

Notes for SPOKES verbal deputation to CEC TEC 15 June 2023

Regarding Queensferry Town Centre Proposals

We have asked for this deputation because we have

- a lot of unresolved concerns about this project...
- and also because of the very serious recent news that
- .. **Sustrans has refused funding, because of excessive parking provision**

Spokes also has serious concerns about:-

- Transport Hierarchy
- A flawed consultation process

1. Unresolved Safety Concerns

Spokes made a written deputation to the February 2023 T&E Committee.

Although some improvements were included in the May update, many remain unresolved.

A detailed list is in the full written deputation paper - which was written by local Queensferry-resident SPOKES members.

Our main concerns...

On the High Street... *this is* where the proposal is for one-way traffic eastbound, with contra-flowing westbound cyclists.

We welcome the redesign at the Seals Craig pinchpoint.

However, we continue to fail to understand the logic of:

- placing the parking and loading on the south side (the “wrong” side) of the High Street,
- sandwiching the westbound contraflow cyclists.

AND

There is nothing to prevent pedestrian and cyclist spaces continuing to be abused by drivers parking willy nilly.

On Newhalls Road (the Waterfront)

- there is better news for contra-flowing westbound cyclists there as they will now have a segregated cycle lane.

The bad news is that eastbound cyclists will have to pass through a long single lane canyon of cars parked on both sides

- with “dooring” danger
- most likely with impatient traffic behind them
- whilst navigating speed bumps

2. Transport Hierarchy

remembering that two National Cycle Network routes pass through South Queensferry...

- we fail to see how this parking dominated design can be compliant with the CEC policies on Active Travel, the Transport Hierarchy and traffic reduction.
- we believe this design will induce even more motor traffic
- for instance the large number of roadside parking spaces in Newhalls road can only be accessed via the High Street.
- because it prioritises motor vehicles and compromises people's safety and enjoyment. it creates less opportunity for active travel, by making it less safe.

3. Consultation process

Why have these proposals completely bypassed the Council's Consultation and Engagement Hub?

- therefore invisible to the wider Edinburgh population.

Unlike with a Hub consultation:

- there has been no online availability of the plans.
- therefore no feedback on how the Council has responded to comments received and what changes were made to the scheme as a result of those comments.
- None of the usual 'We asked, You said, We did' per the Consultation Hub.

As mentioned earlier

Sustrans has refused funding - because of excessive parking provision

- So, it is not just a Spokes having concerns
- it is a policy and finance decision by the Council's main funding partner on active travel projects.
- meaning that if this project goes ahead in its present form, it will have to be 100% funded by other sources....
... which will likely eat into Council cash for other active travel projects
... and therefore additionally lose Sustrans match-funding for those other projects.

4. Conclusion

The Spokes view is that, because of our serious concerns about the:-

- Unresolved safety concerns in the design
- Failure to respect the Transport Hierarchy
- A flawed consultation process

and very importantly because

- Sustrans has refused funding

...the SPOKES view is that this project should be "called-in" for a comprehensive independent review and redesign to make it compliant with:

- Sustrans funding design policies
- CEC active travel policies and the Transport Hierarchy
- Traffic reduction policies
- Wider stakeholder and public consultation via the CEC Consultation Hub