to look at how it has performed during its first full year operating as a motorway and public transport corridor. At that stage, it may be possible to look at other measures to enhance the driveability of any identified problem areas.</p> <p>As this piece of work is being managed by our Transport Strategy & Analysis team, I've copied your email to Veronica Allan, Senior Transport Planner who is better placed to provide up to date information on this issue and confirm to you the timeline ahead.</p>	Dave Sinclair to make contact with Veronica Allan regarding suggested 2020 review outcome (presumably subject to recent CV-19 changes to traffic conditions and staff availability).	<p>The Forth Replacement Crossing Project - One Year After Opening Evaluation Report was published by Transport Scotland in December 2020.</p> <p>Graeme Paget, Transport Scotland Network Manager) recently suggested the Council could contact Veronica Allan or himself if we have any queries or wished to convey the latest position with regards to any issues still being experienced through the town.</p> <p>A traffic count and speed survey are due to be undertaken on Rosshill Terrace and Station Road in August or September 2021 to better understand local traffic conditions first.</p>