

Deputations

Transport and Environment Committee

10.00 am Thursday, 17th June, 2021

Virtual Meeting - via Microsoft Teams

Deputations

Contacts

Email: veronica.macmillan@edinburgh.gov.uk / martin.scott@edinburgh.gov.uk

Tel: 0131 529 4283 / 0131 529 4237

Andrew Kerr

Chief Executive

This page is intentionally left blank

CITY OF EDINBURGH COUNCIL
TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

Item No 3

17 June 2021

DEPUTATION REQUESTS

Subject	Deputation
<p>3.1 In relation to Item 7.1 on the agenda – Potential Retention of Spaces for People Measures – Report by the Executive Director of Place</p>	<p>Keep Edinburgh Moving (written and verbal)</p> <p>Whitehouse Loan Residents (written and verbal)</p> <p>Sciennes School's parent council (written and verbal)</p> <p>Edinburgh Access Panel, RNIB Scotland and Guide Dogs Scotland (written and verbal)</p> <p>Duddingston Primary School Parents (written and verbal)</p> <p>Better Edinburgh for Sustainable Travel (written and verbal)</p> <p>Spokes (written and verbal)</p> <p>Blackford Safe Routes & Spokes South Edinburgh Joint Deputation (verbal)</p> <p>Edinburgh Bus Users Group (verbal)</p> <p>Low Traffic Corstorphine (Verbal)</p> <p>Edinburgh Living Streets (verbal)</p> <p>Corstorphine Community Council (written)</p> <p>Juniper Green and Baberton Community Council (written)</p> <p>Corstorphine Primary School Parent Council - School Travel Action Group (STAG) (written)</p>

CITY OF EDINBURGH COUNCIL
TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

17 June 2021

DEPUTATION REQUESTS

<p>3.2 In relation to Item 7.2 on the agenda – East Craigs – Proposed Low Traffic Neighbourhood – Report by the Executive Director of Place</p>	<p>Corstorphine Community Council (written)</p>
<p>3.3 In relation to Item 7.4 on the agenda – Low Emission Zone - Preferred Scheme for Consultation – Report by the Executive Director of Place</p>	<p>Corstorphine Community Council (written) New Town and Broughton Community Council (written) Car Free Holyrood Park (written)</p>
<p>3.4 In relation to Item 7.7 on the agenda – A71 Dalmahoy Junction Improvements – Report by the Executive Director of Place</p>	<p>Ratho and District Community Council (verbal) St Mary's Church, Dalmahoy Residents Association (written and verbal)</p>

BEST DEPUTATION - Spaces for People - For Transport and Environment Committee - 17th June 2021

Thank you for accepting our deputation. We know it will be a long day for you.

We are speaking on behalf of BEST – Better Edinburgh for Sustainable Travel. We are a collective of community groups and businesses across the city. Our members include Spokes Party, Better Broughton, Newington Safe Routes, Spokes South Edinburgh, Bikes for Refugees, Blackford Safe Routes, Car Free Holyrood, Low Traffic Corstorphine, Spokes, and Hart’s Cyclery. Between us we have visited and used all the SfP schemes in the city.

BEST wants Edinburgh to be a city where every one of its residents and visitors can travel freely whoever they are and wherever they need to go. We should all be able to breathe clean air, we should be able to choose active lifestyles, and we should be able to support our local businesses easily.

We want to express our gratitude to the councillors, officers and contractors who have worked so hard throughout the pandemic. We know it’s been tough.

We’d also like to commend the thoroughness of the report.

We are pleased to see that the majority of schemes have been recommended for continuation post pandemic, either through TROs or ETROs, and that all are to stay in place as long as public health guidance requires social distancing.

Spaces for People schemes have been genuinely game changing. For example:

- The school schemes - which have been popular throughout the city.
- The widening of pavement space in shopping streets that have given people confidence and space to go out and support their local businesses and rediscover their high streets.
- The first schemes delivered for health workers at the Western General and the Royal Infirmary. These provided welcome safe cycling facilities for many staff working under unprecedented and stressful conditions.
- The schemes around Silverknowes and Muirhouse, which have provided a network of safer walking and cycling QA on busy main roads surrounding an area of multiple deprivation, linking it to the north Edinburgh cycle path network and a key recreational route connecting to Silverknowes Promenade. That linkage is a key aspect of achieving modal shift to active travel, and seems to represent a vital change in

design philosophy, moving from a focus on “routes” to one that prioritises “networks”.

- According to ELREC (Edinburgh and Lothian Regional Equality Council), cycling in traffic can be even more daunting to ethnic minorities, migrants, refugees, and asylum seekers who might not be used to the UK traffic or who might not feel confident to cycle on the road. Improved infrastructure, that is segregated bike lanes, pavement extensions, controlled junctions, traffic filters and road calming, increases equal access to active travel as it makes it safer for everyone to ride, and it breaks down some of the barriers that disadvantaged groups face.

We are disappointed by the approach being proposed for **shopping streets**. While we recognise that some aspects have caused problems, for example the temporary materials causing trip hazards etc, we feel a more nuanced approach is required.

We are calling on the Council to be more flexible so that more elements can be retained that are clearly beneficial for walking, wheeling and or cycling, particularly in areas with heavy traffic and or a history of KSIs.

Taking this approach should enable a more joined up approach with the design and implementation of 20 minute neighbourhoods. Successful 20 minute neighbourhoods will require significant traffic reduction.

Removing shopping street schemes to provide more parking, only to try to take parking out again later, does not send a consistent message that Edinburgh has to reduce traffic, particularly in areas where people live, shop, and socialise. It also doesn't acknowledge that many people use cycles to do their shopping, and that cargo bikes are becoming increasingly popular.

We do agree that blue badge holders should be able to park easily in shopping streets, and that loading bays should be accessible and practical for traders - albeit that trolley use should be encouraged where required.

On **cycle lanes** – we welcome the proposed retention and the recommended ETRO approach, which we expect to be able to contribute to. In particular, we hope that, with more specific engagement with disabled people including disabled cyclists, designs can be adjusted to ensure schemes and their wider surrounds are inclusive.

We are concerned that the report mentions the possibility in some schemes of moving the cycle lane so that it would be between parking and the running lane.

This should be avoided. Instead, any redesign must be done in line with the sustainable transport hierarchy and best practice design.

It has been disheartening to hear some people pitting ‘the disabled’ against ‘cyclists’ as if these were two distinct and separate homogeneous groups. Too much road and street space is taken up by private vehicles and not enough space is dedicated to fit for purpose high quality infrastructure for walking, wheeling, cycling, and public transport priority.

Protected cycle lanes are more effective if people can rely on them being clear of parked vehicles. This is a particular issue for nervous cyclists, or people cycling with children. The more people can rely on them, the more people are likely to cycle rather than choose another mode.

We know enforcement resources are tight, but we must have more enforcement, and more expectation of enforcement, on all schemes with parking restrictions. Marketing campaigns may help.

We know there have been some incidents of people on cycles hitting wands/defenders and coming off. This is not a reason for removing schemes, but improving them. Anything that can be done to improve safety, including both on site technical fixes as well as information campaigns, would be helpful.

Sadly, we have seen too many people calling for the wholesale removal of schemes, rather than refinement, after an incident or complaint, or as an ideological position.

We’re asking all councillors to try and take some of the heat out of these issues. We understand that not all councillors agree with the approach the Council is taking, and that some wards are experiencing bigger changes than others.

The heat being created around Spaces for People, along with the unfortunate spread of misinformation in some quarters, will not help us bring people along to make the transformations required to meet climate change, air quality, public health, and economic objectives.

Current rates of private car use in the city are not sustainable for anyone - and reducing rates to more sustainable levels will take courage, collaboration, and commitment over the short, medium and long terms.

In closing, we’d like to reiterate our appreciation of the enormous progress Edinburgh has made during the pandemic to increase the opportunities for people to walk, wheel and cycle. Spaces for People has been a massive step in

the right direction. We urge you all to retain the schemes post pandemic, and to build on the work achieved to date to create a travel and transport network that is genuinely inclusive and sustainable.



CORSTORPHINE COMMUNITY COUNCIL – Deputation to City of Edinburgh Council’s Transport & Environment Committee 17 June 2021

The Corstorphine Community Council wishes to make the following deputation to the City of Edinburgh Council’s (CEC) Transport and Environment Committee (TEC) as our residents are affected by -

- 7.1 Potential Retention of Spaces for People Measures – Report by the Executive Director of Place
- 7.2 East Craigs – Proposed Low Traffic Neighbourhood – Report by the Executive Director of Place
- 7.4 Low Emission Zone - Preferred Scheme for Consultation – Report by the Executive Director of Place
- 7.10 Cammo Road – Trial Vehicle Prohibition (Road Closure) – Report by the Executive Director of Place

being discussed at the TEC meeting on 17 June 2021.

BACKGROUND

Potential Retention of Spaces for People Measures

We have previously submitted a response to the recent consultation exercise which is attached at ANNEX A.

East Craigs – Proposed Low Traffic Neighbourhood

The proposed East Craigs LTN falls within our Community Council area and has been the subject of significant community action and several deputations from Corstorphine CC to the TEC and Full Council meetings.

Low Emission Zone - Preferred Scheme for Consultation

Corstorphine CC hosted the Convener and Deputy Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee with relevant City Council officers at one of our meetings to discuss this issue. We were grateful to all concerned for their consideration and being generous with their time to address residents’ concerns. The position of the Community Council was that having two of the most polluted streets in Scotland within and adjacent to our Community Council area it was incongruous that the proposed LTN did not extend to cover West Edinburgh. This position was supported by most of our Elected Representatives.

Cammo Road – Trial Vehicle Prohibition (Road Closure)

Corstorphine CC has been liaising with our colleagues in Cramond and Barnton CC about residents’ issues concerning Cammo.

As a Community Council opinion has been divided about the merits of the Spaces for People Measures and Low Traffic Neighborhood proposals and I believe this reflects the divergence of views amongst



our residents. I have therefore invited all our members to amplify or amend the views they had previously expressed. The following were received before the deadline to submit our deputation.

CONSIDERSATION

Individual Corstorphine CC colleagues wish to make the following comments -

Potential Retention of Spaces for People Measures

“I am supportive of retaining the bulk of these schemes but am disappointed to see the wholesale removal of the extra footway space along SJR. There are some very narrow pavements here that really benefit from extra pedestrian space.”

“In respect of Corstorphine Primary School I am keen that ensure that the measures on Corstorphine High Street, Manse Road, Manse Street, Featherhall Road, Kirk Loan and Ladywell Avenue are kept. In addition, the measures on St John's Road make the route to school safer and more pleasant for many of the children and families travelling from the north of the catchment. Whilst not perfect the St John's Road measures improve the pedestrian experience which is in line with Council policy of prioritising pedestrians. Loading bays are provided along the length of St John's Road and these prevent clear passage for buses so it feels like a compromise could be reached where pedestrians and loading are accommodated - by removing the pedestrian sections, they are not prioritising buses, they are prioritising parking which is contrary to Council policy.”

East Craigs – Proposed Low Traffic Neighbourhood

“I am disappointed to see this project completely shelved, as there are some busy streets in the area that could benefit from targeted interventions to help reduce traffic domination. I do not live in the area but do walk/cycle into it regularly to visit the doctors on behalf of my Mum and have friends that live in the scheme. The decision not to progress any intervention at all also ignores the significant development to the west, which is likely to create traffic intrusion once completed.”

Low Emission Zone - Preferred Scheme for Consultation

“Disappointment that the proposed LEZ doesn't have a city-wide boundary and the timescales are slow.”

Cammo Road – Trial Vehicle Prohibition (Road Closure)

“I do know the road quite well as I cycle it regularly. Most of the elected representatives and Cramond & Barnton CC support this closure, and I would also support a trial. This view is strengthened by residents who are keen to see this road closure. There is going to be a lot of traffic pressure on Cammo Road with the new Turnhouse development, so I can understand the rationale for the trial. Residents opposing the measures are concerned about having to access their properties via the Maybury junction. This is due for a significant upgrade, so the issue of junction capacity would be addressed in the medium term.”

“Cammo Walk has also been valuable to many families who can use that route to get to Cammo and onward to Cramond. The crossing at Maybury was instrumental in making this a viable route too.”



CONCLUSION

We look forward to continuing to engage with relevant City Council officers on these issues to ensure positive outcomes for our residents. I understand that the Corstorphine Connections LTN will be considered at the next Transport & Environment Committee meeting, and we wish to make an oral deputation at that time. It would also be helpful to know when the TEC will consider the proposed Controlled Parking Zone.

STEVE KERR
Chairperson
Corstorphine Community Council

Chair
Edinburgh Association of Community Councils



ANNEX A

CORSTORPHINE COMMUNITY COUNCIL – Submission to City of Edinburgh Council’s Retaining ‘Spaces for People’ Measure’s consultation

The Corstorphine Community Council wishes to make the following submission to the City of Edinburgh Council’s (CEC) Retaining ‘Spaces for People’ (SfP) Measure’s consultation as our residents are affected by the proposal.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Corstorphine CC is entirely supportive of the health and safety rationale behind SfP Measures in addressing the challenges of the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic. The introduction of measures around local schools has been positively commented on and are widely appreciated.

Residents conflate the thematically linked but separate issues of SfP Measures, the proposed Controlled Parking Zone, and the proposed Low Traffic Neighborhoods’. Negative views on one issue colors opinions on the other two. Indeed, the views expressed by residents often illustrates their confusion.

Several of the SfP Measures have only recently been introduced. An example being Corstorphine High Street. Changes require residents to have a reasonable amount of time to adjust and have a considered view of the intended benefits of the measures. By asking for views now the City Council may be inviting a jaundiced response.

CORSTORPHINE RESIDENTS’ VIEWS

“Gylemuir Primary School

The closure at Gylemuir Primary has been helpful for families cycling to Corstorphine Primary through the Gyle Park as this is on their safer route to school.”

“Carrick Knowe Primary School

Having that extra space now has been great regarding social distancing and just a more pleasant route to school for families. If it continues, we would hopefully be successful in encouraging walk/bike to school choices rather than cars. Unfortunately, the temporary mock-up style and feel to it (along with



many parents ignoring the road closure) is now concerning though. Currently people are parking on corners/double yellows and vision for crossing is restricted, it is also resulting in lots of 3 point turns in areas where children are crossing etc. All in all, from the school's perspective we want to keep it, but adjustments would be required to make it work and feel safer. Ideally, we would have a proper crossing put in place and double yellows, but we have yet to be successful with this request despite two accidents involving pupils and vehicles right outside the school."

CORSTORPHINE CC MEMBERS VIEWS – anonymized

"I support all the current Spaces for People Schemes in Corstorphine. I went down to Corstorphine High Street this afternoon when the School was coming out. The Lollipop Lady at the Crossing confirmed my impression that this scheme is going very well. However, she has observed that with the present closure of Manse Road the volumes and speeds of traffic have increased."

"I am personally supportive of retaining SfP measures in the local area. As a person who currently spends most of their time on foot, they have really helped to improve the environment. I would be keen to see the wider pavements retained along St Johns Road, the measures around the local primary schools made permanent and, providing the Meadow Place Road intervention causes little impact, the retention of this scheme also. The closure of Cammo Walk has been extremely popular, and I would like to see this walking/cycling corridor retained and the crossing point made permanent so people can safely get over the Maybury Road. Tightened junctions at Dovecot and Old Kirk Loan have been particularly good to help me get across roads more safely. I feel the recent build outs on the High Street are helping to improve the walking environment as it is slowing traffic down along this speeding and collision hotspot. I have not personally used the Drum Brae North cycle lanes but am supportive of interventions that help to improve walking and cycling. I would ask that any retained interventions are accurately assessed for equalities - for example I think that the existing cones and wands are poor for people with visual impairments and would need to be replaced with proper infrastructure i.e., actual widened pavements with (where relevant) properly positioned bollards to stop pavement parking and dropped kerbs in appropriate places."

"Manse Street and Featherhall Road

The closure to through traffic to the rear of Corstorphine Primary has been incredibly successful in providing extra space for families and in reducing traffic, congestion, and air pollution near the back gates of the school. Residential and service vehicles are still able to access all properties as needed. It would be good to see a more aesthetic solution implemented to show that the road is open to walking, wheeling, and cycling whilst still allowing access for residents, service vehicles and disabled drivers who require access. This would also help children to understand the boundaries of the safer space. More regular enforcement to deter those who continue to use the road when they should not also be worthwhile (perhaps a permit system could be implemented).

St John's Road



The extra pedestrian space has been very much appreciated and it would be fantastic to see the widened pavements remain (and perhaps more sections given the same treatment as it is a bit stop start). This provision needs to be balanced with safe space for cyclists - perhaps half the width of the road lane could be given to pedestrians and half to a protected cycle lane. Pedestrian crossing point timings still leave people standing waiting for far too long and these should be adjusted to prioritise people not vehicles. With regards to complaints of loss of parking, there are multiple car parks along and just off St John's Road and indeed many of the businesses also have private car parks. Should there be an opportunity for additional measures, Clermiston Road needs traffic calming and better pedestrian provision, particularly on the bottom section from Forrester/Belgrave Road towards St John's Road (and especially next to Sher hairdressers).

Corstorphine High Street

The extra pavement space, particularly to the east between the school gates and Manse Road has been transformative and should be kept permanently with a full width pavement, dropped kerbs and bollards to prevent pavement parking. The build outs have had some positive effect in keeping traffic further from pedestrians however speed remains an issue and further measures are needed to address this.

Junction narrowing and yellow lines.

The junction narrowing has been extraordinarily successful in improving conditions for pedestrians and should be made permanent with appropriate tactile treatment and pavement/road level adjustments to allow those with mobility issues to travel unimpeded. The addition of double yellow lines has improved sight lines for pedestrians crossing at junctions and should remain.

Ladywell Road and Meadowplace Road

The new cycle lanes have just been installed in the past couple of days so have not had the opportunity to see how these work in practice but support the implementation of protected cycle lanes which can aid children and families to move around the area safely. The main issue raised seems to be around parking for the Ladywell Medical Centre and would suggest that the surgery is approached to suggest that they provide patient parking within their large car park for those who require to drive to appointments. The Council needs to find a solution for the cycle lane to be continuous whilst maintaining provision of disabled parking for residents. Rosendale Road in Lambeth has recently been redesigned to accommodate similar demands and may provide good source data for how a permanent change could work.

Cammo Walk

The pedestrian crossing and closure of Cammo Walk to traffic has been brilliant and we have used this route as a family for exercise and trips to the beach at Cramond and Dalmeny Estate by bike which we would otherwise not have been able to do. The pavement at the crossing should be widened to allow for use by bikes and pedestrians and the connection to Cammo Walk should be paved immediately next to the crossing to allow ease of access for pedestrians and cyclists.

Drumbrae North

Have not used this section yet but again, any provision which helps to create safe cycle transport links should remain and be extended to ensure that there is a full network of safer cycle routes for families to provide a genuine alternative option to taking the car or public transport for local journeys."



“It’s good that CEC Active Travel and associated teams are now aware of the legal position and why TTROs and Spaces for People is not an appropriate way to introduce strategic travel changes which do not directly support addressing Covid-19 challenges.

However, the move to permanence is disturbing and comes across as disingenuous as it was said that the condition of the funding was the temporary nature of the measures and their (long) time limit of 18 months. The goalposts seem to have moved considerably in the direction of non-Covid strategic aspirations. These matters, as what a group of people may be willing to put up with for the sake of surviving and supporting each other during a public health emergency is different from a large-scale change in amenity and lifestyle.

Also, the noticeably short 5-day notification period for what is now a multitude of schemes left little or no time for detailed consideration of these measures. The ‘emergency and temporary measure’ reassurance was designed to cover that in part, but it would not now. I am unaware of detailed and agreed (i.e., with affected communities) analysis of how the measures are performing to enable a considered judgement to be made. I am aware that the Edinburgh Access Panel have significant concerns about some schemes; it appears that they are not being listened to.

Whilst encouraging active travel may be a laudable aim, I suggest that trying to do this by force is ultimately counterproductive and that reasonableness, persuasion and incremental change is the way to go. Active travel, as interpreted here, also disadvantages those who a whole range of mobility issues, including hidden disabilities and for whom the level of activity they can manage is at least a calculation, if not a major barrier.

It truly does feel that this has turned into ‘Spaces for Cyclists’ instead of something with benefits for a broader range of people. For example, if pedestrians really are at the top of the hierarchy, then why has the maintenance of pathways and pavements not been prioritised from the revenue budgets during Covid, especially during the icy weather when many were condemned to being inside and alone as walking was too risky?

At some point, there needs to be some realism regarding cycling – it is not for everyone and, even if people are physically and mentally capable and willing, cycling cannot cover a large part of our transport needs, e.g., where multiple people are travelling together, areas are not easily accessible, personal safety, illness, time constraints etc. Some of these constraints also apply to walking.

Public transport may have Covid risks, but these are manageable now. Also, in the longer term, it will be completely fine to use public transport to the full so that area needs consideration. For example, dedicated buses to serve Gyle business park from Corstorphine centre, East Craigs etc. would take some, possibly much, business and shopping traffic off the road. Truly integrated transport, i.e., with good ticketing options, could make this extremely attractive.

I believe that the road is a shared space for all. It is not a play area, or for one group to dominate in preference to others. I am committed to working with fellow community councillors, CEC and others on its enhancement and safety but in a way that is sensible and serves the community, not an ideology. Responding to the objectives in the consultation information, I suggest that:

- Encouraging travel mode change is fine but switching to walking or cycling is dependent on several factors including time, purpose of journey, business productivity and is not always possible, for good reasons.

- Supporting high streets and city centre businesses includes the need for supplier, staff, and customer access. Some people simply cannot walk long distances to have a coffee so, in not coming, the business suffers, and social isolation potentially increases. People accessing a hotel for a funeral reception need available parking etc. Provision of free, but time-limited parking could help eliminate commuter parking but provide a vital boost for businesses and people's wellbeing alike.
- There are many ways to improve road safety including education and non-intrusive measures such as automatic red lights when speeding vehicles are detected. Ultimately, risk cannot be eliminated from life.
- Health cannot be improved if reasonable access to healthcare providers, social opportunities etc. is made exceedingly difficult or impossible.
- In addition to active travel options, the use of electric vehicles and provision of charging points will help reduce carbon dioxide emissions to support net zero carbon targets, so I suggest these are factored into the planning considerations.

Elsewhere the elimination of street clutter is mentioned as an aspiration; my observation is that I have never in 30 plus years seen Edinburgh's streets look such a mess with bollards, lane markings, signage etc. I am not in favour of retaining this standard of streetscape.

In terms of specific SfP measures, I feel that the Drum Brae North's scheme is questionable in that a CEC response to me indicates enhancement to existing cycle routes, rather than strict Covid-related necessity. Although physical distancing considerations have relevance, considerate pedestrians and cyclists can manage this in the context of use of the East Craigs paths – I walk these almost every day so know that from personal experience – and the road network in the area is quiet, as attested to by my cyclist friends and seen by me whilst walking around (I know of two genuine 'rat runs' but that's all.) My understanding is the Spokes did not think that the segregated cycleways on Drumbrae were a great idea, so it worries me that even they are not being listened to regarding suitability/proportionality of schemes. Recently there was an issue regarding an emergency vehicle in the area – the bollards make it difficult to use the road space flexibly to let these pass. My own feeling is that effective emergency response is more important than limited cycle use by an exceedingly small sub-group of cyclists who can and will use the route. I respectfully request that this is reconsidered, perhaps by removing some or all the bollards and leaving the cycle lanes.

In terms of cycle lanes generally, people who are entering or exiting vehicles need protection from fast cyclists, especially those coming down a steep hill like Drum Brae. For example, someone with mobility difficulties, or who is moving children or goods from a car or other passenger transport, is at risk, especially as it is not reasonable to expect these people to take fast evasive action to avoid injury. I could be incorrect in this but, at present, I am not aware of anything in the Highway Code that would require cyclists to give way to people moving between vehicles and the pavement; perhaps there now needs to be, or at least some interim guidance. I see from this week's local newspaper and elsewhere that the Edinburgh Access panel also has concerns with the CEC prioritisation of cyclists over disabled people.

In conclusion, I am not in favour of a widespread adoption of Spaces for People measures. Let us consider carefully - CEC, CCs and the community - what works, what doesn't and how to genuinely enhance our communities for the benefit of all, and without detriment to either the majority or those most in need."

“Many of the streets we wish to comment on are not listed and the options given (agree or disagree) did not allow me to respond honestly as for many of the options we agreed with some aspect of the option but disagreed with others.

We realise that the introduction of ‘Emergency’ Covid regulations do not require full public consultation. In our opinion it would have been beneficial for everyone concerned to have had discussions with residents and businesses as they are the people who are aware of the local situation, and this informs the decision makers of the most beneficial measures to introduce whilst meeting legal and safety requirements.

As these discussions have not taken place and the survey form does not allow us to adequately outline our opinions, concerns, and suggestions we have therefore listed our comments below.

I understand from speaking to the Lord Provost that comments submitted by email will be fully considered as part of the survey.

1. Wester Broom Place.

Measures have not been implemented correctly with incorrect signage, inadequate barriers, and signs. There has been extraordinarily little evidence of these measures being monitored or enforced. The closure of the Wester Broom Place/South Gyle Road junction has in our opinion created a dangerous traffic situation particularly for the children accessing/leaving the school but also at weekends and evenings for children and adults accessing the park when the street is being used as a parking area by parents of football teams using the Gyle Park. Although the new measures prohibit access to Wester Broom Place and the northern end of Broomhall Drive (other than for residents and teachers accessing the school car park), a substantial number of unauthorised cars still access Wester Broom Place/Broomhall Drive and with one end of the street being closed forcing entry and exit at Broomhall Drive. This requires drivers to carry out a turning manoeuvre in a very narrow street (often at the school gate) which in our opinion is an increased danger to children. We have witnessed several near miss incidents involving children. Whilst we are of the opinion that previous arrangements were adequate but needed enforcement of traffic and parking regulations and common sense, we have always suggested that a one-way system was worthy of consideration as we accept that it is always worthwhile considering improvements.

2. Broomhouse Road.

These measures are still in the process of being installed but have been in operation this week. We are particularly concerned at the inappropriateness of the measures introduced which we think are dangerous for vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians. We are of the opinion that the cycle lane layout is difficult to operate e.g., where cyclists are forced out into the middle of the road at bus stops. With the introduction of the bollards dividing the cycle lane and the road this has resulted at busy times in blue light emergency vehicles being stuck in the traffic queue and being delayed for a period. We are also concerned at the narrowing of the road available to vehicles turning right into the Wester Broom estate which no longer allows vehicles continuing to progress up Broomhouse Road to pass the turning vehicle on the inside, therefore causing further congestion on an already busy road. This will add to the difficulties listed above regarding the emergency vehicles. The proximity of the start of the bollards to the traffic light junction at Tesco causes buses and large lorries to cross the white line into the opposite lane. The new layout travelling north at the traffic lights will inevitably increase the amount of congestion which now can see traffic stretching from the traffic lights to St Augustine’s school.



3. Ladywell Road/Corstorphine High Street.

Whilst we accept that it is important to consider the safety of pedestrians (including school children) and that measures need to be considered, we are of the opinion that those that have been implemented have raised serious safety issues. These include the inappropriate siting of the road narrowing bollards at the east end of the High Street and the narrowing of the road in the area outside Claycotts Housing Development. We are also concerned at the loss of parking spaces close to the doctor's surgeries which adversely impact on patients who have mobility issues or due to illness require to use a car.

4. Drumbrae North.

Similar issues to those expressed for Broomhouse Road.

5. St John's Road.

The increased pavement width at some parts of the street is helpful but are also in places much less helpful and unnecessarily take away parking spaces which has a detrimental effect on the local shops by making it more difficult to receive deliveries and potentially reducing the number of customers. It is important that Spaces for People measures do not result in less footfall for businesses as this will result in negative effects on the local community.

6. Other comments.

Although we are not cyclists, we have cyclist friends who are concerned about the cycle lanes being segregated by bollards. Cyclists are trapped in the lane whereas prior to these being introduced they had manoeuvrability when faced with a slow cyclist, pothole, or obstruction in their path. Also, debris collects in the gutters which will not be able to be cleaned by the City Council street cleaning vehicles. In winter, snow and ice cannot be cleared from the cycle lanes by gritting lorries thereby making them dangerous and unusable by cyclists.

We would reemphasise our comments that whilst we are against retaining many of the Spaces for People measures recently introduced because in our opinion, they are inadequate and dangerous, we would support proper consultation with the community to identify what safe measures could be introduced."

CONCLUSION

The views expressed by Corstorphine CC members reflects the divergence of views among our residents. The proposal to make SfP Measures permanent requires further direct discussion with Corstorphine CC and we would welcome an early meeting with relevant CEC Officers to address questions and concerns.

STEVE KERR
Chairperson
Corstorphine Community Council

Chair
Edinburgh Association of Community Councils

Transport and Environment Committee June 17th 2021

Item 7.1 Potential Retention of Spaces for People Measures

Written Deputation by:

Corstorphine Primary School Parent Council - School Travel Action Group (STAG)

We thank Elected Members for their time in considering this written deputation, which outlines:

- Background (to our School Travel Action Group, and School Travel Plan)
- Impact of Spaces for People measures
- Observations regarding potential Retention of Spaces for People Measures

Background

Our School Travel Action Group is a sub-group of the Parent Council and works in conjunction with the school, Junior Road Safety Officers 'One Planet' Group, City of Edinburgh Council School Travel Team and Corstorphine Community Council with the aim of improving safety, encouraging active travel and looking at ways to ensure that everyone can travel to and from school easily, with consideration of others and the environment. Our current School Travel Plan contains lots of research undertaken on the problems faced by the school community and our action plan to address the issues.

The school run is a major contributor to traffic on the roads around 9am and 3pm, yet for many, this is a very short journey. We acknowledge that there are many reasons why children are driven to school and for some, travel by car will remain the only viable option, some or all of the time.

The aims of our School Travel Plan are:

- To significantly reduce the number of cars being used on the journey to and from school
- To remove actual and perceived barriers to active travel to and from school
- To reduce traffic congestion around the school and surrounding area
- To improve safety on the journey to and from school
- To increase understanding amongst the school community of the travel options which are available to them
- To increase awareness of the benefits of active travel

The steps involved in our School Travel Plan are as follows:

1. Establishment of the School Travel Action Group. This is a group of pupils, parents and teachers who meet on a regular basis to develop and promote the plan.
2. Consultation with pupils, parents, staff and local residents. This was done through surveys within school and online. Pupils from the One Planet: Road Safety / Travel to School group assisted with designing and running these surveys. Consultation sessions for parents were also run as part of parents' evenings. Classes within the school conducted walking surveys to map the local area and identify barriers.
3. Targets and plan of action. Targets set are SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Time-based.)
4. Promotion. The plan is promoted throughout the school community.
5. Review. The plan is monitored and reviewed as actions progress and targets are met. It is a 'living document' which will be adapted to the changing situation.

Impact of Spaces for People measures

Whilst Covid-19 has impacted on some of our School Travel Plan targets and timescales, the Spaces for People measures which have been implemented in response to the pandemic have delivered the following benefits for our school and wider community and helped us to make progress with achieving our targets:

Reduction of cars in the immediate vicinity of the school gates

- Introduction of defender units with bollards on Corstorphine High Street
- Closure of Manse Street and Featherhall Road to through traffic

Safer spaces for pedestrians

- Widened pavements on St John's Road and Corstorphine High Street
- Traffic calming measures on Corstorphine High Street

Improved safety, visibility and crossing distance at junctions

- Double yellow lines deter parking across dropped kerbs and improve sight lines
- Narrowed junction bell mouths slow traffic and make it easier to cross

The beginnings of a network which allows pedestrians and cyclists to move around the city more safely

- Introduction of protected cycle routes on Meadow Place Road and Ladywell Road.

Observations regarding potential Retention of Spaces for People Measures

We have 2 main observations in relation to the paper presented to Transport and Environment Committee:

1. Recognising the temporary nature of the interventions to date, **we welcome the proposal** (at paragraph 4.79 onwards) to re-prioritise the School Travel Plan review and to complete this by the end of 2021; with consideration given to necessary legal orders to retain or introduce new measures in line with School Travel Plan proposals.
2. We note that (at paragraph 4.84) *'the current measures are generally in place around the school gates, rather than across a wider area surrounding individual schools. It is considered that, in many cases, it is likely that experimental measures could be more extensive and would require dedicated signage to indicate the restriction in place. Therefore, officers will progress discussion with individual schools in term 1 of school year 2021/2022'*. Again, **we welcome this proposal**. Corstorphine Primary School catchment area straddles the busy A8 arterial route (see Appendix), with the school on the south side of the A8, and the majority of the catchment on the north side of the A8 (extending from Maybury to Edinburgh Zoo). We note the proposed removal of 'shopping streets' infrastructure, including within St John's Road. However, any consideration of 'safe routes to school' for walking, cycling and wheeling would need to consider a broader area than just around the school gates; for example, the adequacy of pavement space in and around St John's Road and around pedestrian crossing points on main routes to school.

Billy Samuel, Chair – Corstorphine PS Parent Council

Tom Wallace, Vice-Chair – Corstorphine PS Parent Council

Vikki Brown, School Travel Action Group – Corstorphine PS Parent Council

Appendix


1. Local Roads surrounding Corstorphine PS (situated on Corstorphine High Street)

The City of Edinburgh Council Atlas




11/19/2018, 12:38:58 PM

• Primary Schools (Non-Denominational)



2. Corstorphine PS Catchment area (including A8 arterial route – St John’s Road)



3. Corstorphine PS Catchment area (Main north/south walking routes to school)



4. Pictures Illustrating Positive Impact of Space for People Measures

Before



After



Before



After



Before



After



Before



After



Before



After



Deputation on Spaces for People Measures Transport and Environment Committee 17 June

Newington Safe Routes, on behalf of Sciennes Primary Parent Council

In this deputation we express:

1. support for making permanent the closure of Sciennes Road
2. support for the protected cycle lanes along Mayfield Road and Causewayside
3. concern about the impact of the planned construction work at Sciennes Primary School on pupils' access to its playground and propose solutions interacting with the way Sciennes Road is closed

Newington Safe Routes

Newington Safe Routes is a group in South Edinburgh who wishes to create safe, low pollution active travel routes through our local area, taking into account the needs of all residents and the businesses and services that support them. The group's membership comprises the Sciennes Primary Parent Council Travel Committee and local residents. The graphic alongside shows the group's area of focus.



Spaces for People

We are writing in **support of making existing Spaces for People measures permanent**. It is clear through the feedback that we have locally that these measures work well, protecting vulnerable road users without negative effects on traffic flow. Retaining these measures is integral to our vision for active travel routes for all residents as set in our proposal, which is endorsed by a range of community groups including Marchmont and Sciennes and Grange and Prestonfield Community Councils and the Grange Association.

Sciennes Road School Street

In particular, we would like to express **support for the 'school streets' closure of Sciennes Road outside Sciennes Primary school**. This measure has been benefiting pupils, parents and local community in the following ways:

- Ensures safety of children especially during busy drop off and pick up times
- Provides space for parents to physically distance
- Allows children to safely cross the road to the nature strip opposite school
- Provides a quiet and 'clean-air' space for the local community

The road closure is popular with local residents. Vehicular traffic continues to flow well in the area whilst encouraging more pedestrian and cyclist commute.

Protected Cycle Lanes through the area

We **support keeping the protected cycle lanes** that run through the area along **Mayfield Road and Causewayside**. They make these roads safe to cycle for inexperienced cyclists including small children for

the first time, and again does not have a negative impact on vehicle traffic and retains parking along the Northern section of this route. The continued protection of vulnerable road users on this route is particularly important since travelling along Mayfield Road is unavoidable when travelling by foot, bike or wheelchair through the area due to the railway lines cutting through the area.

Issue with Sciennes' School playground access and use of Sciennes Road for children

Construction work is planned at Sciennes School over the next 18 months. As a consequence, **pupils will lose access to half of the school's playground space** – which is already one of the lowest playground space per child ratio in Edinburgh.

This will severely restrict the school's ability to provide daily access to its playground to all of its pupils and **deny any possibility of outdoor learning at the school.**

With Sciennes Road closed, either permanently or temporarily, **we call for considering solutions using the portion of the road immediately adjacent to the school.** There is low pedestrian and cyclist traffic through the road, currently closed, and finding ways to dedicate part or all of it to the usage of the school would alleviate the foreseen problems.

Failing that, part of the school's children would have to be taken daily outside the school, either to the nearby Meadows Park or to the closed Road, during the school breaks. Accessing the Meadows requires a safe route and consideration of closure to Melville Terrace with planters at the Livingstone place crossing point. Up to 8 temporary staff would also be needed to supervise the children when they are outside the school, as considered 'excursions'

This issue is causing concern and angst among the parents of the c650 pupils at Sciennes School and we call it to the attention of the Travel and Environment Committee. This is illustrated in the photo below showing how the school's pupils cannot fit in the available playground space, where they are supposed during breaks to be able to interact, play, and run! We blanked out the area impacted by the construction in this picture leaving even less space for the children.



Edinburgh, 15th June 2021

Dear Councillors,

We are presenting this deputation on behalf of a group of parents from Duddingston Primary school who use the cycle lanes.

We are here to talk about agenda point 7.1, the potential retention of SfP measures.

There are a number of SfP measures in the area surrounding Duddingston Primary school, notably the protected cycle lanes on Duddingston Road, Duddingston Road West, Milton Road and Willowbrae Road.

In October 2019, a group from Duddingston Primary School, including children, made a deputation to this committee calling for cycle lanes to be introduced along Duddingston Road because of road safety concerns. We applaud the fact that those cycle lanes are now in place, albeit on a temporary basis at present. These cycle lanes are a great addition to the area and in our view, they are having a positive impact on enabling parents and children to travel to and from school safely by bike.

We are therefore very pleased to see that the Report by the Executive Director of Place is recommending retaining all of these cycle lanes. We fully support their retention.

A speed survey conducted on behalf of the council showed average speeds on Duddingston Road have reduced since the installation of the cycle lanes (see table from survey below^a), and as parents who use the cycle lanes, not just on the school run but on the weekends and holidays as well, we can confirm that they have helped our children feel more able to cycle on the roads, taking them off the pavements and making more room for pedestrians in the process.

However, the cycle lanes as they stand are not perfect. There are a number of improvements and additions we would like to see made, both immediately while the lanes are temporary and also in the longer term, should the lanes be made permanent.

The first pressing issue is the lack of enforcement in a number of areas: Even though average speeds along Duddingston Road have reduced, almost 50% of cars still travel above the speed limit^a. Additionally, cycle lanes and parking restrictions (eg double yellow lines) are simply ignored by a number of drivers. That this is apparently without consequences is not acceptable.

Cars are regularly parked in the cycle lanes on Duddingston Road during the school run, in particular outside St John's Primary School. This may be a very small minority of people, but it appears that those individuals repeatedly park illegally with no consequence whatsoever, and therefore continue to do it. A council parking attendant stationed outside St John's Primary School explained to us that it was very difficult for him to effectively cover such a large area – if he went to approach a car that was parked illegally, the driver would simply move off. He recounted an occasion when one driver had deliberately mocked him, essentially playing cat and mouse, driving up and down the street to park and then driving off again each time he approached. He suggested it would be necessary to have more people to cover the area effectively. A Community Police Officer also explained on one occasion that they were unable to issue tickets unless they had a colleague with them.

Similarly, the School Streets provisions in the area, in particular Hamilton Terrace and Hamilton Drive, are also flagrantly ignored by many drivers. We have been requesting enforcement of existing parking / traffic restrictions for several years, but we have seen no progress on this front. We understand there are resourcing issues in providing a physical presence for the purposes of enforcement, so we wonder if it would be better to employ the use of cameras to enforce speed limits and parking restrictions instead.

The second pressing issue is the perception that the cycle lanes are still not safe for cyclists, because of the continued presence and dominance of cars. This is a fundamental problem which we believe means the lanes are currently not being used to their full potential. There are large stretches of the cycle lane where wands have not been installed, most noticeably outside and opposite the entrance to St John's Primary School. Whatever the Council's reasoning for this, the result is that some parents regularly use this area of the cycle lane to park in at school pick up and drop off times. This has a significant impact on users of the cycle lane during the school run (one of the busiest times of the day for traffic) especially on children, who often have to get back on the pavement as they do not feel safe having to move out into the middle of the road to pass a car which is illegally parked on the double yellow lines in the cycle lane.

The current placement and design of the speed humps often leads drivers to steer into the cycle lane in order to avoid them, causing dangerous situations. If the speed humps were one continuous hump, rather than the existing shape, this could be avoided. Another way to prevent this behaviour would be to position a wand adjacent to the speed hump.

Additionally, it is key that the cycle lanes are extended down Southfield and Brighton Place, creating a link from the City via the Innocent Railway path all the way to Portobello. The Duddingston Primary School catchment extends into this area of Portobello and children and parents have to negotiate this congested and dangerous stretch of road. Just this week a child travelling by bike to St John's Primary was involved in a collision with a car at the junction of Southfield Place and Stanley Street. Luckily the child came away without serious injury, but this is a very real reminder that something needs to be done soon before anything worse happens. This would also be a crucial element of the cycle infrastructure linking up Portobello High School and Holyrood High School with its feeder primaries. Given the spatial challenges on this stretch of street, it may be necessary to explore options such as a bus gate and a separate residents' parking area to make this work effectively. Full cycle segregation on the A1 corridor up to the entrance to Portobello High School is also needed to make cycling a viable option for many children travelling independently from Brunstane and Parson's Green Primary catchment areas

Looking to the future, when these cycle lanes become a permanent feature of our school area, we would like to see more effective segregation. Whilst the wands do go some way to segregating traffic, they are not an effective barrier and as a result, some cyclists, especially children, are put off using the cycle lanes as they still do not feel safe. In order to encourage and maximise active travel for everyone, but particularly for children, it is critical that we make the roads as safe as possible for them. We appreciate that this might result in some inconvenience in respect of parking, but safe active travel should be the key consideration, in line with the priorities set out in the City Mobility Plan and carbon reduction targets set by the Council and Scottish Government.

We would encourage the Council to be bold in its vision and aspirations in order to meet its objectives with regard to active travel and climate change. To go back to our previous deputation in 2019, the children that presented to you are now at High School and are legally expected to cycle on the roads. It is critical that the roads are made as safe as possible. Driver behaviour is also extremely important in this respect and driver awareness, patience, and courtesy towards vulnerable road users also requires improvement.

We note with interest the School Travel Plan which is mentioned at Agenda Point 6.1 and we look forward to participating in this programme. We would also welcome the opportunity for our school community to be involved in any future discussions about the cycle lanes or other improvements to encourage active travel.

Thank you very much for your attention.

- a. Results from speed survey conducted on Duddingston Road. Source: City of Edinburgh Council Active Travel Team

	Pre SfP (6-9/10/20)	Post SfP (16-22/12/20)
Average number of vehicles	4315	3741
Average speed Eastbound (mph)	23.2	18.9
Average speed Westbound (mph)	22.0	20.5
% over 21 mph	74.4%	46.7%
% over 26 mph	26.8%	8.2%
% over 31 mph	4.8%	1%
% over 36 mph	0.8%	0.2%

Deputation to Edinburgh City Council, Transport and Environment Committee 17th June 2021

From: Edinburgh Access Panel, RNIB Scotland and Guide Dogs Scotland

Retaining Spaces for People

Any decisions taken on 17th June will have serious and long-term implications for the citizens of Edinburgh in terms of how they access their city and its amenities. We would, therefore, urge the Committee to consider the following points before making final decisions:

- The City Mobility Plan rightly places walking and wheeling at the top of the council's Sustainable Transport Hierarchy. The needs of pedestrians are therefore paramount. Guaranteeing the safety of pedestrians, particularly the safety of more vulnerable pedestrians, must be the deciding factor when determining whether temporary measures are made permanent. The current wave of temporary measures show a greater regard for the interests of cyclists than those of pedestrians.
- The needs of people with disabilities, including wheelchair users and blind/partially sighted people must be taken into consideration. The introduction of cycle lanes can have a negative impact on wheelchair users, whose access to the kerb (and the safety of the pavement) is limited by their introduction. We urge the Committee to engage closely with disabled pedestrians and drivers before making any final decision about making temporary measures permanent.
- We remain concerned that momentous decisions about changing the way we walk, wheel and cycle are being made before any of us what the future, post COVID, Edinburgh will look like. We are still in a situation where many people are working from home and others are still wary about travel.
- We are urging the Transport and Environment Committee to postpone making any decisions this week and to support having an independent third-party national review of Spaces for People

End of Document

Spokes welcomes the report on Spaces for People (TEC 17 June 2021), and offers the following comments:

1. Spaces for People was a national initiative funded by the Scottish Government in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. The schemes made possible by this funding are echoed in many other locations in the UK and the rest of the world including: Berlin, London, Paris, Athens, Bogota, Madrid, Sydney and Budapest. Those cities are also discussing the retention of temporary measures recognizing the benefits of expanding cycling and walking infrastructure to support public health goals (increased physical activity rates, lower body weight, improved air quality) as well as climate and carbon reduction targets. In other words Spaces for People is not an Edinburgh eccentricity, it is in line with national policy and parallels other capital cities worldwide.
2. As noted in the report, the Spaces for People schemes in Edinburgh contribute to other policy goals, including Council priorities on net zero carbon and wellbeing, the City Mobility Plan, Active Travel Plan and City Centre Transformation programme. The potential policy interactions go further, and Spokes notes the obvious links to the city's air quality objectives, the Low Emission zone, Vision Zero Road Safety Plan^[1], 20 minute neighbourhoods as well as national outcomes in the National Performance Framework¹ including: health – we are healthy and active; and, community – we live in communities that are inclusive, empowered, resilient and safe.
3. While there is much to say about the volume and representativeness of the consultation responses, **none of this feedback** appears to include the voices of any children who live in the city. Under the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, children have rights to participate in decisions which affect them, and to be protected and kept safe from danger. These rights are now enshrined in Scottish law. We are pleased to see broad support for the School Streets schemes and a wider programme of retention and development in the report. What do children say about Spaces for People? Evidence from James Gillespies Primary School quiet route shows that there are more children cycling and walking to school – voting with their feet – and we **strongly support** extended measures around individual schools, as well as safe (low-traffic) routes through each school catchment.
4. In the report, the technical assessment of impacts on businesses focusses on the arrangement of customer parking and delivery bays. We note that businesses in Edinburgh can and do use bikes and cargobikes for deliveries/servicing^[2] and this possibility is not mentioned either as a potential benefit of SfP measures or within potential future delivery/servicing options. We suggest that consideration is given to further cargobike schemes/support for businesses similar to the scheme currently operating on Leith Walk. This is particularly pertinent to the arrangement on George IV bridge where servicing difficulties have been noted.
5. It is very disappointing that most of the shopping street measures are suggested for removal. Many footway widenings are well used, as are the few cycling measures in shopping streets, such as the uphill cycle lanes in Broughton St and Morningside Road. We suggest giving officers flexibility to assess and retain those shopping street measures which are useful. These should be seen as stepping stones towards the broader vision and policy goals for place-making in those locations, so that SfP is seen as interim/temporary intervention rather than a final design.
6. The report notes some locations where there are practical challenges for wheelchair users parking or using taxis, for example where it is not possible to gain direct kerb access. We agree that this is an important issue and support some of the suggested mitigations, e.g. widening of the buffer/door zone between parking bays and cycle lane. However, we are concerned that the report mentions the possibility of relocating the cycle lane between parking and the running carriageway (parag 4.101.3). Instead workable design solutions should be sought which would not involve the removal or rerouting of cycle lanes, and we suggest that the council works with relevant partners and considers best practice from other cities – after all such questions are not unique to Edinburgh.

7. . Finally, many of the Spaces for People schemes are already well used, as is shown by recent Spokes counts and feedback from individuals. Of course, they were of necessity introduced rapidly, and many improvements are possible on the basis of experience and public feedback. Specifically on cycling, combined with other Council existing and planned cycle routes, the SfP main road cycle lanes form the basis of a hugely valuable future network connecting local communities to the city centre and to other local centres by sustainable and active means. All these issues - usage, improvements and opportunities - are covered in much more detail in a Spokes website report [3].

[1] Full council voted unanimously (25 August 2020): "that a new Edinburgh 'Vision Zero' Road Safety Plan - which aims that 'all users are safe from the risk of being killed or seriously injured' on the City's roads - is developed to replace the existing plan and is reported to the Transport & Environment Committee."

[2] Farrout Deliveries offers a cargobike service for businesses in Edinburgh, and works with a diverse range of clients across the city. Uber Eats and Deliveroo use bike couriers to deliver food/takeaways. And, ZedifyUK – a cargobike business have secured investment of 50K to set up an Edinburgh delivery hub (March 2021).

[3] www.spokes.org.uk/2021/05/growing-edinburghs-cycle-network-beyond-spaces-for-people/

Spokes Response to stakeholder consultation on SfP

<http://www.spokes.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/2104-Spokes-SfP-supplement-to-stakeholder-consultation.pdf>



Deputation from Keep Edinburgh Moving to the Transport and Environment Committee, 17 June 2021

Keep Edinburgh Moving (KEM) is an unincorporated voluntary association representing the views of individuals from across Edinburgh.

We are tabling this deputation in order to:

- Bring to the attention of the committee fundamental issues present in the market research survey and presentation of its findings.
- Formally register our strong objection to the proposal that the consultation results be dismissed in favour of the much smaller market research survey.
- **Highlight that the dismissal of the outcomes of the public consultation undermines any confidence in the Council's handling of legally statutory consultations associated with ETRO or TRO processes.**
- Contrary to claims in the report, bring to the attention of the committee the fact that most comments in the market research survey are NOT supportive of retaining Spaces for People measures.
- Provide a response to the report from a number of the most impacted communities across Edinburgh, particularly where proposals fail to take account of the clear will of the community expressed in the public consultation.
- Present evidence from community-commissioned surveys and local / cross-city petitions that calls into question the claims of broad support for Spaces for People measures across the city.
- Highlight safety issues with some schemes.
- Call on the committee to reject proposals to extend Spaces for People schemes where there is no community support for doing so, which, based on Sustrans Places for People funding guidelines and Spaces for People Route Map to Permanence evidence of community support would appear to be a requirement for funding approval.
- **To emphasise to the committee that the recent data protection breach, where alongside their responses, the full postcodes of 1,200 respondents to the consultation were released along with their age bracket, gender and identifying characteristics in terms of health and mobility, give the public one more reason not to engage with future council consultations.**
- And finally to raise awareness within the committee that this whole situation with Spaces for People could signal the death of consultation within the whole of City of Edinburgh Council across all service areas.

Contents

- [1.](#) Key issues and their implications for the council's approach to public engagement
- [2A.](#) Specific response to measures affecting **Lanark, Longstone, Inglis Green and Slateford Roads**
- [2B.](#) Specific response to measures affecting **Silverknowes**
- [3.](#) Detailed response to the committee report with references to **Braid Road, Comiston Road, Braidburn Terrace, Drumbrae North, East Craigs, Lanark Road, Longstone and Silverknowes**
- [Appendix 1.](#) Similarity Analysis of the Market Research Survey Data
- [Appendix 2.](#) Margin of Error in the Market Research Survey Data
- [Appendix 3.](#) Contradictory Responses in the Market Research Survey Data
- [Appendix 4.](#) Representation of People With Disabilities in the Market Research Survey Data
- [Appendix 5.](#) Comments of Respondents to the Market Research Survey
- [Appendix 6.](#) Results from the Change.Org Petition, "Stop Edinburgh council making dangerous road changes, cycle lanes & parking cuts permanent"
- [Appendix 7.](#) Data Evidencing No Majority Public Support for Spaces for People Measures on **Lanark, Longstone and Inglis Green Roads**
- [Appendix 8.](#) Photographic Evidence of Accidents on **Lanark Road**
- [Appendix 9.](#) Results from the Change.Org Petition, "Oppose the Council's plans for **Lanark and Longstone/Inglis Green Roads**"
- [Appendix 10.](#) Data Evidencing No Majority Public Support for Spaces for People Measures in **Silverknowes**
- [Appendix 11.](#) **East Craigs** independent market research survey

1. Key issues and their implications for the council's approach to public engagement

[Back to Contents](#)

a. Background

In deputations to full council on 29 April, South West Edinburgh in Motion, Get Edinburgh Moving and Silverknowes Community Group presented serious concerns about the Spaces for People public consultation and that the results would be unfit to report back to shape recommendations and decisions. Details of the substance of our complaint can be found [here](#).

Following a Conservative motion and Coalition amendment, full council voted for the amendment and was satisfied that the public consultation could report back, in the full knowledge that the public consultation would be conducted as a self-selecting survey.

This decision on 29 April was a vote of confidence by the council that the public consultation was fit for purpose.

b. Council position in the report before committee

It is therefore of extreme concern that, with results from the consultation now showing overwhelming opposition to retaining most Spaces for People measures, the report before committee on 17 June 2021 appears to dismiss the findings from the consultation in favour of the SMG market research survey:

“There is a notable difference in the general level of support and opposition between the market research and survey responses from residents. The market research is more representative of the views of residents as participants are a statistically representative sample of opinions based on Edinburgh's population demographic. The online survey were 'self-selecting' responses so are not statistically representative.”

c. Why this position is unacceptable – key issues with the market research survey

Based closely on the public consultation, the survey inherits issues already raised in the deputations to council on 29 April available [here](#), and in previous answers to questions at full council, it was clarified that the hugely complex surveys were not pre-tested to flush out issues with comprehension of questions, or ability for participants to cope with responding to the scale of geographic and scheme options

But more fundamentally, the survey execution and limited sample size undermine its value as a basis for policy making, for the following reasons:

- **Misleading context** Respondents were financially incentivised to simply return a completed survey. They were not informed that their answers would override the public consultation. Had this been stated then the context for responses would have been very different. We expect that respondents would have responded differently or taken more care over responses had they known this.

- **Sample size** Extremely low sample numbers in many of the questions relating to specific schemes (prior to spam entries being removed) make findings on most individual schemes statistically unrepresentative ([Appendix 2](#)).
- **Spam entries** Multiple spam entries were apparently submitted, which appear to come from one individual and, unlike the consultation, this was not picked up prior to analysis and reporting ([Appendix 1](#)).
- **Representation of people with disabilities** The survey took an inadequate approach to ensuring the sample properly represents the views of people with mobility issues.

Unlike the consultation, there was no question asking “Do you have any long-term illness, health problem or disability that limits your ability to carry out day-to-day activities? - disability/illness”. Questions asking if people use wheelchairs led to confusing and conflicting responses that merit further analysis. It must be remembered not all people with a mobility issue use a wheelchair or mobility scooter. ([Appendix 4](#)).

- **Technical problems** Respondents were able to submit inconsistent answers to questions. For example, saying that cycling was their most frequent mode of transport but also their third most frequent mode of transport.
- **Self-contradicting responses** The data contain many self-contradictory responses, undermining the confidence with which conclusions can be drawn from these responses ([Appendix 3](#)). For example, some respondents wanted all schemes removed AND all retained; or said they supported school schemes but also thought a disadvantage was these schemes made it harder and more dangerous for parents and children to get to school.
- **Illogical indications of support** Out of 101 people who had not used any Spaces for People schemes, 27 people ticked they supported all 6 categories of scheme. In contrast only 17 selected they opposed all schemes. While they were all excluded from the SMG analysis, it is symptomatic of confusion with the survey, where ‘neutral’ or ‘not sure’ would be a more logical response which was chosen by just over half. **This reveals a framing bias, where it seems that if people have not experienced a Spaces for People scheme, they are more open to expressing support of the ‘idea’ of Spaces for People, rather than automatically opposing it.**
- **Sentiment analysis not consistent with conclusions on levels of support** The SMG and council reports say the research evidences support of between 45% and 65% for different types of schemes in a handful of quick ‘tick box’ questions. However, of those who had used one or more schemes, 30% of respondents took more time to make comments and nearly 61% of them made comments opposing Spaces for People, with only 20% supporting.

Of those who supported at least one category of Spaces for People scheme, 45% made opposing comments. Particularly surprising is that of those who showed support for all six categories of Spaces for People schemes, and had used at least one scheme, 8% left opposing comments. **There is a clear indication with this and previous issues that people support the ‘aims’ of improving road safety and helping people walk and cycle more, but the conflicting sentiment suggests people do not support WHAT the council has implemented or HOW they have installed it to try to achieve this.** ([Appendix 5](#))

- **Weightings** Because many invalid or questionable responses have been included in the analysis it means the applied weightings cannot be valid and therefore the sample is no longer theoretically statistically representative.

- **Contrary to other evidence** Independent evidence of considerable opposition, and the legitimate reasons behind this, can be found in the 16,800+ signatures and comments from a public petition to “Stop Edinburgh council making dangerous road changes, cycle lanes & parking cuts permanent” ([Appendix 6](#)). **Given this demonstrable level of public unease with Spaces for People schemes, a small survey finding broad support deserves to be treated with healthy skepticism.**

d. Factually untrue claims in the report to committee

The issues above, and evidence in the linked appendices, highlight factually untrue claims in the report about the market research data, including:

"The comments made in the market research were relatively evenly balanced between those supporting and opposing retention"

UNTRUE: This is untrue because, once 5 spam commenters were removed, 30% of respondents left a comment. Of these, 61% of commenters who had used at least one scheme made comments opposing schemes and only 20% made supportive comments. (There were more spam respondents but they did not make comments.)

Analysis on a question-by-question basis also shows around a 75:25 split between opposing:supporting comments.

"if the Council ran the same survey again with 600 different Edinburgh residents it is expected that the result of that survey to be within 4% for 19 out of 20 questions.

UNTRUE: This is untrue because the 4% figure applies only to questions answered by all 583 respondents. Responses by smaller sub-groups (e.g. people familiar with certain schemes) attract far higher margins of error.

e. Implications

- **Unfit for purpose** The value of the market research survey as a basis for policy decisions appears to be seriously compromised and is now called into question.

The “Potential retention of Spaces for People measures” report in front of the committee relies on this research to make the recommendations for approval and reference to it is embedded throughout.

- **Future public engagement in policy making** Notwithstanding the waste of taxpayers' money (a minimum of £50k for the public consultation) and respondents' time (estimated at 9,000 hours), the proposal to dismiss Edinburgh's largest ever consultation response has huge negative implications for all future public engagement in policy making.

The views of 17,600 people are being dismissed over those of a much smaller, and unrepresentative number.

Dismissing the consultation undermines trust in local democracy, and means Edinburgh residents will rightly ask why they should ever engage in another council consultation.

Of direct relevance to this committee, the dismissal of the outcomes of the public consultation undermines any confidence in the Council's handling of legally statutory consultations associated with ETRO or TRO processes.

The recent data protection breach, where alongside their responses, the full postcodes of 1,200 respondents to the consultation were released along with their age bracket, gender and identifying characteristics in terms of health and mobility, give the public one more reason not to engage with future council consultations.

Overall, this situation could signal the death of consultation within City of Edinburgh Council.

- **Integrated Impact Assessment** The assessment refers to the market research findings as 'evidence of unmet need' and quotes as certainties numbers that we now know to be invalid. This document is a statutory requirement for projects like this and therefore must be accurate.
- **Funding criteria** To be eligible for Places for Everyone funding, Sustrans most recent Design Guidelines state a requirement to "develop ideas collaboratively and in partnership with communities". Their "Spaces for People Route Map to Permanence" states that six key actions must be evidenced to support recommendations and inform politicians. The first two of these are: "Update or undertake a project specific Equality Impact Assessment" and "Carry out meaningful engagement and consultation". The flawed research and dismissal of the public consultation mean the first two actions have not been achieved, so it is hard to see how funding could be legitimately justified.

Conclusions

In view of the concerns above, we call on the committee to:

- Acknowledge that the market research survey is not fit for purpose as a basis for policy making.
- Acknowledge that people's expectation when you run a public consultation is that their views expressed in this will be given priority.
- Consequently, to give the public consultation precedence over the market research survey in their decision-making.
- Respect the clear messages on individual schemes delivered by the public consultation
- Note the broad opposition to retaining the majority of Spaces for People measures.
- Avoid the future use of separate surveys, in parallel with public consultations, which should be run to meet the minimum Quality Standards of the council's own policy.
- Recognise that thousands of people have taken considerable time to comment in the consultation, and therefore to fully review these comments before making any policy decisions.

2A. Specific response to measures affecting Lanark, Longstone, Inglis Green and Slateford Roads

[Back to Contents](#)

In the specific context of schemes affecting South West Edinburgh, specifically Lanark, Longstone, Slateford and Inglis Green Roads, we note:

- The market research survey findings have too small a base to be statistically representative ([Appendix 2](#)) even prior to excluding invalid responses.
- The public consultation indicates a significant desire from residents to remove these schemes, with support for removal of 73–75% ([Appendix 7](#)).
- The public consultation indicates an even stronger desire by businesses in the area to remove these schemes, with support for removal of 70% ([Appendix 7](#)).
- A survey in South West Edinburgh conducted in December 2020 by an independent market research company and attracting over 1000 responses showed 88% opposition to the installation of the Lanark / Longstone / Inglis Green Road schemes ([Appendix 7](#)).
- A survey in South West Edinburgh conducted in May / June 2021 by SWEM and attracting over 440 responses and publicised widely by leaflet, Nextdoor.com and social media showed an 80% desire to remove the schemes ([Appendix 7](#)).
- Strong public support from this survey for council interventions that (i) improve the poor road surface quality, which was responsible for serious injury to a cyclist on Lanark Road in February 2021 ([Appendix 8](#)); and (ii) restore the network of footpaths on the Water of Leith that have been allowed to fall into disrepair.
- A public petition to “Oppose the Council's plans for Lanark and Longstone/Inglis Green Roads” attracted over 1500 signatories ([Appendix 9](#)) and provides many detailed comments explaining why our local community rejects these proposals.
- That, 3+ months after installation, no independent safety audit has been conducted, the council have refused to allow residents to brief specific safety concerns to the safety auditors and that basic safety issues were highlighted by a serious accident on 29 May in which a car hit a vehicle in a floating parking bay ([Appendix 8](#)) and another on 12 June when a cyclist ran over a pre-school child after the council had dismissed concerns raised by a resident reporting a near miss in the same place.
- The last ambulance attendance on Lanark Road for a cyclist was due to the poor road surface. Since then, the Spaces for people measures have moved the centre line for a considerable distance. This has exposed the weakest part of the former centre line of the road by removing the paint providing some protection and concentrating traffic onto the weak point. The already poor surface has degraded dramatically in recent weeks. Spaces for People budget will urgently need to be used to resurface the former centre line area where degradation has occurred directly because of these measures, as this implication is something the road designers do not seem to have been aware of. Some cyclists still use the main road as they do not feel safe the way the lanes force them close to side streets etc. **The Bike Life survey 209 highlighted that road surface was the biggest concern in relation to cyclist safety.**

2B. Specific response to measures affecting Silverknowes

[Back to Contents](#)

In the specific context of schemes affecting Silverknowes, we note:

- The market research survey findings, even prior to removal of invalid responses, have too small a base to be statistically representative for any of the four schemes (Silverknowes Parkway, Silverknowes Road North, Silverknowes Road (North Section), Silverknowes Road (South Section)) ([Appendix 2](#)).
- The public consultation indicates a significant desire from residents to remove these schemes, with support for removal of 73–75% ([Appendix 10](#)).
- A survey in Silverknowes conducted in May 2021 and commissioned by Cllr. Kevin Lang and attracting over 700 responses showed 80% opposition to the installation of three schemes ([Appendix 10](#)).

3. Keep Edinburgh Moving Response to "Potential retention of Spaces for People measures" Report

[Back to Contents](#)

Keep Edinburgh Moving (KEM) is an unincorporated voluntary association representing the views of individuals from across Edinburgh. KEM was responsible for the 16,800 signature petition referred to in the report.

Here we respond to the report presented to committee, with the aim of drawing the committee's attention to details which have an impact on those we represent, or we believe are factually inaccurate or misleading.

- 4.11 We begin with the reference to our petition in 4.11, "A petition against safety measures was published on www.change.org and has 16,809 signatories."

The title of the petition was, "Stop Edinburgh council making dangerous road changes, cycle lanes & parking cuts permanent."

We strongly object to the misrepresentation of this petition as an anti-safety petition, when in fact it makes a strong criticism of the council's failure to conduct independent road safety audits either before almost all the schemes were installed or, as remains the case for some, many months after installation. In addition there is at least one example on Lanark Road and Longstone where the community has been refused permission by the council to submit specific areas of concern to include in the brief for the safety auditors, so that those specific areas of road can be checked for specific scenarios which someone without local knowledge would be less likely to be aware of.

We draw the attention of the Committee to the significantly high number of people who signed this petition compared to any similar petitions (indeed it has amassed more signatures than the 13 most popular posted on the Council petitions portal COMBINED), and also to the number of comments in it relating to safety concerns about the schemes.

- 4.12 It is implied that the Market Research was not self-selecting. This is not correct. Individuals apply to join panels to be paid to participate in research. Then for individual surveys, the online panels invited their members to take part. Members could decline, and so the situation is no different to the open invitation to take part in the public consultation

- 4.16.1 The claim that being motivated to take part in the public consultation makes the results statistically unrepresentative is totally illogical. Strong views exist on both sides of the argument for retention or removal of Spaces for People measures.

The consultation response captures the views of those most benefited by or most impacted by the measures, and this is exactly what matters when making future policy.

- 4.16.2 The figure of $\pm 4\%$ is only true for questions answered by all 583 respondents.

Questions 10 and later were filtered by familiarity, so their base size is much smaller, and the resulting margin of error at 95% confidence is significantly higher.

For the scheme **most familiar** to people (Princes Street) the margin of error is $\pm 6\%$.

For the scheme **least familiar** to people (Stanley Street) the margin of error is $\pm 16\%$.

The claim that "if the Council ran the same survey again with 600 different Edinburgh residents it is expected that the result of that survey to be within 4% for 19 out of 20 questions." **is simply wrong**. A full analysis is given in [Appendix 2](#).

4.20 There is no evidence of adequate representation from disabled people (see [Appendix 4](#)). We therefore question if the market research accurately represents the views of people with disabilities.

4.24.4 We note the statement that, "on some streets, notably Drum Brae North, Lanark Road, and Comiston Road, there was significant net support for removal" and we call on the council to reflect this by removing these schemes.

We also note that City of Edinburgh Council failed on the issue of community engagement with the residents of Drum Brae, and specifically in regard to formal consultation with Drum Brae Community Council.

Participation therefore should have included meetings with relevant Community Reference Groups (including Community Council reps) and Community Councils.

A proposed concept / design should initially be built up from this community's feedback, and should include the traffic data in each area of impact.

4.24.5 We note the statement that, "the Braid Road closure attracted the highest level of net support for removal in both the public consultation and market research" and we again call on the council to reflect this by removing this scheme.

The plans to continue to have both Braid Road and Comiston Road subject to Spaces for People interventions fail to acknowledge the impact both schemes are having on each other. These schemes should be linked and considered as one, this has not happened despite many attempts to be strategic about all traffic using the A702 corridor and adjacent roads.

We also point out that an [active travel proposal for a one-way system on Braidburn Terrace](#) was fully consulted on in 2018 and supported by the community, but has been completely ignored. Despite all the current objections it could have been an acceptable compromise which would have been a welcome outcome, however it has been trumped by the temporary schemes.

4.28 How the weighting by age and sex was implemented is unclear.

4.37 The statement, "The comments made in the market research were relatively evenly balanced between those supporting and opposing retention" **is completely untrue**.

In [Appendix 5](#) we list all of the comments submitted in separate responses to questions. Only 65 of 340 comments (19%) supported retaining the measures. The vast majority of the other 275 comments (81%) wanted the measures removed.

If we look at this at the level of individual people who have used the schemes, 30% made comments of which 61% made comments opposing schemes and only 20% supporting which conflicts with responses to the tick boxes.

We note that these figures are broadly consistent with the retain / remove percentages provided by independent surveys conducted for residents in East Craigs, Lanark / Longstone Roads and Silverknowes.

- 4.49.2 While we fully support efforts to ensure the security of future consultations, we have serious privacy concerns about the decision to record full postcodes.

In releasing the full consultation data on its website, the council published full postcodes for around 7% of respondents, along with detailed personal information such as age range, gender, long term health issues and use of wheelchairs or mobility scooters. This in itself is a serious breach of GDPR and makes it very easy to identify individuals from their responses. We are referring the matter to the Information Commissioner for review.

If the council adopts the proposal here, it must ensure that such a privacy breach cannot happen again. It must also be aware that it is perfectly possible for spammers to work out how to automatically insert a postcode randomly from the 18,200 postcodes in the City of Edinburgh Council area.

In general, in a large consultation, IP address data will be sufficient to identify fraudulent activity without breaching privacy rights.

Also, it would not be beyond reason for the council to undertake genuine community engagement prior to a consultation to ensure that what is put out to consultation is less likely to be so controversial it attracts attempts to influence the outcome unfairly.

- 4.81 We welcome the sensible approach proposed to "amend or remove any scheme designs where there is not the support of the school" however local residents who are directly impacted by retaining or removing any measures or restrictions must also be fully consulted.

We ask that the council extends a consistent approach to schemes beyond schools measures by respecting the expressed views of residents on retaining or removing local schemes.

Based on our analysis of the market research in relation to schools, we urge caution on the almost 'assumed' support on schools measures that is embedded throughout the report and other council communications especially as, to the best of our knowledge, no proactive engagement work has been undertaken since the planters were 'positioned'.

- 4.100 We note the important safety issue surrounding floating parking, and draw the committee's attention to two recent examples on Lanark Road in which floating park was directly implicated in causing the accident. Full details appear in [Appendix 8](#).

- 4.103 **We object strongly to the proposal to "retain the protected cycle lanes on Comiston Road and Lanark Road".**

Overwhelming evidence from the consultation is that the desire of local people and businesses is to remove these measures.

Furthermore, the finding in the market research is inconclusive because of the small base size for both of these schemes ([Appendix 2](#)).

There is therefore no legitimate basis for claiming a mandate from the public for the retention of either of these schemes.

- 7.1 We note that the consultation attracted 10 times more responses than that on the City Mobility Plan, which the Transport Convener acknowledged in her statement

that, "It is extremely encouraging that the vast majority of respondents to our Draft City Mobility Plan consultation support our vision for sustainable, affordable and joined-up transport in the Capital."

The public consultation on Spaces for People has returned a forceful rejection of the council's proposals to retain many of these schemes. If the 1,800 respondents to the City Mobility Plan consultation provided a mandate for that policy, then how much more should the views of 17,600 respondents to the Spaces for People consultation be respected?

- 9.1 (p29) We note that Drum Brae North cycle segregation is recommended to be continued with no changes, despite evidence from the consultation that the desire of local people is to remove these measures.

Furthermore this view is strongly underlined in the "East Craigs Traffic/Travel in your area survey 2021", independently undertaken by Taylor Mackenzie on behalf of Get Edinburgh Moving. 1,562 households responded to the specific question on whether the cycle lane should be made permanent - 76% opposed retention, with only 15% in favour. For every 1 resident supporting, there are 5 in opposition.

Again, there is no legitimate basis for claiming a mandate for retention of this scheme.

- 9.2 (pp35–37) We note that Comiston Road, Braids Road and Lanark / Longstone Roads are unique in being recommended for retention in the face of strong (red) opposition from both residents and businesses.

We strongly object to this proposal. There is no mandate for retaining these schemes, either from the market research (statistically inconclusive) or from the public consultation.

- 9.2 (p40) The assessment scoring system is based on metrics that are unaligned to the project goals.

If the aim is to increase the numbers of people cycling and reduce the use of cars then there should be direct measurement of car and cycle numbers. Simply measuring the increased space on the road is meaningless.

If safety is the metric, then speed should be monitored, and accidents and near-misses should be recorded. We were very concerned to see a response to an FOI requesting information on near misses that the request was unreasonable as it would mean searching through 11,000 emails in the Spaces for People inbox. The implication that emails from the public alerting the Spaces for People team to near-misses are not being collated is of considerable concern.

- 9.2 (p45) The fractional decrease in parking space is not the issue, but rather the location of this space. For example, on Lanark Road, parking has been removed from long stretches of road outside residents' homes. What parking remains has been moved either across the road, presenting issues for residents and visitors with children or shopping, or significant walking distance away further up or down the road.

- 9.4 (p55) We are pleased to see the acknowledgement that the protected cycle lane infrastructure presents "[negative] impacts on disabled street users ... associated with parking restrictions and layout."

For this reason, and others associated with evidence of genuine safety issues, we strongly object to the proposal that "protected cycle lanes are retained using ETROs".

Specifically the measures that are proposed for retention on Drum Brae North, Comiston Road and Lanark Road raise significant ongoing safety issues, as demonstrated by two accidents within 3 months of the Lanark Road scheme being completed ([Appendix 8](#)).

The council's resistance to removing these dangerous schemes in opposition to the wishes of the local community will, over the course of an 18 month ETRO, inevitably lead to more accidents of this kind, with real potential for a fatality.

We call on councillors to reflect on the evidence of actual accidents to date. As an example, Lanark Road has been determined by the council to be safe, as evidenced by (i) their refusal to install a pedestrian crossing as the accident rate on the road below threshold, and (ii) the decommissioning of the speed cameras in February 2021, on the basis that the accident rate and 85% percentile speed (35mph while a 40mph zone) were below the necessary threshold.

In the context of what was therefore accepted by the council as a safe road, the introduction of segregated cycle lanes therefore adds rather than removes risk.

Similar arguments can be made for other schemes, and councillors should consider whether the scheme designers have under-estimated the level of additional road safety risk introduced by these schemes.

- 9.4 (p55) The proposals to retain the road closures to vehicles in Silverknowes are made in the face of very strong opposition from residents ([2B](#)) and, in general, also strong opposition from businesses.

The consultation findings and the residents' survey commissioned by Cllr Kevin Lang ([Appendix 10](#)) are consistent in indicating considerable public objection to these measures.

We also note the serious accident that hospitalized a cyclist on Silverknowes Road North, and that this scheme had not had a Stage 3 (post-installation) road safety audit conducted at the time of the accident.

For these reasons we strongly object to the council's proposals to retain the Silverknowes measures.

- 9.4 (p56) The council's logic on the decision to retain the closure of Braid Road to northbound traffic is contested by residents.

We strongly object to this approach and encourage a rethink on this proposal, taking into account the detailed and positive alternative proposals presented to the council by residents.

- 9.4 (p57) Again we point out that the market research was not self-selecting; respondents were invited to take part and could decline.

- 9.4 (p61) The statement on sampling error is accurate in this statement but we draw the committee's attention to the point that the 4% error only applies to "questions answered by the full sample," meaning that those on individual schemes can have a much larger error.

- 9.4 (p61) We refute the idea that the Commonplace Survey is "Evidence of inclusive engagement of people who use the service and involvement findings." Many areas had very few responses, and those in the most controversial areas had very few to base policy on. For example, only two written comments were submitted on Commonplace for the entire length of Lanark Road, and similarly only two for Longstone Road.
- 9.4 (p62) The council has removed parking suitable for Blue Badge holders (along with some dedicated Blue Badge spaces) on many of the schemes with segregated cycle lanes. There appears to be a consistent misunderstanding among council officers that if all other parking is removed, but a Blue Badge space remains, then this is adequate for disabled people. It fails to recognise that if there was previously ample kerbside parking then many disabled people (not all of whom require Blue Badges) had complete freedom of where to park. If that is removed, then it creates a requirement for Blue Badge spaces that was not there previously, which can still never replace the freedom of choice that was there before. Obviously many of those with mobility issues are not eligible for Blue Badge spaces, and there have been issues with this on Lanark Road.

Even when requests are made for Blue Badge spaces for existing Blue Badge holders, road designs can be unable to accommodate it as we saw when a request for a space was declined on Lanark Road. This is another concern with permanent segregated cycle lanes. It means that should a resident become disabled after the ETRO has moved to permanency then there is not longer any room for manoeuvre on the design. It has been pointed out to the council very clearly by the Edinburgh Access Panel, that 40 km of segregated cycle lanes amount to 40 km of suitable parking removed for people with mobility issues.

- 9.4 (p67) Parking on double yellow lines in a cycle lane is not allowed, so this statement is misleading when kerbside parking has been removed to allow the installation of double-yellow-lined kerbside cycle lanes (e.g. Lanark Road, Comiston Road).

The Ask the Police website, which makes clear differences in parking law between England and Scotland, is clear that parking in a cycle lane is prohibited:

<https://www.askthe.police.uk/content/Q388.htm>

- 9.4 (p68) We are pleased to see the acknowledgement of the major safety issues associated with floating parking on schemes with fast downhill sections like Lanark Road and Drum Brae North.
- 9.4 (p68) We are pleased to note the emphasis on enforcing speed, and it is therefore extremely disappointing that the introduction of lower speed limits (e.g. Comiston Road, Lanark Road) has coincided with the decommissioning of the speed cameras on these roads.

We recommend that the council immediately introduce speed monitoring measures in these locations, since reports by residents are that traffic speed is often significantly exceeding the new limit.

- 9.4 (p69) We are pleased to see proper consideration being given to cyclist and pedestrian safety in the response to 4, specifically that, "In some circumstances, replace floating parking with a layout with the cycle lane between parked cars and the running carriageway."

We strongly encourage the council's designers to creatively approach this as a solution, which (with sufficient buffer space) would address many of the access and safety issues which are presented by floating parking designs.

We request this to be reviewed urgently, given the most recent accident on Lanark Road ([Appendix 8](#)) involving a cyclist and a pre-school child, the day after a resident received a dismissive response having reported a near miss in exactly the same area.

Appendix 1. Similarity Analysis of the Market Research Survey Data

[Back to Contents](#)

Completely identical responses would agree on 497 answers.

Responses below are where 490 or more responses were identical to those of another respondent.

It is to be expected that those strongly opposed or strongly against the measures might submit very similar responses, but it is very unlikely these would be submitted at the same time or would have similar comments.

The data below show nearly identical responses that are:

- correlated in time (consecutive or nearly consecutive)
- correlated in their comments

Possible explanations:

- A single respondent, clearing their browser cookies to allow resubmission
- People in a single household who have both been asked to respond, and have chosen to do so at the same time and submit essentially identical answers

Either of the two explanations undermines the randomness of the sample and these data should be removed.

Row	Q13 comment (column JI)	Near-consecutive response (within 1)?
106	'None should remain - they are dangerous and the fact that the council have taken advantage of a health crisis to install these death traps is repugnant.'	N
321	'ested modification'	Y
322	'ing suggested modificatio'	Y
365	'ding suggested modifications'	N
370	'ing suggested modifications'	Y
371	'suggested modificatiions'	Y
372		Y
377		Y
379		Y
488		N
565		Y
566		Y
568		Y
580		Y
581		Y

Appendix 2. Margin of Error in the Market Research Survey Data

[Back to Contents](#)

Random sampling is always subject to a margin of error, which becomes larger as the number of people sampled becomes smaller. The percentage error is easy to calculate, based on the number of people responding (known as the "base" size).

For many individual questions, the base size in the Market Research Survey was very small. This was a problem that was designed into the survey from the very beginning, due to the inclusion of a vast list of over 80 street names and schools, for a sample of 583 people to respond to during lockdown and it was one of the reasons deputations to council highlighted the consultation (which was similar in this regard) could not meet the council's own Quality Standards. The issue is acknowledged in the slide pack by text like, "NOTE: Very small base sizes", however the significance is not made clear.

In fact, for many questions on individual schemes, the base size is too small for the results to be conclusive, once the margin of error is taken into account.

The following pages present the data from the Market Research Survey with the margin of error included.

Put simply, when the margin of error exceeds the % gap between "retain" and "remove" responses, the results have no statistical value and are inconclusive.

On 6 June 2021 we offered SMG, who conducted the market research survey, an opportunity to comment on or refute our analysis but they have not done so.

Summary

Based on analysing the margin of error at the industry standard 95% confidence level:

- For **installed schemes** (48 reviewed), 29 schemes had too small a base size for the results of the Market Research Survey to be statistically conclusive (prior to exclusion of spam entries).
- For **planned schemes** (37 reviewed), 32 schemes had too small a base size for the results of the Market Research Survey to be statistically conclusive (prior to exclusion of spam entries).
- For **schools measures** (38 reviewed), 30 schemes had too small a base size for the results of the Market Research Survey to be statistically conclusive (prior to exclusion of spam entries).

As we detail in [Appendix 3](#), other issues where respondents contradict themselves in different questions or otherwise show that they did not understand a question, cast doubt on the reliability of the Market Research Survey as a basis for policy making.

Installed Schemes: 19 conclusive; 29 not conclusive

		Remove	Retain		
St Johns Road, Corstorphine - Extra pedestrian space	33.1% ± 7.8%			34.5% ± 7.9%	N
Queensferry High Street - Extra pedestrian space	12.7% ± 7.7%			42.3% ± 11.5%	Y
Maybury Road - Pedestrian and cycle crossing allowing safer access to Cammo Walk	22.5% ± 9.7%			38% ± 11.3%	N
Fountainbridge - Protected cycle lanes	17.1% ± 5.4%			43.3% ± 7.1%	Y
Dundee Street - Protected cycle lanes	16.4% ± 6.9%			41.8% ± 9.2%	Y
Dalry Road - Extra pedestrian space	20.6% ± 6.4%			40% ± 7.7%	Y
Cammo Walk - Road closure allowing traffic-free access to Cammo Estate	15.6% ± 8.1%			40.3% ± 11%	Y
Woodburn Terrace - Meadows to Greenbank quiet route. Selected road closures to...	21.1% ± 13%			36.8% ± 15.3%	N
Whitehouse Loan - Meadows to Greenbank quiet route. Selected road closures to...	24.6% ± 10.8%			21.3% ± 10.3%	N
Old Dalkeith Road - Protected cycle lanes	22% ± 8.1%			32% ± 9.1%	N
Morningside Road - Extra pedestrian space	25.4% ± 6.2%			41.3% ± 7%	Y
Gilmerton Road - Protected cycle lanes	21.1% ± 9.5%			31% ± 10.8%	N
Comiston Road - Protected cycle lanes	23.9% ± 8.9%			35.2% ± 10%	N
Causewayside - Protected cycle lanes	19.2% ± 8.7%			35.9% ± 10.6%	N
Canaan Lane - Meadows to Greenbank quiet route. Selected road closures to create...	15.1% ± 8.2%			31.5% ± 10.7%	N
Buccleuch Street - Protected cycle lanes	12.7% ± 7.7%			35.2% ± 11.1%	Y
Bruntsfield Place - Extra pedestrian space	23.2% ± 7%			36.2% ± 8%	N
Braidburn Terrace - One-way road closure to create safer walking and cycling...	28.4% ± 9.8%			34.6% ± 10.4%	N
Braid Road - Road closure at Hermitage of Braid entrance. Note that it is proposed to...	33.3% ± 7.6%			34% ± 7.7%	N
Braid Avenue - Meadows to Greenbank quiet route. Selected road closures to create...	26.1% ± 8%			31.3% ± 8.5%	N
Willowbrae Road - Extra bus lanes and protected cycle lanes	26% ± 9.8%			22.1% ± 9.3%	N
Stanley Street - Road closure reducing traffic on very narrow road that forms a...	16.7% ± 13.3%			43.3% ± 17.7%	N
Seafield Street - Protected cycle lanes joining off-road cycle paths	19.1% ± 9.3%			41.2% ± 11.7%	Y
Portobello High Street - Extra pedestrian space	18.1% ± 6.4%			44.9% ± 8.3%	Y
Milton Road West - Extra bus Lanes and protected cycle lanes	34.8% ± 11.5%			25.8% ± 10.6%	N
London Road - Protected cycle lanes	18% ± 6.4%			37.4% ± 8%	Y
Kings Place - Road closure and parking removal linking Portobello and Seafield...	25.5% ± 12%			27.5% ± 12.2%	N
Hope Lane - Road closure reducing traffic on very narrow road that forms a...	20.4% ± 10.7%			29.6% ± 12.2%	N
Duddingston Road - Protected cycle lanes	26.4% ± 10.2%			34.7% ± 11%	N
Silverknowes Parkway - Protected cycle lanes	25% ± 10.6%			31.3% ± 11.4%	N
Silverknowes Road North - Road closure from Silverknowes Parkway to Marine Drive...	33.6% ± 8.2%			32% ± 8.1%	N
Pennywell Road - Protected cycle lanes	26.9% ± 12.1%			32.7% ± 12.7%	N
Muirhouse Parkway - Protected cycle lanes	22.4% ± 11.7%			40.8% ± 13.8%	N
Links Gardens - Road closure in middle of Leith Links	25.9% ± 9.5%			33.3% ± 10.3%	N
Ferry Road - Protected cycle lanes	25% ± 6.7%			39.4% ± 7.6%	Y
Crewe Road South - Protected cycle lanes	26.1% ± 9%			31.5% ± 9.5%	N
Arboretum Place - Relocation of parking at West Gate to provide safer pedestrian...	20.7% ± 8.5%			32.2% ± 9.8%	N
Waverley Bridge - Pedestrian area with limited access for deliveries etc	16.1% ± 5%			45.5% ± 6.7%	Y
Victoria Street - Pedestrian area with limited access for deliveries etc	14.3% ± 7.2%			39.6% ± 10%	Y
Tollcross - Extra pedestrian space	16.2% ± 5.8%			33.8% ± 7.5%	Y
Teviot Place - Protected cycle lanes	14.5% ± 9.3%			36.4% ± 12.7%	N
The Mound - Protected cycle lanes	21.6% ± 6.2%			36.8% ± 7.2%	Y
Raeburn Place, Stockbridge - Extra pedestrian space	21.5% ± 7.3%			33.9% ± 8.4%	N
Potterow - Protected cycle lanes	18.2% ± 9.3%			30.3% ± 11.1%	N
Princes Street East End - Buses/taxis/cycles only on Princes Street from North Bridge...	15.5% ± 4.8%			48.4% ± 6.6%	Y
George IV Bridge - Protected cycle lanes	17.9% ± 5.1%			40.4% ± 6.5%	Y
Forest Road - Protected cycle lanes	20.4% ± 7.4%			37.2% ± 8.9%	Y
Cockburn Street - Pedestrian area with limited access for deliveries etc	10.1% ± 5.2%			44.2% ± 8.6%	Y

Planned Schemes: 5 conclusive; 32 not conclusive

		Remove	Retain		
Slateford Road (A70) - Protected cycle lanes	12.2% ± 2.7%		13.4% ± 2.8%	N	
Queensferry Road - Extra bus Lanes and Protected cycle lanes	14.4% ± 2.9%		14.1% ± 2.8%	N	
Orchard Brae Roundabout - Road markings to reduce vehicle speeds and improve...	12.3% ± 2.7%		11.5% ± 2.6%	N	
Orchard Brae - Uphill protected cycle lane	12.3% ± 2.7%		10.8% ± 2.5%	N	
Murrayburn Road (short section at Longstone) - Protected cycle lanes	11% ± 2.5%		9.9% ± 2.4%	N	
Meadowplace Road/Ladywell Road - Cycle lanes and segregation	10.1% ± 2.4%		10.5% ± 2.5%	N	
Meadowplace Road - Protected cycle lanes	10.6% ± 2.5%		11.5% ± 2.6%	N	
Longstone Road - Protected cycle lanes	11.1% ± 2.6%		12.3% ± 2.7%	N	
Lanark Road - Protected cycle lanes	11.8% ± 2.6%		12.5% ± 2.7%	N	
Inglis Green Rd - Protected cycle lanes	11.1% ± 2.6%		9.8% ± 2.4%	N	
Hillview - Extra bus lanes and Protected cycle lanes	10.6% ± 2.5%		8.6% ± 2.3%	N	
Hillhouse Road - Extra bus lanes and Protected cycle lanes	11% ± 2.5%		9.9% ± 2.4%	N	
Drum Brae North - Protected cycle lanes	13.9% ± 2.8%		12.2% ± 2.7%	N	
Corstorphine High Street - Extra pedestrian space	14.8% ± 2.9%		17.8% ± 3.1%	N	
A90 Queensferry Road - Extra bus lanes and Protected cycle lanes	14.6% ± 2.9%		13.6% ± 2.8%	N	
Minto Street - Protected cycle lanes	12.7% ± 2.7%		14.2% ± 2.8%	N	
Mayfield Gardens - Protected cycle lanes	13.2% ± 2.7%		14.4% ± 2.9%	N	
Mayfield Road - Protected cycle lanes	13.6% ± 2.8%		16.1% ± 3%	N	
Liberton Dr (West of Alnwickhill Rd) - Protected cycle lane	12.2% ± 2.7%		14.8% ± 2.9%	N	
Craigmillar Park - Protected cycle lanes	14.1% ± 2.8%		14.9% ± 2.9%	N	
Braid Hills Road/Drive - Protected cycle lane	13.7% ± 2.8%		17.5% ± 3.1%	N	
Seaview Terrace - Protected cycle lane from Portobello prom to Musselburgh (in...	10.8% ± 2.5%		15.6% ± 2.9%	N	
Restalrig Road South (Smokey Brae) - Extra pedestrian space and uphill cycle lane	14.1% ± 2.8%		16.1% ± 3%	N	
Eastfield - Protected cycle lane from Portobello prom to Musselburgh (in partnership...	10.6% ± 2.5%		17% ± 3%	Y	
Duddingston Road West - Measures to help cyclists - to be designed	12.9% ± 2.7%		14.2% ± 2.8%	N	
West Harbour Rd/West Shore Rd - Measures to create a safer connection between...	9.8% ± 2.4%		16.5% ± 3%	Y	
Starbank Road - Extra pedestrian space	11.7% ± 2.6%		12.2% ± 2.7%	N	
Silverknowes Road (South section) - Protected cycle lanes and signed quiet route via...	13.2% ± 2.7%		17.7% ± 3.1%	N	
Silverknowes Road (North section) - This road has been closed to all traffic since May...	15.3% ± 2.9%		19% ± 3.2%	N	
Seafield Rd at Fillyside Road Crossing - New pedestrian/cyclist crossing point	10.3% ± 2.5%		17.2% ± 3.1%	Y	
South Bridge - Buses/taxis/cycles only northbound on South Bridge and North Bridge...	18.2% ± 3.1%		22.5% ± 3.4%	N	
Rodney Street - Protected cycle lanes	10.6% ± 2.5%		11.7% ± 2.6%	N	
Chambers Street - Temporary traffic lights at George IV Bridge Junction	15.3% ± 2.9%		16.5% ± 3%	N	
Canonmills - Protected cycle lanes	13.7% ± 2.8%		15.8% ± 3%	N	
Broughton Street - Extra pedestrian space and uphill cycle lane	13.2% ± 2.7%		19.7% ± 3.2%	Y	
Broughton Street Roundabout - Measures to help pedestrians and cyclists - to be...	12.5% ± 2.7%		19% ± 3.2%	Y	
Bellevue - Protected cycle lanes	11% ± 2.5%		11.8% ± 2.6%	N	

Schools Measures

There were 15 or fewer respondents (highlighted) for more than half of the schemes. It is concerning that 14 people said they were familiar with the Bonaly Primary scheme and 9 for the Juniper Green Primary scheme where no measures were in place at all before or during the survey, and no plans were publicly published. This shows a lack of understanding of what a Spaces for People measure is. As some of those respondents ticked they were familiar with other schemes, it calls into question whether they genuinely knew what they were responding about.

School	Retain	Remove	Base	%MoE95(Retain)	%MoE95(Remove)	Lowest high %	Highest low %	Conclusive?
BonalyPrimary	14%	14%	14	18.2	18.2	-4.2	32.2	NO
Boroughmuir High School	23%	16%	56	11.0	9.6	12.0	25.6	NO
BrunstanePrimary	44%	22%	9	32.4	27.1	11.6	49.1	NO
BruntsfieldPrimary	30%	18%	33	15.6	13.1	14.4	31.1	NO
Buckstone Primary	0%	0%	6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	NO
Carrick Knowe Primary	31%	13%	16	22.7	16.5	8.3	29.5	NO
CastleviewPrimary	50%	17%	6	40.0	30.1	10.0	47.1	NO
Corstorphine Primary	30%	11%	44	13.5	9.2	16.5	20.2	NO
Craigtinny Primary	27%	13%	15	22.5	17.0	4.5	30.0	NO
Craigour Park Primary	33%	0%	6	37.6	0.0	-4.6	0.0	NO
Currie Primary	18%	6%	17	18.3	11.3	-0.3	17.3	NO
Dalry Primary	34%	6%	32	16.4	8.2	17.6	14.2	YES
Davidsons Mains Primary	18%	23%	22	16.1	17.6	6.9	34.1	NO
Ferryhill Primary	0%	33%	9	0.0	30.7	33.0	0.0	YES
Granton Primary	30%	17%	23	18.7	15.4	11.3	32.4	NO
Gylemuir Primary	10%	30%	10	18.6	28.4	11.4	28.6	NO
Hermitage Park Primary	67%	7%	15	23.8	12.9	43.2	19.9	YES
Holy Cross RC Primary	23%	8%	13	22.9	14.7	0.1	22.7	NO
James Gillespies Primary	19%	23%	26	15.1	16.2	7.9	34.1	NO
Juniper Green Primary	44%	33%	9	32.4	30.7	11.6	63.7	NO
Leith Walk Primary	40%	11%	45	14.3	9.1	25.7	20.1	YES
Longstone Primary	40%	0%	15	24.8	0.0	15.2	0.0	YES
Lorne Primary	38%	0%	16	23.8	0.0	14.2	0.0	YES
Murrayburn Primary	14%	14%	14	18.2	18.2	-4.2	32.2	NO
Parsons Green Primary	15%	0%	13	19.4	0.0	-4.4	0.0	NO
Pentland Primary	20%	10%	10	24.8	18.6	-4.8	28.6	NO
PirniehallPrimary	29%	6%	17	21.6	11.3	7.4	17.3	NO
Preston Street Primary	24%	6%	17	20.3	11.3	3.7	17.3	NO
PrestonfieldPrimary	17%	8%	12	21.3	15.3	-4.3	23.3	NO
Rudolf Steiner School	0%	20%	10	0.0	24.8	20.0	0.0	YES
SciennesPrimary	35%	13%	23	19.5	13.7	15.5	26.7	NO
South Morningside Primary	24%	18%	33	14.6	13.1	9.4	31.1	NO
St Catherine's RC Primary	50%	0%	8	34.6	0.0	15.4	0.0	YES
St Francis/ Niddrie Mill Primary	9%	9%	11	16.9	16.9	-7.9	25.9	NO
St Georges School	27%	13%	15	22.5	17.0	4.5	30.0	NO
St John Vianney RC Primary	29%	14%	7	33.6	25.7	-4.6	39.7	NO
The Royal High School	22%	22%	27	15.6	15.6	6.4	37.6	NO
Victoria Primary	17%	17%	12	21.3	21.3	-4.3	38.3	NO

Appendix 3. Contradictory Responses in the Market Research Survey Data

[Back to Contents](#)

We present here an example of the contradictory responses provided by the Market Research Survey.

Time has limited our analysis only to the Schools Measures. We show that, even on this restricted question, the claim of strong support is not fully supported by the data.

Analysis

To be confident someone who says they support school schemes genuinely does, and genuinely knows what a school scheme is, we would reasonably expect certain responses.

We're looking for evidence the question has been understood, that those saying they support consistently show support and that they show evidence of understanding of what a scheme is.

If we don't get these responses then we ask - did people understand the questions in the way we intended? Are they genuine respondents or did they rush through a survey because they're paid to do it? Then we ask, looking at all this, do we have sufficient robust data to inform any recommendations or decisions?

The table below suggests that rather than being able to say that 223 people have genuinely used and support school measures, in the way the council has implemented them, support could be as low as 91. This was prior to planters being introduced that arguably caused new safety issues in some cases.

Support for school measures is reported as a 'given' throughout the report, but this should not be assumed. It is expected there will be genuine support at some schools, but this exercise is of little value in identifying them.

As previously mentioned, this is another example where responses suggest people support the 'idea' of safe roads round schools (and who wouldn't), but this research does not evidence support for WHAT and HOW the council have implemented.

What we would expect	Total sample	Exclusions	Expected responses
	583		
We would expect them to say they've used a school scheme.	Say they've not used a school scheme	-252	331 Used
We would expect them to say they 'support' school schemes if asked directly.	Say they don't support school schemes or are neutral	-108	223 Say they support - this seems to be the figure the council is relying on
We would expect them to be able to tick a school scheme they are familiar with, if they correctly understood the question about whether they'd used a school scheme or not	Can't name a scheme they're familiar with "unsure"	-47	176 Have ticked a scheme they are familiar with
We would not expect someone who genuinely supports school schemes in the way the council has implemented them to say they want 'none' retained	Don't want any school scheme retained "none" (not already excluded)	-22	154 Have ticked one or more they want retained or ticked "unsure" if want any retained
We would not expect someone who genuinely supports school schemes in the way the council has implemented them to be "unsure" about retaining any	Unsure want any retained (not already excluded)	-40	114 Have ticked one or more they want retained
We would not expect someone who genuinely supports school schemes in the way the council has implemented them, to list "harder and/or more dangerous for parents and children travelling to school" (not already excluded) - note 9 of these also contradicted themselves and put a benefit that its safer	Say they think 1 of their top 5 disadvantages is "Harder and/or more dangerous for parents and children travelling to school" (not already excluded) - note 9 of these also contradicted themselves and put a benefit that its safer	-12	102 Don't list any disadvantage relating to schemes making things harder or more dangerous around schools
We would not expect people who have understood what is meant by a school scheme to say they are familiar with a scheme that did not exist. By ticking this, they show they don't know what a scheme actually is.	Say they're familiar with Bonaly scheme which doesn't exist (not already excluded)	-6	96 Don't say they they are familiar with the Bonaly scheme that doesn't exist
We would not expect people who have understood what is meant by a school scheme to say they are familiar with a scheme that did not exist. By ticking this, they show they don't know what a scheme actually is.	Say they're familiar with Juniper Green scheme which doesn't exist (not already excluded)	-4	92 Don't say they are familiar with the Juniper Green scheme that doesn't exist
This is a 'maybe' but you'd MAYBE expect a supporter of schools measures to choose at least one benefit for Spaces for people scheme and not select "none of these" when offered benefits	Didn't pick any advantages of SFP schemes and chose "none of these" (not already excluded)	-1	91 Are able to choose at least one advantage of an SFP scheme
This is a "maybe" but you'd MAYBE expect real supporters of school measures to chose one of their top advantages as "Easier and safer for children and parents to walk or cycle to school"	Didn't pick easier and safer schools advantage in their top 5 advantages (not already excluded)	-32	59 Think that benefits for schools is in the top 5 advantages
There may be other schools that didn't exist that would justify removal of those responses	TBC - could be more		

Appendix 4. Representation of People With Disabilities in the Market Research Survey Data

[Back to Contents](#)

According to the council's [Equality and Diversity Framework 2021 - 2025](#), on p13 it states that 32% of the Edinburgh population has a disability of some kind.

Yet, unlike the consultation, the survey did not have a question along the lines of "Do you have any long-term illness, health problem or disability that limits your ability to carry out day-to-day activities?"

In the questions about more frequent modes of transport, wheelchairs and mobility scooters were lumped in with bus, car, taxi etc, creating a dilemma for someone in a wheelchair who uses these modes of transport with their wheelchair. Which mode should they say they use most?

Therefore, although 8 people said they used a wheelchair in the early questions on modes of transport in a Spaces for People scheme, data for most common modes of transport show only one wheelchair user for during the pandemic (respondent 209 who also uses a taxi and motorcycle) and one for before the pandemic (respondent 131: who also used a bus and walked).

Therefore we do not have confidence that the findings from the survey properly represent disabled people including wheelchair users and the survey cannot be checked to ensure it is statistically representative for these groups.

Q15 "During the pandemic, what forms of transport have you most often used when travelling around Edinburgh? (including for short trips to the local shop etc, and leisure trips, as well as longer journeys around town)."

Most often

Value	Count	Percent
Walk	145	24.87%
Bus	235	40.31%
Car	160	27.44%
Taxi/Private hire car	7	1.20%
None	5	0.86%
Cycle	19	3.26%
Wheelchair or mobility scooter	1	0.17%
Motorcycle	2	0.34%
Tram	7	1.20%
Other	2	0.34%

2nd most often

Value	Count	Percent
Car	111	19.20%
Bus	162	28.03%
Cycle	33	5.71%
Taxi/Private hire car	41	7.09%
Walk	178	30.80%
Tram	26	4.50%
None	24	4.15%

Other	2	0.35%
Motorcycle	1	0.17%

3rd most often

Value	Count	Percent
None	102	18.41%
Taxi/Private hire car	52	9.39%
Cycle	40	7.22%
Walk	151	27.26%
Bus	78	14.08%
Car	77	13.90%
Tram	43	7.76%
Other	7	1.26%
Motorcycle	4	0.72%

Appendix 5. Comments of Respondents to the Market Research Survey

[Back to Contents](#)

30% of respondents who had used a scheme took the time to leave comments. Of these, 61% left opposing comments and only 20% supportive comments.

Even 8% those who claimed to support every type of Spaces for People scheme in the tick box questions left opposing comments.

If people understood what a Spaces for People scheme was, we would have expected the sentiment of comments to largely align with the sentiment of support. **Overall the selected support and sentiment of the comments are at odds which makes the results unclear.**

The following table takes ALL the comments supporting and opposing (for those who have used and not used) for analysis by individual question. Neutral comments have been excluded.

Question numbers refer to the numbering used as column headers in the SMG spreadsheet.

Question	Comments Supporting Spaces for People	Comments opposing Spaces for People
Question 13: If you wish to make a comment about measures you would like to remain in place, including suggested modifications, you may do so here:	38	111
Question 20: Schemes that are in place If you wish to make a comment about measures you would like to see removed, you may do so here:	14	72
Question 26: Schemes that don't exist yet If you wish to make a comment about any of these new measures that you would like to stay in place you may do so here:	7	45
Question 32: Schemes that don't exist yet If you wish to make a comment about any of these new measures that you would like to be removed you may do so here:	6	47

Question 13

Comments in Favour of Retaining Measures (38)

All of these measures make the city more pleasant to live in, pandemic or no pandemic.

Anything to keep the cyclists off the pavements. Easily accessible bus stops. When I used to get out and about, I'd find myself walking long distances to get to a bus stop. This is a particular problem when going from Semple street back out west. You either have to walk back to Lothian road, or quite far onward past the school, where the bus stop is in a popular area for dope smokers and opportunists in daytime and darkness. It's strangely secluded. I was on my own there on Wednesday back of 6pm, after getting my covid vaccine at the conference centre in Morrison street. I am only 5ft with a walking stick and 2 dope smokers who joined the stop, and a street dweller passing with his bags, felt they could comment on what I was wearing.

Anything which makes walking and cycling safer and helps reduce pollution from exhaust fumes

city centre without vehicle allowing walking to be enjoyed

Happy with the cycle lanes, it's about time we moved to a more bike friendly city

I am easy either way although I use car allot more now days.

I am generally for all measures, except when making more space for pedestrians results in less space for cyclist/narrower roads, making cycling more dangerous

I am generally in favour of these measures, but have concern about the poor design of some. In particular, cycleways and extra footway space must not be put in place by sacrificing bus lanes and reducing bus priority, which is essential to retain. An existing 4 lane road would be better converted by relining the road as 0.5 cycle lane, 1 bus lane, 1 (one way) traffic lane, 1 bus lane, 0.5 cycle lane, with the traffic lane for the other direction following a similar layout on a parallel road instead. North Bridge should also be added as a priority cycle route as it is much less steep than the Mound (which I rarely use (cycling) in the uphill direction because of this).

I am looking forward to more pedestrian space on South Bridge, where the pavements are very narrow, and I often have to walk on the road particularly at bus stops. As a pedestrian, I find walking beside a cycle lane much less stressful than walking directly beside car traffic. Edinburgh council is doing a good job, I am sure other councils in Scotland will eventually follow in helping pedestrians, cyclists and disabled people.

I can see the benefit to some of the protected cycle lanes, but not when they coincide with parking bays outside shops such as at Buckstone as it makes it difficult for elderly people to park. The closure of Braid Road has lead to more traffic on Comiston Road which forces us to use Braid Hills Road for our journey to provide care for family in the Blackford/Grange area. Each time we make this journey we now have to travel 2km furthur. How can the Council justify this extra contribution to the pollution levels in Edinburgh? Roads such as Braid road play a vital role in easing congestion on Comiston Road and providing shorter, less polluting routes for residents. An alternative would be to install traffic lights at the Braid Road Hermitage roundabout to make it safer whilst still allowing two way traffic on Braid Road. There could even be a phase on the lights first for cyclists to make their turn ahead of cars. To make more space for cyclists on Braidburn Terrace the council could provide grants for residents there to build a parking space on their front gardens.

I do not drive and so I'm very much in favour of increased space for walking, but please try to separate walkers from cyclists - they constantly interrupt the ability to walk, with many cycling either too fast or without great control!

I like it very much

I love any measures that increase quite spaces in the city, the pandemic has shown the potential of what the city could be going into the future

I support measures to protect cyclists on main roads with fast moving traffic, however the biggest problem I have experienced is the removal of parking spaces in local shopping areas including Bruntsfield, Morningside and Stockbridge. It has been massively offputting for customers of shops there as they wanted to drive and park rather than use public transport because of covid, but were unable to do so. These independent shops are crippled by the lack of customers and difficulty in receiving deliveries while the parking is suspended, and when they are operating under such heavy restrictions anyway the parking was / is just another nail in their coffin. Please support these independents - they are far more valuable to our communities than the big chain shops in out of town retail parks, and also directly support my personal income as I run my own business supplying them with stock!

I think all measures that encourage walking and cycling (and use of public transport) and discourage car use should be retained as long as these do not produce adverse impacts on other roads in terms of increased traffic and pollution. The citizens of Edinburgh need to be persuaded to leave their cars at home when travelling around the city in order to reduce pollution and traffic congestion.

I think it's important to happen as I've been to Sweden and they have all pavements split for cycles and people. It's important to encourage less use of cars for small journeys when people can walk but also needs to take into account that some people do need to use cars due to health

I think most of them should be permanent

I think the restrictions could be flexible: winter time with bad weather restrictions could be applied for time slot (for example 3-4 hours per day late in the morning to early in the afternoon in city centre)

I think they are great

I would like more extra pedestrian spaces

I would like to see as much of Edinburgh designed to favour walking, public transport and cycling as possible and any measures to discourage car use put in place urgently.

It's not on the list but I was sad to see the removal of extra pedestrian space on Great Junction street- it made it much easier to social distance

Most importantly look at closing road to traffic through Holyrood Park

Need to be more continuous bits of wider pavement. Eg in Stockbridge there are little patches when need a full stretch and to get rid of bins and other clutter particularly on south side of street.

Need to make protected lanes more robust in order to prevent deliberate vandalism

Only thought must be given to not duplicate existing safe cycle routes. For instance, nobody needs to cycle on Ferry Road at all, as there are good cycle links here already in an E-W direction, and I have often used them, all the way from the bridge at the East end of Davidson's Mains to Leith.

Overall a good idea as traffic is a nightmare as a pedestrian

Please help keep people safe more

please ensure the protected spaces are just that - either by physical measures, or proper messaging and enforcement

Please keep them where they are they are really helpful

retain the open safe spaces anywhere they cause minimum disruption to traffic flow or are on main arteries into the city centre

Safer cycling routes would encourage me to cycle to work

The premise is really valuable but would need to be managed on a more permanent way with proper infrastructure

The road beside my daughter's school Brunstine has now closed off a road to make it safer for children and adults and should stay like that

These things are fine but come at making it harder and harder for people to get around the city on other forms of transport, including public transport

We have to cut down on car emissions so the sooner the new systems are set up the better

We need more cyclists in the streets and fewer cars. They should have specific days of the week when cars MUST not be allowed to be used. It is causing so much pollution and inconvenience to people who prefer to lead a healthy lifestyle!

Would love to see them all stay. Don't back down!

Question 13

Comments in Favour of Removing Measures (111)

1. Concerned about traffic congestion affecting buses reliability once traffic returns to normal levels.
2. Not at all fond of any measures related to cyclists - they just slow down/hold up buses which impacts on bus reliability.

Adam McVey and the SNP should be facing their constituents with this rather than hiding behind survey. Lesley McInnes should never be allowed near transport infrastructure ever again. She is an absolute embarrassment

Adam McVey should have the courage to face the public with these proposals rather than hide behind surveys like a coward

all this has done is move the traffic - not reduced it

As a central Edinburgh resident since 1976 neither I nor any of my neighbours or local businesses were consulted on any of these so called temporary measures. As a Resident Parking Permit holder I and many others have been robbed of desperately needed parking spaces we have paid good money for. As a lifelong SNP supporter and voter I will find it nearly impossible to vote either nationally or locally for them; law abiding car owners are being treated with disregard and contempt.

Awful idea that will increase traffic

bollards and poles for cycle lanes could cause severe injury, and many are dangerously positioned

Cars need flippin roads

Changes to traffic lanes in Mayfield gardens have effectively moved the centre of the road and result in bus and cycling lanes changing sides at points on the way. Some drivers, unfamiliar with the road centre change, risk clashes with oncoming traffic.

Council needs to be honest that these are nothing to do with COVID whereas it's increasing cycle lanes by the back door

Craigmillar beside Lidl supermarket.

Cycle lanes are a waste of space and slows the flow of traffic

ding suggested modifications

Dont trust the council to make this work. Ould prefer them t try one road change

ested modification

Extra space

Feel it's an inconvenience and wasted money. Really hard as a driver at times as it can be tight on some roads!!!

Fountainbridge

Get rid of them all before a serious accident or fatality occurs.

I am happy with the previous painting on roads to indicate cycle lanes. I do not like the current space for people because when there was heavy snow on the cycle lanes, these areas could not be cleared because of the poles sticking up. My partially sighted mother-in-law has almost tripped and fall because of this "space for people". It is a wasted of money.

I am very saddened by this work the state of the roads and pavements around Edinburgh is atrocious. Some of these markings that are bing done just now are being painted over POTHOLEES. The money should be bing sent on bringing the current road and pavement network up to standard. It is embarrassing to see the work being done. Even the fixing of potholes and pavements the

standard of work is awful. Please look at this before putting in measures that just cause more problems than they solve.

I do not see how more cyclist make the streets safer. It is very dangerous with so many cyclist on sidewalks, parks and even on Holyrood Park and Salisbury Crags. You should not put together the benefits of people walking with the danger of having to share the roads with feral cyclist. I prefer to share the roads with cars than with bicycles or scooters.

I don't drive, do not have children, and am rarely out and about in any of the specified streets, so this has very little effect on me

I don't want any to remain - this is ill thought through, and panders solely to cyclists who don't pay anything towards the road network, and ignore traffic regulations anyway, so they will only occasionally use these measures when it suits them - and continue to use pavements etc. when it pleases them

i dont really know, all the places are not beside me so cannot comment

I hardly see any body using them. Waste of time/money in my opinion

I have been staying home during covid so have little experience to make judgement.

I have no objection to cycle lanes or more space for pedestrians but the hideous black and white poles should be removed.

I live at Roseburn and work in town and despite their being dedicated off and on road cycle lanes, cyclists still cycle on the pavements.

I should like to have added a substantial number (more than 5) reasons why the measures were inconvenient

I think it should go back to the way it was

I think that leaving spaces for people in post pandemic times will cause traffic congestions in already congested streets. Instead Council should spend the money for the roads repairs that make Edinburgh looking like a third world country.

i think the pandemic has made people with small buneses harder to live i feel it a world wide scam

I wish for all of these measures to be removed.

I would appreciate if there was more done for drivers rather than everything being around walkers or cyclist

ing suggested modificatio

ing suggested modifications

Introduce rules for cyclists to follow - i.e. no weaving through traffic, must wear a helmet and high vis jacket, no going from road to pavement and back to road,etc

It is hard to find the right balance between providing more space for pedestrians and leaving enough parking space for employees who work in those areas

It is simply a farce

It is sometimes not clear whether some measures apply to pedestrians or cyclists

Made it so much harder for people with disabilities - fewer disabled parking places available and longer distances to cover. As usual disabled people are at the bottom of the CEC priority pile.

Many of the measures are unsightly. I hope that the Streetscape will be improved in due course.

Measures should only remain in place if an analysis of the impact on road users has been done.

More money wasted by Edinburgh council and the Scottish government

more parking restrictions on main roads e.g corstorphine high street

more pedestrian streets in the city centre, the air pollution is getting pretty bad

More priority to pedestrians when crossing roads. Some crossings don't change until after 60 seconds and would like to see more zebra crossings in the side streets

More signages

most if not all the measure should be removed, dangerous and ill thought out, not to mention confusing for all involved

most of the spaces are currently causing issues for both foot and road traffic and are the vast majority are not required as footfall in these areas is low and existing pavements are sufficient

Need to stop cyclists using pedestrian space on Waverley Bridge - it looks like a cycle lane

no every journey I would normally take or have taken.

none of the measures should remain it is a gross waste of Edinburgh council tax payers money especially it is all about cyclists that don't pay any tax for using the potholed roads the floating parking is dangerous. it is well known in edinburgh the council dont want cars in town they would like to have a car free centre of town the council is not fit for purpose

None of them. Cyclists use the pavements now so why should I support cycle lanes. Pot holes in the road are more urgent and important than cycle lanes. Lothian Road has cars parked in the middle of the road and the cycle path next to the pavement. A parked car could be parked and either the passenger or driver gets out. Opens the car door right into a cyclist in the cycle lane. People trying to get into their drives have to cross a cycle path to access their drive. TOTAL WASTE OF MONEY

none of them...disagree 100% what happens when traffic returns to normal...CHAOS..

None should remain - they are dangerous and the fact that the council have taken advantage of a health crisis to install these death traps is repugnant.

None. Abuse of Emergency powers.

Not enough space in Edinburgh. We need no modifications

Not in favour of measures as disabled people's needs have not been considered.

Painting on the road indicating cycle lanes is good enough.

Parts of roads are narrow and dangerous. Crossing cycle paths the get on the bus is dangerous. Disabled parking spaces are in stupid places not suitable for disabled people. I wonder how long it will be til there is an accident that could have been avoided if these measures were not in place

Pedestrian improvements must be given priority, unlike the approach taken so far which is hugely weighted to cycle lanes

people use pavement not cycle lanes

Places For People is negatively affecting Bruntsfield businesses & shops and many may close as a result

Please do not make cycle lanes on the pavements!!! You are taking up too much pedestrian space in favour of bikes. This is unacceptable. Bikes can cycle on the road. It is very dangerous to share pavement with cyclists as many of them are speeding. Please bear this in mind. I understand you want more people to use bikes but why van they cycle on lanes and road...

please make all roads works made during the night time. Thank you

Please minimise the use of bulky or unsightly road barriers and aim to reduce the density of street furniture

Put thing back to the way they were before the council weaponised covid.

Putting cycling lanes between pavements and parked cars is a particularly stupid mechanism, that should never have been done

Remove all - bad for people and business

Road closures are causing upset to residents in streets that have found themselves on the receiving end of the increased diverted traffic. Drivers are having to cover longer distances producing more pollution and clogging up minor rather than major roads.

road closures cause traffic to be relocated to other busy streets increasing the congestion

suggested modifications

The black and white sticks are unsightly and the road closure drives me mad.

The council didn't clear the snow from the cycle lanes - this meant that bikes and cars were sharing a narrower road making cycling more dangerous. The measures to widen pavements (eg Stockbridge, Corstorphine etc) are no use because they still have kerbs in the middle - so wheelchair, mobility scooter and pram users do not benefit from this. it is now much more difficult for disabled people to get parked near to shops in these areas and the roads are narrowed for cyclists. Stockbridge is just a mess. If the council wanted to encourage cycling they would fix the many potholes on Edinburgh's roads - it is unsafe to cycle after dark. Note that people are using their cars because they are scared of catching coronavirus on public transport.

The crewe Road cycling lane hinders ambulances as cars can not get out the way. Also faster cyclists can't really use these lanes as other cyclists are too slow

The current arrangements are a mess. Existing cycle routes ignored by most cyclists

The cycle barriers on comiston road are dangerous and stupid

the grey clocks that mark out the extra space for pedestrians in Dalry Road are potentially very not to see and therefore to trip over. I'm sure footed, don't wear headphones and have reasonably good eyesight but I've nearly tripped several times. The little lights on the blocks don't give enough warning that some of what's grey is raised and is a tripping hazard. I think they could result in some nasty accidents with oncoming cars. I do appreciate the extra space though. I think it's particularly at corners/junctions that there could be problems, accidents and injuries.

The motorist continues to suffer

The new weird car-parking in the road with cycle lane inside it, on the Lanark Road between Gillespie Crossroads and Longstone is one of the stupidest measures I have ever seen. As I cyclist, it's massively dangerous with car doors opening into the cycle lane - particularly near the nursery. Please get rid of it - there is plenty of room on that road, and the new measures confuse people and probably increase danger to cyclists.

The permanent closure of Whitehouse Loan at the junction with Strathearn Road is of particular concern to me as traffic is even now being redirected along Hope Terrace and Clinton Road. This situation will worsen as lockdown lifts and schools return normal. Neither of those streets are suitable for an increase in traffic.

The roads are a dangerous place with the insistence of the government to keep bicycles on roads. I'm aware of the highway code and of the constant answer of "no one owns the roads" but down here at ground level, its becoming a major problem. Build more cycle paths and keep everyone safe by not allowing bikes on roads, the reason I mention this is this spaces for people initiative is just encouraging more people out on bikes and when this pandemic is over, the problem will still be here. Also the school parents are basically ignoring the road closed signs around my area which in a place where parking is already limited, its causing real problems. I don't know what else to say?

The roads are too narrow

The spaces for people is a waste of time and money. Its about the council pushing their needs and agenda

There are both pros and cons for each road so it is difficult to decide

There should be none . They're dangerous . Another vanity project for MacInnnes and McVey !!!

There's no point putting measures in place if there are ignored, like at Murrayburn Primary, where the closed road is opened by motorists who want to drive through

These have been forced through without consultation and with little justification while people have been isolating. Done by stealth

These initiatives appear to hardly impact South Queensferry. As usual we are forgotten by the rest of the City.

These measure have been brought in at a time when we are facing a world wide pandemic. So far all they have done is increased congestion, increased my journey time, cost lots of money and painted the road in a ridiculous way. Money would be better spent fixing potholes.

These new barriers that have been put on the roads for cycle lanes do not make me feel safer.

These should be for pedestrians, however the vast majority have been poorly planned and implemented cycle lanes and inappropriate road closures.

They don't help

They often don't make any sense. They affect local businesses because people can't park near them anymore so are less likely to shop local and will drive elsewhere with parking. Places like the braids closures have a massive impact on traffic and serve no benefit for walkers and cyxlists

THIS IDEA IS AN INVASION OF PEOPLES RIGHTS

This new development is completely useless and has to be removed

Those poles intended to protect the cycles will only make it worse for everybody. Please remove them.

Totally unnecessary and prohibitively expensive to rate payers.

Tree huggers gone amok

Unfortunately I have seen very little increase in people using the extra walking and more so cycling area, particularly on the outskirts of the city centre. I have seen traffic queuing which will add to the carmon monoxide problem as traffic is delayed.

Unnecessary and a complete waste of a lot of money urgently needed to repair and resurface roads and pavements

Very poorly thought out and forced on residents without proper consultation

Walking up Abbeyhill is particularly distressing as pollution from vehicles has nowhere to disperse; also one gets splashed while walking there on rainy days. I respectfully request that this is made a more pleasant walking route. It is an embarrassing road, it being so neat Holyrood too..Thank you.

waste of time and money

Well, I'm a normal commuter who predominantly uses public transport and walking. occasionally cycling with more guarded roads would be nice and peaceful as it reduces threat of getting accidents

What happened to free bus for children

What's the point, take Lanark Rd for instance. Council put it out for duscussion/concerns and out of the approx 1300 reply almost 90% was against the proposals but a few weeks later the work started. Obviously it was a done del and the council were only doing a box ticking exercise with the residents

Whole concept is ill considered and a waste of money.

You have taken the opportunity to impose draconian measures using a temporary law. It is causing chaos and I hope you suffer a huge backlash.

Question 20

Comments in Favour of Retaining Measures (14)

All schemes have had some positive benefits with very few significant drawbacks

all the measures serve a purpose. Even where a lane is not full of cyclists, it keeps the cars further away from pedestrians.

I am generally for all measures, except when making more space for pedestrians results in less space for cyclist/narrower roads, making cycling more dangerous

I think all measures should be retained where this is practical and the majority of local residents in those areas are happy with these.

I think we should still have them for the foreseeable future

I would not like to see any off my routes removed at all...

Keep it please

No everything is fine

None should be removed. What should be removed is access to cars in lots of streets.

please ignore the motoring lobby, esp when they pretend they are actually speaking up for minority or disadvantaged groups

Removing any would be a retrograde step.

should remain

The cycle lane on Lanark Road between Gillespie crossroads and Lonsstone

there is no point in just doing this once but not continual!

Question 20

Comments in Favour of Removing Measures (72)

1. Stop penalising bus users with your obsession with cyclists. 2. Do something about the badly sequenced traffic lights in the city centre and at the roundabout at the bottom of Leith Street - they just cause congestion and delay hundreds of passengers using buses.

Adam McVey and the SNP should be facing their constituents with this rather than hiding behind survey. Lesley McInnes should never be allowed near transport infrastructure ever again. She is an absolute embarrassment

Again, please make parking available in again in local shopping communities such as Stockbridge, Bruntsfield and Morningside. The independent shops here are already crippled by government restrictions - the inability for them to receive deliveries or for their customers to park is just another nail in the coffin when they really need your support.

all need removed to benefit business, pollution and everyone

All of them, the money could have been spent on all the pot holes. I have not seen more people walking or cycling due to the measures. We may be in lockdown but as many people before lockdown are still on the roads in cars and at the shops

All removed would be best

All the polls sticking out near bus stops because they create a hazard when partially sighted people trying to cross the roads.

All the protected cycle lanes need removed. They are dangerous

As before, doesn't affect me

Braid Road and Links Gardens must be removed given the impact of traffic on surrounding roads. These areas are bad now given its relatively quiet and will be horrendous as traffic rises to normal levels. Bus services must to be hindered by any of the spaces for people measures. The consultation by CEC on the measures has been atrocious in general.

Bruntsfield Place as Places for People increased pedestrianisation is killing Brintsfield Place businesses

chaos again from the council

Complete waste of money

Difficult to work out

Edinburgh council are obsessed with cycle lanes if this is the case then cyclists should have to contribute to using the roads they are nothing but a pest

Edinburgh Council should have spent the money wasted on these measures to repair the roads and pavements to make them safer for all users. Hitting a pothole on a bicycle must be extremely hazardous.

Extended walkways do not work. You have to come off the pavement and this is unsafe for wheelchair users, buggies. Elderly

far too many botched measures. The bus gate at the east end is confusing, you don't see the signage until you are already committed to the road. They maybury road crossing has closed a lane of traffic for no reason at all.

Funnily enough the Council has no money to remove all these impediments so I don't expect any will be removed

Get rid of cycle lane barriers on south Edinburgh

go back to the way it was

Having the road closed by Hermitage just means that only rich people who live within walking distance can enjoy the green spaces as the rest of us have no where to park.

How dare the council take advantage of a pandemic to install these woke discriminatory deathtraps

I have seen very little usage of these areas. Only ones I have seen have been standing chatting and cause difficulty for others to pass. This surely has achieved the opposite to what was intended.

I haven't felt the impact of these measures, so have no desire to see them removed.

I would like to see all measures removed a complete waste of time

I've already been in touch asking for the measures outside my flat to be partially removed, I have extreme fatigue which causes mobility problems and can only walk very short distances. Its no longer possible for my family to park their car right outside my door, as a result I haven't been out since January and had to borrow a wheelchair to get from my front door to the car last time I went out.

It seems that you would try to hurt people

Just a waste of money

less money

Make area more chaotic

money would be better spent filling in the potholes

No benefit

Obstructs traffic particularly buses and are a trip hazard - very dangerous - space is wasted and never used - bad original idea

Over taking a bicycle on a road, is terrifying and dangerous as it is. Making roads narrower is asking for more accidents.

Please remove restrictions on Silverknowes Road. There is no reason to make changed to this road. There is plenty of space for all users.

Protected cycle lanes are more dangerous for everyone who uses the road. It was very clear during the recent bad weather that they impede the ability of gritters and ploughs to effectively clear the roads and they seem to collect dried leaves in the autumn. Unless the council will commit to clearing them, they are dangerous for cyclists. They also prevent cars from pulling over and/or parking safely, making travel more dangerous for drivers and pedestrians.

Remove all cycling paths from the pavements. What a silly idea to take away pedestrian spaces in favour of bikes. Very dangerous for pedestrians.

Remove all those ugly poles designed to protect the bicycles but only creating danger for everybody. Better fix the millions of potholes!!!

remove all, impacts emergency vehicles trying to get past and restricts parking for disabled

Remove most of these badly thought out measures. They create annoyance, thereby endangering the safety of all road users. Annoyance on the roads leads to increase in risk of serious consequences.

remove the bolards

Remove them all please

Remove things that are making disabled access difficult

Road closures are causing upset to residents in streets that have found themselves on the receiving end of the increased diverted traffic. Drivers are having to cover longer distances producing more pollution and clogging up minor rather than major roads. Cycle lanes have absolutely NO cyclists in them at various times throughout the day. Where there are breaks in the cycle lanes to let buses get near the bus stops, cars cannot pass because there is insufficient room to pass the bus because of a traffic island in the middle of the road. I have a partially sighted neighbour who has walked into and stumbled over the newly installed cycles lane poles and their fixtures to the the tarmac.

Same in regards to last point. Doesn't give much room for cars and feel they are an inconvenience

See previous comments about removing poles.

So many of these measures are nothing to do with COVID and some of the designs are poor. Impacts on public transport when city gets back to normalcy in the summer will be terrible, ditto negative impacts on adjacent streets from the closures such as Braid Road and Links Gardens. The look of the schemes are generally awful.

Some pedestrian spaces with bollards just don't make sense, as they are in spaces where either there is not enough pedestrians passing, but the traffic is huge(better use it for safe cycle lanes), or the traffic is just too big to take space from the road, hence better to invest in cycle lanes, clearly marked and safe. I support pedestrian spaces in main city centre though.

The bollards are dangerous. They get hit and go flying. Many are too close to junctions. They look absolutely terrible and spoil our beautiful city.

The Braid Road closure. I would wish to see it reopened both ways. It's closure has resulted in more traffic on Comiston Road. Or journey to the Blackford/Grange area takes 2km longer if we travel on Braid Hills Road to avoid the hold ups on Comiston Road. We are therefore contributing more to pollution levels which goes against the Council's aims. I fear the congestion on Comiston Road and closure of Braid Road will make it more difficult for ambulances to reach the outer suburbs. Braid Road used to enable residents to make shorter, less polluting journeys and help the flow of traffic. It could be made safer by installing traffic lights at the Hermitage roundabout.

The council should be concentrating their money on other things than Spaces for People which is causing more problems than good.

The council should just be honest with their intentions.

The cycle lanes at the top of the Mound are particularly dangerous. Buses going downhill have to turn left at the Bank of Scotland - and they can't do this on their own side of the road. This is an accident waiting to happen.

The extra space for pedestrians hardly gets used it takes away parking for people to pop into the shops... the shop trade (when it is open is affected by the pedestrian sections).

The measures are counter productive. A cycle lane which is currently being widened has only one or two cyclists an hour using it. Total waste of money when potholes etc go unrepaired

The measures have made it so much harder for people with disabilities - fewer disabled parking places available and longer distances to cover. As usual disabled people are at the bottom of the CEC priority pile.

the present measures are bad for retailers and are accidents waiting to happen.

The protected cycle lanes in Duddingston Road will cause more congestion locally. When schools and nurseries are fully back it will force parents to park in narrower side streets. Although I live within walking distance of the area I unfortunately have to use the car to drop children off at two different nurseries to ensure I arrive in Central Edinburgh in time for work starting. Have the council consulted local residents on the practicalities of this? No. I would hate to be a resident living on the street who doesn't have a drive way but now can't park their car outside their house. Likewise the cycle lanes will actually cause more congestion once there is more traffic in the road. All that has happened at my son's nursery is that instead of parking further away parents now bump up on the pavement, which is a much greater risk to safety.

The road closure at Links Gardens should be reinstated due to the congestion being caused on surrounding roads in the area. There is plenty of space for walking, cycling and other activities within Leith Links itself.

The road closures around Woodburn terrace to the meadows are particularly inconvenient and lead to increased traffic on Morningside road as that is the only alternative route. This in turn leads to worse pollution in that area. Also the space for people on Morningside road has led to the road being too narrow outside the Churchill theatre as the bus stop already comes out in to the road and the new space for people on the other side means that a bus and a car cannot pass each other at that point, leading to more congestion and with the potential for an accident to happen if the two vehicles come too close to each other.

The specific design of the bus stop boarders and cycle lanes on George IV Bridge need rethinking. They are far from ideal and a potential hazard for bus passengers unused to them. The Council received masses of bad publicity about these (reflecting badly on all SfP schemes) because of this ill-thought-out layout. In any permanent arrangement, the cycle lane should pass behind the bus stop, as on Leith Walk.

There are far too many of these restrictions and they haven't been properly thought out or consulted on

These death traps which discriminate against the elderly, disabled and drivers, should immediately be removed. This is not and never will be Amsterdam. The delusion and communist attitude of the council is nothing short of atrocious.

These should be for pedestrians, however the vast majority have been poorly planned and implemented cycle lanes and inappropriate road closures. Braid Road, links gardens and the road down from silverknowes should be reopened. Braid a road and Links gardens are both terrible schemes for creating huge congestion on adjacent streets

They don't help and make congestion worse

too great a disruption to general traffic flow

TOTAL WASTE OF MONEY SPEND THE MONEY ON SOMETHING LIKE OUR ROADS
CRUMBLING INSTEAD OF WASTING MONEY ON SILLY SILLY THINGS

unnecessary

very hard to comment on these issues during lockdown in COVID 19 I am not able to access many of these areas due to the restrictions

Waste of money

Waste of money and likely to destroy local businesses

Question 26

Comments in Favour of Retaining Measures (7)

again keep the least disruptive measures

I can't wait to see that protected cycle lane from Portobello promenade to Musselburgh, that is going to be lovely!!! I would cycle that route every weekend.

I think all should stay in place where this is practical.

If Braid Road is reopened, parking should be banned on both sides of the road between Braidburn Terrace and the Braid Hills Hotel.

more pedestrian spaces

removing anything which makes roads safer for pedestrians and cyclists would also be a retrograde step. Not to mention that a reduction in traffic density and speed will improve air quality

These are better for pedestrians

Question 26

Comments in Favour of Removing Measures (45)

Adam McVey and the SNP should be facing their constituents with this rather than hiding behind survey. Lesley McInnes should never be allowed near transport infrastructure ever again. She is an absolute embarrassment

All completely unnecessary but of course no one at the Council ever listens to what anyone in Edinburgh thinks despite us paying their wages and salaries.

All measures should be reversed and no more put in place

Along queensferry road the lines are being put over potholes!!!!!!

Difficulties regarding all issues

Do not take away pedestrian space in favour of bikes. Thank you

Get rid now

Get rid of them all

get the roads back to what they were built for...traffic pavements are for people..

hate edinburgh council

I haven't really been out much in the last 12 months so it is hard to judge.

I only walk around my house since the pandemic so even if I read on the news papers about the modifications on the roads I did not see most of them. I just do not like so many bicycles everywhere, even in spaces for pedestrians.

I want all measures removed and edinburgh council to fix the many potholes

I would like to know what is the status of the very wide pavement on Niddrie Mains Road. When the road was narrowed, I assumed the extra space would be for a cycle lane, This would be very useful for the new Secondary School in Niddrie.

Is this just to make everything harder for drivers? I don't see anything being done to help them.

It is generally a question of balance between users. Would not be an issue if all roads/pavements could be widened. but most of the measures in place or planned have limited benefits that in my view do not justify the disbenefits to road users

It just seems such a waste of money.

More signages

Most were unnecessary and unused. Money could have been used for better purposes.

not at all keep everything as it is thanks.

Our streets are not wide enough to make cycle lanes, it's a disgrace how cyclists have priority and pay nothing

Please do not turn the Powderhall railway line into a cycle path, please use it instead as part of a new tram/train system to alleviate traffic and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Please stop pushing protected cycle lanes. They are dangerous.

Remove all and stop more

Remove them all and KEEP EDINBURGH MOVING

Seems that cyclists, who do not pay a penny towards roads etc, are a priority in Edinburgh now with city council trying to slowly exclude cars. In reality we would love to be walking/cycling to work school etc but the Scottish weather doesn't allow us so cars are necessary..

Some of the measures look horrendous for general traffic flow. A90 and Sputh bridge in particular are so bad

Some of the proposals such as the a90 cycle lanes are awful ideas for congestion and are nothing to do with Covid. They are installations of cycle lanes by the back door

Some of these designs will severely impact movement of public transport around the city such as a90 and queensferry road. Closure of south bridge is utterly bonkers as where is the general traffic meant to go other than onto less appropriate side roads

Stop using covid as a reason to do all this.

The council needs to be fair and actually consult residents before putting new measures in place.

The last thing Edinburgh needs after a pandemic are these measures which endanger life, discriminate against vulnerable people and businesses

The main problem is that these measures will lead to traffic congestion and increased air pollution due to more start-stop traffic.

There are far too many

There are some that I do not know the details of, so am therefore unable to comment for or against.

These measures have made it so much harder for people with disabilities - fewer disabled parking places available and longer distances to cover. As usual disabled people are at the bottom of the CEC priority pile.

These measures only make it more risky for the bicycle users

They are awful - look and feel like third world country - we are being brainwashed into thinking bikes are the way forward when they are quite often ridden dangerously and ignore all road traffic rules with total impunity. Cycling is trendy but cannot replace cars etc as the main mode of transport. Political correctness rules with no real evidence of positive impacts

they are bad for all road and path users - more pollution, less business - no one benefits

totally against spaces for people - this is the minority making decisions for the majority

Totally ridiculous. A wee man in a little office with too much time on his hands thinking up things that are stupid.

Waste of money and based on incorrect assumptions

waste of money, cyclists do not use the lanes. added congestion and pollution of traffic

Waste of money. Unsightly

Well, make cycle users pay

with so many streets closed to traffic...what about electric cars? And what about "filibusses" for public transportation instead of diesel busses?

Question 32

Comments in Favour of Retaining Measures (6)

Again I think all measures should be retained where this is practical

Don't remove it

I am in support of safer cycle routes as my son cycles from Edinburgh to Musselburgh

It is too soon to remove these measures. When a new bypass is built, it isn't them removed when it fails to reduce the traffic in the town it was supposed to alleviate traffic in.

None should be removed. All these measures have brought nothing but improvements to the city.

Why would we want to remove them, given the benefits they will bring in terms of reducing air pollution and making walking, cycling etc safer.

Question 32

Comments in Favour of Removing Measures (47)

Adam McVey and the SNP should be facing their constituents with this rather than hiding behind survey. Lesley McInnes should never be allowed near transport infrastructure ever again. She is an absolute embarrassment

All of these measures should have gone through a proper review and planning phase instead of being rammed in under the cover of COVID-19 improvements

All removed probably

Any measures that stop cyclists running down pedestrians on the pavement and at pedestrian crossings are welcome. Edinburgh council has spent decades widening pavements/narrowing roads - if this is taking any further the city will be inaccessible for local people and stay at home people receiving deliveries.

Complete waste of money, obviously pet projects of officers with no concern for the safety of our citizens

Complicated issues

Corstorphine rd is congested and these measures make it worse

Cyclist can cycle on the roads and lanes.

Edinburgh already had pavements widened for tourists, there is no need to widen them more. The congestion is ridiculous and does not consider locals.

get it back to normal

I don't drive or cycle, so most of these questions are not relevant to me.

I haven't really been out much in the last 12 months so it is hard to judge.

I personally had to give up commuting by cycle after a close shave with an articulated lorry. I continued walking to work until I retired. Now my main source of transport is by hybrid car. (Obviously public transport = buses is not encouraged currently) I feel that the cars are being unfairly penalised, making it more difficult to progress across town and the even larger buses make it more tricky to manoeuvre around in narrowed roads.

Impacts on public transport and general traffic flow from these schemes will be terrible when traffic levels start to return to normal. These schemes are nothing to do with COVID. The schemes should be renamed as places for cyclists given that the vast majority are nothing to do with pedestrians and they ignore the active travel hierarchy

Instead of these measures, build new better roads and have all the potholes fixed properly

It seems that many of these measures have already been pushed through without sufficient consultation with the public. I object to the over emphasis on cycling which is an activity many people are unable to take part in.

just remove the measures

Lanark road already very wide with plenty of space, no cycle lane needed

Made it so much harder for people with disabilities - fewer disabled parking places available and longer distances to cover. As usual disabled people are at the bottom of the CEC priority pile.

more car spaces

No-one should be cycling on Queensferry road at the A90 section, whether with a cycle lane or not - the traffic is too heavy and too fast and it is not safe for the cyclists or the drivers. Putting in a designated cycle lane here will make the traffic far worse and pollution will increase on one of the most polluted roads in Scotland.

Please remove all these appalling measures.

Protected cycle lanes are dangerous.

Protected cycle lanes are not the solution. The roads need real investment and repair, not bollards.

Queensferry road bus lanes after Miller and Carter will be a disaster at peak times driving in the morning after the pandemic

Remove all asap

Remove now before children and elderly people start getting killed

Remove them all and let the city work again for all and not just a vocal minority of cyclists and other lobbyists

Remove them all and put in no more new

Some of these ideas are crazy for use in normal traffic flow. Excessive measures for cycling

Someone has got to pay for these !!!!

stop making stupid decisions

Stop the gridlock, get rid of them all

the cycle lane / parking on Lanark Road are an accident waiting to happen

The Lanark road is dangerous with the parking in the middle of the road.... on going up there I have only ever seen 1 cyclist!!!

The protected cycle lanes on the main A701 corridor (Minto St - Mayfield Gardens - Craigmillar Park) are at the cost of essential bus priority lanes and so should be removed, as there is not enough road space to have both. Bus priority measures must not be sacrificed as that will likely make some bus users return to cars. The previously existing bus lanes work adequately well for experienced cyclists, less experienced cyclists can use the parallel Mayfield Road route instead. Novice cyclists will likely still regard the A701 as too busy a road to cycle on, so these cycle lanes have few benefits and come at the unacceptable cost of the bus lanes on the main corridor south out of the city.

There are far too many

There is already plenty of room on Braid Hills Road for cars and cyclists to both use the road and pass safely. A number of cars have been parking on the road near the golf club car park, but surely some double yellow lines could be painted on the road to deter this. The council could cut back some of the gorse that is bulging over the path to give more space for pedestrians. It also needs to be remembered that the pandemic will end and we won't have to social distance forever, so there won't be any need for people to step into the road to pass others. Too many measures seem to be being put in place in a hurry without the proper consultation with residents and safety planning.

These cycle lanes, alongside the floating car parking spaces, are dangerous for pedestrians attempting to cross Lanark Road. They are also leading to drivers parking their cars in local narrow streets which could cause difficulties for deliveries and emergency services.

These measures are badly planned, poorly executed and take no cognisance of traffic levels returning to normal. They are nothing to do with Covid but installations of cycle lanes by the back door.

These road measures are ludicrous. Not needed. Stop building houses in over crowded areas. Stop painting silly lines on the road. Stop making living conditions unpleasant. People in many areas are going to have to potentially buy permits to park their own cars outside their own houses. Visitors will only be able to get 90 minutes passes. Stop it all. Spend money on the environment, collecting poo filled bins more often, fixing pot holes, cleaning public paths from foliage.

They all have to be removed because they create more danger for road users

they are bad for all road and path users - more pollution, less business - no one benefits and they are dangerous to all users as multi use causes confusion and accidents

Total waste of public money

Trying to create extra pedestrian space at places like Starbank Road is completely baffling. Places where there is already very little room for large vehicles, it just shows how out of touch the council really are.

Waste of money and anti business

What has happened to Great Junction Street in all these plans?

Appendix 6. Results from the Change.Org Petition, "Stop Edinburgh council making dangerous road changes, cycle lanes & parking cuts permanent"

[Back to Contents](#)

- 16,818 signatures (12 June 2021)

Comments (921)

"It will make the roads unsafe for everyone."

"I live on a street where the cycle lanes have been put in. Trying to get in and out my driveway now is a nightmare!"

"Edinburgh council is a bloody joke. Anti car brigade"

"This new layout is horrendous with dangerous parking in the middle of the road and takes away parking for me right outside my house. I don't even live in city centre."

"Edinburgh council are misusing powers and overriding democracy to force through poor designs that do not address the real issues of incoming traffic, badly maintained pavements and roads that are a danger to all users, and infrastructure for the massive

"The council are out of control"

"These are significantly unsafe and totally unacceptable."

"The implementation of this scheme has been undemocratic with zero consultation with local communities. The scheme itself is massively flawed and tainted with bias in favour of cycling pressure groups like Spokes and their extreme anti-motorist agendas."

"I do not consider that it the use of emergency Covid legislation was appropriate. I believe it is potentially more dangerous now than it was before for all road users. I believe a much wider public consultation should have occurred before it was impli

"The sweeping, indiscriminate and entirely unnecessary changes are unwanted by the people of eastcraigs/Edinburgh. They continue to charge us more, reduce our services and now the want to curtail free movement in our own city/neighbourhood. They are in

"The total destruction of Edinburgh needs to stop and the leaders held to account for ignoring a 41% increase in journey times there will be no businesses reopening !"

"These initiatives are being pushed through illegally using covid as an opportunist excuse for the council to pursue its own agenda at the expense of democracy and the needs and wishes of all residents. It's shameful, immoral and likely to cost lives."

"These changes are unsafe and discriminate against the elderly and disabled , limiting their access to their homes and public transport. Consultation required urgently"

"Irrespective of the physical changes being made (which seem often ill-considered and sometimes dangerous), I am very concerned by the approach being taken by Edinburgh Council in these matters. They seem intent on pushing these measures into place with n

"I totally disagree with CEC's approach to these in some cases totally unnecessary changes, without seeking input from the residents who are primarily affected on a day-to-day basis"

"I disagree"

"The implementation of these measures are horrific to disability access. The council clearly are throwing token measures towards disabled people that are ill thought, and display their ignorance towards disability and their reluctance to proactively engag

"These changes are set to impact accessibility to mine and many other businesses by removing a huge portion of on-street parking during what is an already trying time due to Covid - the last thing Edinburgh businesses need is further limitations to custom

"They are downright dangerous."

"I believe that the majority of the local area is already safe for cyclists and pedestrians so the proposals are not necessary"

"This is ridiculous and an abuse of power by Edinburgh Council"

"These Schemes are poorly thought out costing far too much money. With no proper engagement with communities affected. The money should be spent on maintaining Pavement's/ Roads that would benefit all pedestrians and road users."

"I'm against these ill thought out road changes which are not wanted and extremely dangerous. Think again!!!!"

"I need open roads to minimise traffic emissions for my wife who has respiratory problems. Stop/start traffic seriously increases emissions and reduced road space radically increases traffic congestion."

"We need a return to accountability and democracy in this administration. I'm a cyclist, but for me the negative impacts of these schemes outweigh the benefits, meaning that they should only be implemented with proper democratic consent of the communities"

"I have mobility problems and want to park on Lanark Road at the pavement"

"The changes are ill thought out and there has been zero consultation with local people."

"This is a very poorly thought out plan, & the council should consult with the people of Edinburgh about the plans, it is our City."

"I believe some of the changes proposed are dangerous and harmful to the areas."

"I disagree with both the Councils proposals and the total lack of consultation with our neighbourhood, ignoring our objections."

"The vast majority of residents in this area think these plans would be detrimental to their lifestyles and businesses alike."

"The plans for Lanark road are ridiculously dangerous for cars, pedestrian, bikes and people trying to get on and off public transport and in and out of their cars. No thought has been put into how deliveries/pick ups are made or how families get children"

"The proposed changes, some of which have already been made without proper consultation with residents, will cause confusion in Lanark Road where I live. The reduction of street parking will be problematic for residents. Reducing the traffic flow to one I

"It's affecting my everyday life really badly"

"I'm signing this petition as I don't agree with what Edinburgh council are doing in Lanark road"

"even snow plows cant clear them, shambles utter waste of more money."

"In many cases these measures are dangerous and rarely used by cyclists"

"The proposed changes are not necessary."

"The changes in Minto Steet are dangerous and in other parts such as George 1V bridge will cause utter chaos when traffic is back to normal"

"I totally agree that the measures implemented have been badly thought out and detrimental to moving around the city"

"On the Lanark Road as the width of the road for motorised vehicles will be less than what it was prior to the introduction of Spaces for People Scheme, this places cyclists who chose not to use the cycle lane because it has not been cleared of snow or i

"Its importsnt the measures aren't perminant."

"I'm sick and tired of my Edinburgh being ruined by McMeddes, Sinclair, Edwards and the like - on a diversive destructive program."

"Since SfP didn't consult, I requested drawings as the sets issued either side of Christmas (for Longstone Rd/ Lanark Road) had inadequate/ conflicting information. After three requests – dead silence. Clearly SfP is a law to itself and not to be question

"Denise Speirs"

"The decision making behind this is flawed and it needs accepted this is the case before someone is seriously hurt by a cyclist. This is an accident just waiting to happen, if it does I really hope heads roll. We had a family member hit by a cyclist and

"Bad for the locals and businesses."

"The council's plans to close roads,create cycleways in places that don't need them and the same for pedestrian walkways are just ludicrous! The idea may be good ideas but must be done with consultations and also common sense. Moving the problem from one

"There should be proper consultation and risk assessments done. Council vanity at its finest."

"I believe that the council should be carrying out a full consultation and safety audit prior to rushing into implementing temporary unsafe measures on our beautiful streets, with no consideration for residents, businesses, elderly, or those with mobili

"Where do I start ?Firstly, the cyclist's who use Lanark Road, are few and far between. Your lucky if you see one in half an hour.The majority of the cyclist's use the canal.Apparently this is supposed to be similar to Amsterdam! Really ... Amsterdam is f

"Yip turn your back or get distracted in any way and the council /government sneak in and cause the public extra costs, disruption,chaos and don't consider how it's going to work they just love spending and wasting money making out it's for the benefit of

"Edinburgh traffic management is a joke."

"I have experienced first hand, the devastating effect on my business, due to the new cycle lanes."

"These imbeciles are ruining my home city it is very sad to see our beautiful city being destroyed"

"Edinburgh Council are anti car and pushing these Permanent Measures by using Covid Spaces for People as a excuse. These measures have forced people to spend money on a driveway in some areas or park their cars in quieter surrounding Streets. And in my ar

"I want to be able to move over to let emergency vehicles past. I'd like safe spaces for all people, not just the able bodied."

"The typical council never consult properly, but just go ahead and face problems later"

"The council should listen to the public and not just implement changes without the public input"

Name redacted

"The whole system is very suspicious.No consultation. This will deter people from visiting our Capital."

"Edinburgh council are trying to ban cars from the city by the back door with this"

"All this has achieved is to make previously quiet residential roads busy."

"The road closure at Braid Road is ridiculous and causes so much congestion at Greenbank Crossroads and the cycles lane bollards around Fairmilehead are an eye sore and the roads are wide enough for cyclists and vehicles."

"Because the roads are now a shambles because of the changes"

"I believe consultation should take place or at the very least proper safety checks carried out. I have heard various remarks from councillors about the traffic situation that are frankly incorrect."

"The Council need to remember they are elected representatives and need to include the citizens in their decision making. The SfP activities have caused real problems and concerns and should be debated and considered in a democratic manner. The recent sno

"These plans create confusing road layouts for drivers and pedestrians, and potential slow down and/or obstruct our emergency services."

"We need democracy back , council to listen to residents views , and council to stop only listening to cycling and anti car lobby groups"

"Poor design, needs a full consultation to engage with communities."

Name redacted

"Its becomming impossible to get around Edinburgh and councillors are imposing a "green" agenda they did not campaign on."

"These measures have just made life more difficult not easier during lockdown"

"Because I like to help as much as possible"

"Scarce resources could be better utilised.As the petition states , cycle lanes being installed without due care and attention to implications for Businesses / Residents / disabled / emergency services etc."

"I believe these schemes are unsafe and the way they have been implemented is undemocratic."

"It's time Edinburgh Council stopped their War on Motorists..."

"I'm signing this because I agree that edinburgh council is using the pandemic to force through their anti car policy which has continued since their failure to gauge public opinion when trying to introduce road tolls to enter city and wasting millions of

"CEC need to listen to the people and treat Edinburgh residents and businesses with a bit more respect. Half cocked arrangements that do nothing for the amenity of our beautiful city. Just like they have done with the large rubbish bins that litter Mornin

"I am a cyclist and the new implementations have made cycling much more dangerous for me (eg St John's road)."

"I live in Braid farm Road and now travel via Liberton to go to Morningside. What a waste of time and petrol."

"I agree with reasons"

Name redacted

"Utter nonsense. Can't think of a more effective way of ruining local businesses, even in 'normal' times. In the current climate it's moronic."

"Outrageous mess. I have no idea who thinks this is good planning. I understand that we are trying to go greener but totally causing the traffic disruption this is causing is going to end up using with even more pollution due to traffic jams and cars back

"We need to be United to ensure democratic process is followed."

"Edinburgh Council made a promise that its Spaces for People schemes would be temporary, driven only by a Covid emergency. They have misled the people of Edinburgh. Many schemes are dangerous, poorly thought out and make life more difficult for residents,

"All for making the city cycle/walking friendly/accessible but this scheme is not properly thought out and the decisions are being made by only a few people, when we all should have a vote on it!! This affects us all! There are far too many negatives to

"Living in EH10 I have experienced / see the danger and confusion they cause to pedestrians, cyclists, car drivers and particularly the elderly and disabled"

"Far too many areas have been given to this scheme in a day when nobody walks an where also cyclists who never observe the Highway Code and pay no tax or insurance"

"There is no need for this! You are endangering peoples lives when emergency services cant get to them! There are no issues with our roads but you will cause issues forcing people to use already very busy roads."

"It is not well thought out - I am a keen cyclist & drive a car so hopefully unbiased opinion."

"It is vital that the people of Edinburgh get the chance to contribute to a proper consultation on such a significant change to the City infrastructure"

"Waste of money when other things should take priority like NHS and others"

"These changes are extremely dangerous and unnecessary."

"Edinburgh Council is trying to impose new rules without proper consultation. It is undemocratic and needs to be challenged."

"This stuff needs ripping out. Anyone who ractually rides a bicycle will understand - it makes perfectly-safe roads dangerous and confusing. At the moment it's full of half-cleared uneven piles of snow and ice. All they've done is made the roads narrower

"Its ridiculous that they are making spaces for people, there is no need for this pavements are wide enough as it is, 20 more is only going to cause more congestion and pollution"

"This needs more thought and a long term strategy that makes proper provision for cycles and pedestrians."

"It's bloody ridiculous..."

"Total nonsense. Tired of being dictated to."

"Again waste of public funds we don't have rather than use it for proper use like NHS or schools"

"The Council is just anti business"

"The consultation process is being abused , not enough public knowledge about these actions that all ill thought out and agenda driven"

"I want more parking spaces in the Bribtsfiekd ares"

"I am totally opposed to these proposals, I can't think of an area of Edinburgh which has more space . This would be the last area of Edinburgh I would be introducing these measures, which begs the question The current consultation seems to be based

"I agree with this petition."

Name redacted

"This is so damaging for businesses and residents and has been rushed through without consultation"

"Because my son is a cyclist in Edinburgh and I want to make sure it is safe for him and everyone else who cycles around Edinburgh."

"This is becoming ridiculous and making the roads confusing and more dangerous. Obviously dreamt up by non directs/car owners. It is also killing small businesses and will empty the city as folk shall transfer their purchasing to where they can park more

"Its very dangerous totally unacceptable"

"I've seen some of their plans and they're just dangerous with zero consideration for pedestrians, of whom a lot are elderly and disabled. Also no consideration for those who cannot use public transport, cycle or walk. Please stop this madness Edinburgh Co

"I don't believe the cycle and pedestrian lanes have been properly thought out and are actually dangerous. I do believe in safe cycle lanes wherever possible and safe spaces for pedestrians but don't believe that what the council have done is safe. Need

"I think the changes have not been properly thought out and delivered in a devious manner."

"The process Edinburgh Council is following in every 'consultation' is shocking. Since covid they have adopted a dictatorial approach pushing everything through without consultation with residents and stakeholders. We pay the taxes and have a right to be

"I'm signing because without consulting residents Barnton Avenue, Silverknowes Avenue and Parlawy and many other roads have been altered in a thoughtless and sometimes dangerous way. In particular Barnton Avenue at its junction with Cramond Road South

"This plan is going to have a huge negative impact on local residents. We only have one way in and out of east Craig's and the traffic build up blocks our exit roundabout already never mind closing roads and pushing more cars onto the main road"

"It directly affects me and I am unhappy with the approach and proposals"

"Sick of having the ECC force feed their own pet projects down the throats of Edinburgh residents."

"Its causing more congestion and making visibility poor. Parking is needed to stop issues in side streets where kids play"

Name redacted

"Dangerous"

"This is totally undemocratic and an arrogant move by a council that is more interested in vanity projects and initiatives rather than getting on with the day job of repairing roads and pavements for all and maintaining our wonderful City rather than dest

"Roads are inadequate"

"These plans are stupid"

"These plans are very poorly conceived, are being snuck in 'under the radar' with little to no public consultation, and will cause far more problems than they will ever solve."

"The road closures in Morningside at Whitehouse Loan will impact on the emergency services getting quickly to incidents particularly the Fire service"

"I'm fed up of this Council not listening to the people who have to cope with all these ill-thought out and dangerous schemes, especially the elderly, disabled, tradespeople etc."

"I want to access the Glasgow Road and Maybury Road without restriction or further impediment. It's about time the council resurfaced the roads in the area, as well as clearing gulleys in /around the streets and pathways in Craigmount/East Craigs and lift

"They need to be stopped."

"Because the Transport committee of the EDC are inept at running the city's roads and pavements under the guise of temporary Covid 19 measures"

"I don't want this as a permanent feature in our streets"

"City of Edinburgh Council are ignoring the very people they are elected to represent with their bullying behaviour. Its about time they listened to the ratepayers of Edinburgh instead of forcing through plans with no mandate. About time these people are cited

"Lack of thought leading to traffic congestion, which on return to normality will cause chaos."

"Inadequate public consultation. Lack of public engagement. Vanity project for councillors' visibility. Inappropriate use of funds - using SFP/Covid emergency funds to effect unnecessary ill-conceived permanent and disadvantageous change. Unbalanced

"Craig's Road is very important to me. Not least because my child attends Craigmount High. I need to be able to access the local area without sitting in traffic for 30 mins out of East Craigs towards Maybury or Barnton."

"It is causing more problems than its solving"

"I am signing because many of the changes are ill thought out and have serious repercussions for ordinary people!!"

"Because it does not make sense."

"I am totally opposed to the current plans which are being pushed through without any consultation, understanding or consideration of everyone's needs. The current proposals are not proportionate and certainly do not reflect the needs of all residents,

"Fed up with this council not listening to the residents."

"I consider the cycle and walking lanes to be dangerous and to have caused many more problems for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists."

"These new measures are not safe and are a waste of public money"

"These "temporary" moves have ruined lives and businesses. Permanence is even worse."

"The council is filled incompetent people who couldn't give a damn about real working people, business's or motorists. They can make mistake after mistake without any repercussions on themselves other than getting voted out by which time the idiotic decis

"Now my gran is unable to come visit as as no parking even though our street was a quiet street with no accidents has cycle lanes on both sides which are barely used"

"It's a joke the liberties CEC are taking."

"Under-consulted, under-analysed, under-used even? Pause for thought ... but don't hold your breath."

"They have made the roads very dangerous for people crossing.Parked cars are practily in the middle of the road so not much room for big vehicles passing."

"As couriers and can't do the job due to stopping restrictions and increased Road closures and diversions etc bus drivers are forced to be closer to cyclists and increases danger for collisions etc"

"Since the blockage of Braid Road and the placing of obsructive plastic poles on Comiston Road/Buckstone Terrace I am personally aware of 6 accidents so far, 4 involving bicycles and 2 involving cars. This is an area that hasn't seen any accidents for man

"I object and think it's dangerous and a ridiculous Idea that hasn't been thought about properly."

"Calling these closures emergency measures is criminal! Edinburgh council should be ashamed of themselves."

"This needs to be a nation wide thing. The government are trying to make motorists pay for EVERYTHING while not addressing the ridiculous wages of they people administering it all."

"No consultations are being carried out."

"We do not want these changes"

"These decisions should be taken after consultation with the communities they affect and the measures I have seen are both ugly and potentially dangerous."

"These changes are hugely dangerous"

"It's totally unwanted and unnecessary not to mention a waste of public funds. East Craig's is already a low traffic neighbourhood"

"Totally ill-conceived, ridiculous and downright dangerous schemes, without appropriate due diligence being taken to evaluate and establish risks and liabilities for ALL pedestrians and road users. This is a Council out of control and misusing funds, abus

"Pure madness and pathetic excuse to widen the road and blocking out disabled bays, loading bays for essential services. And making it more awkward for the buses to stop and us to overtake them at the bus stop. Put madness and do the folk need to be out a

"I'm a strong supporter of cycling lanes, but I'm seeing pavement widening and re-routes which are problematic with no advantages."

"Our council has destroyed our fine city and now putting peoples lives at risk"

"It's ridiculous what council are doing"

"This has made Edinburgh's roads a dangerous joke!"

"This proposal will slow down traffic and cause congestion. Local businesses will be effected. Pedestrians will be subject to more pollution rather than less. Let's spend the money installing electric charging points and promote electric vehicles in our c

"Really dangerous with all these bike lanes and bollards and cars parked basically parked in the middle of the roads because of silly new layouts who thought of these layouts needs a brain check !"

"Cyclists think they have the right to do what they want, no lights, cycles on pavements, avoids red lights by cutting onto the pavements, never look before moving out, no Insurance, no road tax. We need less of them on the roads not cut car space that we

"I am incensed that the council can make these decisions without proper consultation."

"I live in Bruntsfield and work in Morningside. The measures have had serious impact on me and those I care for. As a result of increased parking restrictions and road closures I my weekly mileage to provide care and assistance to disabled friend on high

"Unnecessary!"

"Absolute nightmare trying to deliver with loading bays and single yellows all gone. Many cyclists don't use the dedicated lanes while trying to beat their PB to work/home!"

"The roads are more dangerous than ever with all the changes, road closures and cycle lanes are a joke as they are not being cleared with the snow so have less room to move in the road.... Absolute joke!!!!"

"I was in Edinburgh last week and it was ridiculous the amount of road and parking places removed for cycle lanes in stupid areas with very few cyclists"

"It a danger to both motorist and cyclist no consideration for elderly more pollution as traffic will be clogged up already witnessed this in Leith links"

"Causing more congested roads and difficult for disabled people"

"we need the roads open so buses can travel normally and i can get back down to silverknowes"

"It's an obvious choice"

"I'm signing this petition because I am fed up and angry with the current council trying to rough ride shot over the people they pretend to represent. They said these measures would be temporary due to covid19 and social distancing but now want to make th

"Waste of money. Will cause. More congestion and pollution. Are these people who thought this up living in the real world. Vote them out"

"No consideration was given to the needs of disabled people to access shops. The disabled parking spaces in local shopping areas are very scarce and it forces disabled people to out of town shopping. I am also concerned about access to local services suc

"These changes are ridiculous. Unsafe, unnecessary and an eye sore."

"how stupid are you clowns at the clowncil safety first and yet you think this is acceptable fecking arseholes"

"Whilst the idea, in principle, may be good. The ways and means that the council has carried it this work appears to be corrupt."

"This Clowncil have demonstrated time and time again they do not care for Edinburgh residents. MacInnes and McVey need to get out on the streets and see the chaos and damage their 'great ideas' inflict. Anyone with an ounce of common sense can see the cit

"This Clowncil have demonstrated time and time again they do not care for Edinburgh residents. MacInnes and McVey need to get out on the streets and see the chaos and damage their 'great ideas' inflict. Anyone with an ounce of common sense can see the cit

"I'm fed up with the council wasting money."

"I am appalled at the behaviour of some within our Council, including their disregard for the law and democratic processes in how they have approached traffic management change in Edinburgh. These schemes were awarded government money to ease the effects

"I feel strongly in favour of the petition"

"I'm angry that they're wasting vast amounts of our money on their own vanity projects"

"Getting to work prior to these implementations were impossible most days which meant i had to leave at least 1an hour and half to get a bus before starting to ensure i was there on time and I only reside a 20 min drive away....once we all go back t

Name redacted

"The council need to start listening to the taxpaying citizens for whom they work, we are fed up of our opinions being dismissed."

"An absolute eyesore that leaves walkers, cyclists and drivers all at risk. Businesses are suffering because customers and delivery drivers are not able to stop fleetingly outside premises. Is this really what small businesses need after a year of hardshi

"Walking in Edinburgh is bad enough without these lunatic spaces"

"Edinburgh roads are a nightmare"

"Minto Street / Craigmillar Park Road is a disaster waiting to happen. A perfectly good 4-lane road where cyclists could ride safely in the bus lane (I was one of them) has become 3-lanes with vehicles weaving in and out of traffic islands and no one know

"Not what the majority in Edinburgh want."

"These precautions are dangerous and ludicrous"

"I'm sick of the changes to Braid Road and Buckstone Terrace."

"This is not carrying out the will of the people."

"They way Edinburgh council behave is appalling. For once they should listen to and work for the people instead of forcing through policies and schemes nobody wants"

Name redacted

"The whole process is completely undemocratic and will highly inconvenience families living in the areas"

"I love cycling but I am also use my car for shopping and visiting my elderly mother in Edinburgh. I use the car to take her for shopping. East Craig's is currently a very quiet neighbourhood and there is absolutely no need to block the streets. Keep Edin

"Corstorphine high is less safe.. And I've just driven to warreston crematorium. On why I consider to be dangerous rutted roads dodging potholes. Third world roads!!"

"I do not agree with many of the council's proposals and also strongly object to the 'targeted' supposed public consultations which only ask selected groups to comment on schemes. It is discriminatory biased undemocratic and falls well short of standards

"With a return to normal, pre-covid traffic levels, the demarcated bits of road to be used by pedestrians and cyclists (especially pedestrians) during covid restriction times will be unnecessary. If made permanent, they will add further to congestion, del

"I'm a business owner and a car driver. There's not enough parking, free or otherwise as it is. The cycle lanes are barely used too. As for the social distancing aspect again the lanes are unused."

"The unacceptable congestion caused by closing braid road, resulting in increased pollution at morningside school and bus travel time has increased significantly. Also by closing the road you just move traffic to other areas and have caused a rat run via

"Because you have no idea how the transport infrastructure in a city works. Closing main road DOES NOT IMPROVE TRAFFIC."

"My objections have fallen on deaf ears with the council who are obviously not listening or addressing constituents concerns. I find it baffling that they can actually congratulate themselves on a job well done when it's caused more issues to problems tha

"I hate Edinburgh council fucking idiots"

"Craig Miller Park is dangerous. The amount of times car drivers have just about collided with buses because they cannot understand the merging lanes.Its only a matter of time until there is a serious RTC"

"I believe the Council is creating solutions to problems which simply don't exist in the majority of roads they have targeted. The CEC must consult the public properly so we can collectively improve our city. I would suggest starting with the quality of t

"They are not required, they increase traffic congestion and pollution and are dangerous for cyclists."

"Because i wish to stop Edinburgh council making spaces for people permanent.It is dangerous and has caused alot of accidents.."

"Not fit for purpose this council and they're hare brain plots & plans. Ruining the city"

"It is not a good idea as it is dangerous to drivers they are to close to each other and I dont feel safe walking in these extra spaces to close to vehicles"

"These changes are pointless and dangerous. Spend the money fixing all the dangerous potholes instead!"

"I don't think these changes have been thought through. Of course I welcome better access for pedestrians and cyclists but so many of the changes are actually endangering those very peopler are unnecessary or inappropriate. Hell for those who can't use bi

"SO dangerous!"

"Councillors do not have the best interests of their constituents as their main concern. Pandering to PC wokeness has always been their number one concern"

"Deluded councillors not listening to the people,"

"I disagree with the current actions taken which have caused more problems for drivers getting around."

"Bonaly Brae seems to be a target for a traffic ban. I found out about this by accident. No notification to residents. Why? Bonaly Brae, apart from the rear entrance to the primary school, does not lead to anywhere else e.g. The Pentlands or local amenities"

Name redacted

"No thought has been given to the disabled or the elderly"

"Implemented without real consultation by unelected officials who have run away with their egos with the support of certain radical councillors."

Name redacted

"It's dangerous, expensive and makes our lovely city look horrendous."

"The restrictions will increase traffic congestion thus increasing air pollution."

"This is not aligned to the Disability Discrimination Act and is an abuse of emergency Powers. This is elitist and makes an assumption that everyone is able to access local facilities without use of their car."

"It's an eyesore, proving dangerous in some areas of the city and needs a complete rethink on how the money still available can be spent and utilised."

"The SNP council have no interest in the people of Edinburgh and have repeatedly shown a complete disregard for disabled people"

"Quite simply these changes are a danger to all who use them and the congestion will be horrendous when normality resumes"

"I live in Muirhouse and what the council did here is stupid. Those people who approved it they never been in this area and now clue how many people actually cycling and how many people are driving in these roads. It works in theory but actually it was was"

"Sylvia Mclean sylvia.mclean@hotmail.co.uk"

"Not the time to be making permanent decisions"

"The Council are discriminated against the disabled who have few options in favour of cyclists who have many options"

"The restriction on traffic is for the benefit of a miniscule proportion of road users, will cause congestion and increase roadside pollution. You just need to look at busses on Morningside road as an example."

"The changes are more dangerous for pedestrians and car users alike"

"As a cyclist I find using bollards to block cycle lanes is more dangerous. A faster cyclist can not over take you, wet leaves and snow collect in blocked cycle lanes. Please stop spending money blocking roads for all to use. The roads would be do much sa"

"I'm signing because it is necessary !"

"The council constantly undermines the majority in favour of the shouting minority. If we had a Mediterranean climate this might make sense, but for 8 months of the year this infrastructure is untenable. The resources could be far better spent getting rid"

"I disagree with the way the council has implemented these changes and I think they make the city more dangerous for people, cats and cyclists."

"These schemes were intended to be temporary."

"The widening of the pavements are in most, so unnecessary, making the roads really quite dangerous, both for people trying to cross and for drivers. There is now nowhere for walkers to walk safely, as there are bicycle users zooming by everywhere, with n"

"I live in the area and this hinders locals it does not help anyone"

"These measures are confusing and ill-thought through. Yes they served a purpose to support social distancing but they need better thought out before being implemented more permanently or extensively. Our own experience is that they make roads more danger

"I disagree with changes made. The reduction in parking affects local residents & parking bays on the inside lane next to the cycle lane are an accident waiting to happen."

"I think it is lethal and needs to be dealt with before the unspeakable, inevitable happens, please."

"They are killing Edinburgh with these stupid measures"

"The road changes being railroaded through by council dictators are just a nightmare. COVID 19 seems to have given them free license to do whatever they wish - painting lines on roads for cyclists only, erecting bollards on cycle lanes for a select few, t

"The Council's behaviour is atrocious. We live in a democratic society and these changed should not be pushed through without proper consultation."

"The people of Edinburgh were not consulted and some of the changes are dangerous to users."

"I think the council are wrong to impose this"

"It is the same here in Glasgow. Glasgow shitty council DON'T want cars on the roads but it is the car driver who paid and continues to pay for the roads. Instead of this scheme they should have spent the money repairing the pot hole, etc. The cyclists ha

"Brunstane Rd is being closed under Covid regs against the will of the wider residents (84% against) and objections by the emergency services."

"The measures are not safe for public or traffic"

"These plans are ill thought out and the voices of local people are not being listened to."

"I specifically chose and moved into a property in February 2020, that met the needs of my disabled husband and his frail disabled mother. The house was chosen because it's within a residential green suburban garden area, that had a wide road, wide pavem

"The road changes are an absolute disgrace. Making life more difficult than it should be."

"Because these ludicrous "spaces" block roads and congestion our streets even more than normal. Idiotic scheme, benefits only a small minority"

"The scheme is causing chaos and danger on the roads and when it snows or is icy, it is unusable."

"They cause more accidents cyclists hit a pothole then islands of lanes"

"Londin has been Grid locked by the idiotic cycle loving mayor. Pollution increases when a city's traffic grinds to a halt."

"EDC has acted beyond its permitted scope and is ignoring the needs of the majority of the residents who are essential car/vehicle users."

"The plans presented by the council are not based on a true and honest community consultation. They are at best badly thought through and at worst incredibly dangerous."

"The roads are in a terrible state & this does not help. Small businesses are suffering throughout this "transformation" Usage of these new features is extremely low."

"This is undermining the democratic process"

"This will increase congestion and is a accident waiting to happen. Improve the paths, fix bridges on the water of leith and canal if it's really to benefit sfp"

"It's a lot of Shite."

"This is concept is being pushed trough with little or no consultation. The target would appear that cycling or trams being the only option come 2030!"

"Poorly thought out infrastructure, benefiting only cyclists. No consideration for residents, businesses, disabled, non-disabled elderly, conservation area or delivery drivers."

"I am signing because the City leaders are clueless about running businesses and everything we have said , questioned , and offered our side of the solution have BEEN TOTALLY IGNORED since the start of the INITIAL RETURN for businesses after the first LO

"They are stupid and useless, total waste of money even pedestrians don't think they are needed"

"This scheme is dangerous to cyclists, motorists and pedestrians. Like "smart" motorways, it will result in injuries and possibly deaths. Poorly thought out!"

"Everything the council did with these crazy schemes under the cover of covid was ridiculous and embarrassing for them. Millions of our money wasted which makes it dangerous for many to leave their houses or to get access and will undoubtedly affect busin

"Lack of consultation on the project and was brought in as temporary measure during covid. Never meant to be permanent and just causes traffic jams along the areas affected."

"Please concentrate on pothole repairs. They are a disgrace."

"Edinburgh is incredibly busy, needs to be safe for everyone."

"So many of the temporary measures are I'll advised, making them permanent, will only compound the errors."

"I care about life!"

"I was seriously injured due to tripping over the base (grey on grey!) of one of these bollards on Bruntsfield Place. Had I tripped in the opposite direction I would have careered straight into oncoming traffic. I did complain to the Council but have not

Name redacted

"No consultation.. dangerous around my area.. as cyclists have to dodge potholes!!"

"I strongly object to vendetta against drivers that are restricting where Blue Badge holders can park."

"I'll conceived and in my opinion just an excuse to force through their agenda to the detriment of many"

"It is already bad enough accessing Edinburgh for those of us who find public transport difficult or impossible to use for our journeys; soon this city, already unfriendly enough towards visitors and those from outside the city will become a no-go area."

"I'm signing this petition as in this pandemic period the Council are making decisions on road closures etc without a comprehensive traffic analysis; developing cycle lanes with no creative thinking to take them off main roads etc etc etc"

"Shocking, nearly had an accident today driving down Minto Street. The driving lane ran out and I was nearly hit by another car getting into the bus lane. Gilmerton Road no better with bollards so badly positioned they could could a serious accident. Plea

"I am sick of the lunatics running the asylum any longer. How come the council can find money for Spaces for People but nil for roads?"

"Our roads and streets are fine the way they are. The changes that are being made in some areas are dangerous."

"I think the city is being served very poorly on this issue. As if we didn't have enough to concern ourselves with at the moment. Many local shops, who have suffered badly due to Covid 19, will be unable to reopen as they will being caught up in the expan

"It is a hairbrained scheme that benefits the few to the detriment of the majority."

"There should have been more open discussion about this."

"Lanark road already congested with parking in almost the middle of the city bound carriage"

"It's amazing how they are always struggling for money except when it comes to making bad traffic management changes n"

"There has been poor information on what they are trying to do within transportation in Edinburgh... because most of us are not travelling to & fro into various areas within the city ... we are not seeing if the legislation of new regulations of transport

"I work in Edinburgh and have to drive through because of my hours - the scheme is a mess."

"As a driver, it is the worst designed system ever!!! Dangerous to both cyclists and drivers!!! Get rid ofnall the plans!!!"

"This will just lead to more traffic delays, greater pollution and less parking availability for disabled drivers and able bodied drivers and less parking available for shoppers to support local businesses."

"Councils, everywhere, need to remember that their salaries are paid by residents, and that it is, in any event, incumbent on them to serve, not trample on the people whose views are paramount. There will be elections, not long hence. Ask the candidate

"I am opposed to anything which hampers disabled and visually impaired people"

"Well done Edinburgh council for wrecking a beautiful city .Always claiming poverty but always find millions for numbskull ideas when it comes to transport and showing utter contempt to the people you claim to represent.I was astounded when I heard that

"Planned by monkeys. Am all for sensible road management, but current logic and implementation is laughable"

"The roads in Edinburgh are dangerous enough without adding ridiculous safety measures to thrm. More cycle lanes would be great but do it properly."

"The roads are an utter disgrace roads are meant for cars!"

"The council are corrupt and have used a devastating virus to push through unpopular plans. They should be ashamed of themselves. Noted that the City of Edinburgh Council are now colluding with East Lothian Council to try and extend cycle routes from the

"The whole project is a bad idea"

"Edinburgh hates cars and is forcing their poor and overpriced public transport on us."

"I am fed up with this council's idiotic ideas."

"I am sick of this council not listening to the people of Edinburgh."

"This is going to cause so much disruption to traffic car owners pay money for our roads and yet get very little thought from this government maybe spend money repairing the roads instead ."

"Think they are dangerous as a pedestrian I do not feel safe with speeding cyclists on electric bikes"

"I cycle myself and this was a very bad idea from beginning"

"Once traffic back to pre Covid levels will be a nightmare"

"When the city starts to busy up again, the increased traffic on narrowed roads will create havoc. As well as huge delays and congestion, people will be put off travelling into town. The economy has taken enough of a battering thanks to lockdowns and rest

"Edinburgh road system a shambles for both drivers, cyclists and pedestrians"

"Causes a risk to pedestrians with mobility issues, causes issues and risk for motorbike riders. Ineffectively planned."

"I agree with all the points made in the petition."

"At present the changes have severely damaged traffic movement in the city and have made many areas a single lane. Cyclists travel both ways in cycle lanes against the traffic and with the traffic Name redacted"

"These measures are unnecessary and have caused endless problems and accidents apart from the unsightliness of them."

"Object to wasting money on projects that inconvenience MOST people who do not want these changes."

"Agree with points made in the petition"

"Fed up with road closures all the time"

"I feel that the spaces for people changes have made edinburgh city centre roads more dangerous. Forcing parking into smaller and unsafe areas which restrict visibility to those exiting side roads; holding up traffic with no space to pass safely; and givi

"Besides the potholes and shitty pavements, things were just fine the way they were before all the change. Too many things to complain about to type out. Fucking disgrace and dangerous"

"The council is hiding behind these fancy ideas to cover up the fact that they are inept at keeping the roads pothole free and safe. I am a cyclist who commutes from Bonnington/Leith to RIE everyday and the main problem is the potholes, they also introduc

"My business has been affected!!"

"There was little or no consultation in advance of these far-reaching and often dangerous measures being introduced. The impact on residents, businesses and the environment seems to have been ignored. I have witnessed considerable traffic congestion, w

"Not enough thought has been given. I stepped off a bus on North Bridge and was nearly hit by a cyclist. She fell off her bike avoiding me. She was on the pedestrian walkway because she felt unsafe on the road as it was very narrow."

"Edinburgh Council need to realise that not all of us have 9-5 working within the City jobs! Some of us work unsocial hours outwith Edinburgh and using Public Transport is not an option. This scheme has been pushed through without any apparent consulta

"This is not necessarily, decision of the Edinburgh Council is ridicules. They didn't even ask public about this and they make decisions behind closed doors."

"As someone who has been knocked over by a speeding cyclist and ended up in A&E i am convinced we need better provision for both cyclists and pedestrians not this ill thought out piecemeal approach where there may be a 100m of pedestrian space then 200m f

"So many of the cut roads are very dangerous for people, cyclists and drivers. Driving on many occasions i perceived these roads could lead to accidents."

"The council needs to rethink its plans and what it decides to develop and build, if you have signed this petition then you might also feel strongly about developing at silverknowes and ruining a peaceful location!! <a href="http://chnng.it/7BYLw7mB" rel="

"The council just not listening like a few others."

"This lousie corrupt Thieving councillors Has to go . They are illegals the act against the residents interests ."

"This damages businesses in the heart of Edinburgh and in many cases makes things more dangerous rather than safer. It's just wrong."

"Thoughtless changes causing problems and bad for the environment!!"

"Edinburgh council is a joke. The number of small businesses that have been affected by the lack of parking for their customers and access for deliveries and collection as a direct result of these pointless bollards that no one uses and which I have witne

"Sick fed up of this marxist dictatorship slowing Edinburgh's roads down to a crawl and leaving them in a dreadful state full of pot holes and cheapest of tarmac. Get this lot out and get Edinburgh moving again."

"Dangerous, impractical and a complete waste of money."

"High streets are slowly dying as it is without restricting access further"

"It looks really dangerous and unplanned/ unthought out, terrible for those with poor mobility / eyesight."

"Poor governance, full-stop!"

"As a cyclist, having the cycle lane between the pavement & parking, especially near nurseries, poses a real risk of children & passengers standing in or opening doors into the cycle lane. They are expecting to get out on a pavement. Having the cycle lane

"These traffic measures are dangerous"

"These restrict movement and are dangerous. They are stopping shops from having custom from anyone who needs to drive to their area because of age and infirmity, as buses are utterly inadequate and stops too far apart. Edinburgh survives because it is a b

"Please don't ruin the beautiful Edinburgh roads by putting these horrible billiards & narrowing the road"

"Very concerned about inadequate parking, often near the middle of the road, for older people, disabled, parents with prams/young children, and delivery vans etc Whose idea was that regarding safety? Local businesses being affected by lack of parking wh

Name redacted

"Inadequate safety assessments, no thought for disabled and elderly people, and ignoring over 10,000 objections - says it all"

"It is an ill thought out plan and will increase the risk of accidents and cause a lot of problems for the elderly and those with young children"

"They are not safe"

"If it ain't broke then don't try to fix it. Do local authorities ever think of the people who will be badly affected by their messing with what has worked for years."

"I'm signing this because of grave concerns that Health and Safety of the public especially the infirm, blind, elderly and disabled has not been considered and accidents have happened!!! Also it affects bus stops in certain areas where you step towards o

"The measures being imposed are ill thought out. In most cases the measures are not needed and causing serious impact and safety issues in other areas."

"This whole process is completely underhand by the council."

"It is dangerous and not feasible when traffic is back tto normal after Covid. All it does is cause tailbacks which means cyclists and pedestrians and breathing in more exhaust fumes"

"These changes make it dangerous for me collecting my child from nursery"

"The elections are impending, DO NOT VOTE SNP, DO NOT VOTE LABOUR. Decide for yourselves which of the other parties to vote for, bearing in mind which party is propping up the party you do not want to vote for. Maybe we will then get a council that is FOR

"The suggestions are just dangerous"

"I feel that there is minimal consultation and these changes are being driven by a lobby group who are focused on a cyclist agenda."

"This does not provide adequate parking for residents."

"Sleekit decision making by an incompetent self serving Council. It is now very dangerous to drive on the roads; unsafe at bus stops for passengers, and does nothing for the cyclist who sometimes weave all over or jump red lights. Why change Ferry Road wi

"I object to the road changes being made in the North West of Edinburgh. The changes are going ahead in spite of local objections."

Name redacted

"It is creating chaos and slowing traffic to a frustrating level and cyclists don't like it"

"Don't feel these measures are safe for cyclist or pedestrians or drivers also"

"Yes"

"It is dangerous and honestly it's a complete mess."

"I disagree with the councils approach of using Covid as an excuse to force through changes. The way they are playing fast and loose with Council funds and wasting money putting in measures and then removing them when they do not work. I am all for Spaces

"The council kept proportionally the least amount back of all councils for removal of these measures meaning their plan was to make many permanent all along. This shouldn't be done without proper democratic process rather than pressing on with their anti-

"Decisions like these should be correctly debated and not pushed through without the proper consultation and taking the views of the majority into account."

"These changes along with many more make living and working in Edinburgh more difficult for residents - I own a flat off Easter Rd. lived there for 10 years and now rent it out. We don't all live in a world that ends at the bypass, we have the right to be

"edinburghs road network is turning into a shambles, councillors who dont listen to the general public who elect them."

"I object to the Councils plans and the underhand way they have been introduced"

"I struggle to find a parking space and I pay for a resident permit."

"It time the council were held to account for their crackpot decisions. Just remember who brought these changes about when you vote in the next council elections"

"I'm affected"

"I'm signing because the works being done are so disruptive and do not meet ANY objective. Eg in Barnton Avenue, there are bollards to widen walking and cycling spaces, but theswe are interspersed by parked cars, and concrete blocks (which prevent cyclis

"Bus-using disabled people are not being considered when bus stops are being continually moved. Folk with mobility problems need to know where to get on/off without having extra obstacles to overcome."

"CEC get away with cutting corners all the time without repercussions. They should be focussing on real issued such as the housing crisis and not wasting our money on this."

"In my view it is not achieving its objectives and is causing significant delay and more importantly pollution There does not appear to be any £ to put things back when the TTROs expire"

"the artificial slowing of traffic massively increases pollution, both in the form of emissions that are harmful to human health, and the increased CO2 emissions that are some 8% higher at 20 mph than at 30 mph."

"I am unhappy and don't agree with it"

"These emergency measures, many ill thought out and confusing for all, should not be made permanent without proper consultation"

"Robust active travel infrastructure must be designed properly without short cutting the process. Safety assessments at all stages are critical. Local people must be consulted. Businesses at the centre of our economy need customers to access them so they

"The cycle lanes are nothing but a joke. Maybe fix the potholes first eh??"

Name redacted

"The spaces left for cars to travel through have not clearly been thought through, don't get me started on trying to pass a bus"

"Unnecessary barriers everywhere in a city with terrible road surface conditions and not enough space for all the road users-cycles, cars, motorbikes, busses, lorries, trams!!!!"

Name redacted

"Edinburgh Council have an arrogant, non-listening, "we know best" attitude towards the public who pay their salaries ! "Consultations" are just window dressing, held after the decisions have been made and started to be implemented. They are shameless in

"This idea is the worst idea, it will cause more congestion, it causes dangers to pedestrian crossing roads as the have to cross cycle park and parked cars before they even get to the road"

"It is so unsafe for pedestrians Also with the bad weather last week I don't know how there were no fatalities on the main road from buckstone to Morningside as it was so narrow with the bollards and mounds of snow Edinburgh wastes so much money on things

"They are dangerous!"

"I live in corstorphine and do not think the proposals will solve anything"

"What the council are doing is a complete waste of resources and a remaking changes without consultation or due consideration"

"I am an NHS Advanced Nurse Practitioner who has to travel to work in the present restrictions. Cycling to work has become more difficult since the narrowing of roads has been implemented. The cycle lanes were not cleared of snow, cars pass too closely

"These arrogant councillors who by the way were elected by 'us' the normal people , think they can do what they want without any due regard for the people that are living in the area, these temporary measures are all a lie, and they need to be reversed,

"I drive a truck in Edinburgh and on George 4th Bridge we are forced to stop blocking the road because there is nowhere to park and its a main bus route. At present you are told to stay at home so why implement this when no-one is meant to be walking the

"These are making roads worse"

"This is a poorly implemented scheme with no public consultation and badly lit cycle lanes Narrowing the road on main ambulance routes to the hospital is crazy Spend the money on the Edinburgh suburban rail route"

"I am a local resident who believes that most of these measureas are unnecessary, are in danger of becoming permanent without proper democratic process and will damage local business and community services and amenity."

"I'm disturbed that the council are not listening to communities and their needs. Cycle lanes are being prioritised over bus lanes which is incredulous that a minority in the community are getting precedence over a majority of users, makes no sense."

"I work in Edinburgh and it is a nightmare to get around! Any road changes must be consulted upon and not done on the whim of the council!"

"The council are killing Edinburgh. The narrowing of road lanes and all the barriers look awful and in my opinion are dangerous."

"There is clearly no need for these measures to stay in place !! Dangerous and not useful at all ."

"These draconian parking restrictions are destroying small businesses as well as spoiling simple pleasures like accessing my favourite local shops."

"I do not think this project is changing our road system for the better."

"I'm signing because these non emergency measures are being pushed through under the cloak of Covid and the citizens just won't be fooled."

"These changes have resulted in chaos - driving traffic onto fewer roads can only mean increased congestion."

"There are little enough places to park/load vehicles in most of these areas as it is and this has only been made more difficult with the introduction of this scheme, which seems to be nothing more of an inconvenience to local businesses and drivers."

"Many of the changes to date are poorly thought out and some are dangerous. There must be consultation."

"The approach is ridiculous on many points - in snow bike lanes can't be cleared properly. Floating bus stops are dangerous. Narrow roads can be dangerous."

"I'm signing because of the mess and upheaval CEC are making in our community between people spaces and now on top of that no parking in front of our own doors when we are a good distance from main roads. This will cause real problems to the village enviro"

"Disabled access should never be compromised and businesses have suffered enough during pandemic without making them less accessible"

"I do cycle in and out of Edinburgh regularly and have experienced the "temporary" measures put in place for covid. While I'm all in favour of creating more safe cycle routes/lanes, I do question if the people designing these actually ride a bike? This ne"

"These measures have caused serious congestion and dangerous parking in side streets around my childrens primary school and made it unlikely to allow them to walk to school unaccompanied through fear of them crossing what were once quiet roads with clear"

"Roads are like Baghdad"

"Live and drive in Edinburgh, very frustrating!"

"I believe the council has acted unlawfully and against public interests and wishes. The changes made to the roads in my area are dangerous and unnecessary."

"These proposed changes costing c. £5million, I understand, are completely pointless when they force vehicles down quiet residential streets, when cyclists are likely to come to harm with the myriads of potholes and pedestrians can trip on the badly maint"

"Ridiculous changes for the worse"

"The council are taking liberties with this to suit their own agenda"

"Some of the changes made are frankly ridiculous and dangerous, and should never have been put up temporarily, never mind permanently."

"Seeing the wind and rain today confirms that the solution can't be focus just on cycling as that is not inclusive it must focus on BUSES"

"Whilst most cyclists pay attention to other traffic on the roads, others don't. Seems more consideration is being given to cyclists than vehicles."

"These r dangerous"

"I don't believe these are necessary and will lead to increased risk of accident."

"The changes being made will make parking extremely difficult and lead to dangerous parking & public hazards."

"A lot of cycle lanes are more dangerous both for cyclist and drivers and the exit points. Now cars are being made to park in the middle of streets beside cycle lanes, this makes cars look abandoned and dangerous for pedestrians exiting their vehicle and

"We never received any communication from the council prior to the changes in Lanark Road and only knew about it thanks to a neighbour. We now have no parking and there has already been one bike accident since the changes! I even saw one cyclist completel

"This impacts my Mums road. Drop off with my toddler now dangerous as can't get parked or if we can can't get our pram out the boot"

"Should be filling all the dangerous pot holes instead of wasting money on cycle lanes."

"It's a danger and causes congestion. How do emergency vehicles get through. Problems for small businesses, a total waste of our council tax when roads are dire and in need of repair. Clowncil at its best !"

"The changes have been done in an arbitrary, ill-informed manner without actioning local concerns or objections. Some of the changes are also, clearly, dangerous"

"Being disabled I depend on my car to get around but have no longer access to several businesses as the parking facilities have been removed in favour of cycle lanes & wider pavements all to benefit those who are fortunate in having no disabilities to cop

"I live off Comiston Road and find it more dangerous than it was."

"I walk, drive and cycle and it's an unsafe mess out there."

"Tried quiet route today and discovered that road surfaces which might be ok for cars are not ok for bicycles. Surely they assessed the state of the road before doing this."

"It's a waste of money, is extremely ill-planned, is bad for local businesses, causes more traffic and bus jams, and is only done in the name of establishing fashionable "green credentials". I'll perhaps re-consider when I see the Lord Provost step out of

"I want to live in an independent Scotland not exist in a police state"

"I own a shop in Stockbridge and the changes are hugely detrimental to my business"

"These people who passed this legislation should be sacked from there position, absolute waste of money ."

"Difficult working as a community nurse my car is essential in order to do my job.Restrictions Will impact heavily on me and my colleagues getting around."

"Pushing through these schemes without proper consultation is outrageous. Secondly, if the council wish to make Edinburgh a safer, greener city and more pleasant place to live/work, I suggest they start by properly gritting roads/pavements in cold weather

"The council's actions are undemocratic and do not stand up to any form of scrutiny for them to be the basis for long term change."

"I feel there is more priority given to cyclists who pay no insurance or road tax. As well as giving them more road space they now think they own the pavements.....also cycling in pairs is not on. They need to pay for a registration plate, be suitably

"I'm signing because I believe the council is trying to pull a fast one, using the excuse of COVID related adjustments to implement ill designed and ill thought out schemes with inadequate public consultation. It's another abuse of their powers and pays n

"I consider that East Craigs is not n area which has a high traffic flow and the proposed plans cause dangerous road junctions, high pollution and unnecessary problems for people with mobility problems"

"Their idea is dangerous and crazy."

"I would like safer roads but with consultation with residents. There must be some common ground and not impose these road restrictions under current covid legislation."

"I don't agree with temporary measures being made permanent without proper consultation."

"This scheme is totally inadequate. There have been a few accidents on Comiston Road involving cyclists and pedestrians the very people this crazy council are "supposed" to be helping."

"It would appear that the council are so wrapped up in their own self-interests and ideologies - painting lines on roads for cyclists only, erecting bollards on cycle lanes for a select few thus narrowing the roads even more. These road changes being rail

"The people should have been consulted and this is just a wast of money should have fixed pavements and roads instead"

"Name redacted These measures aren't needed . And are dangerous . They aren't maintained in my area they get a sludge forming and can't use them . I have seen people slip and fall as a result . I need the car to do shopping and have had to travel fu

"The spaces are useless and ugly. I haven't seen anyone using them and the pillared cycle lanes are too narrow and dangerous."

"I think the whole idea is ill thought through. It is not joined up thinking. It leads to more congestion more health problems. Edinburgh Council would be better spendin money on roads 1st before someone gets killed in a pot hole"

"As a cyclist, the narrowing of the road space has made it more dangerous. The new dedicated cycle lanes are a travesty. 1. they are not gritted or cleared of snow forcing cyclists to share an even narrower section of road with main traffic 2. path weaves

"Very Important"

"I consider these measures to be wrong, inappropriate, in the wrong places and been bulldozed through without due diligence having been done. I do not consider these measures to be in the public interest as they are not the best measures. I consider fund

"Council now consulting on this so leave your views at <https://consultationhub.edinburgh.gov.uk/bi/retainingspacesforpeopleconsultation/>"

"This I'll thought out scheme carried out under cover of the COVID restrictions has had and will continue to have a material detrimental impact on residents, disabled and businesses who are already hugely effected by COVID. The Council need to be brought

"It's a ridiculous idea!"

"I object to the ridiculous narrowing of roads making the use of the whole road system for pedestrians, cyclists, motorists, etc much more dangerous for everyone."

"What a waste when roads and pavements just look at Princes St,are in a dreadful mess. Our Crescent has been dreadful since the traffic was diverted for the tram work."

"This is potentially dangerous and, speaking as a disabled person, is entirely discriminatory to the disabled and elderly!"

"Feel free to introduce spaces for people along Seafield Road where Arnold Clark take over the road (massive car transporters) on a daily basis making it impossible to cycle/drive safely."

"Does not take into account disabled or people who are not able to walk or ride a bike. Total waste of money, better spent repairing the roads and getting rid of potholes."

"The Spaces for People scheme was ill-thought-out and causes far more problems than it supposedly solves. Scrap it now."

"Is the council wanting to keep the spaces for people because they blew their full spend installing these areas and have left no money to remove them? I think they have been a pointless spend and should be removed for safety reasons"

"The changes used a fast track consultation approach and have created a very dangerous environment for traffic, cyclist and pedestrians and have stopped businesses and people having their right of free movement. To now force through these changes which ad

"I don't like what the Edinburgh council doing they're not repairing potholes Edinburgh roads are so bad for car damage my car so many times hitting the potholes cost me 1000s of pounds I don't know why they're spending a lot of money on these things this is not acceptable

"The spaces for people are causing more traffic congestion, pushing cyclists onto the roads when snowing and taking space away from businesses. It is just not needed and is downright dangerous."

"Road closures near my property make access for myself and others extremely difficult - I can only imagine the havoc it plays with emergency services. Seems completely unnecessary and solves a problem that wasn't there"

"Edinburgh council have completely lost the plot. They are treating the people who they represent with complete contempt. They just do not listen to what we want and need. Our roads are like that of a 3rd world country. Use the funds for the tram extension

"We don't want these spaces for people it's causing more traffic and it's dangerous"

"I drive in Edinburgh, we have horrible road bends curves up and down road shape and narrow roads now new introducing cycle drive way is more harder to drive and take more time to cross any normal road, more over I don't find much people very rare people

"Temporary measures should not be made permanent without a proper review."

"It's very dangerous and done without any planning and consideration of all types of vehicles. I would like council to make life easy for people not hard."

"I feel these changes have been carried out incorrectly and without consultation"

"I feel the changes being made are going to cause accidents, pollution and road rage from all users"

"As someone who has to deliver in the city it has made an already challenging job even harder."

"The spaces for people infrastructure makes it incredibly difficult for me to do my job effectively. There are many areas where private hire vehicles simply cannot stop to drop off or pick-up passengers. Also, a lot of the proposals allow for buses, Hack

"Cycle lanes are dangerous when getting on the bus with cyclists having no insurance they won't pay for any damages or injuries and I don't know why we need them as they cycle on the pavement no police around to charge them."

"The elderly, disabled, parents, shoppers will be restricted by the lack of parking or difficulty in accessing public transport. Edinburgh Council making 'safer' spaces is a joke because the retailers are struggling as it is for customers. Making it safer

"Because what the council has done this last year is dangerous to road users, pedestrians and cyclists."

"Traffic will be chaotic when out of lockdown due to them"

"There is no public consultation and you are vilifying car users"

"Traffic will be chaotic around the area causing tail backs on the roads that are open."

"I think cutting down the roads make the traffic worse plus unfair on shops on Morningside road ."

"It is causing congestion and also causing accidents and making reducing parking and even buses cannot pass."

"Its is one of the stupidest idea ever not a thought for elderly, disabled or people think there will numerous accidents heaping more pressure on the NHS."

"Obviously decided by people who don't live or know the areas they have changed. I am a pedestrian, cyclist, bus user and a driver so I am not biased to any mode of transport. The changes on the Lanark Road completely unnecessary and waste of our money."

"The whole scheme is a shambles no thought given to the elderly or disabled people. These measures have caused more accidents."

"I'm angry that the Council are ignoring legislation and public opinion with regard to major changes being implemented to our roads and our safety. We were informed that Spaces for People was a temporary measure, therefore any permanent changes must sur

"Bollards have been installed by Spaces for People for (unnecessary) pavement widening outside the Baptist Church Hall in Portobello High Street. Unless removed, these bollards will prevent minibuses delivering and collecting dementia-sufferers and frail

"The roads are bad enough without adding more danger to pedestrians, cyclists and drivers"

"I feel the imposed changes are a risk to life as well as undemocratic imposition on all road users"

"Many of the changes made have the potential to lead to loss of life."

"As a regular cyclist I find the imposed cycle lanes to be, mostly, unsafe and claustrophobic and they push me into the traffic at points where they join with the main road. They were a unusable during the snowy period as homeowners piled their excess sno

"Residents should have been consulted, I do however welcome the 30mph speed limit on Comiston Rd/Buckstone Terrace"

Name redacted

"As a disabled person living in Slateford this makes me extremely angry. No thought whatsoever has been given to the safety of vulnerable people. The council are using Covid as an excuse to drive through their ridiculous plans and hoping to get away with

"Some if the design of the cycle lanes are absolutely terrible, I don't think it will be long before someone is seriously hurt , I have actually seen cyclist not using them ,"

"It has now become extremely dangerous being out in Edinburgh. Also it is putting lives at risk as ambulances can't get through as cars can't move out the way to let them pass"

"All a nonsense!!!"

"They've started on Drumbrae now which is ridiculous and not for cycling."

"New cycle lanes on the Lanark Road with cars now parked to the outside of the cycle lane are utter madness. If a passenger opens their door without seeing the cyclist both could be seriously injured. And what of cars now having to park a couple of feet o

"No consultation. No concern for the actual wishes and needs for Edinburgh residents. Cases where double yellow lines appeared over night outside resident's homes with no consultation."

"I am fed up with paying ever increasing costs of having a car and getting less and less in return in term of the condition of the roads we are paying for. If the Council are so determined to turn George Street into a "Boulevard" can they also guarantee t

"It's nonsense"

"The City of Edinburgh has a very unreasonable attitude towards car drivers."

"Who are making these crazy decisions?"

"The changes are dangerous to cyclists and motorists alike, they further impede the flow of traffic, along with speed bumps, thus leading to higher fuel use and more pollution. Furthermore, the consultation has been inadequate and the use of covid dybds f

"It is a nightmare that's all I can say"

"These road restrictions restrict rather than free up space - the cycle lanes in Holyrood Park are never used and these designated cycle lanes will cause rather than solve problems. Visitors are unable to park, access to driveways are restricted, left tu

"It is unsightly and dangerous."

"This is making the roads more dangerous and goodness knows how ambulances and fire engines will manage to get through the limited spaces."

"Fed up with this council wasting our hard earned cash on useless projects listen to your constituents"

"The badly thought out system is dangerous and unacceptable."

"They are putting double yellow lines outside my family home ,where I've been able to park for last 22 years."

"Enough is enough. Our once beautiful city is being ruined forever by the council and these posts outlining the cycle paths are ridiculous. They dont look very temporary to me."

"I have never seen anything so dangerous or stupid. With traffic sent onto the wrong side of the road in Craigmillar Park it is just a question of time before someone is killed in a head on collision. there have already been accidents on Comiston Road w

"It's ridiculous that we're never consulted about these things going on"

"I'll thought through vanity project"

"The council seems to think it can do what it wants without consulting the public."

"Usual council scheme, poorly thought out knee jerk reaction. But equally excellent at finishing off local businesses (who pay business rates)."

"If ferryroad busy at peek times no emergency vehicles can get through traffic because of bollards stupid idea from council as usual"

"While I am supportive of our city infrastructure offering alternative solutions to motor vehicles some of the measures have been implemented without any real consideration for the impact on the city as a whole or in some cases even the safety to cyclists

"the schemes are causing congestion, lengthening car journeys and making parts of Edinburgh inaccessible for the elderly who don't want to risk using public transport during a pandemic as they can no longer drive and park nearby."

"The schemes have been poorly thought through, with no consultation, and no consideration of consequential impacts. I am in favour of segregated, protected cycle lanes but not in the way it has been undertaken"

"I dont want these cycling lanes to be permanent"

"The roads are a disgrace with po and holes and pavements are also in a diabolical state. Put money into maintaining these first. Cyclists need to pass the highway code and pay something towards roads. Also many don't seem to know a red traffic light mean

"I'm signing because it's redic!As a blue badge holder for someone who has limited mobility, it's becoming increasingly difficult to park near to where we need to be. This potentially could lead the person to have to use a wheelchair rather than promote w

"There are better ways of cutting down traffic on the roads eg low bus fares, good road surfaces for bikes and sufficient room for bikes and cars side by side."

"The changes are dangerous & ill-conceived"

"for info the council have a consultation up and running on this on their consultation hub <https://consultationhub.edinburgh.gov.uk/bi/retainingspacesforpeopleconsultation/>"

"These are more dangerous than useful and I am sure that ECC should have more pressing things to spend tax payers money on."

"On my pre-pandemic visits to Edinburgh I've seen how many older people, many with mobility issues, rely on the city's excellent bus network to get around. These changes make level access to buses much more difficult and unsafe for people we should be loo

"The roadworks are completely random and not very well thought out."

"Waste of money.Repair the roads.counslors with there own agendanot the normal person in the street's.....totally ridiculas."

"The council is a corrupt cooperation!!!!"

"I agree with the petition."

"Accidents need to be reduced not increased"

"Agree cycle lanes too close to bus stops . Dangerous as cyclists dont adhere to give way lines."

"Proper consultation has not taken place and council continue to ignore concerns of residents on safety and implications for other traffic becoming congested and having to name long diversions"

"I object to City of Edinburgh Council spending limited resources on ill-conceived schemes that introduce further confusion and danger onto our roads, whilst ignoring the glaringly obvious danger of ever-present potholes and damaged pavements which are ne

"If these measures were made permanent and traffic flows return the City will come to a standstill. Trying to force everyone into Public transport doesn't work hence the reason for a drop in bus passenger numbers prior to COViD."

Name redacted

"Cyclists don't even use the lanes. No warnings where they were placed when first coming out and seen plenty of moments that nearly led to an accident. They do more danger and they don't even get used properly."

Name redacted

"I am signing this because these plans are ludicrous beyond belief."

"I agree with this petition, lets actually fix the roads, the conditions are the worst in the country. For a capital we should have much higher standards."

Name redacted

"Edinburgh council always intended this to be a permanent and detrimental change to our roads. Edinburgh Council are anti car and mostly consider how tourists view the city. These dodgy moves were under the guise of covid based on no evidence of reduced t

"It adversely affects the elderly and disabled when trying to go about their daily routine as it can severely hinder or prohibit them from accessing businesses, it can also have a detrimental effect on the small local business"

"Please follow the due process of the law. These changes are unnecessary and unacceptable."

"Any necessary changes must be fully explained and evaluated with integrated impact assessments by getting all stakeholders involved in a proper community consultation rather than a half baked online one in the middle of a pandemic. The whole process must

"Feel it's dangerous for pedestrians, elderly and disabled"

"Am disabled with a blue badge and what's the point of having it if the roads are closed off. No consideration for the disabled and elderly with mobility issues. Not everyone with mobility issues is in a wheelchair! Am sick of being on a pavement and havi

"My husband drives a bus in Edinburgh"

"Congestion is bad enough in Edinburgh without this adding to it."

"I am signing this because cyclists are the bane of my life! Cyclists should pay some form of taxation and 100% there should be insurance carried by cyclists, if last 2 points are implemented I would be in support of cycling lanes!"

"Minto Street and Craigmillar Park has become a danger to pedestrians, cyclists and drivers. So many pinch points now on the main road and people not understanding which direction is two lanes. As for turning into our street (Crawfurd Road) now coming from

"Hopefully people will vote against these Councillors at the next Elections"

"And how will that change what actually happens on the roads?? Please don't assume that I'm a cyclist when you reply."

"The Minto Street arrangement was clearly thought up by someone in Edinburgh zoo!!"

"It's a danger to road users and causing even more city congestion"

"Edin Council are out of control on this issue"

"I think this is wrong."

"I have a disability. I love this City and want to be able to Access most of it. I need to be able to drive otherwise I am excluded."

"This does nothing for the elderly and their carers and families Post lockdown, it will severely restrict their movements Has already for GP, dentist and chiropody visits Making walks and exercise more difficult e.g. the hermitage Same with parents an

"We love and did visit Edinburgh"

"Leaving the cycle lanes is very dangerous as they end at odd places and you are faced with rejoining a single lane with traffic passing at speed."

"Council are not listening to the concerns of the people living in the affected areas. I am a cyclist AND a car user!"

"It's time to sort out all travel choices - repair the roads; remove obstacles; separate pedestrians, motorised vehicles and cyclists to keep everyone safe."

"Where is public information! These things spring up out of nowhere"

"I totally agree - it is becoming a nightmare trying to access anyone or anywhere in Edinburgh by car. The initial rationale is well-intentioned, but the implications, for residents, particularly elderly or disabled are simply not justified. Who are these

"This scheme is so costly to locals and businesses and is ineffective."

"Council are railroading through unsafe changes on our roads without proper consultation"

"It's an absolute farce of a scheme"

"A frustrated driver is a dangerous driver. Pre-pandemic I was a regular walker on the Meadows to Braids route and it was perfectly quiet enough without additional measures to eliminate vehicle traffic. Pollution in Morningside last summer - when traffic wa

"Fed up with this dictatorship Council"

"I despise these proposed changes. It solves no problem and creates more."

"Because such a colossal number of expensive schemes are being put in place with no consultation I can not support any of them. All decent people know that this consultation will be used only to support the schemes."

"The planned road realignment have been poorly thought out and will cause congestion, confusion, and, with all the extra road furniture and signage, dangerous distractions to all road users possibly leading to an increase in collisions."

"Had so many almost accidents Crazy scheme! why did we need this NO ONE was out!!"

"Who ever came up with this idea wants sacked. Not only has it created a danger for motorists and cyclists but also pedestrians. As for the poor bus drivers I can't begin to think what they have to go through . Lucky if you see a cyclist in the lanes ! A j

"The changes are ridiculous and will cause more traffic congestion and I think they will cause more accidents - cars are parking in the middle of the road"

"I believe having cars parked almost in the middle of the road is very dangerous also people who live in these streets have no where to park"

"I believe that accidents have already happened with this middle of the road parking was this reviewed and taken into account before changing the temporary to permanent?"

"These changes often make things more dangerous for cyclists and more confusing for car drivers. I've seen several bikes forced into a narrowed section of road due to barriers and blocked cycle lanes/ overtake and very near passes by cars. I've also seen

"No parking, even outside my own home"

"It is neither safe nor fair!!"

"These changes will affect the flow of traffic in emergency situations. It will cause unnecessary traffic if there are break downs."

"Edinburgh City Council are hellbent on pushing out drivers which can only have a detrimental effect on tourism and locals alike in that they can't get access to city centre due to affordable and joined up public transport infrastructure."

"the council couldn't organise something to do with brewery....they are making things dangerous."

"Making roads more dangerous for all"

"I love Edinburgh and don't want to sit back and watch the council destroy it."

"Signing because these changes are so dangerous!! Did anyone involved in planning this actually consider the risk to life?"

"These changes have too many impacts and have not been assessed correctly"

"Another knee jerk reaction from Edinburgh council people and goods need to move through the city and restricting roads without a viable alternative is not the way forward."

"The lack of thought on traffic flow is beyond belief and seems to be focused solely on making Edinburgh the least traffic friendly city it can possibly be"

"This council led by Adam McVey continues to pursue misguided policies and ignore the citizens of our city, disregarding public consultations, defying objections and even introducing summary processes without justification in order to avoid public dialogu

"These measures are further restricting movement round the city for it's businesses and citizens, it has created a hazard by forcing traffic onto the middle of the road, created further risk to cyclists having to negotiate in and out of cycle zones and th

"No joined up thinking, they want to reduce road use and CO2 emissions, but only exacerbate the situation by poorly thought out road management which is going to cause more harm than good in so many ways."

"The new cycle lanes seggregations are dangerous to the public. They are too narrow, there is no possibility to clean the cycle paths"

"It is killing local shops"

"I do not agree the changes are necessary and there should be better consultation to proceed"

"I just want the right to travel to my home and my work . I don't want to be dictated to by the council about how I get around. The council should concentrate on fixing the roads, not closing them"

"I'm signing this because the council has implemented too many road changes during lockdown without proper consultation or planning many of which are ill thought out, dangerous or inappropriate."

"Its a joke for public money.!!!!!!"

"The road is now more dangerous for both cyclists and car users. This scheme was approved despite 300 objections out of 327 replies. Hardly democratic. I have requested the risk assessments from the Council as I believe there is no way they have assessed

"Sick of Edinburgh council doing what they want even when we the public who pay they're wages are very much against it and wasting our money□"

"cycle lanes should be created, but in a logical way that doesn't ridiculously inconvenience traffic and dangerously confuse motorists. These 'places for people' make it hard for everyone to get around."

"It is wrong what they're trying to do and the money could be spent fixing or adapting water of leith for cyclists which the community agrees on"

"I'll thought out and totally unecesary."

"I use the Lanark road everyday and it is a danger"

"As a taxi driver in Edinburgh I am fed up with all of these traffic changes under the guise of safety because of covid 19. It is the complete opposite and is detrimental to the safety of drivers, passengers, disabled, elderly and the general public. We a

"I am a driver and a cyclist and as both I just don't think Edinburgh has the infrastructure to roll this out safely. I think it will put me at risk both on my bike and in my car."

"I have yet to see any evidence that these spaces for people are necessary. I am in corstorphine every day and I just can't fathom why we need them and it just causes hassle and safety issues for motorists."

"It is really dangerous."

"I don't agree with the scheme. I believe that they will put lives at risk."

"Waste of money, hazardous to road users, obstacle for emergency vehicles"

"This isn't wanted and removing parking spaces in certain areas will harm local business. Our pavements aren't over capacity and we don't need the extra space anywhere. This is a waste of money"

"I have yet to see any significant benefits from chopping up arterial routes in and out of Edinburgh"

"Lanark road is an obstacle route, totally useless, an accident waiting to happen!"

"These measures are dangerous.... they obstruct emergency services, deliveries and buses"

"It is getting worse dont know 2which way to look when crossing roads"

"As a disabled person I genuinely believe this Council has an anti-disabled agenda, seemingly supported by Lothian Buses: they don't listen and they don't care."

"Its vandalism by the council and works directly against businesses elderly and infirm the councillors who introduced this should not be in authority"

"Lanark Road is an accident waiting to happen!"

"I am disgusted and angry that such a dangerous shambles has been allowed to go ahead and at such cost."

"It is a completely ridiculous idea."

"The newly introduced "floating parking" along Kingsnowe is a danger to all who are forced to use it; experienced drivers are forced to swerve back and forth randomly and it is only a matter of time before someone not familiar with the area either ploughs

"The changes make for a dangerous environment not a safer one."

"There is plenty room on the pavements, and not enough room on the roads. Besides, next to no-one uses them!"

"Congestion, causing pollution and inaccessibility for disabled people are characterising Edinburgh roads at the moment. Also the main route out of and into the south of the city has become a slow traffic jam."

Name redacted

"i think it is only a matter of time before someone is seriously injured by these measures"

"Lanark Road is now extremely dangerous - accidents waiting to happen. Council should be ashamed allowing this to happen."

"The roads are worse instead of better. The council just making their own decisions and not for the better or safer."

"I'm a cyclist, but I hate what's happening. The bollarded lanes make me feel hemmed in and less safe. I'm a full road user, and shouldn't be crammed in a narrow ghetto. Also, I drive on occasion, and the ill-considered closures have caused chaos. Try get

"Its been rushed and ill thought through"

"I'm signing this because I don't like the way this scheme is going ahead without proper consultation and because the people implementing the road changes are not thinking about the safety of children, people using wheelchairs, the elderly and those pe

"Yet again, the people who pay these councillors salaries haven't been listened to. We haven't been asked. Decisions are made with no apparent regard for common sense. Shutting roads etc that vehicle owners have to pay to travel on - to make way for pedestrians

"I am appalled with the state of roads in Edinburgh since the first lockdown last year. Priority has been placed on superficial measures and not essential works such as fixing dangerous potholes. I do not wish my tax money to be spent in that way."

"I am fed up of CEC making decisions that severely affect council tax payers without giving sufficient consultation beforehand or taking on board views that are voiced."

"The whole thing, while with the best intentions, is ill thought out."

"These idiots know nothing about cycling or safe transportation around the city and have left students, elderly, handicapped, cab drivers and all sorts of others without any consideration."

"causing far more problems than it purports to 'solve'"

"Edinburgh looks like downtown Beirut now, and not the beautiful city it used to be. Get the potholes fixed properly."

Name redacted

"This scheme has been rushed through at great expense, on tenuous grounds, with lack of proper consultation or planning. It will cause more problems than it will solve. At the same time potholes and cracks in pavements remain."

Name redacted

"It doesn't make the roads or pavements any safer. Having a cycle lane hidden by parked cars then emerging close to traffic lights is extremely dangerous. The loss of local street parking makes access much more difficult for disabled people who find dista

"They are a waste of money sn dangerous"

"Edinburgh council having been making poor infrastructure decisions for a long time now that are frequently at the expense of residents and council tax payers. It's time for change"

"Totally Agree"

"The whole thing is dangerous and ruining a one beautiful city. Killing business and costing a fortune"

"The changes the council have made to the roads have made it much more difficult to travel around. I am a resident of Edinburgh and I am therefore one of the 'people' they are creating spaces for. I have a disability and the changes to the roads have i

Name redacted

"As an HGV driver who now lives and delivers in and around Edinburgh this also stops loading areas being used and forcing us to cross busy roads with goods to premises that require them which means moving a cage of about 600kg from one side of the road to

"People with reduced mobility won't be able to. Reach their destination"

"This is ill though out and in some areas with no regard for disabled access or common sense"

"I believe the proposals are ill thought out and the Council are trying to push them through on a false emergency pretext and because they are damaging to business and make congestion worse rather than better"

"Ridiculous road restriction measures will cost workers and business's money and time. Money should be spent repairing the roads!"

"The council have gone bonkers!"

"I am objecting to parking charges that are being put in place in my area and The new cycle lanes are dangerous for all"

"Council seems to think everyone can jump on a bike. They should spend the money repairing the roads instead."

"Many changes are dangerous and unnecessary - even cyclists agree!!!"

"its terrible . it takes ages for me to get to the hospital at ashley ainslie . re open the road"

"I agree with this petition. Get the council to properly repair roads in the city. They are not fit for purpose. Neither is the council"

"McInnes and McVey out!"

"The new layouts are dangerous and will cause more accidents Money wasting too"

"I drive around Edinburgh for work and the council has made a total mess of this city. The road narrowing is dangerous, it puts people's lives at risk."

"These are to harass drivers into cycling which although cost taxes will never work we are not anti-progressive leftist."

"It's the most ridiculous and equally dangerous and waste of money (AKA improvement) that the CEC has even undertaken and that's saying something considering some of the other "improvements" they made _____"

"The whole scheme is outrageous and dangerous."

"These changes were meant to temporary, and have been pretty disastrous for the average person."

"Born and bred but couldn't get out of Edinburgh fast enough"

"100 percent behind this!"

"It puts others at risk, which is quite ironic for something to make things safer"

"This is a bloody joke all for cyclists who pay nothing to any kind of road tax, plus what about older or disabled people trying to get to their cars ,they need more time to get in and out of the vehicle.Bikes don't stop at lights or crossing , so what ar

"Stealth changes. Bad moves."

"Councillors are elected to serve all members of the community including the elderly and disabled not just cyclist"

"The parking areas on Lanark Road have made dangerous when exiting Dovecot Park. There was a near miss when a resident in the street narrowly missed a cyclist, when turning into the street from the main road. The parking areas are causing a hazard by forc

"Residents should have a say in their area. There should be full and proper consultation. It is not for the council to dictate what should happen."

"Edinburgh council is a law unto itself - spending vast sums of resident's council tax on all of its anti motorist procedures. The cyclists that I know dislike the lanes - much too restrictive. Many cyclists still cycle on the pavements- soon there will b

"Spaces for people endangers walkers and cyclists by creating a huge rise in pollution caused by idling vehicles which are stuck in traffic, crowded into one lane which can't move on. They also endanger lives by blocking fire engines and ambulances unable

"Roads don't require to be narrowed."

"It's an ill thought out attack on motorists which leads to many dangerous situations for all road users. Once the traffic goes back to pre covid levels there are so many choke points , the system Will lead to frustrated drivers which is in itself a dange

"What a disgrace to the streets of the capital"

"This is a complete waste. There aren't sufficient bikes or pedestrians on most of the roads. It is slowing traffic and increasing pollution"

"These are a total waste of time, I drive around Edinburgh every day, the space isn't being used."

"I don't agree that the new road layouts is beneficial to anyone at all"

"I think they make things more dangerous for pedestrians, cyclists+drivers"

"As someone who drives in Edinburgh almost daily, these new layouts are an accident waiting to happen, in the event of a breakdown they prevent moving to a safe place, now imagine a bus or a HGV + a blind bend and the ensuing crash that could happenThe 'f

"I feel these changes to the roads around my area are poorly thought out and have added to the dangers faced by cyclists and drivers in the city"

"As I work in Edinburgh on a regular basis, I have seen how ridiculous these changes are. Roads need to be clear for safety, obstacles endanger everyone."

"It's lunacy"

"Its dangerous"

"I thought it was an April fools when I last drove in Edinburgh, the cycle lanes are bigger than the car lanes, turns out they are actually for real, unbelievable this, stupidity beyond belief"

"These schemes are out of all proportion and the cost of it all is ridiculous and would have been better spent repairing the roads and pavements."

"For every reason noted - just steamrolled in making a complete and confusing mess of our beautiful city - sure you can spend the money on better things like repairing the roads and pavements properly"

"Less parking is not good for the ec6"

"It's an accident waiting to happen."

"Because the council is playing with all of our lives!!!"

"Very dangerous changes. Congestion and pollution increased unnecessarily. Revert ASAP."

"Our Council leaders might not UNDERSTAND but more importantly they don't seem to CARE."

"It's not working out"

Name redacted

"Extremely dangerous plans, Council are pushing through plans at a time when the public have more concerns due to Covid. Surely holes in the road need to be filled as a priority which are dangerous to the public, whether walking, driving or cycling. Chan

"This pandemic has let Councils go over the top with stupid ideas. Inverness has the same things that you guys are protesting about."

"They are dangerous to all !!"

"The road system is a disaster , the person that thought this up needs sacking ."

"many of the changes are ridiculous like creating random 5 yard spots of walking space in Raeburn Place which no one ever uses. Let's have cycle lanes, but plan them properly and don't shut some roads so that the ones available have double the traffic wi

"Because I'm completely fed up with this seemingly random chopping and changing if streets which were fine as they were - if it ain't broke don't mend it!"

"This is dangerous"

"I believe making the streets narrower is also making them less safe."

"It's totally unnecessary. They are making the roads more dangerous."

"If taxis can't get right alongside pavements to unload wheelchair/powerchair users they could have quite some distance to get to a dropped kerb to allow them to get onto the pavements! This is absolutely ludicrous! I'd like to know how many disabled righ

"It's so dangerous!! Not only for cars but cyclists too"

"Seen this in London, what a load of shite, don't know how the bastards got away with it! It's ugly and in fact has made the road more dangerous. Typical of the Government, look after the uninsured, unlicensed baskets and screw the motorist!"

"The city is grinding to a standstill but the clowncil don't realise people have to use cars, you can't buy large items then take them on a bus !!!!!"

"In our opinion, Edinburgh City Council are proving, once again, that they are totally inept at being responsible for Edinburgh's traffic management schemes."

"James Tullis is 100% RightWe had all this before with Burns & Anderson spending our money on traffic lights at places like Canonmills to slow traffic down for congestion charge into City before they got wiped out in referendum. I would not let 85% of the

"These changes are ridiculous. Some are down right dangerous."

"I travel on ferry road at golden acre every week and its now terrible with the new cycle lane. Takes twice as long grr"

"I'm all for more cycling lanes, but what the council has done has made it more dangerous for me to cycle around the city.Do it properly and make them safe or don't do it at all."

"Yesterday a south- bound cyclist overtook me on the inside cycle lane as I was indicating to make a left turn into Church Hill Place. I saw him approaching fast in my mirror and let him through of course, but he seemed potentially unaware of the danger.

"I'm sick of being held up in traffic caused by cycle lanes and road narrowing especially Morningside Road in particular."

"I am a huge fan of cycle lanes but being a regular cyclist I do think these lanes have made the roads more dangerous! They end abruptly, and often force bikes out onto the middle of the road."

"I'm signing because Edinburgh has not considered people with disabilities when making those road changes. Our streets are now more dangerous and frightening for us to get out and about. We do not want to feel imprisoned in our own homes."

"It's madness"

"As a cyclist I feel the addition of many cycle lanes makes it more dangerous for cyclists- particularly George IV Bridge. Also alterations to roundabout Orchard Brae/ Comely Bank very confusing for drivers and cyclists, and surely does not conform to Hi

"I agree. I think the measures have made Edinburgh a dabgerous, congested mess. Lucky if you see a maximum of 3 bikes on South Crewe Road at any one time. Measures have maderoads narrow and more dangerous. Cones everywhere. It's like a ski slalom, with tr

"There's not been any proper consultation. Areas not being used as they've been set up to use. Accidents waiting to happen."

"This is a dangerous situation and should be withdrawn"

"What they have done just blows my mind! Whoever came up with this idea should be ashamed of themselves!"

"I have been smashed into by a cyclist on Forest Road which caused considerable bruising, nearly hit by a bus on the mound as it swung out to avoid bollards and saw an elderly lady being reprimanded by a cyclist whilst get out of the passenger side of the

"These new restrictions are accidents waiting to happen. I have seen so many near misses as I have driven around Edinburgh. They are not safe."

"Most dangerous idea Edinburgh Council has come up with. Park in the middle of a road and then try and get a disabled person who can't Herat out the car. Also got to cross a cycle lane to board a bus."

"They're dangerous"

"The roads are now a confusing mess of bollards, islands, appearing and disappearing cycle lanes etc. Cars have to weave in and out, cyclists and pedestrians are confused - it is madness. I think the roads are much more dangerous than they were before.

Name redacted

"Accident waiting to happen..No regard for disabled or elderly..Waste of taxpayers money..causing problems and dangers that weren't there before."

"Absolutely crazy!!!!"

"This initiative that isn't safe was done under the auspices of a temporary measure. Any move to make this permanent is ill conceived and typifies CEC's arrogance and lip service to the average person"

"I think this is so badly thought through by the council and a serious waste of money."

"The measures taken by the council to make the roads safer have done exactly the opposite. I'm a cyclist and find the lanes to be dangerous, for example if there is another cyclist in front of you and you don't know the lane is there, you can't see the b

"The council have not taken into consideration the long distances elderly/disabled people are having to walk to bus stops with all the tram works. Why do they have to have so many roadworks going on in Edinburgh at the same time?"

"The dafter the idea the more the Council will implement it!!"

"Useless Council at it's best, sneak things in that THEY want. Wasn't necessary in most cases during worst of the pandemic and this joke is just getting worse! Take a look at yourselves, you're a laughing stock Council.. Sort it out and stop putting peo

"I'm sick of Edinburgh CC treating us like crap(that's the most succinct I could be)"

"The roads are going to be dangerous"

"The idiots that run this council are a complete waste of space. These changes damage local business"

"I'm sick of this council destroying our City , with their stupid dangerous road changes ."

"These changes are not thought through well enough and are a menace to all road users - people, bikes and cars!"

"I'm signing because the road changes are positively dangerous and someone is going to be killed as a result!"

"pedestrians and cyclists not a good mix in limited space allocated. Edin council spoiling lovely city."

"I think the Council needs to give a lot more thought to how the streets can be made safer for the elderly and disabled. Yes, and cyclists too, but these designs, including those on Minto Street/Mayfield Gardens/Craigmillar Park or Old Dalkeith Road will

"These changes are aesthetically displeasing - do you think tourists are going to want to visit this brutalised capital city. Day to day use of local shops for people that need to use their cars to get about and cannot walk far can no longer park near them

"Edinburgh is beautiful as it is. No more changes please."

"Take it these councillors that thought up this crazy dangerous idea, fly into work in the mornings ? Because nobody would subject themselves to this nonsense purposely. The excuses they have given to the taxi company videoing the fails is a bigger laugh

"These measures are an accident waiting to happen. Enclosed cycle lanes already building up debris with no escape for cyclist. Please spend the money on potholes and make the roads safer for everyone."

"Who thought this was a good idea? Ridiculous_"

"The work carried out is dangerous in many places and has clearly been designed by someone who knows nothing about road safety."

"What they've done is dangerous for all road users. It's not practical for daily living and a complete waste of money."

"I have observed this process over time in my area and have already sent my views to the consultation process but have no faith that Edinburgh residents views are being taken into account as these measures were supposed to be temporary and there has been

"I agree"

"It is so dangerous in Morningside and Newington let alone the rest of the city . Imagine what the traffic will be like when the COVID rules ease and more cars are on the road and old people are try to cross the roads."

"This is totally unsafe and clogs up the city. It will cause mayhem and a lot of bad feeling"

"We were told these measures were to be temporary. They are unnecessary and dangerous."

"I'm very concerned about all road users, including disabled people, kids, inexperienced drivers and more...this plan has been chaos and without thought for ALL."

"The public didn't get a say"

"When are these people going to do the job they are obliged to do, namely serve the people of Edinburgh. ALL the people of Edinburgh. If they can't, they should resign."

"There is no benefit to any road user with these dangerous schemes. Turning the capital's streets into utter chaos."

"Serve your people Edinburgh and stop prioritising tourists and their means of travel!"

"It's a terrible and dangerous system. What a mess the council have made of this."

"You're destroying a beautiful city !!!"

"I'm signing because its an accident waiting to happen _"

"They are a hazard to all in particular disabled and elderly people. They are also increasing congestion which in turn increases pollution as vehicles are no longer able to safely pass stationary vehicles on the narrowed roadways thus causing more pollut

"Disturbance for residences n caters especially for disabled people, tight spaces for parking cause accidents with cyclist"

"I'm signing because it is quite difficult and leaves cyclist more vulnerable at junctions. Also if any vehicle which is parked on the side of the road makes the person go into another lane (into oncoming lane) which creates more confusion and dangwrous"

Name redacted

"Cyclists aren't using them ,it also makes it more dangerous for pedestrians to cross the the road also ,the council haven't thought about disabled people"

"I am signing because this is destroying our beautiful city and there are more bollards than there is cyclists."

"The changes the Council have made without proper consultation and scant regard to health and safety considerations are ridiculous and dangerous to the public."

"People's livelihoods are at stake here just because the council on a whim put these things in place its now time for them to go"

"I've driven in Edinburgh since this mad scheme has been implemented. The sheer lunacy of it defies belief. People are going to get injured and accidents happen. All in all a dreadful waste of money and effort and made the roads a confusing and unsafe pla

"Most of the changes are ill concieved and reasonable provision for parking is vital in shopping areas both for the businesses and shopper"

"It has been rushed through, is ill designed and is extremely dangerous to cars and their passenges."

"Very worrying safety issues in Edinburgh now. I've been a black cab driver for 35 years in Edinburgh and I know what works and what doesn't. Wait until the steets are busy again. EDC have no foresight."

"R"

"It's an absolute disgrace. So dangerous only matter of time before someone gets seriously hurt. I really do not know what the council were thinking with this plan it's really ruined the roads. It's like a bloody obstacle course the lines are all over the

"It's far to dangerous and a complete waste of money."

"It's a DANGEROUS shambles"

"Supporting communities and local businesses, to help get the council to listen and follow the correct procedures when implementing changes in Edinburgh."

"The whole city is a total mess ,and someone is going to get killed or seriously injured and it will be E.C.C 'S fault , no one has been informed of any of these stupid rules ,if the police aren't happy with it ,"

"I think what you do with road is not logic"

"I care."

"Council is useless"

"This is an accident waiting to happen"

"It's a shambles!"

"Floating parking bays in the middle of the road is an accident waiting to happen, cyclists already had their own area on the road inside a bus lane, weaving from one side of road to other and back is dangerous....and all the roads down to one lane , HOW

"I disagree with these changes"

"I'm fed up seeing my City being ruined by 'well meaning' but badly thought out schemes. Pity the wedding car operators, undertakers and disabled trying to reach a place of worship. And what about the emergency vehicles? I was lucky when I drove fire app

"Safety"

"As a cyclist I believe many of these changes are dangerous and killing our local communities."

"Not everyone is able to cycle some of our older generation can't walk far either and depend on their cars for mobility. Not enough thought given to this group."

"These changes have turned narrow quiet roads where children could play safely into dangerous rat runs risking children's lives that are of no further benefit to anyone! No consultation or proof of requirement - bureaucrats gone mad!"

"I work in the newington area & see the trouble the new road layout is causing for ambulances going to & from the hospital,all this before some sort of normality comes back & theres even more traffic on this route"

"It's outright dangerous, how many lives will it cost? Ambulances can't get to patients in time"

"The roads are just ridiculous now with these and there's more space for cyclists than cars"

"The measures seem to make it unsafe for pedestrians, cyclists and disabled drivers. They will also affect access for emergency vehicles."

"The whole thing is ill conceived and should be done in a proper,sensible and properly consulted way."

"This in no way attempts to be a modern combined transport policy for the benefit of all, but is purely a scheme backed by people with vested interests in their own little bit ."

"I'm appalled at the new road design around the hermitage and midmar - an accident waiting to happen"

"The road layout is very dangerous. Not only has the roads been narrowed for less room for lorries/ buses to pass safely. The cycle lanes are now a hazard passing parked cars on the inside. I was taken out on my bike by a passenger opening their door in

"The council should be spending this money on fixing the potholes. I had a nasty bike crash last year due to a deep pothole. As a cyclist I find these new lanes more dangerous, due to the handle bar height plastic pillars and the stop start nature of the

"The levels of restriction are ridiculous. Emergency services will be delayed. Too many trip hazards. Accidents waiting to happen. Not to mention the mess to my beautiful city. Criminal."

"Enough of careless cyclists who cannot behave properly and think the roads are theirs...very dangerous."

"CO"

"I'm not sure who is meant to benefit from these incredibly ugly and messy looking measures but if anyone knows please let the rest of us know, never witnessed such vandalism since they toppled the headstones in the graveyards in the 1990's , they are sti

"Sick of Council making changes without proper consultation. The new bollards are a danger... more so at night. Whoever came up with all these ideas need sacked"

"Most of the changes are not helpful. Very poorly designed and dangerous in places"

"What a waste of money"

"The widening of pavements to keep pedestrians on Morningside Road 'safe' has not only caused traffic grid lock but a hazard to pedestrians too as I can vouch for from personal experience. 3 weeks ago I tripped over the angled concrete border at the end o

"the loss of parking spaces is killing business in my area."

"What the Council are doing is ill thought out, not risk assessed, breaching any principles relating to engagement and consultation practice and down right illegal."

"I am appalled at the way the council has used Covid, to implement their bicycle scheme without the proper consultation! Surely the 1st step would have been to repair most of our Capital City roads, in order to make them safe for all users? The roads are

"The city is a mess and restrictions dangerous in many cases."

"Spaces for people is a total wast of time and money"

"Lack of thought from council on the implications of this system."

"I have no idea what the council are thinking about. As per usual there will need to be fatalities before any thing is done"

"Ambulances and fire engines cant get passed on meadowplace road. Luton vans need to cross onto the other side of the road at the brow of a hill due to bollards an a traffic island on Drum Brae North."

"Have they given a thought to the confusion they have created for guide dogs not being able to see the edge of pavements."

"It is confusing at best, dangerous at worst and mostly totally unnecessary."

"Pedestrians in Edinburgh already have enough space without these measures. They also look so ugly that they are ruining one of the most beautiful cities in the world."

"These measures are actually more dangerous and cause frustration which in turn is also dangerous. Accidents waiting to happen."

"The roads have become more dangerous for cyclists"

"Dangerous, stupid design causing congestion and anger at motorists paying for cyclists who ignore highway code. Cycle test & licence only way forward"

"Total lack of thought as usual from CEC. A waste of money ."

"The changes make the roads MORE DANGEROUS!!!! Cyclists already have an engorged sense of importance!!! Stop encouraging them to damage cars by kicking them! Im appauled by the behaviour of these people! LICENCES FOR CYCLISTS AND THEY SHOULD PAY ROAD TAX!

"This Council is way too blinkered about reducing traffic, increasing walking and cycling. They do not consider all the users of the routes, most especially residents, businesses and the one that affects me most - the disabled!!! A total rethink of trans

"I use the car once a week to travel to Glasgow, now that we are allowed to again, and one of the great pleasures was to drive home down Braid Avenue to where I live in Blackford and take in the magnificent view of Edinburgh. Now the same road has been va

"In Queensferry it is an accident waiting to happen and there have been several near misses. It is the most stupid idea the council have come up with and most people ignore the signs!"

"It's a shambles !!!!"

"Make areas safe"

"Total waste of money."

"Motorists are paying so much in road tax to use the roads, but this council are removing our rights to do so in Edinburgh."

"I completely agree with this petition and feel it should not go ahead . Daily I see the dangers of it to a whole cross section of the community."

"Ridiculous for elderly infirm blind disabled and the list goes on. Also"

"This is a total waste of money that should go to better organisations such as school and cleansing but snp run council preferred to waste our money."

"The space devoted to cyclists and pedestrians is underutilised. It is also dangerous. Post Covid, the loss of road space will see Edinburgh grind to a halt."

"The current proposals have not been discussed with residents and the impact of all concerned. We all want a safer space for all but the way the council is running this rollout is alienating all road users"

"As a person who works in the city this is a shameful scheme impacting on so many and benefiting noone."

"What is happening to our roads is a safety disaster for cyclists and motorists and pedestrians"

"alot of the changes are dangerous and whats this utter waste of TAXPAYERS MONEY re wooden planters near schools they wont last 2 mins in some areas."

"The changes are a disgrace. A ruination of a beautiful city and bloody dangerous"

"Fatal accident is waiting to happen. Biggest stupidest waste of money. Obviously the people who thought this was a good idea have no clue or they dont drive ."

"As everyone returns to work this will just create unnecessary traffic jams and increased pollution!"

"The council need to seriously look at the carnage being caused, by the new traffic restrictions put in place"

"I'm not stupid"

"Whils driving along an Edinburgh road, I heard a siren and realised there was no way I could move to allow the emergency vehicle passed due to the spaces for people bollards, extremely dangerous especially in both rush hour traffic and roads being worked

"These temporary measures do not work and need to be removed and a sensible permanent solution implemented"

"The expensive mess is making us the laughing stock of everywhere else! It's an absolute farce. The people responsible for this stupid and DANGEROUS error should be sacked and never again allowed anywhere near a responsible job. How must it be going to

"I'm a delivery driver"

"Dangerous and causing traffic issues"

"Edinburgh is congested enough without making roads narrower and slowing everything down. The cycle way barriers are an eye sore too. This once beautiful city just being made an absolute mess"

"I'm signing because it's going to cause someones life too dangerous who ever thought of it should be sacked maybe they were pissed at the time they thought of this idea"

"It is not fair to the old people having to walk that far to a bus and to me these are accidents waiting to happen! Cyclist pay nothing to the Road and one of them nearly knocked my 86 yr old mother over by cycling really fast on the pavement!"

"It needs work..."

"It's dangerous and unnecessary"

"The number of pedestrians falling over the extremely dangerous grey 'bollard holders' is unbelievable. The pedestrians, cyclists and motorists all universally hate the confusing and ill thought out changes. Please take them away. Please also look at the

"These barriers are a nuisance"

"There was little if any consultation with the public about the introduction of cycleways and even walk way on the road for pedestrians when there is a very wide pavement. It appears dangerous to all!"

"We need to make safer access for all but some of these measures put too many people at risk and are dangerous."

"I believe this makes roads more dangerous and stops elderly people from getting out easily from their driveways."

"Dangerous in many places and unsightly everywhere."

"Spaces for people should be safe places, not downright dangerous ones!!"

"As if there was a fire they need easy access and so do the ambulance service, waste of time and money"

"It's a safety hazard"

"The bollards are a hazard and dangerous for cyclists. The cycle lanes have numerous potholes, bottles, broken glass etc, which to avoid means cycle out of the bollarded cycle lane, at risk of clipping the grey bollard base, and at an angle directly into

"These badly thought out plans are causing chaos all over the city. The government are telling us not to use public transport because of covid but the council don't want us to use our cars. I know we're all supposed to cycle or walk everywhere but I'm sor

"This is very important to the people of Edinburgh. The waste of money by the council putting up many temporary spaces for people. Reducing parking spaces etc we are against more of our civil liberties being eroded by the council."

"The measures I've personally experienced as a pedestrian, cyclist and driver are not well designed and do not balance the needs of the community. Some are unsafe and most are unsightly too."

"I am a cyclist and appreciate the cycle lanes. However the road surfaces are making them very dangerous indeed. I keep having to avoid pot holes. This makes cycling all but impossible for anyone not totally confident on their bike. I also object as minis

"Of the impact to local business, access for the disabled, decrease of parking in an already over crowded area (Stockbridge) and increased congestion through stockbridge as Delivery vehicles have no where to stop."

"The Council lurch from one extreme to another, let's plan for residents car use and local businesses as well as cyclists and pedestrians (many of us use cars as well as cycle and walk!)"

"These road closures are totally ridiculous and designed to do nothing other than antagonise the residents of Edinburgh. They need to encourage people to come in to Edinburgh town centre after covid 19 not try to destroy the high street further. How dare

"They have totally ruined our beautiful city and caused nothing but congestion"

"dangerous for emergency vehicles bus drivers remove them now."

"Roads are outrageous and dangerous now in Edinburgh, some roads cars are forced onto cycle paths, madness!"

"Learning to drive and it's cause alot of issues. Not only for learner Is but for all drivers. Emergency vehicles also"

"They are dangerous and cause pollution"

"So it may help the ignorant minds to cease this very mean scheme which fills up pockets of certain people. 30m wasted , utter disgrace. shame on clowncil and susFtrans or their followers"

"I think that this whole scheme (along with the 20MPH nonsense) has been poorly thought-out and poorly implemented right from the start. We're having stuff forced upon us by local councils that we never voted for (or even had the choice of voting on) and

"The road restrictions are dangerous for motorists who are paying for the roads yet are being prevented from using them safely. Pedestrians and cyclists do not pay Road Tax."

"I'm sick of seeing accident or near misses"

"I think that these changes are dangerous and also not helpful for local businesses who have had a hard enough time"

"I deliver on a moped, and used to be able to make good time, all the space for filtering safely has been removed. Emergency vehicles have to park far away from the emergency. The traffic is the worst I've seen outside of August in Edin. Sack those respo

"The roads ain't Edinburgh are at breaking point and this is making it even worse"

"I think these measures are dangerous."

"I believe the changes are making the roads more dangerous."

"It's a farce ! Waste of money.pot holes everywhere"

"I'm sick of the mess and the councils waste of all this money on something no one not even the cyclists want"

"safety is paramount for ALL"

"I am signing because amongst all the things against the car drivers this has reduced the overall lanes in the city causing congestion. It has prevented emergency services from passing through traffic as there is nowhere to pull out of the way.Also I have

"I am disgusted at these changes. No matter what time of day there is now unacceptable levels of congestion when trying to do the most simple of journeys in and out of Morningside, Bruntsfield and Fairmilehead. I totally despair at this amateurish scheme.

"This increase traffic congestion and pollution and restricts access to shops making people shop on line rather than locallyAlso few people over 40 are going to get on a bike and cycle to do any shopping and most certainly for larger items and"


"I fell over one of the bollards in Stockbridge. If I had fallen into the traffic, rather than away from the traffic I might not have been here to sign this petition."

Appendix 7. Data Evidencing No Majority Public Support for Spaces for People Measures on Lanark, Longstone and Inglis Green Roads

[Back to Contents](#)


Public Consultation (residents)

- 68–79% want the scheme removed



Public Consultation (businesses)


- 70–86% want the scheme removed



Professionally conducted market research commissioned by SWEM in Dec 2020

- Survey of those who live, work and travel to the area by a company registered with the Market Research Society
- Promoted through community councils, local businesses, social media and door-to-door
- Fieldwork conducted from 14 December to 30 December, 2020
- Total response of 1,011
- Data checked and validated using IP addresses

Support for City of Edinburgh Council Proposals




Local survey conducted by SWEM from 24 May 2021 until 7 June 2021

Publicised on social media (Facebook, Nextdoor.co.uk), by inviting Longstone Community Council to disseminate, and by local leafleting.

- 80% of respondents want the schemes removed entirely:

Q14: Looking to the future, do you think that the schemes on Lanark, Longstone, Inglis Green and Slateford Roads should:

Answered: 447 Skipped: 0



Powered by SurveyMonkey

- Some support for measures like double-yellow lines near junctions and the 30mph speed limit on Lanark Road:

Q15: Please select which elements of any schemes you would like to become permanent: (please tick one or more options from each row)

Answered: 447 Skipped: 0

	LANARK ROAD	LONGSTONE / INGLIS GREEN ROAD	SLATEFORD ROAD	NONE	TOTAL RESPONDENTS
Segregated cycle lanes (bollards and rubber lane defenders)	9.84% 44	8.05% 36	7.16% 32	88.81% 397	447
Floating parking spaces	6.71% 30	5.82% 26	5.37% 24	92.84% 415	447
Reduction in speed limit	43.18% 193	31.77% 142	28.41% 127	49.22% 220	447
Double yellow lines near junctions	51.01% 228	49.22% 220	46.31% 207	44.52% 199	447
Double yellow lines away from junctions	12.75% 57	12.08% 54	11.63% 52	84.79% 379	447
White hatching to narrow junctions	14.77% 66	12.75% 57	12.53% 56	83.89% 375	447
Bus lanes (currently only Lanark Road)	33.11% 148	8.50% 38	13.42% 60	64.43% 288	447

Powered by SurveyMonkey

Strong majority support for council interventions to maintain roads and off-road paths:

Q17: Are there any features NOT currently included in the Spaces for People schemes that you consider are needed to encourage walking and cycling?

Q18: If you answered "Yes" above, please rate the priority of the following options: _____

Answered: 301 Skipped: 146

	LOW PRIORITY	MEDIUM PRIORITY	HIGH PRIORITY	TOTAL
Speed indicator signs that display speed as cars drive past	37.89% 108	42.46% 121	19.65% 56	285
Off-road paths maintenance and improvement (e.g. Water of Leith, Union Canal)	12.03% 35	20.27% 59	67.70% 197	291
Wider traffic islands with dropped kerbs on pavements opposite traffic islands	34.49% 99	35.54% 102	29.97% 86	287
More traffic wardens to enforce sensible parking based on pre-Covid parking arrangements	54.06% 153	30.74% 87	15.19% 43	283
Light-assisted pedestrian crossing(s) on Lanark Road	25.95% 75	39.10% 113	34.95% 101	289
Cycle lanes with no bollards, that go around parked cars (rather than up the inside of parked cars)	40.91% 117	30.42% 87	28.67% 82	286
Road and pavement pothole repairs and maintenance	5.76% 17	4.41% 13	89.83% 265	295
Functioning speed cameras	31.34% 89	41.90% 119	26.76% 76	284
More traffic islands in the areas	43.45% 126	36.21% 105	20.34% 59	290

Powered by  SurveyMonkey


Appendix 8. Photographic Evidence of Accidents on Lanark Road

[Back to Contents](#)

17 February 2021 Female cyclist attended by an ambulance on Lanark Road. Cyclist came off due to a pothole (eye witness report). No other vehicles involved.



29 May 2021 Car was in collision with a van parked in the floating parking.



12 June 2021 Cyclist in collision with a pre-school child on downhill section of Lanark Road opposite Dovecot Park (eye witness report).



Witness statement (14 June 2021)

Hi

As we discussed over the weekend, on Saturday (12 June 2021) I witnessed a horrific accident on the Lanark Road involving a cyclist and a toddler which, in my opinion, arose as a direct result of the recent changes to the road layout.

My daughter and I drove to Dovecot park for a football training session that was due to begin at 12 noon. We travelled down the Lanark Road in the direction of the city centre and parked in the floating spaces that are on that side of the road. While were waiting (in the car) a cyclist (travelling in the direction of town) collided with a toddler who had just stepped out from in front her parent's car. At that location, the cycle lane passes between the pavement and the parked cars leaving the cyclist, who thankfully was not going at an excessive speed on this downhill section, nowhere to manoeuvre round the girl. He also couldn't have seen her any earlier as his line of sight is obscured by the other parked cars.

Midway through crossing the cycle lane, the young girl's mother shouted to her when she saw the cyclist, but the child froze not knowing whether to keep going to the pavement or return to her mother. All of this happened in the space of a couple of seconds but the chill I feel thinking about watching such a small child bundled under the wheels of the bicycle is something that will live with me (and no doubt the others that witnessed it) for a long time. Both the child and the cyclist suffered significant injuries but thankfully neither required hospitalisation. I suspect this is mostly due to the cyclist's quick reactions and attempts to slow the bike down, but earlier this year a collision resulted in death of the pedestrian (<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-56320121>). It chills me to think that this was very nearly the outcome on Saturday. In the aftermath of the incident the families dog ran out across the road and was not retrieved. Whilst not connected to the immediate incident it's easy to imagine how the situation could have escalated.

Upon reflection I don't think there was a great deal either party did wrong, as a cyclist and a parent, I could see the incident from both sides. However, it would be a dereliction of duty for Edinburgh City Council to say this collision was just a freak accident because the potential outcomes of these events are too

catastrophic to be simply brushed under the carpet. I'm sure this wasn't the first time this has happened, but as we return to more active lives these sorts of incident will happen more frequently. Perhaps next time the unfortunate parties involved won't be so lucky?

We **must** reflect on these incidents and consider on what action can be taken to avoid them happening again in the future. A primary factor in the collision was the cyclists inability to take evasive action and this was purely as a result of the recent changes made to the road. The inherent problem with this design is that the cyclist has no way to avoid a collision, trapped between the cars and pavement there is no escape route left or right.

A fundamental principle of any city council is surely to ensure the safety and well-being of its citizens. To allow these bicycle channels to remain in place for a single day longer is in complete contravention of that, it is to place the implementation of this flawed design ahead of all else and to disregard the people of Edinburgh. I await to see which path is chosen.

Yours sincerely

Name provided to *Keep Edinburgh Moving* and available upon reasonable request.

Further details: *This eye witness was sitting in a car directly in front of the collision. The child suffered bruising and grazing. The cyclist was sufficiently injured to have to return home, and suffered serious cuts to his face and leg. Local residents on Lanark Road provided dressings for the cyclist.*

The day before this accident, a local resident who had reported a near miss at exactly the same spot had received this response from the Spaces for People team:

Parking Access – Near Miss _____

Thank you for bringing this incident to my attention. We are aware of concerns regarding conflict between people accessing and egressing parking and cyclists at the parking bays on the downhill side of the road. We will consider whether any changes can be made at these locations to reduce conflict as part of the scheme's ongoing review.

It is not a case of 'whether can changes *can* be made' it is a case where changes 'must' be made.

We note that an FOI request revealed the council officer replying to this resident had briefed the Lanark Road scheme on a whim, which subsequently was designed by Sustrans in London in a timescale of only two weeks, along with Longstone and Slateford. This rushed approach to complex road design has created a negative legacy for the community for the last five months, and the response from the officer above illustrates the lack of urgency when responding to issues like this in spite of repeated press comment from the council that schemes will be changed where there are issues. In this case 'tweaks' simply cannot fix it. The entire design is flawed.

Appendix 9. Results from the Change.Org Petition, "Oppose the Council's plans for Lanark and Longstone/Inglis Green Roads"

[Back to Contents](#)

- 1,515 signatures (12 June 2021)

Comments (104):

"As a resident object to plans"

"Another stupid idea from the council, I bet none of them live in the area."

"It's totally useless and un needed in these streets.. There is no footfall"

"This is shocking !! Whoever thought of this idea needs their head looked at.. take it they don't live in the area.. when my daughter gets knocked down getting off a bus when she comes home from school.. i will sue the council... i just pray she doesn't get killed with the speed the bikes come down the Lanark road !!!"

"I'm signing because other than a reduction to 30mph there is absolutely no need for these measures. Whilst the road is too fast it is certainly never that busy. There's ample room for cars & bikes at present. Pavements are already wide enough for social distancing. Just why would anyone think spending tax payers cash on this would be a good move is beyond me!!"

"I truly feel this would make this more dangerous for drivers and pedestrians. I also feel the walk way is sufficient and enough space for people to pass safely. The roads have parked cars on them and by taking this away will make roads off the main road much more dangerous as these roads haven't enough parking spaces for those who live in the area."

"It restricts parking on Lanark Road with a knock in effect with side streets becoming even more congested. Traffic lights on Lanark Road / Kingsknowe Road South would be an excellent safety feature for traffic turning right into Lanark Road. They would also and reduce traffic speed"

"Lanark Road needs a reduced speed limit (30mph) and a pedestrian crossing to make it safe. The proposed changes do nothing to make it safer, but in fact more confusing and dangerous for all users. The fact that it can be done quickly and on the cheap with some plastic does not make it the best option. Spend some money, consult local users/witnesses and make it safe."

"I'm signing because the Lanark Road works well as a dual road - had heard NOTHING about this - but it has to be stopped!!"

"Ridiculous idea"

"Don't agree with the changes."

"I'm signing this petition because it would cause more problems than it would solve"

"It is an illogical plan that is doomed to fail, and it appears dangerous for pedestrians."

"Enough is enough the people of Edinburgh are tired of thos Council doing whatever they want even when their plans are Ckearly not what the residents want again the council pay NO attention to the voices of their city.GET A GRIP EDINURGH COUNCIL LISTEN TO YOUR CITIZENS THATS YOUR JOB"

"These alteration have not taken In the volume of traffic and width of the roads for these alterations. Having buses stop beside a cycle lane is an accident waiting to happen. Someone will step of the pavement when the bus arrives and a cyclist will come through the middle."

"It's ridiculous"

"Ridiculous, I'll thought out plan."

"We can't take anymore buildings sort the infrastructure first"

"We do not need these changes to the Lanark road. Many people are working from home due to the pandemic and should be able to park outside their homes or at least close by. The Lanark road also has lots of local businesses, who rely on their customer's to use on road parking. If this was to go ahead, it would have a huge economic impact on such businesses In an already difficult time. There is a cycle path at the water of leith and the canal, so there is no need to introduce these new measure to the Lanark road, when frankly no one wants them. : I think you need to consider the community's views and look at the bigger picture, before this goes ahead ."

"A completely impracticable idea. This road is busy enough already and this plan will lead to even more congestion and pollution."

"This will cause greater disruption"

"I think the council have to take another look at the set up"

"The obstructions created by these measures will not help anyone. They will increase congestion and frustration for drivers."

"It defies logic, people are being forced into their cars v public transport, particularly for shopping and those key workers who must travel for work. This is not the answer. It feels it will benefit a very small percent."

"Not needed. Plenty of good cycle routes in the area, will cause a traffic nightmare with increased pollution"

"I'm sick to death of having my daily commute interrupted by roadworks. At pbe point last year. I was caught in Road works and could see the effect of the last set of lights on my rear view mirror. ENOUGH."

"This would be a nightmare and people would park is streets off the lanark road, where residents are struggling to get parked in there own street at present."

"It's such a ridiculous idea, I can't believe it's even being considered."

"This is a ridiculous idea and will hold up public transport which i use , it is also a time where money could be better spent"

"This is a great idea let's take one of the few free flowing roads in the city and reduce it to one lane creating more congestion and pollution with stationary vehicles at the same time we can increase the risk off accidents by reduceing the width of the road, since this road is currently dual carragway allowing free flowing traffic to take local residence to amenities such as shops and work with relative easy and safety for all concerned we should make it narrower reducing the efficency of public transport making it more congested more dangerous and less convinient for local residents influencing them to travel on narrower and more densely populated routes used by children to go to and from school full of speed bumps and traffic calming measures causing further pollution in these areas and increasing the risk off accidents here as well big thumds up to the council for putting the needs of the few before the needs off the many"

"I do not believe these changes benefit the residents in any way and will lead to more congestion rather than solve a perceived problem."

"There is no requirement for this. Any cyclists wanting away from the main road can use the Water of Leith and Canal towpath."

"Edinburgh Council take no consideration for residents of the area."

"This is a very poorly thought out and unnecessary plan."

"It doesn't make sense council ☐"

"It will bring harm upon the existing use of the Lanark Road, disruption to traffic flow during construction, we don't want change! We will consider taking the council to court over this massive change to our roads and amenities if needed. You clearly don't know how users who live in the area want it to be kept. The cycle route is along the water of leith and the canal. Not the road!!

You've done the same over in East Craig's. People are very angry about the move. Turn back your decision and stop causing people more stress in their lives. This is not needed right now."

"What is needed is an alternative route to Lanark Road to ease congestion and allow alternative routes travelling east to west and west to east at peak commuting times, when congestion occurs. You can rarely travel more than 30 miles per hour along Lanark Road due to congestion."

"I have no issues with speed reduction. But actually need a crossing! Don't think there is need for making a single carriageway!"

"I agree that the plans will cause the problems as described"

"How can this be called 'Spaces for People' when it doesn't consult the people affected? It doesn't even make them aware of the proposal! If it's not 'Covid safe' to put notices in lampposts and put letters through doors to those who aren't constantly on the council website, how is it Covid safe to actually do the work on the roads? The last thing residents need as we head into more lockdown is new and unnecessary parking restrictions outside their own homes - especially elderly, disabled and those facing financial crisis or Long Covid."

"I live in Juniper Green on Lanark road and I totally agree with everything in this proposal"

"What is wrong with the Council? Allowing planning for thousand of houses that will use this road and they want to introduce measures to slow it up further. Maybe introduce a bus service as frequent as the 26 or 22 on the 44 route. Cycling is not an option for the masses."

"Abuse of powers from the council throughout the city with regards traffic implementation."

"A supposedly temporary measure costing £165k which will cause chaos not just on this road but the many rat runs that it creates"

"Yet another hair brained traffic management scheme from the Clowns at Waverley Court. Perhaps the speed limit should be reduced and a pedestrian crossing put in. However reducing this road to single carriageway is just plain stupid."

"Another lunatic idea from the City of Edinburgh council. Stop, consult then agree a sensible way forward!"

"Absolute joke. The council do not listen to the people who vote them in. This is an accident waiting to happen."

"In my opinion, the new markings will create a potentially dangerous situation for all road users: pedestrians, cyclists, disabled road users who will have to park "in the middle of the road." This as well as effectively narrowing the road, creating tailbacks and the need for dangerous manoeuvres in busy traffic. I support the 30mph speed limit; long overdue."

Name redacted.

"Lanark road works fine as it is, any change to it will reduce traffic flow and increase congestion. It is a main route into the city centre with numerous homes. The current lay out allows parking, delivery and buses to use it without impacting the free flow of daily traffic"

"I don't want to see a reduction in the availability of parking close to Gillespie Crossroads. I attend the nursery there and don't want to have to cross Lanark Road with two small children on a regular basis."

"The dual carriageway on Lanark Road works well. It keeps traffic flowing, allows for safe overtaking up the hill, allows for people to park outside their houses and for deliveries to be made safely. There is room for cyclists, and plenty of room on the pavement for pedestrians to pass each other safely. Don't fix what isn't broken. Reducing this to a single carriageway will cause many issues for residents and push parking of cars into the side streets where residents need to park their own cars. This is an unnecessary waste of resources. Think again please."

"This will also cause severe congestion on side streets if there is a major event on at kingsknowe golf club."

"There is already plenty of space for people walking it already has lovely wide pavements which I walk on nearly every day with my dog and plenty of room for cyclists with having two lanes, if it's not broken don't fix it, surely there is something else at this time of uncertainty that the money could be spent on !!"

Name redacted.

Name redacted.

"Lanark Rd can't cope with the traffic at the moment, I feel this plan will only make things worse, there will be nowhere for parking."

"How many changes do we need leave things alone"

Name redacted.

Name redacted.

"Not happy with this proposal at all. The last thing we need is this confusion and additional congestion on Lanark road, especially in the morning. The cons far outweigh the benefits for us residents as far as I can see."

"These proposed measures are bad for local residents, bad for congestion and will make the roads less safe. They are also unnecessary as the current set up generally works fine"

"The council are certifiably mad. They've got no money, they can't maintain the roads and pavements that we already have but they are spending a fortune on these stupid ugly road alterations, OUTRAGEOUS!"

"I never understand why so many Councils do not liaise and consult with the people directly involved and affected by their decisions! Power just goes to their heads I suppose....please stop and think, consult and liaise, with your constituents and businesses involved, when making plans...especially when they often don't live in the affected areas and don't know the full picture!"

"It's a badly thought out plan"

"As a cyclist I don't want to stop every time someone gets on the bus as per the proposal of the new cycle lanes, I'm happy to safely overtake the bus when passengers are getting on as I currently do. I also feel this will increase congestion on the roads in this area and have a negative affect on the local community and shops."

"Another ill-conceived crazy council plan, look at the mess they've made of morningside & comiston roads to see what will happen here"

"Lanark road works well just now. I am old enough to remember when trams stopped in the middle of the road and you took your life in your hands as you rushed to the pavement. So how will a person with reduced mobility or in a wheelchair get to the pavement before a bike, with no speedometer, flies down the road!?"

"As a cyclist and car user I dispare at the lack of consultation or even a well thought out argument on why CEC feel this Draconian measure is needed. Just say NO"

"This will impact on my ability to play golf at Kingsknowe golf club when car park is full."

"I disagree with the recommendation"

"I presume whomever devised the plan is unfamiliar with the area. Cyclist have the canal path and Water of Leith at their disposal. This would stop children in particular using the playing fields at a time when they are prohibited from exercising indoors."

"Changing the speed limit will not reduce the issue and Lanark road has two speed cameras."

"I don't believe these proposals will help the local area. It will create more congestion and disruption"

"This is a total waste of money which could be spend in much better ways ie road repairs !"

"Unnecessary! Inconvenient for households, emergency services, delivery drivers... the list is endless. Plus it's an eyesore."

"The cycle lane is unnecessary . It'll be unhelpful for disabled residents."

"I use the nursery on the Road and the changes will make stop off and pick up very unsafe!"

"Typical stupidity of the council. Waste of time and money on something totally unnecessary. As usual, complete overkill. Please someone start a petition to sack the council!"

"This is completely unnecessary and will lead to accidents."

"There is no evidence that this is needed - there are already cycle paths on the water of Leith and along the canal, and there are very few pedestrians that walk along Lanark road on Kingsknowe other than to get into their houses after parking their car outside their house - something that this daft and no doubt expensive proposal would stop. Has whoever thought this up even visited Lanark Road? The main traffic on this stretch is cars, buses and lorries/delivery vehicles, not people and bikes. All this proposal would do is create dangers and traffic jams where there currently aren't any."

"It's crazy!"

"It's dangerous and a waste of our money . They have already made a massive danger zone of Comiston Road . How much of our money are they going to keep wasting? It could be put to much better use , ie, HEALTH CARE"

"Just why"

"This plans is nuts- why change something that doesn't need changing"

"There are 2 alternative options to cycle avoiding Lanark Road. Speed limit restrictions are more than adequate"

"The new restrictions have not been thought-out and will lead to serious congestion"

Name redacted.

"The new restrictions will heavily affect the parking in Riccarton Mains Road. We are currently seeing a high volume of traffic throughout the day."

"Ensuring residents have access to their homes and services is crucial, plans in place will only disadvantage residents. Surely its about making the best decisions not the worst. Do it properly, consult and take peoples needs into consideration."

"this is ludicrous. I'm a cyclist and I've seen what they've done on Morningside Road and it's LESS safe than without measures. Complete and utter waste of time, money and effort"

"This is not wanted and will impact many."

"Reduce speed limit , and leave it the way its is.. change for change sake is complete waste of tax payers money and not what the people in the area want or support"

"This affects family members jobs."

Name redacted.

"There are already cycle paths that simply need upgraded and would make the already slim roads safer id cyclist actually used the cycle paths in situ."

"Brexiters used rail about faceless bureaucrats in Brussels . The Edinburgh ones do much more damage. If the is serious about providing places for people ie pedestrians and bikes they should spend all their efforts on making pavements safe to walk on and providing road surfaces that are safe to cycle on. Once that is cracked other improvements can be looked at. In meantime the 4 lane Lanark Road provides a flexible and valuable park and ride facility."

"This council is destroying our city. Leith walk is a disgrace a total waste of money Too much consideration to cycling . Instead of improving the roads for the paying motorists. This is not Amsterdam ."

"These changes are not necessary. A reduction in the speed limit To 30 might make some drivers Reduce their speed to 40"

"It is not required. The water of Leith and canal path can be cycled on."

"I believe that this part of Edinburgh already serves cyclists well (The Dell and the canal). The pavements were wide enough pre-covid on Longstone and Lanark Road. Longstone. Parking spots currently used by workers in the area will just be forced off the main road and into already crowded streets. My biggest concern is that these 'temporary' measures will not be removed"

"The bike is a mode of transportation used by the minority"

"An absolute disgrace. Ill thought out and completely lacking in any consultation with the local residents and businesses. Around 93% opposition, yet the council are going ahead regardless. We vote these people in to represent our views, not to lord over us and ignore our opinions. This is about a small minority of cyclists and has nothing to do with 'spaces for people' I will not be voting for any of the pro parties on this issue at the next elections, even if it means voting for a party I have never voted for before. I suggest we all do the same."


"The plans do not make it safer for cyclists. They make it more dangerous for drivers and cause congestion. Also cause great inconvenience and pollution for residents."

Appendix 10. Data Evidencing No Majority Public Support for Spaces for People Measures in Silverknowes

[Back to Contents](#)

Public Consultation (residents)

- 73–75% want the schemes removed



Market Research commissioned by Cllr Kevin Lang in May 2021

- Responses from almost 700 local people over these last two weeks.
- Overwhelming opposition to three schemes as detailed below.

Silverknowes road and cycle lane changes - the survey results

1. Silverknowes Road North - What is your view on the current closure of the road down to the promenade to private vehicles, with access only for buses and cyclists?

- Strongly opposed - 72%
- Slightly opposed - 8%
- Neutral - 3%
- Slightly in favour - 5%
- Strongly in favour - 12%

TOTAL OPPOSED - 80%
TOTAL IN FAVOUR - 17%

2. Silverknowes 'quiet cycle route' - what is your view on the 'quiet cycle route' through Silverknowes, which involved new cycle lanes on Silverknowes Road and Road East, as well as changes affecting Silverknowes Court and Place?

- Strongly opposed - 83%
- Slightly opposed - 5%
- Neutral - 2%
- Slightly in favour - 4%

- Strongly in favour - 6%

TOTAL OPPOSED - 88%
TOTAL IN FAVOUR - 10%

3. Silverknowes Parkway - what is your view on the introduction of the cycle lanes on Silverknowes Parkway?

- Strongly opposed - 62%
- Slightly opposed - 8%
- Neutral - 11%
- Slightly in favour - 7%
- Strongly in favour - 12%

TOTAL OPPOSED - 70%
TOTAL IN FAVOUR - 19%

Appendix 11. East Craigs independent market research survey

[Back to Contents](#)

Taylor McKenzie (TMcK) undertook quantitative research with residents of the East Craigs area to assess:

- Opinion on traffic & travel, to help define which problems exist in the area
- Opinion on a range of potential solutions proposed by the City of Edinburgh Council as part of the LTN
- Opinion to a number of other proposed solutions to improve the area for residents

The research was commissioned by Get Edinburgh Moving (GEM), a community body that was created in opposition to the original LTN proposals.

Taylor McKenzie took a mixed data collection approach to this research. A paper survey was developed and mail dropped to all households within the East Craigs area. The postal copy of the survey included a web address and QR code to allow residents to complete the survey online if they preferred to do so.

A freepost return envelope was provided so that the survey could be easily returned by those who wished to complete the survey by post. To ensure that only households within the area could complete the survey, a unique 6 digit code was added to each postal survey. Data which did not include a valid

The survey is important as a highly representative view of the residents of west Edinburgh in relation to Spaces for People interventions / potential interventions, and traffic / transport priorities of Edinburgh residents.

Also, specifically it addresses the Drum Brae North segregated cycleway. From a base of 1,562 households responding, only 15% support the DBN cycle lane, while more than 5 times as many households (76%) oppose its retention. This survey is very significantly more representative of local residents than either the Council's consultation, or its market research survey, and the result – a conclusive rejection of the scheme – could not be clearer, and should be respected.

Some selected findings of the survey are below - the detailed survey results are available [here](#).

Reaction to potential solutions


Measures with most support:

- ✓ 'Improving maintenance of pavements & paths' (93%)
- ✓ Making Maybury temporary crossing permanent (74%)
- ✓ 'Extending the 68 bus service' (61%)

Measures with least support:

- X 'Permanently closing some junctions' (9%)
- X 'Installing a 1 way bus gate at the junction of Maybury Rd. and Craigs Rd' (13%)
- X 'Make the temporary cycle way at Drum Brae North permanent' (15%)

Agreement with potential measures




Reaction to potential solutions split by location

There are some variations in appeal based on household location...

- ✓ Those on Craigs rd. are more likely to agree with 'upgrading double yellows to double reds'.
- ✓ Those in Barntongate and Craigs/N Gyle/Glasgow rd. are significantly more likely to agree with an 'extension to the 31 bus route'.
- ✓ 'Improve maintenance on paths and pavements' remains the most agreed with measure across all locations

Agreement with some potential measures by Location



* Base Numbers on Slide 23


Main problems with traffic/travel: Inside East Craigs Area (purple on map) – split by location



Overall, 'Quality of roads' and 'Quality of footpaths/paths' were the main issues across locations...

- ✓ Those in Craigs Rd. and Craigs/ N Gyle Rd./ Glasgow Rd. were most likely to raise 'Speed of Traffic' as a problem.
- ✓ Craigs/ N Gyle Rd./ Glasgow Rd. households were also more likely to state that 'Volume of traffic' was a problem.
- ✓ 'Public transport options' were seen as more of a problem by those in Barntongate, Bughtlin & Craigs Rd.

Main problems with traffic inside East Craigs by Location



Total	Online	Postal (SEM Inpuffed)	BARTONGATE	BUGHTLIN	CRAIGS ROAD	CRAIGMOUNT NORTH	CRAIGMOUNT/STUARTS	CRAIGS/ N GYLE ROAD/ GLASGOW ROAD	NORTH GYLE
1621	733	888	104	408	205	221	236	118	151

Deputation - Juniper Green & Baberton Mains Community Council – Item 7.1 - Potential Retention of Spaces for People Measures – Report by the Executive Director of Place

Juniper Green and Baberton Mains Community Council supports efforts to increase active travel but remains concerned by the practical implementation of some of the Spaces for People (“SfP”) measures, specifically those on Lanark Road.

We remain concerned by the treatment of public feedback that is critical of the scheme or elements of it. For example, in section 4.11, a public petition is labelled as “a petition against safety measures”. Whether you agree with the petition or not it was clearly intended to improve safety.

Such a strong response by residents in the public consultation should be celebrated rather than undermined by directly comparing it to separate market research. 17,600 respondents is an incredible level of engagement and offers an insight into feelings that might never be revealed on other Council schemes or strategies. There may be practical challenges in considering the 30,000 comments but this insight should inform the Council on the population's concerns and how best to address them, either through its communications, educational content or amendments to specific schemes.

There appears to be a contradiction between the large numbers looking to remove all of the SfP implementations, whilst there being broad support for themes within SfP, for example improving safety around schools. Perhaps this is caused by feelings of frustration in the general population that whilst they accept the need in principle to address climate challenges and support active travel, they strongly believe that the specific solutions delivered could be greatly improved upon and are desperate to be listened to.

If we consider Lanark Road specifically, from the outset there has been concern about the protected cycle lanes and how they interact with children or mobility impaired people entering or exiting cars and buses, the loss of on-street parking near nurseries and public parks and the way that cars now have to zig zag counter to the natural flow of the road. However, there is broad support for the reduction in the speed limit. If there was a willingness to respond to and actively monitor accidents and near misses, there would be less desperation from residents to remove everything and recognition that some elements have been positive. We therefore welcome the consideration detailed in 4.101 for the suitability of specific approaches where there is a steep incline causing higher speed cyclists than would otherwise be expected, assuming this will be applied to the relevant stretches of the Lanark Road.

We remain concerned by the use of or lack of data around the scheme:

- - There still appears to be no specific success criteria (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, time-bound) instead continued use of generic improvements. For example, in Appendix 1, the measures on Lanark Road are included in the “travelling safely” section, but there is no data to show if the changes have improved safety in terms of accidents or near misses, particularly when anecdotally there have been more incidents.
- - It seems inappropriate to demonstrate changes in behaviour based on a single week in April (Data on service uptake/access, p7, Section 4 Integrated Impact Assessment), when months’ worth of data is now available and would give a more representative and comparative sample against any data collected before the measures were installed.
- - In table 4 in section 4.29.2 it states that the consultation had 1,760 responses from cyclists (10% x 17,600), whereas the market research had just 17 (3% x 583). It could reasonably be argued that cyclists are one of the groups most affected by the changes but the views of just 17 cyclists are taken as being representative of a group which has such a diverse demographic.

If there was an opportunity for us and other stakeholders to talk through issues and concerns with Council Officers and collaborate to develop the solutions going forward it would be a huge step forward.

We are all desperate to create a better environment for future generations and discussions on how transport can help us best deliver that would be infinitely more productive if we were able to move away from the “them and us” environment which has sadly emerged round these measures.

Aonghas McIntosh
 Chair, Juniper Green & Baberton Mains Community Council

Deputation for
CEC Transport and
Environment Committee
17 June 2021

3.1 Whitehouse Loan residents deputation for
Agenda item 7.1 Potential Retention of SfP Measures

Paper 7.1 says that SpF closure measures on Whitehouse Loan should be retained – and throughout the summer

(relevant closures re Quiet Connection and Gillespies decided on slides 32 and 37 – note almost all other closures to be removed over the summer)

The real truth is that ALL three CEC surveys said that all measures on Whitehouse Loan should be REMOVED not retained (see data).

We have spoken – please listen to us and reverse this decision today

Public Consultation outcomes





Business Consultation outcomes

Q. How much do you support or oppose retaining the following type of measure?
 New “quiet connections” for day to day cycling with road closures to reduce traffic

Q. Please select streets with SfP changes in place that you would like to see retained/removed following pandemic Whitehouse Loan

Q. How much do you support or oppose retaining the following type of measure?
 New “quiet connections” for day to day cycling with road closures to reduce traffic

Q. Please select streets with SfP changes in place that you would like to see retained/removed following pandemic Whitehouse Loan



Slide 9 of 30

Slide 13 of 30


Slide 21 of 30

Slide 25 of 30

Views on retaining/removing measures, based on those familiar/most familiar with each measure

Q. Please select schools with SfP changes in place that you would like to see retained/removed following pandemic James Gillespies


Remove Retain



Slide 27 of 65

Q. Please select streets with SfP changes in place that you would like to see retained/removed following pandemic Whitehouse Loan


Remove Retain



Slide 38 and 61 of 65

Q. Please select streets with SfP changes in place that you would like to see retained/removed following pandemic Whitehouse Loan

Remove Retain



Slide 39 and 62 of 65

15 June 2021

Dear Transport and Environment Committee

Car Free Holyrood Park is a group of local residents campaigning for a safer, greener Holyrood Park and an end to motorised through-traffic on private park roads. We submit the following deputation in relation to Agenda Item 7.4 LEZ Preferred Scheme for discussion at 17 June Transport and Environment Committee meeting.

We recognise that the eastern diversion route uses Holyrood Rd/Holyrood Gait and a short section of Queen's Drive in order to access Horse Wynd. This section of the park roads has been treated differently by park managers and in legislation as it is the only road link between Canongate and Holyrood Rd. We are not opposed to this limited use of Holyrood Park's road network. However, we do have concerns about the modelling with respect to Queen's Drive between Commonwealth Pool and Holyrood Gait which we have outlined below.

Key issues for Holyrood Park and LEZ Preferred Scheme:

We have concerns about the modelling contained in 7.4 LEZ Preferred Scheme papers. We have two key issues:

1. Traffic Flow Modelling in Holyrood Park

While not explicitly explained, the projected traffic modelling anticipates diverted traffic will travel along Queen's Drive from Horse Wynd to Commonwealth Pool, not along the intended diversion along Holyrood Gait/Holyrood Rd.

Appendix 5, page 18, *Revised Fleet Composition, Transport Modelling Report*, describes the diversion as follows: "Non-compliant traffic wishing to travel through the city centre is required to use a diversion route including London Road, Abbeyhill, Horse Wynd (Holyrood Palace) and Queen's Drive." Appendix 5, page 1, also notes that: "Queen's Drive is not an acceptable diversion as it is closed to general traffic on a Sunday (and at all times for some vehicles)".

Traffic modelling in Figures 4.7-4.12 feature traffic flow on Queen's Drive by Dumbiedykes, and therefore we assume they pertain to the 'unofficial' diversion through the park to Commonwealth Pool, not Holyrood Gait/Holyrood Rd.

Figure 4.8: East End Total Traffic Flow Change Relative to 2023 Base – AM 2023 Original LEZ + ECCT




Figure 4.8 in Committee papers showing 7% increase in traffic on Queen’s Drive within the park’s private road network.

In Appendix 5, traffic modelling in Holyrood Park (Preferred LEZ boundary + ECCT) shows that traffic volumes will immediately rise during AM, Inter Peak and PM, and increase in both AM and PM peaks over the next few years. Therefore traffic will increase and then continue to increase over time rather than use the intended diversion, yet there is no stated mitigation strategy in the committee papers of this negative impact on a historic site, SSSI, and beloved greenspace. This increase in traffic in Holyrood Park will also negatively impact park users’ experience and active travel journeys in the park.

Table 1: Traffic Modelling in Holyrood Park (Queen’s Drive) - Preferred LEZ Boundary + ECCT

	2019	2023
AM	+3%	+7%
IP (Inter Peak)	+10%	+3%
PM	+4%	+5%

2. Fleet Analysis

Fleet modelling by Jacobs projects that non-compliant LEZ traffic -- the most polluting vehicles -- will not use the intended diversion through St Leonards/Pleasance/Holyrood Rd, but will instead

travel through Holyrood Park’s Queen’s Drive from Commonwealth Pool to Holyrood Gait, see Figure 4.18 below.


LGVs, largely used for commercial purposes, make up a significant portion of the estimated non-compliant LEZ traffic (see paragraph 4.57):

- 16,000 cars (diesel) (22% of diesel cars forecasted to be non-compliant in 2023)
- ~3610 LGV (18%)
- ~120 HGV (8.4%)

Commercial traffic, including Light Goods Vehicles and Heavy Goods Vehicles used for commercial purposes, are not permitted to use Holyrood Park’s private road network. The Holyrood Park Regulations 1971 prohibit driving or using any vehicle designed to seat more than seven passengers (in addition to the driver), or constructed or adapted for the purpose of any trade or business or as a dwelling, effectively prohibiting commercial vehicles.

However, this is consistently ignored according to HES’s traffic surveys and from resident observation. Historic Scotland (the park managers at the time) commissioned a traffic survey in 2006 which showed commercial vehicles comprised approximately 5% of traffic at weekends and 9% on weekdays ([ISIS Holyrood Park Traffic Survey 2006](#)). Ranger correspondence from 2019 also confirmed that “volume of traffic increases year on year.” Despite some enforcement efforts and a campaign by Historic Scotland in 2011, commercial vehicles continue to use the park with regularity and minimal enforcement.

The modelling shows the vast majority of non-compliant LEZ traffic will use Queen’s Drive from Commonwealth Pool to Holyrood Gait, unlawfully in the case of LGVs and commercial traffic, rather than the intended diversion along Holyrood Rd/Horse Wynd. The committee papers however do not include mitigation measures to encourage use, particularly by commercial vehicles, of the intended diversion or for the negative impact of non-compliant LEZ traffic on park users and active travel journeys in the park



In Appendix 5, Figure 4.18 shows the Preferred LEZ boundary fleet composition at morning peak with ECCT in place, the red lines showing where LEZ non-compliant traffic will travel. Figures 4.17-4.28 all show Queen's Drive (Commonwealth Pool to Holyrood Gait) taking the LEZ non-compliant traffic rather than the intended diversion through St Leonards/Holyrood Rd.

Suggested Actions:

We suggest the Committee and Council take the following actions to mitigate negative impacts on Holyrood Park due to the preferred LEZ boundary:

- **If available, more detailed modelling for Holyrood Park's private road network should be published. If not already available, new modelling should be completed of the impact of the preferred LEZ boundary on fleet traffic and traffic volumes for the scenario in which motorised through-traffic is not permitted on Holyrood Park's private road network (with the exception of the Holyrood Road/Holyrood Gait/Horse Wynd route, as previously described).** The Council's future transport policies, including the LEZ, should be viable without relying on a private road network, and modelling should be completed accordingly in order to inform this decision on the preferred LEZ boundary.
- The Committee should **consider expanding the LEZ boundary to include Holyrood Park** to protect this vital greenspace from traffic volume increases of the most-polluting vehicles, including from non-compliant commercial vehicles that are not allowed inside the LEZ nor on Holyrood Park's private road network.
- Regardless of changes to the LEZ boundary, but especially within this context, the Council and HES should work together to **close Holyrood Park to motorised through-traffic**. This will protect against traffic increases in a vital greenspace, encourage behavioural modal shift changes, and end an inequitable and undesirable status quo.

Many thanks

Alice Murdo
Mitchell Fraser
Thomas Hawtin
Chris Young
Andrew White
Vicki White
Stewart Nichol

Sean Allan
Oscar MacLean
Martin Gemmell
Aaron McFaul
Barney Dellar
Wojtek Krakowiak
Neil Birch

Tracy Peet
Hazel Darwin Clements
Sarah Gowanlock
Diarmid Mogg
Nicholas Oddy

On behalf of Car Free Holyrood Park

Deputation to Transport and Environment Committee meeting to be held on 17 June 2021 regarding item 7.4

“Low Emission Zone – Preferred Scheme for Consultation”

The New Town and Broughton Community Council welcomes the Council’s plans to move forward with introducing a Low Emission Zone (LEZ) in Edinburgh but we are concerned that the current proposals are not sufficiently ambitious and will have serious detrimental impact for some residents. We are also disappointed that information on the proposed scheme was released less than a week before the committee meeting making it difficult to provide any comprehensive response to a report running to 239 pages (with eight detailed appendices) on such an important topic for our community.

The boundaries of the proposed LEZ will not include parts of the New Town and Broughton Community Council area that are largely residential in nature. The report states non-compliant vehicles will increasingly use the roads immediately outside the LEZ resulting in increased pollution on these routes. The SEPA forecast attached to the report shows an increase in atmospheric pollution on Queen Street, London Street and Abbeyhill; all areas on the edge of the currently proposed LEZ. We note that the Council has included an objective to “minimise the impact from traffic displacement across network, related to LEZ scheme”. No detail is provided on the mitigating actions that will be taken or how achievement of this objective will be measured. It is important that this information is available for the planned consultation to reassure residents living near the LEZ.

We note that there no longer appears to be any plan to introduce a City-wide LEZ as previously proposed at some later date. The differences therefore between areas inside and outside the currently proposed city centre LEZ will be permanent. Is this correct and if so justified? As we have noted in the past the proposed boundaries of the LEZ do not include any of the City’s current ‘town centres’ or areas like Broughton Street which would be expected to be part of the Council’s plans to encourage 20 minute neighbourhoods. Many of these areas already have higher levels of pollution as shown by the Council’s existing monitoring. The introduction of the currently proposed LEZ will increase levels of pollution in some of these areas.

The current plans appear to be focussed on reducing NOx levels within a small part of the City to meet current legislative limits. In our view that does not go far enough. Other emissions need to be both more closely monitored and reduced; in particular the levels of

particulates. We would like to see the Council setting more ambitious and wide ranging targets for improving air quality and reducing pollution. As well as ensuring that non-compliant vehicles are not used in the LEZ, there needs to be a greater effort to reduce pollution elsewhere. As an example, we note that there is no mention of encouraging the use of electric vehicles in the report. We would have expected to see a commitment to accelerate the roll out of electric vehicle charging points. While we understand the reasons for seeking a reduction in private car usage this should not be to the exclusion of encouraging people to switch to more environmentally friendly vehicles. The wider availability of EV charging points would encourage this change of use, which would be positive for both the environment and economy.

We recognise that the current plans are intended to simplify the arrangements for introducing the LEZ and in general we support this approach to include all vehicles within the LEZ following a single grace period. We are however concerned about two groups of people that we believe should be exempt from the rules or at least have a longer grace period. These are people who live outside the LEZ and only make very occasional visits to the city centre (e.g. medical appointments) and people who as part of their work are required to visit the city centre on a regular basis (e.g. carers). For these groups the proposed arrangements that are intended to encourage disposal of non-compliant vehicles are not going to provide adequate financial support for the costs that they will incur in replacing perfectly serviceable vehicles for ones that will comply with the new rules. We therefore propose that there should be a system in place that allows people for specific reasons to obtain a limited dispensation from the new requirements similar to that we understand is already in place for disabled drivers.

We welcome the plans to have a further period of public consultation before the final decision on the LEZ is taken. It is important that this consultation is accompanied by a comprehensive programme of communication and engagement with the communities most affected by these new regulations such that they fully understand what is being proposed.

NTBCC would also request that it is allowed to participate fully in the development of the detail supporting the introduction of the LEZ and of the Council's efforts to reduce overall levels of pollution.

15 June 2021

Dear Councillors,

On the June 17th agenda of TEC meeting is item 7.7 A71 Dalmahoy Junction Improvements. The report put before your consideration is asking for approval to do exactly the opposite of resident's requests for over 30 years, against what residents were promised, and against the recommendation of the 2016 TEC.

The intersection is well known as a dangerous place. The entrance to The Dalmahoy Hotel is not aligned with the Dalmahoy Rd where they join the A71, there is a slight curve west of the Dalmahoy Rd that contributes to visibility issues when exiting Dalmahoy Rd, and there is a building on the SW corner that blocks visibility when exiting The Dalmahoy Hotel entrance. Combine those sight issues with a section of the A71 where passing is allowed, and the fact most are doing 50+mph before suddenly coming to a 40mph and it adds up to an accident looking for a place to happen.

The main issue at the junction is visibility not speed. The A71 could still be a 50mph zone if signals and a realignment were installed.

The plan that was shown to residents had signals, a pedestrian crossing, safe bus stops, dedicated turning and through lanes, drainage fixed and was to be a 40 or 50mph zone.

What is presented in the 7.7 report is a costing measure, as admitted. While residents understand that cost-cutting is done, they also agree that this is one of those times when it can-not be done. To prioritise cost over safety, at a known dangerous junction without reconsidering the difference of opinion, would not be right considering the data used to justify this report was gathered when interim measures were in place, and during a year of pandemic restrictions.

It is very difficult for anyone to write a report or plans up that can 100% reflect an issue as it is. Descriptions can come very close but there is always that one place that can-not be represented truly. This is one of those times, until you see what you can't see, you'll never see it.

Please reconsider, pay us a visit in Dalmahoy, see for yourself and then vote, please.

Ben Bright

This page is intentionally left blank