

Transport and Environment Committee

10.00am, Thursday, 17 June 2021

City Centre West to East Cycle Link and Street Improvements Project – Proposed design changes and Statutory Orders update

Executive/routine Wards	Executive 6 – Corstorphine/Murrayfield; 11 – City Centre
Council Commitments	16 , 17 , 18 , 19 , 27 , 39

1. Recommendations

- 1.1 It is recommended that the Committee:
- 1.1.1 Notes the project progress and proposed revisions to the City Centre West to East Link and Street Improvements (CCWEL) project designs as a result of two rounds of value engineering, which have reduced the overall estimated project costs by £4,695,000, and approves these changes;
 - 1.1.2 Notes the financial arrangements for the project and approves an additional funding allocation of £1,937,548 from the Active Travel Investment Programme budget towards the delivery of this scheme;
 - 1.1.3 Notes that the revised Redetermination Order for Section 2 of the plan can be made and gives approval for officers to proceed with this; and
 - 1.1.4 Notes the completed Baseline Report which constitutes the first part of the Monitoring and Evaluation for the CCWEL project and the results within.

Paul Lawrence

Executive Director of Place

Daisy Narayanan, Senior Manager – Placemaking and Mobility

E-mail: daisy.narayanan@edinburgh.gov.uk

City Centre West to East Cycle Link and Street Improvements Project – Proposed Design Changes and Statutory Orders Update

2. Executive Summary

- 2.1 This report provides an update on the City Centre West to East Cycle Link (CCWEL) and Street Improvements project. It outlines the outcome of design review, details the funding strategy and sets out the next steps, following statutory orders, to construction.

3. Background

Design Review

- 3.1 The Council formally engaged the Preferred Contractor via a pre-construction contract facilitated by SCAPE Scotland. The objective of this engagement was to provide early contractor involvement in finalising the tender design and procurement stages prior to awarding the main construction contract.
- 3.2 As part of this pre-construction stage, the Preferred Contractor submitted their initial tender proposal in July 2020. They proposed a value of £17,142,657 for the main construction contract.
- 3.3 This was then subject to direct challenge by the project team and immediately followed by an initial round of value engineering. As a result, a revised tender proposal was submitted by the Preferred Contractor in January 2021 for a value of £15,712,240 for the main construction contract.
- 3.4 Whilst providing significant cost savings, the impact to the quality of the scheme resulting from this first round of value engineering was limited. This process was led by the Council and was undertaken with the support of both the Principal Designer and the Preferred Contractor, as well as with input from Sustrans in their role as project sponsor. A summary of the design changes introduced as part of this first value engineering is shown in Appendix 1.

- 3.5 In December 2020, Sustrans requested that the Council carry out a review of its portfolio of projects funded via their Places for Everyone (PfE) funding programme, with the objective of gaining a better understanding of funding requirements in future financial years. In the meantime, the approval of new expressions of interest and change requests was put on hold across the entire portfolio.
- 3.6 This review triggered a second round of value engineering which concluded in early March 2021. This second round also included a review of major scope elements and a generalised review of the quality aspects of the scheme. The rationale for the design changes introduced as part of this second round of value engineering is detailed in the Main Report.

Statutory Orders

Section One

- 3.7 The Statutory Orders for Section 1 (Roseburn to Haymarket) were approved and have now been made, with a coming into effect date of 26 May 2022 which will be mid-construction.

Section Two

- 3.8 A TRO and RSO for Section Two of the project were subject to a statutory consultation in May and June 2019.
- 3.9 The TRO objections were set aside by the Transport and Environment Committee and the TRO was subsequently made in full. The objections to the RSO were referred for determination to the Scottish Ministers who determined that the Order could not be made, as published, because it included redetermination of private land not within the roads network.

Section Three

- 3.10 Section Three of CCWEL will connect George Street to Picardy Place via St David Street, Queen Street and York Place.
- 3.11 Improvements to Charlotte Square, George Street and St Andrew Square are programmed following the completion of the CCWEL project. Once in place, these projects will complete the route between Randolph Place and North St David Street.
- 3.12 The proposals for Section Three are split into two areas:
- 3.12.1 Section 3(a) - Queen Street and York Place; and
 - 3.12.2 Section 3(b) - St David Street.
- 3.13 The RSO necessary to implement the changes proposed for Section 3(a) has already been made.
- 3.14 A report on the TRO and RSO for Section 3(b) was considered by the Transport and Environment Committee on 12 November 2020. The Committee decided to set aside the TRO objections, to make the TRO and to refer the RSO objections to Scottish Ministers for determination. The RSO objections have been referred to Scottish Ministers and a result is expected soon.

4. Main report

Design Review

- 4.1 While maintaining the project's outcomes and objectives, the second value engineering exercise introduces a generalised review of certain quality aspects of the scheme.
- 4.2 The design changes introduced as part of this exercise are organised around four key themes as presented in Table 1 below. A detailed list showing the cost savings associated to each of these changes is shown in Appendix 2.

Theme	Locations/Further Details
Replacement of natural stone materials by precast concrete for footway resurfacing.	<p>This change in the material specifications represents a significant cost saving while still meeting the requirements for extended footway space. This theme has been applied to the following locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Roseburn Terrace including Rejuvenating Roseburn. ▪ Haymarket Terrace. ▪ Randolph Place.
De-scoping temporary layouts and ancillary roads.	<p>Charlotte Square</p> <p>A temporary kerbing layout was scheduled to be delivered within the scope of CCWEL, which would then be made permanent at a later date as part of the Charlotte Square Improvements Project. The temporary layout at Charlotte Square has been removed from the CCWEL scope, the route through Charlotte Square will be delivered in the coming years alongside the George Street and First New Town project as part of City Centre Transformation. There are no proposed works at Charlotte Square or Charlotte Street as part of the proposed CCWEL construction contract.</p> <p>St Andrew Square</p> <p>A re-design of the junction of George Street and St David Street using temporary materials was scheduled to be delivered within the scope of CCWEL. This has also been removed from the scope of CCWEL pending delivery of improvements here in the coming years alongside the George Street and First New Town project as part of City Centre Transformation.</p>

Theme	Locations/Further Details
	<p>As part of the proposed CCWEL construction contract minor revisions to the road markings at this location will be implemented in order to provide safe access/egress between George Street and the new cycleway on the East side of North St David Street.</p> <p>Walker Street to Rutland Square</p> <p>The cycleway connecting Walker Street to Rutland Square south of Melville Street has been removed from the scope of proposed CCWEL construction contract. The removal of this ancillary route generates a significant cost saving while maintaining the integrity of this section of the scheme.</p> <p>This section can be considered for implementation as a standalone scheme as part of the previously mentioned review of the Active Travel programme provided that it is deliverable within the constraints of the overall level of funding available for the programme.</p>
<p>Removal of public realm at Melville Crescent.</p>	<p>It is proposed to remove the public realm improvements at Melville Crescent from the scope of the CCWEL. This results in a significant cost saving, while maintaining the core aspects of the scheme. It is proposed to use road markings and temporary materials to substantiate the footway widening on Melville Crescent, with the intention to deliver the full scheme at a later date at such a time that funding becomes available.</p> <p>The overall cost saving from removing the public realm improvements from the scheme is £2,230,000.</p> <p>This approach has been discussed with Edinburgh World Heritage Trust, and colleagues in Spatial Planning who have agreed that they reflect reasonable alternatives.</p>
<p>Reduction of tree planting to avoid clashes with public utilities.</p>	<p>The planting of trees often involves clashes with underground public utilities apparatus and, as a consequence, a significant amount of diversionary work to guarantee that these utilities remain accessible. A number of trees have been removed from the scope at the following locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Murrayfield Gardens.

Theme	Locations/Further Details
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coates Gardens. ▪ Randolph Place. <p>Alternative options to deliver greenery in the form of moveable planters are being considered to avoid any impact on underground utilities.</p> <p>It is worth noting that a number of full-sized trees will still be delivered as part of CCWEL across Roseburn, as well as at Rosebery Crescent and Apex House.</p>

Table 1 – Key Themes and Design Changes

Funding Strategy

- 4.3 Considering the outputs of the second value engineering exercise, the anticipated value of the main construction contract is £13,172,829, down from the £15,712,240 resulting from the first round.
- 4.4 Additionally, it has been estimated that the total cost saving associated with minimising the clashes with existing public utilities is £1,046,851.
- 4.5 With this, the total project cost estimate at completion for CCWEL is £18,744,907. The different elements beyond the main construction contract and diversionary work making up this figure are shown in Table 2 below.

Cost Item	Value
Design	£820,170
Site Investigations	£587,261
Project Management	£744,889
Diversionary Work	£831,397
Main Construction Contract	£13,172,829
Site Supervision	£312,700
Monitoring & Evaluation	£340,000
Client Risk	£1,935,661
Total Estimate at Completion	£18,744,907

Table 2 – Project Cost Estimate following Value Engineering

4.6 Table 3 below provides a summary of the funding structure for the project.

Funding Source	Funding Availability
Sustrans Scotland: Places for Everyone (PfE)	£12,853,250
Scottish Government: Cycling, Walking and Safer Routes (CWSR) 2020/21	£870,676
CWSR 2021/22	£442,809
Placed-Based Investment Programme (to be confirmed)	£220,624
Capital Commitment	£2,420,000
Funding Availability	£16,807,359

Table 3 – Project Funding

- 4.7 The original contribution awarded by Sustrans under PfE was £9,884,526 based on a project cost estimate at completion produced in 2018.
- 4.8 The figure shown in Table 3 for the PfE contribution has been revised to account for Sustrans' announcement in May 2020 of an increase in their contribution towards the construction stage for all PfE supported projects from 50% to 70%. It also includes a 100% contribution towards all planning and design costs. However, this increase is not sufficient to meet the total estimated project costs.
- 4.9 The CCWEL project has been included in a long list of projects which could be recommended by the Council for funding new Place Based Investment Programme (previously Town Centre Fund) for an amount of £220,624 once this fund is established (a report on this will be presented to the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee on 25 June 2021). This application covers the CCWEL public realm improvements in the area known as Rejuvenating Roseburn. More details on the award date for this new fund will be reported to Finance and Resources Committee. Should funding from the Placed-Based Investment Programme not be forthcoming for any reason, it is proposed to deliver these elements as part of the core scheme, which will increase the funding shortfall outlined below.
- 4.10 Assuming this funding is agreed, the project has a funding shortfall of £1,937,548. It is currently intended to address this shortfall by allocating additional funds from the Scottish Government's Cycling Walking Safer Routes funding award in 2022/23. The funding is awarded on the basis that the Council should spend a minimum of 36%, and preferably over 50%, of the award on works to promote cycling for everyday journeys. The funding award for 2021/22 was £2,299,000 and this level of

funding is expected to be maintained for the foreseeable future. Discussions are also ongoing with Sustrans to establish whether there is any further scope for their funding contribution to be increased.

Statutory Orders

Section Two – Scottish Ministers’ Determination of RSO

- 4.11 Relevant documentation regarding the RSO for Section Two, including all objections, were sent to Scottish Ministers on 2 July 2019.
- 4.12 Scottish Ministers subsequently determined that this Order could not be made as per the Roads (Scotland) Act 1984, because it included the Redetermination of private land not within the Council’s road network at Bishops Walk, and notified the Council and all objectors that this Order could not be made for this reason.
- 4.13 The Council advertised a revised RSO for Section 2, with Bishops Walk removed, in November and December 2020. No objections were received during this period.
- 4.14 The Council referred the seven objections to the previous RSO to Scottish Ministers and requested they determine the new Order in January 2021. The Scottish Ministers responded stating that, as these objections were made to the previous Order, and no objections were made to the new Order, there was no need for a determination from them. Scottish Ministers confirmed that the Council is free to make the new Order, as it sees fit. It is proposed that members of the Transport and Environment Committee consider these objections directly and decide whether to uphold them or set them aside.
- 4.15 Officers have contacted the seven objectors to the original RSO to notify them of the situation and ask if they would like their objections to be considered by this Committee or withdrawn. To date none have indicated that they wish to withdraw their objection.
- 4.16 The seven objections to the previous RSO are provided in Appendix 3, to allow the Committee to give them due consideration. Correspondence received from objectors following the Scottish Minister’s determination has also been included for reference. It is recommended that Committee sets aside the original objections for the reasons stated in the responses and approves making the new RSO.

Section Two - Further Statutory Procedures

- 4.17 At the junction of Melville Street and Queensferry Street the detailed design of the signal installations has produced a requirement to alter the proposed cycleway alignment slightly from the original RSO.
- 4.18 These changes will require a further TRO and RSO to be advertised. Approval was previously granted by Committee to proceed with the process required to deliver this, which can commence following the original Orders being made.

Bishop's Walk

- 4.19 Under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Scotland) Order 1992 (the "GPDO") the Council has permitted development rights to carry out various works without the need to make an application for planning permission. Class 31 of the GPDO, grants permitted development rights to a Roads Authority for the following:
- 4.19.1 On land within the boundaries of a road – any works required for the maintenance or improvement of the road;
 - 4.19.2 On land outside but adjoining the boundary of an existing road – any works required for or incidental to the maintenance or improvement of the road.
- 4.20 Bishops Walk is a private road, and the introduction of the cycleway constitutes works to improve this road, as such the works at Bishops Walk fall within the Council's permitted development rights and can commence without further statutory procedures.

Monitoring Plan Baseline Report

- 4.21 The Baseline Monitoring and Evaluation Report for the CCWEL project is now available on the project website [LINK TO BE ADDED] and contains a great deal of information about the baseline metrics for the various objectives of the CCWEL project.
- 4.22 While many of the results are primarily of interest in terms of a comparison between before and after implementation surveys, there were notable findings including those from the Household Survey, such as:
- 4.22.1 58% of respondents were aware of the scheme, with the most common source of knowledge being communications from the Council.
 - 4.22.2 49% of respondents were supportive of the scheme, with 11% opposed, and 40% unsure.
 - 4.22.3 Over 10% of respondents cycle at least 3-4 days a week, and 8% cycle as their main mode of commuting to work.
 - 4.22.4 Less than 40% of respondents had access to a Car or Van. Though fewer still had access to a bicycle (28%).
 - 4.22.5 Almost 60% of respondents walk five or more days per week, and around 8% of respondents cycle five or more days per week. Over 20% of respondents cycle at least once a fortnight.
 - 4.22.6 The majority of respondents (60%) walk, cycle or use public transport for their journeys to work, with 31% driving.
 - 4.22.7 Of those respondents who stated that they do cycle, 34% stated that they were not confident cycling, or were only confident cycling away from traffic.

- 4.23 Post construction monitoring will be carried out at several stages, including six months, 12 months and 24 months post completion.

5. Next Steps

- 5.1 The Council is in the process of negotiating the main construction contract with the Preferred Contractor through the SCAPE Civil Engineering Framework Agreement. The proposed design changes resulting from the second value engineering exercise are being implemented in the contract drawings, which will inform the Preferred Contractor's tender submission in mid-July 2021.
- 5.2 It is currently intended to address any resultant funding shortfall by allocating additional funds from the Scottish Government's Cycling Walking Safer Routes funding award in 2022/23. This will result in a fully funded proposal that will be taken forward to Finance and Resources Committee seeking approval for awarding the main construction contract in August 2021. Discussions will continue with Sustrans to establish whether there is any further scope for their funding contribution to be increased.
- 5.3 It is anticipated that the construction stage for CCWEL will then commence in Autumn 2021 with a total duration of 78 weeks.
- 5.4 The Council will proceed with the remaining required Statutory Orders for additional modifications to the layout and those required for the taxi rank in Section 1.
- 5.5 If Committee approves the relevant Recommendation in this report, the Council will proceed to make the TRO and RSO for Section 2.
- 5.6 The Council will continue to liaise with Transport Scotland regarding the Scottish Ministers' determination of the Redetermination Order for Section 3(b).

6. Financial impact

- 6.1 The additional capital contribution of £1,937,548 will be sourced from the Cycling Walking and Safer Routes funding award for 2022/23.
- 6.2 A strategic review of the entire Active Travel Investment Plan (ATINP) has been initiated. This will consider different options to reduce, where possible, the scope of individual schemes, as well as applying value engineering and reviewing the phasing of construction stages.
- 6.3 A financial review of CCWEL has already been completed, reducing costs as outlined above. It is not anticipated that the wider ATINP review will impact the financial considerations relating to CCWEL that are outlined in this report.

7. Stakeholder/Community Impact

- 7.1 The project proposals have involved significant stakeholder and public consultation and engagement, as detailed in earlier reports. The results of previous engagement and consultation exercises have been published on the Council's website.
- 7.2 The proposed reductions in the quality and scope of the project proposals outlined in this report have been discussed with local ward Councillors, Community Councils, Edinburgh World Heritage Trust, SPOKES, Living Streets and relevant internal teams, and feedback has been taken on board where possible in the proposed revisions to the project.

8. Background reading/external references

- 8.1 Report to the Transport and Environment Committee on [12 November 2020](#); City Centre West to East Cycle Link and Street Improvements Project – Section 3(b) (North St David Street) – Representations to Traffic Regulation Order and Redetermination Order.
- 8.2 Report to the Policy and Sustainability Committee on [14 May 2020](#); City Centre West to East Cycle Link and Street Improvements Project – Statutory Orders and Progress Update.
- 8.3 Report to the Transport and Environment Committee on [20 June 2019](#); City Centre West to East Cycle Link and Street Improvements Project – Section 2 (Haymarket to Charlotte Square, and Melville Crescent to Rutland Street) – Representations to Traffic Regulation Order and Redetermination Order.
- 8.4 Report to the Transport and Environment Committee on [20 June 2018](#); City Centre West to East Cycle Link and Street Improvements Project – Section 1 (Roseburn Place/Murrayfield Avenue to Rosebery Crescent/Morrison Street) – Objections to Traffic Regulation Order and Redetermination Order.
- 8.5 Report to the Transport and Environment Committee on [9 March 2018](#); Melville Crescent Public Realm Project - Updates.
- 8.6 Report to the Future Transport Working Group on [16 December 2016](#), 'City Centre West to East Cycle Link and Street Improvements Project'.
- 8.7 Report to the Transport and Environment Committee on [30 August 2016](#); 'City Centre West to East Cycle Link and Street Improvements Project: Consultation Results and Potential Project Amendments'.
- 8.8 Report to the Transport and Environment Committee on [3 June 2014](#); 'Development of Major Cycling and Walking Projects'.
- 8.9 [Melville Crescent Consultation and Engagement Report](#)

8.10 [Randolph Place Consultation and Engagement Report](#)

8.11 [Rejuvenating Roseburn Consultation Report](#)

9. Appendices

9.1 Appendix 1: Output of first Value Engineering Exercise

9.2 Appendix 2: Output of second Value Engineering Exercise

9.3 Appendix 3: Objections to Section 2 RSO and Council Responses

Appendix 1: Output of first Value Engineering Exercise:

Theme	Potential Saving	Quality Impact
Direct challenge to contractor rates	High	N/A
Resurfacing works at Haymarket Terrace charged back to Roads Renewals budget.	High	N/A
Removal of footway resurfacing at Southern footway on West Coates.	High	Medium
Retain (clean and repair) existing PCC slabs at Melville Crescent.	High	Medium
Removal of Roseburn Gardens/Roseburn Place junction.	Medium	Low
Removal of Roseberry Crescent/Grosvenor Gardens junction.	Medium	Low
Removal of Lansdowne Crescent/Grosvenor Street.	Medium	Low
Removal of Manor Place/William Street junction.	Medium	Low
Removal of Queensferry Street/Alva Street junction.	Medium	Low
Removal of Queensferry Street/Charlotte Lane junction.	Medium	Low
Removal of Walker Street/Coates Crescent junction.	Medium	Low
Removal of West Coates/Balbirnie junction.	Medium	Low
Removal of Palmerston Place Lane entrance.	Low	Low
Entrance of St Mary's Cathedral from Manor Place.	Low	Low
Alternative solution for the retaining wall at York Place (King Post).	Medium	Low
Total cost savings	£1,430,417	

Appendix 2: Output of second Value Engineering Exercise:

The Council has utilised the preferred contractor's tender bill to inform client-estimated cost savings. These cost savings, as shown below are based on contractor's rates and assumptions and have been assessed by an experienced consultant Quantity Surveyor. These are conservative estimates accounting for construction direct cost and associated contractor fees but not including the savings result of indirect cost reduction such as preliminaries or traffic management.

The final detail of the overall cost saving including preliminaries will be provided by the preferred contractor in July 2021. The Contractor will market test the revised design drawings to validate these estimations.

Section	Theme	Potential Saving	Quality Impact	Cost saving
1	Use of concrete slabs instead of natural stone at Roseburn terrace footways including Rejuvenating Roseburn.	High	Medium	£260,777
1	Use of concrete slabs instead of Scoutmoor at Haymarket Terrace.	High	Medium	£185,666
1	Other design changes e.g.: removal of raised tables, asphalt footways etc	Medium	Medium	TBC
2	Removal of all works South of Melville Crescent from Walker St to Rutland Sq.	High	High	£156,878
2	Use of concrete slabs instead of natural stone on Randolph Place footway.	Medium	High	£78,551
2	Other design changes e.g.: removal of raised tables, asphalt footways etc	Medium	Medium	TBC
2	Removal of all public realm works at Melville Crescent	High	High	£1,219,935
3	Removal of most temporary works at St Andrew's Square	High	High	£100,187
4	Removal of all temporary works at Charlotte Square	High	High	£394,811
Anticipated Direct Cost savings plus contractor fees				£2,539,412

Theme	Potential Saving	Quality Impact	Cost saving
Removal of trees at Western Planter at Murrayfield Gardens.	High	High	£127,405
Removal of trees at Coates Gardens.	High	Medium	£86,480
Removal of trees at Randolph Place.	High	Medium	£166,310
Removal of trees at Melville Crescent	High	High	£290,662
Reduction of diversionary works at York Place due to removal of retaining wall	High	Low	£375,994
Total Cost Savings (Diversionary Work)			£1,046,851

Total anticipated cost saving			£3,586,263
--------------------------------------	--	--	-------------------

Appendix 3: Objections to Section 2 RSO and Council Responses

Objection 1. to TRO/18/92 and RSO/18/21

My wife and I object to the plans proposed in Traffic Regulation Orders TRO/18/91A & 18/92B and Redetermination Order RSO/18/21 for the "City Centre West to East Cycle Link and Street Improvements Section 2 Haymarket - Randolph Place", primarily because of the proposed changes to Melville Street parking, which we believe would adversely affect our ability to park near our home at [REDACTED] Drumsheugh Place, Edinburgh EH3 7PT and would diminish our overall quality of life.

The information provided on the Council web-site for Traffic Regulation Order TRO/18/91A & 18/92B and Redetermination Order (RSO/18/21) was difficult to review on a laptop (maps are small and broken into panels) and there is no overall guide to the information, so we went to the Walpole Hall drop-in session on Chester Street on 20th May to see what additional information and material was on offer, and to discuss our views and concerns. The drop-in provided complete wall maps, still difficult to read, but there was very little actual new information to support the project proposals. No handouts, no statistics or surveys. The Council representatives did not seem to have tangible links to the project area; they did not live in the area, use Zone 1 or any of the parking, nor did they appear likely to travel across Edinburgh by bicycle. I expect they also can park their cars near their homes. The project officer I spent time with had not been on the project long and would, for example, be commuting to Edinburgh via the Tweedbank train. He could not provide the information requested, so he wrote down my questions and concerns and said he would get back to me, but no-one has. So I am writing them here again in our formal response.

Q1) In all the documentation provided, there is only a single reference I could find to Resident Parking, i.e. at the end of the 18/21 Statement of Reasons. It simply states that "There will be a decrease in parking on affected streets of around 16%, but no net decrease in Residential Permit Parking." The statement is too vague to understand precisely how it would impact our Zone 1 parking and the use of pay parking by Zone 1 permit holders. At this time, we sometimes have to rely on pay parking spaces available to Zone 1 permit holders by dispensation (as an overflow) when Zone 1 parking is full, which at times it is. The statement therefore needs to be fully clarified to include all parking available to Zone 1 permit holders. Zone 1 permit parking is currently at times insufficient.

There are over 100 spaces down the middle of Melville Street that will disappear under the proposed changes. Some 50 such spaces in the Middle of Melville Street are east of Stafford Street nearest our home. There are some designated Zone 1 spaces, but most are pay spaces available to Zone 1 permit holders. Several such spaces in this section alone can be occupied by Zone 1 cars. I have counted them myself. Where will the replacements for such parking spaces, currently available to Zone 1 permit parking, be situated should the proposed changes to Melville Street go ahead? How are these spaces included in the statement in the SoR?

Our own experience is that, over time, Zone 1 resident parking has come under increasing pressure, perhaps as domestic developments have increased in the area. Where we live, there is an increasing need for spaces, not the same, not less. Resident Parking spaces are also often reduced by official closures, illegal parking, mobility vehicles, taxis, trades people, and trades vehicles with special permits, etc. Some of these are essential to the functioning of the community. Some spaces are even dangerous. Falling dead branches at Drumsheugh Gardens last year caused over £1,000 of damage to our car. Although legally an Act of God, no-one would take any responsibility for looking after

on the basis of parking reduction, and an objection to the Redetermination Order (RSO/18/21) on the basis of route alignment on Melville Street.

Please find below a response to the comments and queries that you have raised.

Availability of Information

I am sorry to hear that you felt there was insufficient information provided online, or at the drop-in session. You can find more information regarding the CCWEL project on our website here: www.edinburgh.gov.uk/ccwel. I am also sorry to hear that you did not receive a response to your questions after the drop-in event. If there are any questions that you still wish to raise do not hesitate to contact me using the details supplied below.

Residential Parking

The changes associated with these orders would increase the number of spaces exclusively available to Residential Permit holders in Zone 1 by a total of 18 additional spaces. The main increases will be seen on Coates Crescent, Alva Street, Walker Street and Melville Street (primarily to the West of Melville Crescent).

On the section of Melville Street to the East of Stafford Street there are currently eight Residential Permit spaces. Under the project proposals this will be increased to 12.

You are correct that there will be a significant decrease in Pay & Display parking, however 104 Shared Spaces will be introduced, which can be used by Residential Permit Holders, or by Pay & Display customers.

A map showing the proposed location of all of the different parking bays can be found on our website at the address above.

Project Cost

The total cost of the City Centre West to East Cycle Link and Street Improvements Project is estimated at between £10.5M – £11.5M. This includes the construction of segregated cycleways, and where required the reconstruction of footways and carriageways, through the city centre from Roseburn to Randolph Place, and from St Andrew Square to York Place.

The cost of the CCWEL interventions associated with these orders (Section 2, Haymarket to Randolph Place) is approximately £5M, however this includes significant investment in public realm improvements in Melville Crescent.

It is important to note however, that a large proportion of the funding which is assigned to the CCWEL project will come from third parties, and not the Council. This is because it is anticipated that much of the funds which will go towards construction will be granted to the Council by the Scottish Government (via Sustrans Scotland) specifically for the delivery of this project, as part of their Places for Everyone funding stream. As such the direct cost to the council is much smaller than the overall cost of the scheme.

Demand for Proposals

As part of the Project Justification Report which was developed in 2014, a Cycle Demand Model was carried out. This model forecast a potential increase in one-way commuter cycle trips across the route from 1,675 to 3,142 – an increase on 88% (1,467). This represents an increase of 16% in the number of people cycling to work across Edinburgh to 10,872.

The project has involved significant stakeholder and public consultation and engagement. An initial consultation exercise on the Preliminary Designs which was carried out during the winter of 2015/16. This consultation exercise received 2,771 responses, of which 1,768 (or 66%) were supportive.

Route Choice – Melville Street

Melville Street is a wide street, which leads directly towards the City Centre. It is already part of National Cycle Route 1 and well used by people cycling for various types of trips, as an alternative to Shandwick Place. There is a large amount of space between the buildings meaning that it is possible to provide a coherent protected cycleway along its full length.

In contrast, William Street, is a very narrow and cobbled street which terminates in a T junction at both ends. It would not be possible to provide a coherent protected cycleway along any of the length of William (or Alva) Street, without enormous impact on other road users.

Duplication of Documents

I am unsure why some of the documents have been duplicated, and apologise for any confusion.

We hope that you find the above response related to your representation, and objection to the advertised Traffic Regulation Order, and Redetermination Order useful, and that it goes some way to addressing your concerns. If you wish to withdraw your objection, based on this response, please contact me before 5:00pm on Wednesday 19 June.

We will report all outstanding objections, letters of support, and any changes made to the design following objections received, to the meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee at 10am on Thursday 20 June. The Committee Report documents will be available from Friday 14 June, and the meeting itself can be viewed online here: <http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/cpol>

The Transport and Environment Committee will decide at that meeting whether to progress with the Traffic Regulation Order, and the Redetermination Order for the project. However as several objections to specific aspects of the Redetermination Order have been received, the council will need to seek input from the Scottish Government, who will determine the outcome of the order, before proceeding..

As your representation contains objection to a specific aspect of the Redetermination Order, should you wish for this objection to be maintained, you may be contacted by a representative of the Scottish Government in the coming weeks, and it is possible that a public hearing will be required.

If we do not hear from you before 5:00pm on Wednesday 19 June we will assume that you would like your objection to be maintained.

Should you require any further information on the CCWEL project, or the process for the Statutory Consultations for the Traffic Regulation Order and Redetermination Order please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully,

Rurighd McMeddes

Objection 2 to TRO/18/92 and RSO/18/21

Comment

I am a long-term resident in the area concerned. I use my car for my charity work and to transport my wife, who has mobility issues, about. I use the bus in town for journeys and my cycle for exercise and recreation. I can therefore claim to be able to comment usefully on all the transport aspects of this proposal.

Issues

Palmerston Place Cycle Lanes.

1. On the west side, from West Maitland Street, north to Grosvenor Crescent. I know of three residents with disabled car badges who use this area to park outside their houses. With severe mobility issues, these people will now be unable to drive or be transported, to the detriment of their quality of life. By definition, parking away from their main entrances is a blight to their mobility.
2. Again, on the West Side, continuing down to Chester Street. There are four residents in the area who rely on grocery deliveries from Tesco/Sainsbury/etc. These people are unable to walk any distance or carry supplies and these delivery services are their lifeline. There are another three, at least in area 1) above, who rely on grocery delivery. At a time when grocery delivery is encouraged to save multiple car journeys, this appears to be a counter intuitive proposal.
3. There is an Early Days Nursery at No 36. There, hard working parents are able to continue working by dropping off their children. There is no alternative, or free parking nearby, recent allowances to residents to have two parking permits mean that parking in and around Grosvenor/Lansdowne/etc is at a premium and often unavailable. If this facility, to leave their children in the Nursery's care is removed, I have no doubt that some parents will have to give up work and about ten nursery staff will be unemployed.
4. On both sides. Outwith working hours, and in particular on a Sunday, these areas are much used by the congregations of both St Mary's Cathedral and Palmerston Place Church. By and large, they are elderly and lack mobility. To remove the OOH parking will deter these good people from attendance. I understand that two disabled spaces will be placed outside St Mary's. This is wholly inadequate and a sop to possible objections.

Grosvenor/Lansdowne Crescents

Here, alterations are to be made to the already congested residents parking by the installation of speed humps, presumably to reduce speeding, in a short road where it is hard to speed in any case. Some residents parking will be lost

1) The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) and a study by Imperial College has recommend that the positioning of speed bumps encourage driver to speed up and slow down between them. This adds to harmful emissions and noise pollution for nearby residents. Smooth driving reduces emissions and stop start acceleration and deceleration is harmful. An Imperial Study found that in one north London street with a speed limit of 20mph and fitted with road humps, a petrol

driven car produced 64 per cent more Nitrogen Oxide and 47 per cent more particulate matter, with 60 per cent more Carbon Monoxide emissions.

2) Following on from the issue of smooth driving and on a day when Edinburgh (largely thanks to its previous schemes, e.g. forcing all traffic onto Queen Street, shutting of access down to Stockbridge via Ainsley Place etc) has the biggest congestion problems in the UK, the proposal here is to shut off vehicular access into Grosvenor and Rosebery Crescents. This will put additional cars into the 100yd stretch that is West Maitland Street, already a very congested place, feeding in from four roads on the way East and South. I suggest a site visit from one of your staff around 10am one day to see the chaos now in place thanks to the reduction of traffic into two lanes from the tram project and then to quantify, by counting the cars now using Grosvenor Crescent in particular, the further input into this narrow road that is West Maitland Street.

Suggestions

1. Regarding the Palmerston Place Cycle Lanes. The introduction of these lanes has large unintended consequences which, in my view and in those of my fellow residents share. Road safety comes from good visibility, road sense and speed. A bit of white paint is not a force field against encroaching and impatient motorists. I should be happy to read the quantitative risk assessment of this particular area of the proposal, balancing hazard against risk. This is a wide, well lit street with no hill to hinder visibility. There will be great inconvenience to elderly resident, church goers and working mothers should these lanes be provided and brief period parking stopped.
2. With reference to the speed bumps in Grosvenor/Lansdowne Crescents. Much more effective and requiring very low maintenance, would be the introduction of Radar Speed Indicators, with 20mph as the target. They have a proven efficacy in speed reduction without sudden braking and leave an impression with the driver that prevent acceleration afterwards. New models also offer data collection for analysis and are solar powered. No parking would be lost, pollution would not be increased and the inevitable maintenance of the speed humps would not be needed.

Conclusion

Whilst as a cyclist, I applaud any attempt to make life safer, I would suggest that, in this case the areas I have highlighted be revisited.

To believe and to misquote Mao Tse Tung, that a million cyclists will flower when this project is delivered is fallacious. Edinburgh is a hilly and intemperate city and those who do cycle are doing so now. At a time when this country is experiencing rickets amongst the young because they don't get off their sofas and Ipads, the idea that this project will deliver increased fitness is virtue signalling. There are ample traffic free cycle routes in and around the city already and when I use them, I rarely see a child on them.

The project is not fully linked, for example there will be no cycle lanes in Grosvenor or Lansdowne Crescents as to do so would rob the council of much needed funds from parking revenues. So, a cyclist will be "safe" in his lane towards Haymarket, but "unsafe" in these crescents. You have the tool to reduce cycling accidents already in the 20mph speed limit, a regulation unenforced and unenforceable due to police and council cutbacks. Introduction of frequent speed camera checks, both fixed and mobile will soon get the message across, particularly away from the rush hours, when virtually no vehicle obeys this regulation.

By way of comment I also submit (and I am one of them) that another project to reduce pollution and congestion, the one-line tram system, has done more to injure (and in one case kill) cyclists than normal traffic has ever done. It is also a large contributory factor to the congestion in the West Maitland/Haymarket area and has not taken one bus off the road.

I urge the council to reconsider this plan, in particular regarding the local issues I have highlighted and I welcome your feedback.

Response 2.

Dear Sir/ Madam,

CITY CENTRE WEST TO EAST LINK SECTION 2 STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS TRO/18/92, AND RSO/18/21

Thank you for submitting a representation to the Statutory Consultation for the above orders.

We are treating your representation as an objection to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO/18/92) on the basis of the introduction of waiting and loading restrictions on Palmerston Place, and the introduction of Speed Humps and consequent reduction of parking on Grosvenor Crescent.

We are also treating your representation as an objection to the Redetermination Order (RSO/18/21) on the basis of the introduction of segregated cycleways on Palmerston Place.

Please find below a response to the comments and queries that you have raised.

Palmerston Place Cycle Lanes

Under the advertised Traffic Regulation Order restrictions to waiting and loading would be introduced on Palmerston Place which would ban waiting (effectively parking), while still allowing Loading along most of the street outside of Peak Times (ie: from 7:30am - 9:30am, and 4:00pm – 6:30pm), meaning that, for example, supermarket deliveries would still be able to be received.

However there would have been one area – immediately opposite of the Cathedral – where Loading would be banned all day.

In response to your objection, we are proposing to slightly amend the proposed Traffic Regulation Order for this specific area, such that, like for the rest of the street, loading will only be prohibited during peak times, from Monday to Friday, along the full length of the affected area of Palmerston Place.

Thus, although, where the relevant restrictions apply, parking will not be permitted at any time, all residents will be able to receive deliveries and be picked up or dropped off, (or pick up or drop off children) along the full length of Palmerston Place except during peak times, Monday to Friday.

Furthermore, Blue Badge holders are able to park wherever loading is permitted. This means that Blue Badge holders will be able to park on the double yellows on Palmerston Place at any time, except during peak times Monday to Friday.

Grosvenor / Lansdowne Crescents

The proposed speed humps on Grosvenor Crescent serve a dual purpose. The both slow down traffic, and provide indicative crossing points for people accessing the gardens. In this way they

also provide a level crossing facility for people with mobility impairments. As such they have been placed at the gates into the gardens.

These are quiet streets, and are likely to be even quieter following the implementation of the CCWEL, as such it is likely that the pollution associated with vehicles on these streets will be very low. The key concern in such an environment is vehicles speeds, and it is this issue which the speed humps seek to address, to ensure a safe environment for people cycling of all abilities.

The proposed restrictions on traffic turning into Grosvenor Street and Rosebery Crescent are not part of this Traffic Regulation Order and are being dealt with as part of separate Statutory Consultation procedures.

Demand for Proposals/ Eventual Use

As part of the Project Justification Report which was developed in 2014, a Cycle Demand Model was carried out. This model forecast a potential increase in one-way commuter cycle trips across the route from 1,675 to 3,142 – an increase on 88% (1,467). This represents an increase of 16% in the number of people cycling to work across Edinburgh to 10,872.

The project has involved significant stakeholder and public consultation and engagement. An initial consultation exercise on the Preliminary Designs which was carried out during the winter of 2015/16. This consultation exercise received 2,771 responses, of which 1,768 (or 66%) were supportive.

We hope that you find the above response related to your representation, and objection to the advertised Traffic Regulation Order, and Redetermination Order useful, and that it goes some way to addressing your concerns. If you wish to withdraw your objection, based on this response, please contact me before 5:00pm on Wednesday 19 June.

We will report all outstanding objections, letters of support, and any changes made to the design following objections received, to the meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee at 10am on Thursday 20 June. The Committee Report documents will be available from Friday 14 June, and the meeting itself can be viewed online here: <http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/cpol>

The Transport and Environment Committee will decide at that meeting whether to progress with the Traffic Regulation Order, and the Redetermination Order for the project. However as several objections to specific aspects of the Redetermination Order have been received, the council will need to seek input from the Scottish Government, who will determine the outcome of the order, before proceeding.

Furthermore, it is possible, based on the nature of some of the objections that have been received, that a public hearing may be required. Should this be the case, due to the nature of your objection to the Traffic Regulation Order, should you wish for it to be maintained, you may be invited to take part.

Finally, as your representation contains objection to a specific aspect of the Redetermination Order, should you wish for it to be maintained you may be contacted by a representative of the Scottish Government in the coming weeks.

If we do not hear from you before 5:00pm on Wednesday 19 June we will assume that you would like your objection to be maintained.

Should you require any further information on the CCWEL project, or the process for the Statutory Consultations for the Traffic Regulation Order and Redetermination Order please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully,

Rurigdh McMeddes

Stakeholder Liaison Officer, City Centre West to East Cycle Link and Street Improvements Project.

Objection 3 to TRO/18/92 and RSO/18/21

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to express my opinion about the proposed plan over in the West End, where I currently live. There seems to have a massive alteration in traffic for the cyclists and presumably for their safety. I do agree we need to look after all road users' safety, including cyclists. But does this plan help? I am not convinced.

First of all, it looks like this would try to divert all cycling traffic towards Melville Street, and away from the busy Shandwick Place. But this won't work. As all human being try to use the shortest route for travelling, who would cycle up 2 blocks to use Melville Street instead of Shandwick Place, which is clearly the most direct route. That will only be possible if all cyclists will be banned from using Shandwick Place but I know that won't be possible. And secondly, towards the end of Melville Street at Queensferry Street, there will be nowhere to go and cyclists will eventually end up travelling along the busy Queensferry Street with no cycling lanes and lots of bus stops on both sides. This is hugely dangerous. My prediction is that the cycling lanes in Melville Street will be empty because it is not convenient to cyclists.

I live in Coates Crescent and I know the road extremely well. The proposal seems to ignore some basics. The proposed plan will create a few more residential parking spaces near #12 to #15 on the left, to compensate the loss of spaces elsewhere. This is welcome but Coates Crescent is not very wide and sometimes being used for buses when there is a problem with the tram tracks and due to other diversions. How can that be possible to have parking spaces on both sides there? More ridiculous is that, under the new proposal, cyclists are allow to go against the traffic! First of all, how wide is the road if both sides are full of parked cars? Were we told to leave cyclists plenty of space? Worse if the cyclists are travelling towards you! If you try to park your car there, particularly to the left as we do now, you will be going towards the cyclists! This is essentially building an accident blackspot! The chance for any residents who park there to have an accident will be very high. Also, it also increase the chance for cyclists to damage parked cars. I know that happens and don't fool yourself saying that this won't happen as all cyclists are careful... the Deliveroos are certainly not, neither are UberEats. This is indeed insane.

Finally, this is a very expensive project and will create a fancy cycle lane that few will use because the whole plan was not thought through properly. During the consultation, I was told there were funds "ring-fenced" for this. Well, I think these funds should be release to mend the pot holes that on many Edinburgh trunk roads (those on Western Approach Road West bound were waited for years to be mended!). How about the pavements that need to be re-surfaced? How about extra

streetlights so that it is not so dark in winter? How about investing in improving public transports so that more of us give up cars?

This is a classic white elephant project to please minority users. It might be nice for publicity but for local residents, this is worse than pointless. It also creates dangerous spots for cyclists as well as other road users. I think it's not cheap already to draw up these "plans" and I think we have spent enough there. Let's face it, unlike Amsterdam or Munich, British cities, including Edinburgh, were not designed for bicycles. To force the issue unnecessarily won't work.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Coates Crescent

Response 3.

Dear Sir/ Madam,

CITY CENTRE WEST TO EAST LINK SECTION 2 STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS
TRO/18/92, AND RSO/18/21

Thank you for submitting a representation to the Statutory Consultation for the above orders.

We are treating your representation as an objection to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO/18/92) on the basis of the introduction of cycle contraflow on Coates Crescent.

We are also treating your representation as an objection to the Redetermination Order (RSO/18/21) on the basis of the proposed route alignment along Melville Street.

Please find below a response to the comments and queries that you have raised.

Cycle Contraflow – Coates Crescent

The Edinburgh Street Design Guidance includes a presumption in favour of all streets being two-way for people on bikes. Research has shown that permitting cycle contraflow, even on narrow streets, can have safety benefits including encouraging cyclists to shift from arterial routes to quieter streets and reducing footway cycling. You can find more information on our website here: <http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/downloads/file/12353/c5 - contraflow cycling>

Route Alignment – Melville Street

The route alignment for the CCWEL project was initially developed using a feasibility study in 2014, which assessed a number of potential route alignments between Roseburn and George Street. The chosen alignment between Haymarket and Charlotte Square will run along Rosebery and Grosvenor Crescent, Bishops Walk, Melville Crescent, and then along Randolph Place and through the north vennel around West Register House into Charlotte Square. This provides a direct route to George Street and the City Centre.

As part of the Project Justification Report which was developed in 2014, a Cycle Demand Model was carried out. This model forecast a potential increase in one-way commuter cycle trips across the

route from 1,675 to 3,142 – an increase on 88% (1,467). This represents an increase of 16% in the number of people cycling to work across Edinburgh to 10,872.

The project has involved significant stakeholder and public consultation and engagement. An initial consultation exercise on the Preliminary Designs which was carried out during the winter of 2015/16. This consultation exercise received 2,771 responses, of which 1,768 (or 66%) were supportive.

Funding

It is not possible to re-direct the funding which is assigned to the CCWEL project. This is because much of the funds which will go towards construction will be granted to the Council by the Scottish Government (via Sustrans Scotland) specifically for the delivery of this project, as part of their Places for Everyone funding stream.

We hope that you find the above response related to your representation, and objection to the advertised Traffic Regulation Order, and Redetermination Order useful, and that it goes some way to addressing your concerns. If you wish to withdraw your objection, based on this response, please contact me before 5:00pm on Wednesday 19 June.

We will report all outstanding objections, letters of support, and any changes made to the design following objections received, to the meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee at 10am on Thursday 20 June. The Committee Report documents will be available from Friday 14 June, and the meeting itself can be viewed online here: <http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/cpol>

The Transport and Environment Committee will decide at that meeting whether to progress with the Traffic Regulation Order, and the Redetermination Order for the project. However as several objections to specific aspects of the Redetermination Order have been received, the council will need to seek input from the Scottish Government, who will determine the outcome of the order, before proceeding.

As your representation contains objection to a specific aspect of the Redetermination Order, should you wish for it to be maintained you may be contacted by a representative of the Scottish Government in the coming weeks., and it is possible that a public hearing will be required.

If we do not hear from you before 5:00pm on Wednesday 19 June we will assume that you would like your objection to be maintained.

Should you require any further information on the CCWEL project, or the process for the Statutory Consultations for the Traffic Regulation Order and Redetermination Order please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully,

Rurighd McMeddes

Stakeholder Liaison Officer, City Centre West to East Cycle Link and Street Improvements Project.

Objection 4 to TRO/18/92 and RSO/18/21

Dear Sir,

CCWEL Haymarket to Randolph Place Statutory Consultation

Ref: RSO/18/21, TRO/18/92A and TRO/18/92B

We have a number of comments and objections to make to the latest plans for the above section of the Cycle Link, particularly in relation to its passage through the private road at Bishop's Walk.

Major Safety concerns re Bishop's Walk

We are owners of residential parking between Manor Place and Palmerston Place, which is accessed via the private Road at Bishop's Walk. There are 97 residents' parking spaces, all of whom use this single car width access road, which makes it manifestly unsuitable and unsafe to be used as part of the cycle highway. We have a heritable right of access over the road and have also paid for the upkeep of the road surface and the adjacent grassy area alongside the footpath from Palmerston Place, on which you plan to construct the bike route.

The road is very narrow and requires us to exit from the car park through a narrow entrance in the stone boundary wall, marked in blue and A on the adjoining map and a photo of the view is attached. Cars entering and leaving are usually moving at walking pace as the turn is very tight and visibility to check whether the route to Manor Place is clear is non-existent until the car is already about a car length out into Bishop's Walk. For this reason there is a metal fence, marked in red and B on adjoining map, at the end of the grassy area to provide some safety margin for cars turning out.

If a car has already entered from Manor Place there is no room to pass and one vehicle must reverse. The current council plan shows an area hatched in white, marked D, which is supposed to prevent cars parking there and provide better visibility, but this will not be effective. We have tried many ways of keeping this area clear but locals know it is private land and they will not be penalized or ticketed for parking there, so it is used as free parking by cars and vans EVERY day, under our "NO Parking" sign! Prior to the metal fence being erected, works vans and other vehicles also parked regularly on the grassy area, doing a lot of damage to the grass surface which had to be leveled and replanted at our expense.

At present, bikes using the path and the road are forced to slow down to go around the end of the metal fence and cannot collide with cars exiting the car parks. If the cycle way is built as currently envisioned, they will be moving much faster and closer to the car park entrance. That will make exiting from our car park onto our private access road much more difficult and dangerous than it already is.

To avoid creating a safety hazard, it's essential that bikes are forced to slow down to the same speed as the pedestrians and cars using Bishop's Walk. They must also give way to cars and pedestrians exiting the car park. Having the give way lines at the blind car park exit doesn't work as there is no safe visibility unless the safety fence is maintained. The current map is also unrealistic in that it appears to show room for two cars to move through this space, which is physically impossible. As well as give way lines applying to users leaving the cycle path and joining our private access road, the largest part possible of the fence must be retained. Some cyclists will ignore speed restrictions and road markings, so nothing less than a physical barrier will be safe.

Other Bishop's Walk comments

- Putting metal fencing along the shrub area adjacent to No 24 Manor Place will further reduce the width of the already very narrow road for both bikes and cars. Cars won't pull over as

far if they risk hitting their mirrors on a new fence. The fence idea appears to exacerbate the tightness of the limited available space, and hence potential safety issues, without adding anything to the design.

- Removing the metal railings along the length of the Bishop's walk footpath adjacent to the Cathedral Gardens creates a further safety hazard and loss of amenity for local residents who enjoy the gardens with young children, and for the many dog owners who exercise their dogs there. At present this is a safe space but with the railings removed children and dogs will be able to run out from the garden towards the busy traffic in Palmerston Place and Manor Place, together with the presumably much busier new cycle way. Currently, as long as they are not near the gate half-way along the footpath, they are safely contained.
- We object to putting a bike rack in this area. It is badly lit at night and unlikely to remain secure. If more bike racks are required, the council should site them in better lit and higher foot traffic areas on public property. People will also walk and cycle over the grass and wear it down, as they do at the moment, rather than use the hard standing from the footpath for access.
- We also object to the siting of 2 benches on this area. Their use will lead to an increase in noise and litter.
- The benches in the Cathedral garden are already often used by homeless rough sleepers. It feels like a security risk if more benches are sited on what is a quiet and badly lit footpath.
- We note that there is no intention for Edinburgh Council to provide any ongoing supervision or maintenance of Bishop's Walk or the garden area on which they wish to site the benches and Cycle storage racks.

And now some general comments:

- The planned crossing at the Manor Place end of Bishop's Walk is very close to the junction, making it difficult for cars waiting to turn in and out to avoid queuing right on top of the crossing.
- Manor Place bollards - Previous proposed plans have shown the Melville Crescent area as one which would prioritise pedestrian spaces. Closing off the street junction with bollards at the Manor Place/Melville Street junction will result in many more car journeys and a much longer diversion for all vehicles travelling north/south on Manor Place, forcing them to go through the Melville Crescent junction and around by Melville Street, Walker Street and Chester Street. The West End Medical Practice in Manor Place will also be congested as any vehicles dropping off or attempting to park there will have to turn around at the bollards as there is no other exit.
- 2 way cycle traffic in one way streets at Alva Street, William Street and Coates Crescent – as someone who uses these streets daily as a pedestrian, I think 2 way bike traffic will be confusing and create a safety issue for those pedestrians who are unaware that bikes may approach from both directions. There are ample routes already available for wheeled vehicles without making this change.
- Parking - Holders of Resident Parking Permits should continue to have shared use of all the Pay and Display parking bays in Zone 1. In Palmerston Place, since the tram works, we have no residents' bays left and are about to also lose more Pay & Display spaces.
- Traffic light and crossings – We already have lots of queuing traffic in Palmerston Place at peak times since most traffic was rerouted along there from Manor Place and other turning restrictions put in place after the tramway was completed. This crossing will be the 4th set of lights

within a matter of a few hundred metres in Palmerston Place. Will they be synchronised in such a way as to minimise queuing traffic getting held at each set of lights? Under no circumstances should either of the crossings at each end of Bishop's Walk make any audible noise. We already hear the tram bells each time they cross the Palmerston Place-West Maitland Street junction.

Summary

We are not opposed to the cycle scheme per se, but it is essential that it's implemented in a way which doesn't create safety and security hazards for local residents and/or cyclists. We suggest that a further site visit is made to Bishop's Walk in order that the blind car park exit and the tightness of the available space for shared use can be appreciated fully, and safer solutions found.

While safety and security concerns are paramount, please also give careful consideration to our other concerns. It is important to balance the interests of passing cyclists with amenity for local city centre residents who live here all the time.

Yours faithfully,

Shona and Christopher Morrison

Response 4.

Dear Sir/ Madam,

CITY CENTRE WEST TO EAST LINK SECTION 2 STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS
TRO/18/92, AND RSO/18/21

Thank you for submitting a representation to the Statutory Consultation for the above orders.

We are treating your representation as an objection to the Redetermination Order (RSO/18/21) on the basis of the proposed route alignment along Manor Place and Palmerston Place, which requires the routing of cyclists along Bishops Walk.

We are also treating your representation as an objection to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO/18/92) on the basis of the introduction of cycle contraflow on William Street, Alva Street and Coates Crescent.

Please find below a response to the comments and queries that you have raised.

Bishop's Walk – Driveway Entrance

Under the proposals people cycling along the CCWEL route will use the existing driveway entrance to the private car-park for residents of Palmerston and Manor Place. There will not be any significant changes to the design of the driveway itself.

This driveway access is very quiet, and meets Manor Place, which is a quiet street. The nature of the driveway is such that vehicles speeds are very low. As such safety concerns are considered to be minimal. The project proposals have been subject to a Road User Safety Audit, which did not raise this as a major concern, and the designs will be subject to a further Road User Safety Audit (Stage 2 – Detailed Design) before any construction takes place.

The waiting and loading ban associated with the proposed zebra crossing on Manor Place will remove some of the Single Yellow Line designation, which will improve sightlines at this junction, including for people turning into Bishops Walk from manor Place northbound.

Cycle Contraflow – William Street, Alva Street and Coates Crescent

The Edinburgh Street Design Guidance includes a presumption in favour of all streets being two-way for people on bikes. Research has shown that permitting cycle contraflow, even on narrow streets, can have safety benefits including encouraging cyclists to shift from arterial routes to quieter streets and reducing footway cycling. You can find more information on our website here: <http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/downloads/file/12353/c5 - contraflow cycling>

We hope that you find the above response related to your representation, and objection to the advertised Traffic Regulation Order, and Redetermination Order useful, and that it goes some way to addressing your concerns. If you wish to withdraw your objection, based on this response, please contact me before 5:00pm on Wednesday 19 June.

We will report all outstanding objections, letters of support, and any changes made to the design following objections received, to the meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee at 10am on Thursday 20 June. The Committee Report documents will be available from Friday 14 June, and the meeting itself can be viewed online here: <http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/cpol>

The Transport and Environment Committee will decide at that meeting whether to progress with the Traffic Regulation Order, and the Redetermination Order for the project. However as several objections to specific aspects of the Redetermination Order have been received, the council will need to seek input from the Scottish Government, who will determine the outcome of the order, before proceeding..

As your representation contains objection to a specific aspect of the Redetermination Order, should you wish for it to be maintained you may be contacted by a representative of the Scottish Government in the coming weeks, and it is possible that a public hearing may be required.

If we do not hear from you before 5:00pm on Wednesday 19 June we will assume that you would like your objection to be maintained.

Should you require any further information on the CCWEL project, or the process for the Statutory Consultations for the Traffic Regulation Order and Redetermination Order please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully,

Rurighd McMeddes

Stakeholder Liaison Officer, City Centre West to East Cycle Link and Street Improvements Project.

Objection 5 to RSO/18/21

Dear Sir or Madam

Re CCWEL TRO/18/92A

I am a bike, bus, tram and car user and resident at [REDACTED] Manor Place. I [REDACTED] as a result of a cycling fall and also been hit by car while cycling. Additionally I lobby for environmentally friendly approaches. For these reasons the proposals have caught my attention and I hope my view will be sincerely considered.

Pathway by St Mary's Cathedral between Palmerston Place and Manor Place/ Only access route (private road) to the private car park and back doors for disabled people.

I write to raise concern about the proposals increasing danger by encouraging bikes onto the private road which links part of the route between Palmerston Place and Manor Place.

I understand that the uneven pavement will be improved for pedestrians. Having had a scheme designed for cyclists in mind, even as one myself, I am sure that cyclists will see the route as their right and priority and are likely to put themselves at risk. I request a barrier to keep cyclists on the pavement too - cyclists could push their bikes the short distance along the pavement rather than use the road.

To me the mixed use proposal lacks realism in respect of this private road. Drivers cannot move up onto the pavement to allow other vehicles to pass so reversing is obligatory! If cyclists and drivers are not to be separated, what greater mechanisms will be put in place to slow cyclists and encourage them to be vigilant of manoeuvring cars? It will certainly increase disturbance by car honks!

The current proposal will mix cycles with cars on a single road with many reversing vehicles. It is an accident waiting to happen particularly in the dark winter months. And when one does, as is inevitable, the truth will be it was the Council's failure to take heed of concerns raised from the beginning of the proposal. Dare I say in a similar way to the Edinburgh tram/bike death.

When the survey was done counting cyclists and pedestrians' use on this pavement, were cars moving in and out of the car park monitored in the same way? How many forward moving vehicles were there at rush hour? (I understand the car park has 140 spaces). How many of vehicles were forced to reverse "blind" back onto Manor Place? How many were forced to reverse "blind" through the wall gate into the car park to give way to another car? The proposal will doubtless add more cyclists to this already hazardous mix.

Already I experience some unpleasant gestures from cyclists for being on the private road in my car, despite being courteous as a fellow-bike user, travelling very slowly. Cars are forced to drive slowly moving through the tricky gates and again when joining Manor Place - it is hard enough without having to consider an increased flow of bikes on the road. *There is no alternative* but to drive to access some distant rural locations! I walk and use alternative methods of transport when I can.

Additional pedestrian lights on Manor Place

Given the cordoning off of Manor Place at Melville Street after the Cathedral it is really hard to understand the need for building these. The road is easy to cross at present. It seems a waste of tax payers' money when there are lights less than a minutes' walk on Atholl Place, particularly with the closure of Manor Place at Melville Terrace with pavement crossing also.

Any additional bleeps/buzzers associated with a pedestrian crossing would further add to the disturbance for an increasingly residential area. I hear tram bells, Manor Place/Atholl Place pedestrian crossing's bleeps, traffic breaking/accelerating on the cobbles and sirens when in bed as it is. Please do not make this worse!

These pedestrian lights will further complicate accessing the car park/disabled people's access via the private road. Cars are obliged to reverse at the junction onto Manor Place sometimes. Add traffic lights, queuing and more bikes. It's an unnecessary complexity and increase in danger.

Pedestrian lights mid-street will be ugly and detract from the prestigious and attractive West End's nature.

The pedestrian crossing lights will be at odds with the West End's Conservation area policy.

I hope you will take my concerns into consideration.

Yours faithfully

██████████

Response 5.

Dear Sir/ Madam,

CITY CENTRE WEST TO EAST LINK SECTION 2 STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS
TRO/18/92, AND RSO/18/21

Thank you for submitting a representation to the Statutory Consultation for the above orders.

We are treating your representation as an objection to the Redetermination Order (RSO/18/21) on the basis of the proposed route alignment along Manor Place and Palmerston Place, which requires the routing of cyclists along Bishops Walk.

Please find below a response to the comments and queries that you have raised.

Bishop's Walk – Driveway Entrance

Under the proposals people cycling along the CCWEL route will use the existing driveway entrance to the private car-park for residents of Palmerston and Manor Place. There will not be any significant changes to the design of the driveway itself.

This driveway access is very quiet, and meets Manor Place, which is a quiet street. The nature of the driveway is such that vehicles speeds are very low. As such safety concerns are considered to be minimal. The project proposals have been subject to a Road User Safety Audit, which did not raise this as a major concern, and the designs will be subject to a further Road User Safety Audit (Stage 2 – Detailed Design) before any construction takes place.

Following construction Stage 3 and 4 Road User Safety Audits will also be carried out to ensure that any safety issues which appear post-construction are recorded and dealt with as required.

The waiting and loading ban associated with the proposed zebra crossing on Manor Place will remove some of the Single Yellow Line designation, which will improve sightlines at this junction, including for people turning into Bishops Walk from Manor Place northbound.

Crossing over Manor Place

This crossing will not be traffic-light controlled. It will be a parallel pedestrian and cycle zebra crossing. As such there will be no traffic lights, and no auditory signals.

We hope that you find the above response related to your representation, and objection to the advertised Redetermination Order useful, and that it goes some way to addressing your concerns. If you wish to withdraw your objection, based on this response, please contact me before 5:00pm on Wednesday 19 June.

We will report all outstanding objections, letters of support, and any changes made to the design following objections received, to the meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee at 10am on Thursday 20 June. The Committee Report documents will be available from Friday 14 June, and the meeting itself can be viewed online here: <http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/cpol>

The Transport and Environment Committee will decide at that meeting whether to progress with the Traffic Regulation Order, and the Redetermination Order for the project. However as several objections to specific aspects of the Redetermination Order have been received, the council will need to seek input from the Scottish Government, who will determine the outcome of the order, before proceeding.

As your representation contains objection to a specific aspect of the Redetermination Order, should you wish for it to be maintained you may be contacted by a representative of the Scottish Government in the coming weeks, and a public hearing may be required.

If we do not hear from you before 5:00pm on Wednesday 19 June we will assume that you would like your objection to be maintained.

Should you require any further information on the CCWEL project, or the process for the Statutory Consultations for the Traffic Regulation Order and Redetermination Order please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully,

Rurighd McMeddes

Stakeholder Liaison Officer, City Centre West to East Cycle Link and Street Improvements Project.

Objection 6 to RSO/18/21

Mr McMeddes

Having reviewed the plans for the West East cycle link through Edinburgh, I have a few queries relating to use of the private road joining Bishops Walk and Manor Place. We live on Manor Place and have a parking space in the car park between Manor Place and Palmerston Place, accessed via this currently private road. Unfortunately the majority of this stretch of road is between plans RSO-003 and RSO-004 so it is difficult to determine what is going to happen to it.

The plans (page RSO-003) show the end of this private road, labelled Y, which the legend describes as existing carriageway redetermined as cycletrack. My questions are:

Is this road to be a dual use road, for all cyclists and for cars accessing the car park? If not, how is car park access to be maintained?

If so, is the road going to be widened - it is not currently wide enough for both cyclists and cars and if the cycle track is to be dual direction, then it is certainly not wide enough in it's current state

Will the current pavement to the side of the road remain or will this disappear to enable widening of the existing road. Where will pedestrians go? It is currently well used as a short cut from Haymarket to the West End.

Will the small stretch of garden remain between the end of terrace and the road?

Will something be done about the constant illegal parking of vehicles on this private road directly under the no parking, fire access required sign? I've spoken to traffic wardens regularly but because it is currently a private road, they won't/can't do anything. Apart from the fact that it is grossly unfair on those of us who pay for parking in the city centre, it makes this road very unsafe. I have had to reverse out onto Manor Place many times (often with next to no vision - see point

below) when a car is coming out of the car park as I am coming in and there is nowhere to pass.

Will the yellow lines on Manor Place near the corner of this private road be changed to double yellows. If you access this road from the Haymarket end of Manor Place, it is often impossible to see if there is anything on the private road, due to a van or 4WD parked right on the corner on the single yellow lines. If this is to be a cycle route, access by car from this angle would need to be made safer for cyclists.

Ensuring a long enough stretch of double yellow lines would enable better vision.

Access into and out of the actual car park from the private road is very tight and in some cars requires a slight swing out in order to turn and miss the illegally parked car and entrance walls to the car park.

Will some allowance be made for the required space for cars to turn in and out here safely?

Will the fire access remain here?

I look forward to your responses to my questions as soon as possible.

I'm absolutely in favour of this cycle route in principle, I just want to understand how this road will work in the future. Having cycled to work safely many times when I lived in London the first time I cycled to work on my return to Edinburgh I was knocked over by a car!

Response 6.

Dear Sir/ Madam,

CITY CENTRE WEST TO EAST LINK SECTION 2 STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS
TRO/18/92, AND RSO/18/21

Thank you for submitting a representation to the Statutory Consultation for the above orders.

We are treating your representation as an objection to the Redetermination Order (RSO/18/21) on the basis of the proposed route alignment along Manor Place and Palmerston Place, which requires the routing of cyclists along Bishops Walk.

Please find below a response to the comments and queries that you have raised.

Bishop's Walk – Driveway Entrance

Under the proposals people cycling along the CCWEL route will use the existing driveway entrance to the private car-park for residents of Palmerston and Manor Place. There will not be any significant changes to the design of the driveway itself.

This driveway access is very quiet, and meets Manor Place, which is a quiet street. The nature of the driveway is such that vehicles speeds are very low. As such safety concerns are considered to be minimal. The project proposals have been subject to a Road User Safety Audit, which did not raise this as a major concern, and the designs will be subject to a further Road User Safety Audit (Stage 2 – Detailed Design) before any construction takes place.

Following construction Stage 3 and 4 Road User Safety Audits will also be carried out to ensure that any safety issues which appear post-construction are recorded and dealt with as required.

The waiting and loading ban associated with the proposed zebra crossing on Manor Place will remove some of the Single Yellow Line designation, which will improve sightlines at this junction, including for people turning into Bishops Walk from manor Place northbound.

We hope that you find the above response related to your representation, and objection to the advertised Redetermination Order useful, and that it goes some way to addressing your concerns. If you wish to withdraw your objection, based on this response, please contact me before 5:00pm on Wednesday 19 June.

We will report all outstanding objections, letters of support, and any changes made to the design following objections received, to the meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee at 10am on Thursday 20 June. The Committee Report documents will be available from Friday 14 June, and the meeting itself can be viewed online here: <http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/cpol>

The Transport and Environment Committee will decide at that meeting whether to progress with the Traffic Regulation Order, and the Redetermination Order for the project. However as several objections to specific aspects of the Redetermination Order have been received, the council will need to seek input from the Scottish Government, who will determine the outcome of the order, before proceeding and a public hearing may be required.

As your representation contains objection to a specific aspect of the Redetermination Order, should you wish for it to be maintained you may be contacted by a representative of the Scottish Government in the coming weeks.

If we do not hear from you before 5:00pm on Wednesday 19 June we will assume that you would like your objection to be maintained.

Should you require any further information on the CCWEL project, or the process for the Statutory Consultations for the Traffic Regulation Order and Redetermination Order please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully,

Rurighd McMeddes

Stakeholder Liaison Officer, City Centre West to East Cycle Link and Street Improvements Project.

Objection 7 to TRO/18/92 and RSO/18/21

To whom it may concern,

I live and have my business in town I have just received your mail drop about the so called 'street improvements' regarding Section 2 Haymarket - Randolph Place. It appears the ECC have decided to enforce ridiculous road closures and increased bike lanes. Firstly your mail drop has been made deliberately confusing to the majority of people who bother to read it in the first place. I would like to have the opportunity to speak to someone face-to-face and outline why Edinburgh City residents do not want any further changes to roads. The ECC seem determined to continue with the failed Tram line, more buses, less parking for residents, increased bike lanes etc, etc. I am aware the consultation for the George St 'green cycling area' was a pathetic 3000 people. Mostly made up of the pro cycling groups such as Sustrans. It is time the actual people who live and conduct business in town have their say. Not have the out of touch 'green supporting car hating ECC' who enforce their opinions down our throats. So I will attend your meeting at Walpole Hall. You need to understand that these road changes cannot and will not continue. Perhaps maybe get cyclists to respect the Highway Code and also be charged with road offences like drivers. Look forward to speaking to whoever is in charge at the meeting !

It is interesting how your consultation only runs on a Monday from 12-6 effectively giving the tens of thousands of people who disagree with your proposals no time to come and object. In fact it is their lunch hour and most people finish work at 5.30 giving no time to raise their objection to further road closures and bike lanes.

Please let me know who I can speak to before I arrive.

Response 7.

Dear Sir/ Madam,

CITY CENTRE WEST TO EAST LINK SECTION 2 STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS
TRO/18/92, AND RSO/18/21

Thank you for submitting a representation to the Statutory Consultation for the above orders.

We are treating your representation as an objection to the Redetermination Order (RSO/18/21) on the basis of the introduction of segregated cycleways.

We are also treating your representation as an objection to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO/18/92) on the basis of the timed closure of Charlotte Lane, and full closure of Manor Place at its junction with Melville Street.

Please find below a response to the comments and queries that you have raised.

Road Closures

There are two proposed partial road closures associated with these orders:

- The timed closure of Charlotte Lane, which has been proposed following positive feedback during the consultation for the improved public realm proposals at Randolph Place.
- The closure of Manor Place just to the north of its Junction with Melville Street. This was included in the preliminary designs for this project which went to consultation in 2015 and were met with majority support from respondents.

Both of these closures affect very quiet streets, and thus have minimal impact on traffic movements throughout the city, yet will help to re-balance streets in favour of people walking and cycling.

Increased Bike Lanes

The council developed the first Active Travel Action Plan in 2010 which aims to increase the number of people cycling throughout the city. A core part of this Action Plan is the introduction of segregated cycle lanes through the city centre as part of the City Centre West to East Cycle Link and Street Improvements Project.

Public Support / Demand

As part of the Project Justification Report which was developed in 2014, a Cycle Demand Model was carried out. This model forecast a potential increase in one-way commuter cycle trips across the route from 1,675 to 3,142 – an increase on 88% (1,467). This represents an increase of 16% in the number of people cycling to work across Edinburgh to 10,872.

The project has involved significant stakeholder and public consultation and engagement. An initial consultation exercise on the Preliminary Designs which was carried out during the winter of 2015/16. This consultation exercise received 2,771 responses, of which 1,768 (or 66%) were supportive.

Statutory Consultation

The statutory consultation ran from May 14 to June 11, and all representation received in this time are considered.

We hope that you find the above response related to your representation, and objection to the advertised Redetermination Order useful, and that it goes some way to addressing your concerns. If you wish to withdraw your objection, based on this response, please contact me before 5:00pm on Wednesday 19 June.

We will report all outstanding objections, letters of support, and any changes made to the design following objections received, to the meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee at 10am on Thursday 20 June. The Committee Report documents will be available from Friday 14 June, and the meeting itself can be viewed online here: <http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/cpol>

The Transport and Environment Committee will decide at that meeting whether to progress with the Traffic Regulation Order, and the Redetermination Order for the project. However as several objections to specific aspects of the Redetermination Order have been received, the council will need to seek input from the Scottish Government, who will determine the outcome of the order, before proceeding and a public hearing may be required.

As your representation contains objection to a specific aspect of the Redetermination Order, should you wish for it to be maintained you may be contacted by a representative of the Scottish Government in the coming weeks.

If we do not hear from you before 5:00pm on Wednesday 19 June we will assume that you would like your objection to be maintained.

Should you require any further information on the CCWEL project, or the process for the Statutory Consultations for the Traffic Regulation Order and Redetermination Order please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully,

Rurighd McMeddes

Stakeholder Liaison Officer, City Centre West to East Cycle Link and Street Improvements Project.

Correspondence with Objectors following Scottish Ministers Determination on RSO/18/21

Received Correspondence relating to Objection 1

Dear Mr Ahluwalia-McMeddes,

Here is my response to your letter dated 24th May 2021. Thank you for the opportunity.

Please submit the three items of objections attached here, along with your letter and the Table 2 (see below) attached, i.e. all the attachments here, to be considered by the Council's Transport and Environmental Committee at its meeting on Thursday 17 June 2021.

Our objections have always primarily been against the proposed changes to the parking spaces in Melville Street, as described in Redetermination Order RSO/18/21, and detailed in Table 2 as presented to the Transport and Environmental Committee at its meeting of 20 June 2019. Specifically the loss of 100+ parking spaces from the central part of the whole of Melville Street, spaces which are still required by residents, visitors, trades people, etc., alike, but especially for residents, as a necessary overflow to the wholly inadequate resident permit parking located along the sides of Melville Street and across the rest of Zone 1.

Please note that when we can walk we walk, but even with the buses, taxis and trams available, we still need our cars. The loss of these Melville Street parking places will adversely affect our ability to park near our home, and significantly diminish our overall quality of life. It will in no way sufficiently be compensated for by the meagre additional permit parking being proposed, much of it in difficult to access, narrow streets adjacent, but further away to the south. The net loss of parking spaces will be 63 spaces (Table 2).

As Edinburgh recovers from Covid-19, it has been all too clear over the past few weekends how important the additional 100+ parking spaces are to West End residents, visitors and businesses alike. The entire parking in the areas concerned has at times reached its limits. Much of the proposed compensatory street parking is difficult to navigate, especially with trade trucks parked there, and are simply not as safe and open as Melville Street - or suitably near our home, an important consideration for the elderly and with shopping, and families with young children.

We have lived next to Melville Street for some two decades now. The street is actually relatively quiet, and we would ourselves be happy to cycle on the road there. It is wide and accessible and has a 20 mph restriction. To provide separate cycle access, we would propose paring back the 5m-wide sidewalks, or sidewalk demarcation zones such as those in many big-city parks, and lateral perpendicular-parking or central slant-parking, to retain more parking for vehicles. Alternative routes were proposed and dismissed. The original vision for Melville Street, around a long time now, still prevails, not surprising, supported by government, charities, lobbying groups and special interests and funding. By comparison, proper engagement and discussion with residents and the public has been lacking, made difficult especially with the lack of data and quality information. We are kept more in the dark than treated as proper stakeholders. People we meet while parking are still surprised to hear of the proposed changes.

There is a lack of meaningful data. It was particularly frustrating that the two surveys used by the Council to present its proposals for this part of the cycleway to the public were largely anecdotal and quite useless. The first 'survey' appears to be a vague assessment of just a single day's count of parking numbers on Melville Street, used to support the proposed parking changes. The published text lacked any meaningful statistical basis. The second 'survey', ostensibly supporting the Council's presumptive pronouncements of 'latent demand' for cycling, we were told comprised mostly weighted, leading questions whose results would therefore also be pretty meaningless. We have not seen any published data. Although 'latent' can

mean 'hidden', the purpose of this 'survey' should have been to assess future cycle demands, not provide vaguely supportive opinions.

To better present our case for resident parking, I tried to obtain data from Parking. Amazingly, they didn't appear to have a lot of operational data. Data was difficult to obtain, but was eventually provided under FOI requests. It was sufficient to show in August 2019, as described in our objections, that Zone 1 resident parking supply (resident spaces) fell well short (by over 40%) of demand (resident permits issued). Hence the importance of the continued access for residents to the 'pay and display' parking spaces on central Melville Street, which the Council thankfully has so far allowed residents and visitors to continue to use, for which we have been grateful..

Interestingly, Mr Ahluwalia-McMeddes, your written response in October 2019 to my explaining my analysis of the resident parking data in Zone 1 was that the Zone 1 parking 'imbalance' was not the worst in Edinburgh. It was an amazing admission! You are therefore well aware of these parking issues. I find it sad that you can provide such a commentary knowing this and still wanting to get rid of more parking access on Melville Street. Zone 1 parking is in crisis and you are happy to make it worse! Admittedly, the Council website does say that a resident parking permit does not guarantee a parking place, but it is true maybe not for the best of reasons. It is anyway quite a statement for those paying hundreds of pounds for a permit with spaces disappearing, and a pity that the chances of disappointment should be made so artificially high.

We further understand from your letter that, through some minor technicality actually irrelevant to our objections, the referral of the original RSO /18/21 to Ministers was conveniently avoided, and that a replacement (RSO/18/21A), the same RSO/18/21 minus the minor technicality, was then passed without any objections, allowing what is essentially RSO/18/21 to proceed without any ministerial review! And then you write 6 months too late to tell us that everything was passed. So why weren't our objections to the original RSO simply resubmitted at this time? Why weren't the original objectors even notified what was happening? Apparently, the only notification of the submission of RSO/18/21A was condemned to the obscurity of the Gazette? It is no wonder that there were no objections, with thoughts concentrated on family, Covid-19 and staying well.

You posted on the internet (LinkedIn) that you are working for Sustrans, as an embedded employee in the Council, apparently not a conflict of interest. Not sure about the rest though, how the Council, Sustrans, government, charities, funding and special-interest lobbying fit together, how residents and vehicle owners have been 'managed' out of the process, and how 63 lost parking spaces are just part of the uncontested collateral damage. It is not surprising that people in the public objecting fail to make much headway. It is sad that many have become resigned, just saying with a shrug and a shake of their heads, anecdotally paraphrasing, "what's the point, the Council hates cars". But of course the changes will affect families and groups looking to shop in the city, or entertaining themselves of an evening (with designated drivers!), or going for lunch/dinner in the West End. So much for the local economy.

We have had some really good interactions with Edinburgh Council over the years. Staff members have been understanding, kind, empathetic and genuinely helpful, but not this time. This time the Council has fallen short with key stakeholders (residents, public) in most aspects of engagement and communication throughout the project. Getting information from the Council has been difficult and frustrating. Such standards of public consultation would not be acceptable in the professions I have enjoyed since the 1970s. We have to accept any decision the Council makes, but many of the public at large is still not fully unaware of what is coming - the loss of 100+ parking spaces in Melville Street. I believe that you have let them down.


Objection 1 Enclosed Documents:

Date 24/05/2021

Your ref

Our ref RSO1821A

To whom it may concern,

**CITY CENTRE WEST TO EAST LINK SECTION 2 REDETERMINATION ORDER:
RSO/18/21, AND SUBSEQUENT ORDER RSO/18/21A**

I am contacting you today regarding the objection that you raised to the proposed Redetermination Order RSO/18/21 for the introduction of cycleways on various roads in the Edinburgh's West End, including Palmerston Place; Manor Place and Melville Street, required for the introduction of the CCWEL cycle route.

As you may recall;

A statutory consultation for RSO/18/21 took place during Spring 2019 and objections to this order were reported to the meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee on 20 June 2019, where it was agreed that the objections to the RSO/18/21 would be referred to Scottish Ministers for their determination;

Scottish Ministers subsequently advised in a letter dated 23 October 2020 that they had determined that they could not confirm RSO/18/21 as it included redetermination of land on Bishops Walk which is not a Public Road. Thus the Order contained provisions which were *ultra-vires*. This terminated the process for RSO/18/21.

Subsequently the Council prepared a revised Redetermination Order for Section 2 of the CCWEL project, with the proposed redetermination of Bishops Walk removed – RSO/18/21A. Redetermination Order RSO/18/21A was subject to Statutory Consultation during November and December 2020. There were no objections to this Redetermination Order during this period.

Following this statutory consultation the Council referred the revised Redetermination Order RSO/18/21A, along with the original objections to RSO/18/21 to Scottish Ministers for determination.

Road Safety and Active Travel, Place Development
G4, Waverley Court, 4 East Market Street, Edinburgh EH8 8BG
Tel 0131 469 3643 CCWEL@edinburgh.gov.uk

Scottish Ministers replied in a correspondence dated 7 April 2021 stating that as there were no objections to RSO/18/21A, there was no need for their input and the order could be made.

As a result there are no further steps required before the Council can proceed with making the order RSO/18/21A, which will establish the cycling infrastructure required for the CCWEL cycleway.

Nonetheless it is appreciated that you, and others, objected to RSO/18/21, and that the revisions contained in RSO/18/21A are of a technical nature, and do not reflect any specific changes in the proposed infrastructure – which remains the same.

In the interest of ensuring that all objections are given appropriate consideration it is proposed that your original objections will be considered by the Council's Transport and Environment Committee at their meeting on Thursday 17 June 2021.

If you have anything that you would like to add in reference to your original objection, or if you would now like to withdraw your objection please let me know by 5pm on Wednesday 9 June, and this will be included in the Committee Report.

I hope that this letter has been of interest.

Please get in touch if you have any further questions.

Yours sincerely



Rurighd Ahluwalia-McMeddes
Active Travel Officer

Enclosed Document 2 – Contains the Objection shown above on page 15

Enclosed Document 3 – 190613b – Parking Objection – I&OW 2.doc

From: [REDACTED]
To: "Transport (VIP Use)" <Transport.VIP@edinburgh.gov.uk>, rurighd.mcmeddes@edinburgh.gov.uk
Date: 13 June 2019 at 18:34
Subject: Re: CCWEL SECTION 2 STATUTORY CONSULTATION REPRESENTATION

Re: Objections to the plans proposed in Traffic Regulation Orders TRO/18/91A & 18/92B and Redetermination Order RSO/18/21.

Dear Mr McMeddes,

Thank you for the attached pdf of your letter to us dated 13th June via Jackie Ward in response to our objections. It was very helpful. There are issues outstanding that we raised in our original objections that we would still like you or your department to address.

I hope that it is ok to communicate directly by email. It is just so much easier, but I appreciate that you may have your own rules to follow. Although we are still asking for further responses from you that were covered in our original objections, hopefully they are not too onerous.

Yes, for the record, we are still objecting to the plans proposed in Traffic Regulation Orders TRO/18/91A & 18/92B and Redetermination Order RSO/18/21 for the "City Centre West to East Cycle Link and Street Improvements Section 2 Haymarket - Randolph Place". As previously stated, our concerns focus mainly on retaining sufficient parking spaces for Parking Zone 1 residents in Melville Street. Your proposals will remove well over 100 spaces from Melville Street that Zone 1 residents can currently use. Places proposed for compensation will be further away from our home and will necessarily already be spaces required by those residents of those compensating areas. As you know, lost parking in Melville Street will include mostly pay-parking spaces, but which are also eligible for Zone 1 residents when existing resident parking spaces are insufficient.

We do appreciate the answers you gave us to some of the issues we raised in our original objection. Costs we would not dispute, they are estimates after all. There are others that we still disagree with, and some we need further clarification on (see below).

We did review related material, including the report on Bike Life dated 2017, and the appropriate parts of the Consultation Report dated July 2016. Unfortunately, we still find it almost impossible to take in the detailed information provided on the electronic maps provided. We can see the loss of dedicated and potential access to well over 100 Zone 1 parking places on Melville Street, but we cannot see how and where those spaces are compensated for. You name the streets where new parking spaces are promised, but we cannot visualise them from the maps. Is there some way these spaces could actually be highlighted and published with not much additional effort by your department? Perhaps we can visit and have this explained to us on clearer maps than we have been provided so far?

As older people in the city centre, it is also important for us to park reasonably close to our main door. You seem to be pushing us into areas further and further away where we will have to compete more directly with the local

residents already there. This raises an issue again that you did not answer. Our questions were on resident parking permit numbers, actual and forecast. We wish you would go back and look at those questions and provide the Council's views. The information should be readily available. The demand for resident spaces empirically to us seems to be increasing. We see that resident parking is increasingly difficult and something we pay for. And where will essential trades people and other pay-parkers park now?

These are local community issues and we noted with interest the objections to the proposals from the West End Community Council on page 48 of your Consultation Report. Nor is it unfamiliar to us where local objections are overruled by canvassed opinions, many of whom will not be adversely affected, if at all. It is an unfortunate consequence of majority opinion when you are in the minority! Unfortunately, there is no weighting attributed to our 'downside' case (lost parking access) and people similarly affected.

Do cyclists really require a dedicated separate road down the sides of Melville Street? You note in your letter that the street is wide and that the road is already well used by cyclists. I guess you would say yes and we would not agree.

We won't ask about the 'Cycle Demand Model', but can you point us to an explanation in the Council web pages? We must have missed it. Nor will we get into road surfaces. We have seen and been told completely opposing views on cobbled streets for cyclists.

In any event, we would mainly welcome sight of a clear graphic that shows us how the more than 100 lost parking spaces in Melville Street will be compensated for, and some calculation/estimation of current and future demand on Zone 1 residents parking and other parking needs. Basically, what could the future look like? That might give us some comfort, or not, but so far you it is not clear.

Surely the Parking department has provided these numbers? Or have the parking needs of residents now and in the future actually been considered?

Please add this email to our objections.

Best regards, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Drumsheugh Place, Edinburgh EH3 7PT

Enclosed Document 4 – 190819 – Parking Objection I&OW 4.doc

From: [REDACTED]
To: "Transport (VIP Use)" <Transport.VIP@edinburgh.gov.uk>, rurigdh.mcmeddes@edinburgh.gov.uk, paul.lawrence@edinburgh.gov.uk
Date: 19 August 2019 at 12:38
Subject: Impact of CCWEL on Zone 1 resident parking supply & demand

Dear Mr McMeddes,

Thank you for your letter dated 3 July 2019, a further response to our ongoing concerns and objections over the adverse impact on residents and others who use Zone 1 parking of the Cycle Link and Street Improvements (CCWEL) Project. We appreciated the offer of direct contact in your letter, but my subsequent phone call and message left went unanswered, and now we have new information which better informs the parking debate and on which this letter is now based.

Your letter still did not address our main concerns, namely:

- 1) the supply and demand balance (imbalance) of resident parking in Zone 1, for which there still seems to be a lack of any proper analysis;
- 2) the proposed removal of over 100 spaces of P&D parking in Melville Street, parking which is currently available to residents with permits to support the otherwise inadequate number of resident parking spaces, and;
- 3) the adverse impact of both 1) and 2) on the residents of Zone 1 and others who park in the area.

As members of the public and residents of Zone 1, we do not have the access and data that you must have in the Council. Since we are trying to understand the supply and demand of resident parking in Zone 1, we had to make our own enquiries with Parking, which then set off an FOI request. The results of the FOI enquiries, at least all we are going to get, are now in - unfortunately, they are not ideal.

On the parking 'supply' side, Zone 1 had 734 resident parking spaces on 14 April 2016 and 734 on 3 May 2017, and on 15 March 2018 resident parking had increased to 783 spaces. We did not receive any numbers for 2019. Perhaps you could provide these? The pay & display parking spaces on the same dates were consistent, at 494, 494 and 490 respectively. The shared use parking spaces were 21 on all dates.

A directly comparable picture of parking 'demand', as represented by permits issued, could not be provided under the FOI process. It was not possible to get a breakdown of permits by time periods to make an analysis of recent historical trends. In an email dated 15 August 2019, we were only told that the current number of valid resident permits for Zone 1 was 1076, exempt permits 10, and active trades permits 697. We understand that these trades permits can be used in any parking zone across Edinburgh.

In any event, using the 'supply and demand' data provided by the FOI responses, there seems to be a complete mismatch between the much higher 'demand' for resident parking spaces, as measured by permits issued, over the parking 'supply', as measured by the way too few resident parking spaces available (a significantly smaller number of spaces available than permits issued). The Council makes it clear that resident permits do not guarantee the availability of parking spaces, but the numbers are so skewed against the

availability of resident parking that it actually beggars belief. Resident parking supply (availability of resident spaces) falls short by over 40%! Hence the importance of the availability of the pay & display parking spaces for use by residents, as well as others, in central Melville Street.

Proper analysis of parking supply and demand and a proper estimate of future trends should at least be made and presented to the public and government before all the P&D parking on central Melville Street used by residents as overflow and others is got rid of. After all, the P&D parking on Melville Street represents over 20% of the total P&D parking in Zone 1 and parking decisions taken under the CCWEL Project now will impact over 1,000 adult residents in Zone 1 and potentially many more. Other parking users, mobility, tourists and others are no less important, and P&D parking is presumably a source of a not insignificant income for the Council.

As an additional consideration, the trades permits also put further pressure on Zone 1 resident parking availability. There appears to be a high uptake of trades parking in Zone 1 resident parking, satisfying change-of-use, upgrading/refurbishment and maintenance needs of a significant ongoing number of buildings, many of which are historically graded. The trades parking displaces residents from their spaces, albeit officially between 9.30 am and 4.30 pm. Wouldn't it be better or fairer for trades to use P&D parking and pass the cost on to the residents who hire them, leaving the much-needed resident parking for the residents?

We have expressed other concerns in previous correspondence that we still feel have not been fully addressed, including alternative and healthier cycle options. And resident car users can also enjoy a better quality of life and health that the use of their cars can bring. They can park near their homes and enjoy the city, and they can travel and explore beyond the city, and visit friends and family. We even have bikes that fit in the back of a car.

We have also voiced our concerns over the representation of the parking situation at Melville Street in reports to the Council, and the impact on resident parking, or lack of it, from the CCWEL project. We feel that a proper data-based picture of parking and the adverse impact that the CCWEL project will have has not yet been properly presented.

Are we now correct in understanding that our concerns are considered 'heard and dismissed'? It seems a pity to make decisions when data does not appear to have been properly analysed, or it has not been well enough communicated. Sadly also, for us, the maps provided on line are still too difficult to decipher apart from the proposed loss of P&D parking on Melville Street. We still have not yet met a person on your team that represents car owners/users or residents living in or near the city. Now at least through our own local council, we know that we are not alone. But, as a result of all the above, as residents and car owners, don't be surprised to find us feeling somewhat disenfranchised, devalued and irrelevant.

We would appreciate your answering the outstanding questions in this letter, but particularly where the CCWEL project is now, particularly regarding Melville Street parking, and any part that we can still play in affecting any outcome - as succinctly and directly as possible. If you have done a data-driven analysis of the impact of CCWEL on resident parking supply and demand, can we please know where it can be viewed by the public?

Best regards,

Drumsheugh Place, Edinburgh, EH3 7PT

Enclosed Document 5 – 190620 – CCWECL&SI Project – Table 2 p11.pdf

Table 2: Proposed Changes to Parking in The West End

Street	Existing							Proposed						
	Motor cycle	P&D	Permit (Zone 1)	Shared Use	Car Club	Disb	Total	Motor cycle	P&D	Permit (Zone 1)	Shared Use	Car Club	Disb	Total
Manor Place	1	4	29	-	1	-	35	1	-	38	11	2	2	54
Melville Street (West)	-	32	-	-	-	-	32	-	11	-	12	-	-	23
Melville Crescent	2	26	10	-	-	-	38	2	-	-	8	-	-	10
Melville Street (East)	1	101	19	-	2	-	123	1	14	22	16	3	-	56
Randolph Place	1	5	15	-	-	-	21	-	-	-	3	-	-	3
Randolph Lane	1	5	15	-	-	-	21	-	-	-	4	-	-	4
Walker Street	-	3	-	-	-	-	3	1	-	15	30	-	-	46
Stafford Street	-	17	7	-	-	1	25	-	12	8	9	-	1	30
Alva Street	2	17	19	-	-	-	38	2	6	36	5	-	-	49
Coates Crescent	-	15	11	-	-	-	26	-	8	18	6	-	-	32
Total	7	237	122	-	3	1	370	7	51	137	104	5	3	307

Overall Impact of Parking Changes in The West End

- 4.45 In the streets in the West End affected by the CCWEL there will be an overall reduction in the number of parking spaces, from 370 to 307. There will be a significant reduction in the number of Pay and Display spaces, from 237 to 51. However there will be a net increase in Residential Permit spaces from 122 to 137.
- 4.46 In addition, 104 Shared Use spaces will be established, allowing for more efficient use of the existing road space, while the introduction of additional Car Club spaces and additional Disabled spaces will help to reduce the reliance on traditional private cars for those in the area, and ensure that those who need to make journeys by car can do so.
- 4.47 A parking survey carried out for the project suggested that, in general, parking in these streets is not used to capacity. The average number of cars parked on these streets during the day of the survey was 305. There is evidence of light demand in the morning (180 vehicles between 0500–0600), growing through the day (307 vehicles between 1200–1300), with greater demand in the evening (367 vehicles between 1800–1900) suggesting that increasing pressure is introduced by visitors to the area.

Received Correspondence relating to Objection 6

Mr McMeddes

Thank you for your email and the enclosed letter.

We have received no notification of resubmitted plans for this proposed cycle route so I am very grateful to have the chance to again voice my very serious concerns about the safety of both cyclists and drivers.

I stand by all my previous comments, and as far as I can see, all this revised plan has done is ignore the private road, Bishops Walk, but effectively directed the cycleway right to the end of it on Palmerston Place, with the cycle route picking up immediately after the exit from this private road on Manor Place. So although Bishops Walk will not officially be a cycle route, you have directed all the cyclists to either end of it.

This does not address any of the safety concerns about this stretch of road at all. This road is nowhere near wide enough for a car and bike to pass each other and there is nowhere for a car or cyclist to go in order to pass. Just this morning as I was part way down Bishops Walk in my car, having left the car park, a cyclist rode in at speed and suddenly panicked when he saw me on the road. There was nowhere for either him or I to go. As usual there was a car illegally parked directly under the No Parking Emergency Access sign so there wasn't even anywhere for me to reverse back to in order to give him space. Whilst technically it was my right of way as I was already part way down the road that would be of no consolation to a cyclist if they rode straight into me. How is this sort of situation going to be managed? The pavement is well used in normal times so a cyclist can't easily hop on the pavement if he/she turns onto the road to find a car coming (and it wouldn't do his/her bike much good either). This is by no means the first time this has happened this year.

By directing cyclists directly to either end of this private road, they will understandably assume that this is part of the cycle way and therefore assume they are both safe and have right of way.

For reference, I've pasted in my original safety concerns which are just as relevant as ever.

Received Correspondence relating to Objection 7

Dear Mr McMeddles,

Thank you for your response. Can I firstly point out that my objection stands and I will not withdraw it. Secondly can you please, in layman's terms, translate in English exactly what your letter says ? Quite frankly it would appear to state 'the CEC couldn't care less about people that object to anything the council enforces on the residents of Edinburgh'. It also appears to say that after your meetings you'll press ahead with whatever screwball ideas that you have !!! Please don't forget that you work for us ! The CEC are funded for by the taxpayer. You will reply in full to my objection and I will be taking your letter and publishing it on and to social media platforms, local press and local MP. If you think that sending a 'jargon filled nonsensical letter' is some sort of reply then you'll failed in your role. Look forward to your reply and taking mine and other objections seriously !

Yours sincerely,