

**Report on City of Edinburgh Council Community Grant
2022-23**

**Polwarth Pavement Project
The Polwarth Roundabout**

A community engagement exercise



**Merchiston
Community
Council**

CONTENTS

Section	Page
Executive Summary	3-5
1. Organisation of report	6-8
2 Project purpose & scope	9-11
3 Policy context – national & local	12-16
4 Polwarth roundabout – a ‘local centre’	17-27
5 Project governance & delivery	28-29
6 Engagement process	30-41
7 Survey evidence	42-49
8 Traffic counts	50-56
9 Pedestrian crossing & PV2s	57-63
10 Road safety: views from Police Scotland	64-65
11 Towards an integrated solution	66-68
12 Proposals and visualisations	69-86
13 Paths to implementation	87-92
14 Our learning as a Community Council	93-96
15 Conclusions	97
Annexes	
1. Survey responses in graphic form	99-105
2. Survey questions coded to Place Standard	106-115
3. CEC policies reflected in MCC proposals	116-120
4. CEC Bin Hubs: proposed locations in Polwarth	121

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Polwarth Roundabout is unsafe for pavement users and for cyclists.

In the words of one resident, it is an 'awful, risky junction'.

That is the conclusion of a year-long study by Merchiston Community Council (MCC) into road safety at and near the roundabout; and into pavement amenity in the adjoining area.

Some 65,000 - 70,000 vehicles negotiate the area of the Polwarth roundabout every week. Over a typical day, some 7,000 crossings are made by pavement users in the area of the roundabout, supported only by one ageing zebra crossing and two pedestrian islands. Residents have voiced their concerns over several years about the risks they face when shopping, going to work or college, or using the services of Polwarth's 'local centre'. **They aspire to be active travellers but multiple hazards and obstacles lie in their way.**

On the basis of evidence amassed through a community survey and detailed traffic and pedestrian counts, MCC has identified four main issues:

- **inadequate and risky crossings** for pavement users; and the subordination of pedestrians to vehicles, reflected in out-dated pavement guardrails and cramped circulation space
- **the volume and speed of vehicles**, linked to the increasing use of the Polwarth corridor and Merchiston Avenue as a short-cut for traffic, particularly HGVs
- **inadequate provision for cyclists** on approach to the roundabout (and along the length of the Polwarth corridor, from Yeaman Place southwards); and for parking of cycles
- **neglect of the footway and carriageways**, posing risks to all road and pavement users but especially to those with disabilities.

To address these issues, MCC makes the following recommendations:

- **Pavements should be substantially widened** to provide more public realm and to reconnect the local centre to its residents and clientele.
- The primacy of the east/west (bus) route should be reasserted to give emphasis to public transport; instead of a mini-roundabout, the **junction with Polwarth Crescent should become a T junction**, with a 'Stop' sign and a protective waiting space for cyclists.
- An **elevated 'table'** should be laid on top of the remaining carriageway surface and demarcated from pavements by colour and finish; such a table, level with the surrounding space for pavement users, would remove the need for dropped kerbs; the table should extend beyond the crossing points at the intersection.
- **'Refuges' should be removed and improved road crossings across narrower carriageways should be installed**, with good lighting, at the crossing points habitually used by pavement users. The **refuse bins** at the south-east end of Polwarth Crescent should be **repositioned** as a matter of urgency, in order to improve sight lines for pavement users. The zebra crossing at the eastern end of Polwarth Gardens should be upgraded to a light-operated 'puffin' crossing.
- The remaining railings at pavement edges near the roundabout should be replaced by **bollards with reflective banding**.
- **Cycle parking** (including parking suitable for cargo bikes) should be installed; cycle hangars should also be provided.
- **Planters should be used** to shorten vehicle sightlines, wherever it is safe to do so.
- **Loading bays** for the resupply of local centre shops and services should be created from surplus road space released by the proposed T junction. Innovative systems for delivery should be trialled.
- The **City Council should use its TRO powers** to prohibit turns by Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) right or left at the proposed 'T' junction, or to **designate** Polwarth Crescent, Yeaman Place and Merchiston Avenue as **routes unsuitable for heavy goods vehicles**. Use of the north/south short-cut should be discouraged by preventing HGV right turns up Merchiston Avenue and Merchiston Park and by narrowing the junction of Merchiston Avenue & Granville Terrace, by pavement extension.

- **speed triggered warning signs** should be installed along Polwarth Gardens and Merchiston Avenue, both used by children going to & from Bruntsfield Primary School. In line with CEC policy, the 20mph limit should be enforced by CEC and Police Scotland acting together. Appropriate **signage**, alerting vehicles that they are entering a zone for pavement users, should be put on all approach roads.
- Granville Terrace and Merchiston Avenue should be included in the list of streets scheduled for **speed reduction measures** in the Council's draft Road Safety Action Plan. (We welcome the inclusion of Polwarth Gardens in that draft Action Plan.)
- **Carriageways and footpaths** which are not covered by the junction changes described above (but still within the neighbourhood of the roundabout) should be **overhauled** to remove cracks and potholes.

All of these recommendations are in line with policies already announced by the City of Edinburgh Council (CEC), most recently in the City Mobility Plan and associated Active Travel Action Plan and Road Safety Action Plan, 2023.

Each of these recommendations is discussed in detail at Section 12 of this report.

In Section 13, we set out desirable next steps and paths to implementation, offering the City Council options for moving forward with our recommendations and recognising resource constraints.

POLWARTH PAVEMENT PROJECT

POLWARTH ROUNDABOUT: REPORT ON COMMUNITY GRANT

SECTION 1: ORGANISATION OF REPORT

1.1 In March 2022, the City of Edinburgh Council (CEC) awarded a community grant of £3,795 to Merchiston Community Council (MCC) to pursue a community engagement exercise focused on the streets and pavements of Polwarth. The physical scope of that project was subsequently adjusted (with CEC's agreement) to focus, in the first phase, on the area within 5-10 minutes walking distance of the Polwarth Roundabout. This paper reports on that exercise.

1.2 In **section 2** we explain the origins and purpose of the engagement exercise, the adjustments to the spatial focus of the project and the anticipated uses of this report.

1.3 Further context is set in **section 3** dealing with strategic thinking at national and local level about city development, community sustainability, and low carbon transportation. We note the twin imperatives of the climate crisis and concern about inequality as drivers towards policies on, for example, 20-minute neighbourhoods, place-making in a time of net zero emissions, and active travel. We relate these policies to Edinburgh's own local plans, notably the City Plan 2030 and the City Mobility Plan.

1.4 In **section 4** we offer an overview of the neighbourhood at the heart of our project – its demography, prosperity, housing tenure – and focus on Polwarth's 'local centre' which lies around the roundabout and is the core of its commercial life.

1.5 **Section 5** deals with the governance and delivery of the engagement project and how we have sought to deliver on our promises to be community council led and community focused, to feed-back regularly and to share data, to listen and learn.

1.6 The next two **Sections 6 & 7** expand on the engagement process we carried out within our community. We describe our early informal conversations with residents and local businesses which confirmed to us that there were real issues to explore and strong views in the neighbourhood about what should be done to improve things. We report on our formal consultation processes and materials and the way we handled the responses we received. We also explain how our engagement prompted us to seek other, quantitative data – traffic count data - so that we could test and confirm (or challenge) the views elicited from residents (**sections 8 & 9**). We then report at **section 10** on our engagement with the SE & SW divisions of the Police in Edinburgh, whose community teams have been helpful to this project. A report by SW Police Division is included in this section.

1.7 Sections 11 & 12 set our key findings and recommendations based on the data we accumulated from the engagement exercise in all its forms. We trace the linkages between these recommendations and the policy drivers discussed earlier. We discuss 12 key recommendations which we put to CEC.

1.8 In Section 13 we set out paths to implementation, recognising the resource constraints affecting CEC. We reaffirm our willingness to engage with other funders, if the Council gives its backing for the principles of our approach.

1.9 In section 14, we explore what this project has meant for us as a community council, the learning it has called for and supplied, and how our experience might benefit other community groups grappling with similar issues in neighbourhood development. We think about the principles and practice of engagement; and about those individuals and organisations who have been instrumental in assisting this project and sharing vital knowledge and skill. Finally, we ask questions about the viability of the model of community development that relies on volunteer energies and competence and what needs to be put in place to make expectations of community-driven neighbourhood development a reality. Some brief conclusions are set out in section 15.

1.10 Comments from residents and local businesses appear throughout this report. Here are a few:

“We need more crossings and [to] make them much more child-safe. We are considering moving as a result of the danger at the roundabout for our kids.”

“Street clutter prevents easy access for wheelchair users...the curbs are not dropped low enough for wheelchair users” [at the foot of Merchiston Avenue]

‘My 70-year-old dad got knocked down on the zebra crossing 6 years ago’

“As a mother of 2 young children crossing the roundabout is extremely difficult; cars do not stop, park on double yellows to ‘pop’ to the shops, bins are obstruction to line of sight. Speed of traffic is too fast, heavy usage of the street at all times of day. No reduction of speed as cars approach the roundabout.”

‘People don’t treat it as a roundabout and cut over it. Working opposite it we see a lot of dangerous driving.’

1.11 MCC has many people to thank – our acknowledgements are at the end of the report. In the annexes readers can find more detail on the analysis of survey responses, links between our recommendations and policy commitments in the CEC City Mobility Plan, and a detailed accounting of how MCC spent the CEC grant, for which we are grateful.

Declan Murray (to August 2022))

Roma Menlowe) Merchiston Community Council

John McKenna (from August 2022))

Charlotte Bae, Architecture & Design Scotland, volunteer to MCC from January 2023

Marion Preez, landscape architect, Urban Pioneers

Report submitted to the City of Edinburgh Council, July 2023.

SECTION 2:

PROJECT PURPOSE & SCOPE

The spur to action

2.1 In 2021, MCC took a presentation from *Living Streets Edinburgh* on their audit of streets in Polwarth. This is available here - <https://www.livingstreetsedinburgh.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Living-Streets-Polwarth-street-audit.pdf>.

2.2 That audit drew attention to the poor 'streetscape' in and around the roundabout at the junction between Polwarth Gardens, Yeaman Place and Granville Terrace. The environment for pedestrians was deteriorating. Relentless traffic (including commercial and HGV traffic) along Yeaman Place, paucity of pedestrian crossing places at the Polwarth roundabout, obstructive and ugly street signage, broken pavements and railings, shortage of green spaces, the loss of street crossing patrols – all these factors contributed to a sense that the neighbourhood was neglected and failing as a community hub.

2.3 The LSE study did not come out of the blue. It had been preceded by efforts on the part of many Polwarth residents to bring about improvements in the pedestrian crossings in the locality. Residents had written to local councillors to express concern about crossing points. There were (failed) petitions to get signalised crossings on Polwarth Crescent/Yeaman Place. And many people expressed their concerns over safety on Twitter over the years. In short, the issues have been brewing for some time: the Living Streets audit represented the first concerted effort to address pavement issues in the round.

2.4 Noting the drift of public policy, at all levels, towards more sustainable and healthier city living, MCC resolved to explore the possibility of a project which might offer solutions to some of the problems that had been identified. It was clear, however, that before proposing any specific measures, engagement with the community to discover the views and priorities was essential.

The community grant

2.5 In January 2022, MCC applied for a CEC grant from the Community Grant Fund for South-West Edinburgh. In our application we described the broad aim of the project in this way:

...MCC plans to launch a project to improve the pavements of Polwarth, with the long-term goal of enhancing the pedestrian environment and improving the public realm.

We noted that the area

...suffers from heavy motor vehicle traffic, a shortage of safe pedestrian crossings, obstructive street signage and railings, broken pavements and insufficient green spaces – all contributing to a deteriorating pedestrian environment.

We were clear that the first stage was to consult the community: this was the prerequisite to defining the actual steps to be taken to improve the streetscape:

The project will be defined through community consultation. At present we do not know the scale of the community's ambition: our aim might be simply to remove redundant street furniture, or we might plan something more radical involving multiple improvements to the pedestrian environment and changes to road layout in order to improve public safety.

2.6 A grant was sought to enable MCC to carry out that community engagement exercise. We undertook to consult widely and deeply, covering both residents and local businesses in the Polwarth 'local centre', as it is described in the City Plan 2030. We envisaged using a range of approaches - walkabouts, drop-in sessions, leafleting as well as online consultation. We sought support for training in best practice, to be provided by Planning Aid Scotland (PAS). PAS would also supply expert advice on the collation, analysis and interpretation of consultation responses. We committed to a staged approach –

...In our consultation materials we will stress the advantages of a staged approach to environmental improvements: we will encourage the community to start modestly and to proceed in line with available resources.

2.7 At the end of March 2022, MCC was awarded a grant of £3,795 for the purposes of this community engagement exercise – the full sum we had requested.

Adjustments to method & scope

2.8 Following the award, MCC at once opened discussions with PAS on the training in community engagement that was part of the grant contract. That opened up an interesting option. At that point, PAS was about to launch a substantial programme of project support under an initiative by *Paths for All*. This programme included exactly the kind of training that MCC's project needed and in addition offered the benefit that volunteer facilitators drawn from residents in the community would also have access to training and would participate directly in the collection of consultation responses. PAS offered to hold open a place for us on this programme and CEC kindly agreed this adjustment to the mechanics of providing support.

2.9 However, we could not, despite several attempts, recruit sufficient community-based facilitators: our engagement was too new and the project still in its infancy. Neighbours were understandably hesitant about becoming involved – perhaps quite heavily involved – in a brand-new venture. We withdrew our expressing of interest in May 2022 and reverted to the original project design.

2.10 As summer approached, the project had to respond to new developments affecting its spatial footprint. As originally conceived, the project was intended to cover the whole ‘corridor’ from the roundabout at Polwarth Gardens/ Granville Terrace to the north end of Yeaman Place where it joins Dundee Street. Then we learned that developers were interested in a substantial site on the east side of Yeaman Place, currently used as a scrapyards by the firm Daltons. They proposed, and held public consultations on, a major new development of student housing, for which they submitted a planning application to CEC. We learned on 15 March 2023 that the City Council has approved this development.

2.11 It was clear to MCC that any development of this site would have a major bearing on pedestrian flows along Yeaman Place and neighbouring streets. If the development included ramped access from Yeaman Place to the Union Canal, that would also have an impact on pedestrian and cyclist flows in the area. In short, a new use for that site would affect the community’s view of its priorities in terms of streetscape improvement. With CEC’s agreement, we decided to divide the Polwarth Pavement Project into phases with distinct footprints. In the first stage we would focus on the roundabout and its environs. In the second stage – and once the planning status of the scrapyards site had been determined – we would proceed with the remainder of the area running north from the roundabout down to Dundee Street.

2.12 It was on this basis that the project ran forward from August 2023.

Anticipated uses of this report

2.13 We hope this report will inform CEC decisions on priority improvements to the environment for pedestrians and cyclists at and around the Polwarth roundabout. As the evidence we present later will show, this area needs investment in order to fulfil its role as a ‘local centre’ in the City Plan 2030. While some of the proposed improvements would represent substantial investments in active travel and amenity, we believe they are necessary to anchor and enhance the community, and to reverse recent decline. It may be that this report would also be of interest to other public and charitable funders of streetscape improvements.

2.14 Resources are everywhere tightly constrained. At the same time, available resources should follow policy priorities. The preservation of ‘place’, achieving a better balance between vehicles and active travellers, and designing streets and pavements for local enjoyment and community exchange are all fundamentals of current policy, as the next section explains.

SECTION 3

POLICY CONTEXT, NATIONAL AND LOCAL

A shift in thinking

3.1 Over the last 15 years, there has been a fundamental shift in strategic thinking about urban development, community sustainability, and city transportation. The drivers for this lie in the climate crisis, inequality and in a strong sense that a better quality of life in cities should be possible. Goals have been re-drawn; and in urban settings across the world questions are being urgently asked about models of sustainable urban living and how to ensure that economic benefits are widely shared.

3.2 A range of policy documents has been consulted in the preparation of this report – the main ones are mentioned below. Through them we can see how policy at the Scotland, regional and city level has changed across the fields of climate, planning, transport, open space, urban design and place making. As the climate crisis has intensified, policy makers have grappled with increasing urgency with the implications – for city living and the built environment - of bearing down on CO2 emissions and the equal and pressing need to ensure that investments are spread justly across communities.

National policy

3.3 The challenges of climate change, poverty, exclusion, inequality and public health and wellbeing are highly influenced by the way we travel around, to and from our cities, and how we deliver goods and services to the places where people need them.

3.4 One of the earliest expressions of a major shift in thinking came in 2009 with the *Climate Change (Scotland) Act*, which first announced the need for emission reduction targets. This Act was amended and strengthened by 2019 legislation which set emissions reduction targets in line with the UN Paris Agreement. Since 2016 cities and national governments in 39 countries (including Scotland) have made climate emergency declarations.

3.5 In 2020, as hopes rose that the Covid pandemic would over time subside, the Scottish Government published *Protecting Scotland, Renewing Scotland* which outlined a recovery plan for health, economy and society. It embraced the idea of ‘20-minute neighbourhoods’ – where people can meet most of their daily needs within a 20-minute walk from their home – arguing that this would enable people to lead healthier lives as well as supporting net zero ambitions. That concept was enshrined in the 2020 Programme for Government published by the Scottish Government

3.6 In land use planning too, new ambitions have been articulated through the *Scottish Planning Policy (2014)*, which sees the function of planning as supporting sustainable growth and the transition to a low carbon economy, and through the *National Planning Framework (NPF4) for Scotland 2045*, which set out actions required for urban transformation including

low-carbon, resilient urban living, 20-minute neighbourhoods, urban greening, the re-use of land and buildings, net zero housing solutions and a focus on the 'well-being economy'. In parallel, the *National Transport Strategy 2* puts sustainable modes of movement at the heart of the transport hierarchy. Walking and 'wheeling' are the top of that hierarchy (wheeling refers to pavement users with buggies, prams, mobility scooters or other mobility aids); cycling is second; and private car use lies at the bottom. In line with this hierarchy, government will support investment in sustainable public transport as well as active travel (ie walking, 'wheeling' and cycling).

3.7 Similarly, In the field of design, the 2010s saw seismic changes. *Designing Streets (2010)* was the first policy statement in Scotland for street design and sets a clear focus away from the motor car and towards the creation of 'place'. And in 2013, the Scottish Government's policy statement on architecture and place – *Creating Places* – affirms the value of good design, noting that successful places can unlock opportunities and build vibrant communities. The policy statement *Reducing car use for a healthier, fairer and greener Scotland (2022)* sets out a roadmap to reduce car km by 20% by 2030.

City of Edinburgh Council policy

3.8 Interesting as all these high-level policy statements are, it is the vision and commitments offered by the City of Edinburgh Council that bear most directly on this project. Here, two documents are of particular interest.

3.9 The *City Plan 2030* will, when approved by Scottish Ministers, form the successor to Edinburgh's 2016 Local Development Plan. It is ambitious: 'We want the future growth of our city to be sustainable and net-zero. [This] strategy sets out how we will deliver a place-based approach to future growth.' As well as setting a target to be net zero carbon by 2030, CEC has also committed to a wide range of other goals, including the eradication of poverty.

3.10 The Plan will 'deliver a network of 20-minute walkable neighbourhoods' and will embed a 'place-based approach' to the creation of high quality, mixed-use and walkable communities. The Plan notes that 'improving wellbeing and health outcomes is a vital part of ensuring sustainable communities, particularly in ensuring equality of those outcomes for different groups and spatially across the city.' Importantly, the Plan says that the lifelong health benefits of walking, wheeling and cycling will be realised by creating "streets and public spaces for people over cars".

3.11 The Plan aligns with and supports the delivery of the City Mobility Plan (February, 2021), endorsing its commitment 'to make Edinburgh a city...where the streets are for people not cars and with accessible and pleasant places to safely walk, wheel and cycle around.' Although the City Plan 2030 announces no specific policies relating to Polwarth, it says at 2.110 that 'development must take all opportunities to enhance the walking, wheeling and cycling access to local services, ensuring routes are safe, direct and pleasant, including making necessary connections to make safe routes to school...'.

Polwarth 'local centre'

3.12 It is worth noting also that the Plan lists the Polwarth 'local centre' amongst the 63 such centres across the city, saying that 'these [centres] contribute to the quality of life and sense of identity of neighbourhoods by providing local shops and other services within walking distance'. The sole specific spatial reference to Polwarth in the City Plan lies in Table 5, listing potential connections to the existing local travel network for cycling that will be safeguarded: reference ATSG26 notes the future need for ramped access from the Union Canal to Yeaman Place.

3.13 The local community had hoped that the scrapyard site on Yeaman Place would be used for mixed housing, including affordable flats to ease local housing pressures; but that is not to be the case. In any event, re-development of the site for student housing will inevitably increase footfall up and down the Polwarth 'corridor' and, welcome though this is for the 'local centre', it reinforces the need to ensure the safety of pavement users, and cyclists, at the roundabout intersection.

Fountainbridge Developments

3.14 *City Plan 2030* also makes proposals for the large development area on the north and south sides of Dundee Street, running parallel to the Union Canal. Development is now well underway (the north side is almost finished and ground preparation is well advanced on the south side). This will eventually become an area of fairly dense residential development, with workshop and recreational spaces at the Canal side. Car parking will be extremely modest, following the goal of encouraging residents to walk or cycle or take public transport. Whether private vehicle numbers will in fact be restrained will be discovered in time; what is without doubt however is that the influx of new residents will make itself felt on the whole neighbouring community.

3.15 The Polwarth 'local centre' is the nearest useful collection of shops and services for the new Fountainbridge development. An increase in footfall and in cycle use in and around Yeaman Place and Polwarth Crescent is to be welcomed – but it reinforces the sense that now is the time to ensure that the road layout is safe for all pavement users.

3.16 The Fountainbridge development also serves to underline the disparity between the newer and the older parts of Fountainbridge & Polwarth. This is the moment, MCC feels, to secure visible uplift for those older parts of the adjacent area.

City Mobility Plan

3.17 It's in the *City Mobility Plan (CMP)* and CEC's draft *Active Travel Action Plan 2023* that we find specific policy measures that bear directly on the problems we identify near the Polwarth roundabout. We list these below; and in Annex 3, we link our recommendations to these measures so that CEC can see the direct connection between our aspirations for a pleasant and prosperous Polwarth and the City Mobility Plan.

3.18 CMP Policy Measures:

Movement 14: enhance and where necessary expand the walking/ wheeling network to serve and connect key destinations across the city.

CMP says: the [active travel] network 'is especially valuable for local journeys where walking and wheeling should be the natural mode of choice'.

Movement 15: Expand and enhance the citywide network of cycle routes ...including increased segregated cycle infrastructure on main roads.

Movement 20: Protecting vulnerable road users. The CMP says it will 'prioritise resources to improve the safety of the most vulnerable people using our streets....'

Movement 21: Speed limit reductions: The CMP will explore speed limit reductions on all non-20mph within the Council boundary and work with Police Scotland to enforce speed limits.

Movement 22: Tackling inconsiderate parking: the CMP commits to using existing legislation to tackle issues associated with parked vehicles obstructing footways, crossing points, roads and junctions.

Movement 24: Safe and accessible paths and streets. The CMP commits to designing and maintaining paths and streets 'to maximise safety and accessibility for all needs and abilities.

Movement 26: Managing deliveries and servicing. The CMP commits to reducing the impact of delivery and servicing vehicles by, for example, access & timing restrictions.

Place 2: 20-minute neighbourhoods: the CMP will support this concept so as to reduce the need for longer distance journeys.

Place 4: Liveable Places. The Plan commits to creating more liveable places by managing motorised vehicle access and traffic in the city centre...and residential areas.

Place 7: Street design. The Council observes "We need to put the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users first when designing streets. While most streets will accommodate car use, we need to achieve a much better balance, one where the street environment positively influences driver behaviour and where other street uses, and other forms of travel, especially journeys by foot, wheel or bicycle are prioritised over speed of movement by car."

Policy challenge

3.19 The enormous challenge facing public authorities, at every level, is to mobilise their available resources to help communities adapt and thrive, and to do so both at the micro

level of street improvements as well as at the macro level of strategy and large-scale investment programmes.

Polwarth – a demonstration project?

3.20 Merchiston Community Council sees this first phase of the Polwarth Pavement Project as a small-scale demonstration project – an example of neighbourhood initiative that both fulfils policy and drives beneficial change for the community. We know we are not going to solve the climate crisis by adjusting the Polwarth roundabout; and cars are not going suddenly to disappear (some residents feel that space for their cars is already far too limited). But we do suggest that small scale initiatives of this kind can make our neighbourhoods better places for living. In doing so, they contribute to the larger policy objectives – notably 20-minute neighbourhoods - which public authorities are trying to deliver.

SECTION 4

POLWARTH ROUNDABOUT: A 'LOCAL CENTRE'

4.1 The Polwarth roundabout lies at the intersection of Polwarth Gardens, Polwarth Crescent and Granville Terrace. It sits very close to the boundary between Wards 9 & 10 within the City. CEC's datasets analyse districts along ward boundaries, and smaller datasets are limited. For this reason, the statistics we offer should be used with caution: they are not mapped on to the modest area of this study. We also offer some photos, which may speak louder than words.

4.2 The residential area near the roundabout was laid out in the Victorian period. The buildings are stone. The authors of the *Buildings of Scotland – Edinburgh* say: "Polwarth Gardens: mostly four storey tenements of the 1880s with some good townscape incidents". They also remark on the junction of Polwarth Crescent and Temple Park Crescent – the crossing 'has two baronial corners with red sandstone dressings by James M Thomson, 1897, crowned with a spire and a compound ogee [S-shaped curve]'. The gentle curves of the streets north of the roundabout are well shown in a map of the turn of the century –



4.3 A slightly different view (roughly the same period) is given here –





Population density & other characteristics

4.5 Polwarth – especially as it runs north towards Dundee Street and Fountainbridge – has high population density. Fountainbridge and Leith Walk have the highest population densities in the entire city, according to the Population Density paper by CEC based on the 2011 census. The paper points out -

*On the other side of the city centre, in the vicinity of Fountainbridge, densities peaks at 25,250 p/800m-rad. Densities above 20,000 p/800m-rad are recorded in Leith Walk, Central Leith, Pilrig, Broughton, Fountainbridge, Tollcross, Dalry, **Polwarth**, and parts of South Side to the east of the Meadows.*

4.6 The boundary with Ward 9 is at the Walker Bridge over the Union Canal, some 3 minutes north of the roundabout; given this, it seems to make sense to see the area as sharing rather more of the characteristics of Ward 9 than of Ward 10 (Morningside), which extends well to the south.

4.7 North of Polwarth Crescent, the Victorian tenements of Yeaman Place are more concentrated, with up to 16 flats in each stair. When built, they most probably housed the artisans, craftspeople and labourers who were key to the successful enterprises on and near the Union Canal, notably the North British Rubber Company and McEwan's Brewery.


4.8 We learn from Ward profiles – see [ward-profiles \(edinburgh.gov.uk\)](http://ward-profiles.edinburgh.gov.uk) based on the 2011 census data – that the population of Ward 9 tends to be slightly younger than the Edinburgh average, that there are proportionately more tenement flats in the area than in Edinburgh overall, that Ward 9 had (at the time of the 2011 Census) rather more 2-room households than the city average, more households renting from a private landlord than across the city as a whole, and rather more full-time students than the all-Edinburgh average. This last is amply confirmed by even a short visit to the roundabout area: many flats nearby are occupied by students, attracted no doubt by the proximity of Napier University's Merchiston

campus on Merchiston Avenue, and good transport links into the city centre and the University of Edinburgh and also westwards to Heriot Watt. Student footfall is important for the viability of many businesses in the area.


4.9 Some of these indicators will no doubt have changed – perhaps markedly – in the period since the 2011 Census (not least, the proportions of students to overall population). It will be interesting to see the updated Ward profiles in due course. We would have liked to include demographic data linked more precisely to the scope of our project but could not find any source for these.

Deprivation Index

4.10 We consulted the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation to see if it could shed any useful light on characteristics of our target area. The immediate vicinity of the roundabout, according to SIMD, is shown below



Blue indicators suggest relatively less deprived; this image shows only one red indicator. By contrast, the area north of the roundabout, by the canal, is shown in SIMD as follows:




Many more indicators are on the red side, signifying drops in income, employment, health and education. This ties in with the data from the Council's ward profiles, suggesting deteriorating affluence and increased population density to the north of the roundabout. SIMD also suggests there is more (relative) deprivation to the east of the roundabout than to the west.

4.11 The interesting question for policy is whether infrastructural improvement could even out these disparities in affluence. That however lies well outwith the scope of this study.

The Commercial Centre

4.12 The Edinburgh Local Development Plan 2016 (soon to be replaced by the City Plan 2030) offers an image of the Polwarth Local Centre – the small, irregularly shaped area bordered in red below.



4.13 Currently, there are 18 businesses along the arms of the roundabout and at the north end of Merchiston Avenue. They comprise:

- A much-valued mini-market (Margiotta), with a supermarket link
- Three take-aways (Indian, Chinese, Pizza)
- Drycleaner and launderette
- Vet clinic
- Two Dental clinics
- Pharmacy
- One café – formerly two, see below.
- Two hairdressers
- Accountancy firm
- Physiotherapy clinic
- Domiciliary care agency
- Dressmaker
- Travel agency

4.14 This is a very useful range of goods and services. As Polwarth Crescent gives way to Yeaman Place, there are two pubs – the Polwarth Tavern and the Golden Rule. But the image above slightly exaggerates the extent of commercial properties near the roundabout. In recent years, several of the shops near the foot of Merchiston Avenue have been converted into ground floor flats. While this provides some much-needed smaller flatted accommodation, it reduces the sense of a community hub. The cobbler has gone. The stamp shop has gone. Very recently, the proprietor of Piece Box was driven to offer her

lease for sale: she told the project team that staff recruitment problems had been exacerbated by the absence of loading bays for commercial use. Over a dozen jobs hang in the balance.

4.15 Such issues are of course by no means peculiar to Polwarth: many local centres are struggling. We highlight these issues simply to make the point that the stability of this one cannot be taken for granted. It is currently stressed by factors that could be addressed, principally the negative impact of traffic flows on pedestrian footfall and community atmosphere.

4.16 The 'local centre' is well used by residents, including the many students living in Polwarth. It is also a lifeline for the residents of the retirement complex at Ker Court, Polwarth Gardens – just a few paces from the roundabout. There are 33 flats there, occupied by persons over 60. The presence of older residents may have been a factor in the original decision to place a zebra crossing across Polwarth Gardens, at Margiotta; but that crossing, as we show later, is inadequate for safe access to the range of community shops and services.

4.17 What we have in the Polwarth local centre is the kernel of a 20-minute neighbourhood. But it will never flourish until its amenity is improved, pedestrian safety enhanced, and some restraints applied to the volume and speed of traffic using the roundabout as a short-cut from Dalry to Morningside. We return to these issues in Sections 11 & 12 . From our survey here are a few comments that illustrate the impact of the streetscape on the use of the local centre:

"In general, I think there is not enough pavement space and there are not enough safe places to cross around the roundabout."

"It's hard to cycle with children because of the speed of motor traffic, poor sight lines and lack of cycle paths."

"Poor road/pavement surface, street clutter, need bike parking near shops"

"Wider island at crossing from Margiotta to cafes: currently it is too small to wait on while crossing (my dog doesn't fit, and a pushchair / wheelchair wouldn't either)."

"Rat run at peak times. Pedestrians wait for a gap and hope!"

"Bad pavement surfaces - trip hazards; and graffiti!"

Transportation

4.18 Public transport within the city – by bus or tram – will become increasingly important as the local authority strives to approach net zero. The Polwarth centre lies on two important bus routes – the nos. 10 and 27. Bus no 10 runs from Western Harbour in Leith

to Bonaly near Colinton, starting shortly after 0500 and ending just before midnight at 10-20 minute frequency throughout the day. It uses two stops close to the Polwarth roundabout. Bus no 27 runs from Silverknowes to Hunter's Tryst and uses the same stops in Polwarth; it starts even earlier around 0430 and runs, on a frequency similar to no 10, till around midnight. Both buses take passenger to the centre of the city within minutes. They are well used, with around 50 buses in each service travelling in each direction (east and west) each weekday.

4.19 These bus routes are vital for all residents but perhaps especially for those living in the retirement housing in Ker Court, and those (many) residents who do not have their own car. CEC policy is to assert the primary of bus routes and encourage their use.

Spaces for People

4.20 The Council's *Spaces for People* initiative, launched during the Covid pandemic to offer additional space to pavement users and cyclists, did not extend to Polwarth (save in relation to the bollard narrowing of the junction at the north end of Yeaman Place, which was removed following accidents to pavement users in late 2022). The area is devoid of measures to assist cyclists: their segregated lanes along Dundee Street abruptly finish at the turn into Yeaman Place.

4.21 The pedestrian crossing arrangements at the Polwarth roundabout are rudimentary. There is one ageing zebra crossing at the eastern end of Polwarth Gardens; and there are two 'refuges' – one lying across Polwarth Crescent and the other lying at the eastern side of the roundabout between the café Florentin and the Polwarth pharmacy. Our traffic count data – which we analyse in Section 8 – shows that all these crossings are well used throughout the day and not just at peak hours. As we will explain, residents have acute concerns over the safety and adequacy of these crossings, which are seen as increasingly hazardous as traffic flows, especially of HGVs along Polwarth Crescent, have increased.

4.22 We note that the Council's plans to extend city Greenways with a major new extension from Roseburn to the Union Canal will bring more active travellers – pavement users as well as cyclists – to Fountainpark. Until an active travel route to the Union Canal is opened up on Yeaman Place, cyclists must seek another entry point to east or (more likely) west and in doing so negotiate the narrows of Yeaman Place without lane segregation or active vehicle speed monitoring. Those wishing to head south must similarly head up Yeaman Place, negotiate the roundabout, and make for Holy Corner via Merchiston Avenue; from there they can relatively easily access the 'quiet' route south to Greenbank and beyond.

4.23 Our traffic counts tell us that, over an average day, some 200 cyclists use Polwarth Crescent (in both directions) and over 130 use the Polwarth Gardens route to & from the roundabout. Around 100 cycles move east/west along Granville Terrace. (Note: these numbers are not additive: the same cyclist may use several of these routes.)



Streetscape – greenery, upkeep etc

4.24 Polwarth has one excellent city ‘lung’ – Harrison Park. But in terms of the greening of the streetscape, the area does not do well on this metric of well-being. There are no trees at or near the Polwarth roundabout; nothing to sit under or show the passing seasons. The sole tree at the corner of Yeaman Place and Watson Crescent (at the ‘Golden Rule’) comes as a surprise. Interestingly, there are some trees in the streets to the west of Yeaman Place – perhaps the result of a much earlier initiative to improve the appearance of these streets – but nothing along the main carriageway or at the local centre. We propose to change this.

4.25 Close to the roundabout, the carriageways and footpaths are pitted with potholes, uneven or cracked. There are missing dropped kerbs, obstructive street furniture, hedges that block pavement users (especially those with buggies or mobility scooters), a decrepit public phone box, and cycles tied inconsiderately to railings (blocking those with disabilities). A sense of neglect sharpens further south along Yeaman Place, where residents note a persistent problem of littering and dog dirt. (We are pleased to report that City Councillors recently launched an initiative to clean up this street on a regular basis.)

4.26 Pollution from traffic, anxiety when negotiating crossings with young children, absence of view with greenery – all this impacts on the well-being of residents, even though we cannot put metrics on it.



SECTION 5

PROJECT GOVERNANCE & DELIVERY

5.1 MCC was clear from the outset that this project should be driven from within the community council. The MCC routine of monthly public meetings with written or oral reports seemed apt for steering the project and ensuring transparency. Since the project's inception, the project team have supplied regular written reports for public meetings; these are reflected in the minutes of those meetings which are available online at MCC's website.

5.2 Governance by the community council has also brought four further advantages. First, it has opened the project to constructive criticism from council members and from members of the public. Those immersed in any project can sometimes become blinkered and the project team have welcomed constructive challenge and comment from a wider audience.

5.3 Secondly, it has simplified budget management. The CEC grant was simply added to MCC's current account balance; and our Treasurer has monitored spending and arranged payments to contractors such as printers, traffic consultants, PAS (who have supplied training and professional expertise) and a landscape architect. This meant that the project team (comprising two MCC members) were able to focus on the issues, confident that money matters were being handled with care and propriety.

5.4 Thirdly, we were able to take advantage of MCC's existing web presence to publicise the project. On our website at [The Polwarth Pavement Project – Merchiston Community Council \(merchistoncc.org.uk\)](http://The Polwarth Pavement Project – Merchiston Community Council (merchistoncc.org.uk)) readers will find posts that chart the development of the project from its start-up until this report. With invaluable help from a fellow member who is skilled in website management, we were able to use MCC's existing web profile to give news and invite opinion.

5.5 Lastly, anchoring the project to MCC simplified decision-taking. MCC decided to set a delegated authority limit of £1000 within which the project team could commission goods and services. Spending over this limit would have to be justified at a public meeting and approved (or rejected) in the normal way.

5.6 In case this all sounds rather pat, we want to make clear that the Polwarth Pavement Project is the first streetscape development project that MCC has undertaken for some years. Neither member of the project team is a project manager by training. We have had to learn on the job. We offer some reflections on this in a later section.

5.7 A key focus in the project has been traffic management. This is often extremely contentious locally. It is no surprise that our engagement process uncovered a range of views - some of them diametrically opposed – on possible solutions to problems such as pedestrian crossings and parking. In these circumstances, our responsibility – as we see it in MCC – is to acknowledge all the evidence, test it, and present to CEC the most complete account of community opinion that we can assemble. When we refer to 'testing the

evidence' we mean that views, such as on vehicle speeding, are sometimes capable of being independently verified - or rebutted - by quantitative data such as traffic counts. Where views could be confirmed or challenged by numerical data, we have sought to do so. All of the quantitative data that we have assembled is available to any member of the community and will be provided to CEC.

5.8 As to delivery, we did not adopt any sophisticated project management software to guide the progress of this project. We felt that the modest scale of the project did not warrant the use of heavy IT. Moreover, the composition of the project team changed in September 2022 (one member left to take up a post overseas; another joined) and it seemed to us simpler and more effective to deal with this transition by mutual updating rather than digital tools.

SECTION 6

ENGAGEMENT PROCESS

6.1 Engaging with a community is not a one-off process. It has to be iterative, using the learning from one phase to inform consultations on the next. We summarise five distinct phases of engagement with the community.

6.2 Whilst the audit of Polwarth streets by *Living Streets Edinburgh* was a spur to our early thinking, we knew that we could not sensibly apply for a Council grant before we had taken wider soundings on the merits and feasibility of the Polwarth Pavement Project. We needed to be sure that our early ideas were viable and worthwhile and that we were working with the grain of local opinion and local policy.

Preliminary discussions


6.3 We therefore sought preliminary discussions in late 2021/ early 2022 with ward Councillors; with the *Causie* and Fountainbridge Canalside Community Development Trusts; & we made contact with CEC Transport and Road Safety team and with Bruntsfield Primary School. All expressed positive interest. We also set up a dedicated email account for the project and, through MCC's website, invited residents to respond to our early ideas.

6.4 Tens of residents emailed the project inbox with comments on road and pedestrian safety. Our volunteer has constructed a mind-map of these – below – to give readers a sense of the comments that came back to us. Some residents offered their own professional expertise on bottom-up planning, civil engineering and support for pedestrian crossing improvements along the Polwarth 'corridor'.

6.5 Two key points emerge from the mind map: first, the complexity and inter-connectedness of the issues around pedestrian safety, traffic, 'greening', and pavement conditions. Secondly, we had a strong sense early on from this work that a complex problem would require an integrated set of solutions, not just one or two standalone measures on their own.

6.6 The key points emerging from other discussions were that MCC needed to be realistic and consider a staged approach; there should be thorough public consultation to help define priorities and timescale; & efforts to enlist funders beyond CEC would be crucial.

RESIDENTS' COMMENTS



Discussions with businesses near the roundabout

6.7 Our second phase of consultation, once the footprint of the project was amended in the summer of 2022, took the form of door-to-door discussions with the businesses in the area. We wanted to hear their perspective on the road & pedestrian safety issues that residents felt keenly about; and we wanted them to know that issues such as loading and delivery bays, customer (including disabled) parking, and amenity issues such as pavement cleanliness and repair, were very much on our agenda. Without exception, we were given a very fair hearing. Many proprietors and managers were close to despair about driver behaviour at the roundabout and felt strongly about the hazards faced by their customers, especially at peak hours. Here are some of their comments:

“Cars come flying round that corner [at top of Polwarth Crescent & on to Granville Terr]. Speed control is required, plus better signage. Watching pedestrians trying to cross is scary”.

“the Zebra crossing needs major overhaul. Traffic [is] intent on roundabout navigation & fails to register zebra crossing. Our working day is punctuated by horns blaring and shouting from drivers.”


“Traffic approaches the roundabout too fast. Cars turning left at Polwarth Gardens /Margiotta do so at speed and cannot see pedestrians until too late. The pedestrian crossing from Delhi takeaway to Margiotta is especially risky given poor sightlines (curve of road amplified by waste bins sticking out).

‘Pedestrians have to stand in road to see’ oncoming traffic. Risks to elderly and partially sighted.

One proprietor, whose daughter was knocked down on the zebra crossing in 2021, commented - *“We wanted this place to be safer”*. The roundabout *“should be reconfigured to slow traffic down & make pedestrian crossings safer.”*

6.8 A mind map of business comments follows.



BUSINESSES' RESPONSES



6.9 MCC offered a ‘walkabout’ for Ward 9 & 10 Councillors in the summer of 2022. We were delighted that Mandy Watt and Ben Parker took up this offer; and others – Neil Ross and Marie-Claire Munro – though unavailable on the day expressed real interest.



6.10 By August 2022, we had enough informal evidence of problems at the roundabout to put up on our website our early analysis of the issues that people had brought to us.




Messages to our email account were generally very supportive and we felt justified in proceeding to the next stage of formal survey.

Formal Survey

6.11 The goal of the survey was to collect evidence about the lived experience of residents and businesses in the neighbourhood of the Polwarth roundabout. We wanted to hear from people in their own words; we wanted to make it simple for them to record their concerns and impressions; and we wanted to be able to aggregate the responses and talk meaningfully about them.

6.12 During September and October, we constructed and trialled a survey leaflet that could also be accessed digitally as a 'google form' via a QR code. Drafts were much improved by comments from residents. Here are images of the final survey leaflet (the A4 folded leaflet here shown as outer and inner sides), which was mirrored by an online googleform asking the same questions:

<p>Please complete your survey by 30th November. Leave it in the box marked MCC at Marglotta or Plecebox. We will empty these regularly.</p> <p>Once the responses are analysed, we will put a summary of the community's views on the Community Council's website, at https://merchistoncc.org.uk/projects/the-polwarth-pavement-project/</p> <p>Then we will work up options for improvement and seek your views. Further events will be posted on our website. And you can write to us at pavementproject@merchistoncc.org.uk</p> <p>Please help us to reach as many of the community as possible</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post to your group—Email, text or post on your street/neighbourhood/club group to encourage others to complete the survey • Rule of three—Find 3 neighbours/friends and complete the survey with them • Strengthen our voice—use social media to talk about the survey (people need to see something an average of 7 times before they act on it and you can help!) 	<p>Merchiston Community Council (MCC) is running a pavement improvement project from Dundee Street to the Polwarth roundabout. This first phase focuses on the roundabout.</p> <p>Residents have told us about risks to pavement users, including those with a wheelchair or pram. There is also concern about the state of the pavements and provision for cyclists.</p> <p>We need your views so that we can put proposals to the City of Edinburgh Council.</p> <p>If you would like to receive project updates, please sign up using the contact form on our website - https://merchistoncc.org.uk/projects/the-polwarth-pavement-project/contact-the-polwarth-pavement-project/</p> <p>Please see below* for how MCC safeguards your personal information.</p>	<p>Merchiston Community Council</p> <p>Have Your Say On The Polwarth Roundabout!</p>  <p>Do you feel safe when walking or cycling near the roundabout?</p> <p>Do you want to help us encourage the City Council to make the area safer & more pleasant for walkers & cyclists?</p> <p>Then please make your views count and complete the survey inside by the end of November!</p> <p>The Polwarth roundabout is at the junction of Polwarth Crescent, Polwarth Gardens and Granville Terrace.</p> <p>If you prefer to complete online, use the QR code or this link - https://forms.gle/aQ9MFakBckPBEmA38</p>  <p>Thank You!</p>
	 <p>Merchiston Community Council</p> <p><small>*In line with the Data Protection Act 2018, any personal information given on the contact form will be used by Merchiston Community Council solely for the purposes of the Polwarth Pavement Project. We will treat your information with respect. You can change your mind at any time and ask us to remove your information—simply contact us pavementproject@merchistoncc.org.uk. See also our privacy policy at https://merchistoncc.org.uk/privacy-policy/</small></p>	

About you

Please tell us your postcode

Do you live close to the roundabout—within a 5 or 10 minute walk? Circle your answer.
Yes / No

How do you use this roundabout?
Circle your answers – please answer all 3!

Pavement user: every day | once or twice a week | never
Driver: every day | once or twice a week | never
Cyclist: every day | once or twice a week | never

How many adults are in your household?

How many children in your household who pass the roundabout by foot, buggy, scooter or bike?

How concerned are you about road crossings for pavement users (pedestrians, wheelchair users and parents with pushchairs etc) near the Polwarth roundabout? Please tick a box below.

Very concerned
Moderately concerned
Not concerned

How concerned are you about provision for cyclists near the roundabout?

Very concerned
Moderately concerned
Not concerned

What problems most affect pavement users, including those with a disability, near the roundabout?
Tick as many as you think apply:

- Heavy traffic at peak hours
- Traffic speeding
- Not enough pedestrian crossings
- Poor sightlines for pedestrians
- Zebra crossing not well maintained
- Obstructive street furniture (eg rubbish bins, parking poles)

What about problems for cyclists?

- No lane segregation on approach to the roundabout
- Not enough cycle hangars/stores

Other issues – for businesses, disabled drivers & about general amenity

- Not enough delivery/loading bays
- No disabled parking place near shops
- Dirty pavements (litter, dog dirt)

Other problems for any type of user? Write below

If you don't think there are any problems with this area, please tick here

Which of these issues present the GREATEST RISK to pavement users & cyclists? Select one or more numbers from list above

How can we improve things?
Tick all options below that you would support:


- Improved or additional zebra crossings for pavement users, including children on school routes
- Pavement widening and/or removal of railings to give priority to pedestrians
- Cycle lanes on approach to roundabout
- Replacement of roundabout with fully signalled intersection incorporating 'pelican' crossings for pedestrians
- Measures to slow traffic down on Polwarth Gardens and Crescent, and Granville Terrace
- Limits on HGVs using Yeaman Place/ Polwarth Crescent
- Benches and greenery to promote wellbeing
- Other ideas?

If you don't see any need for change, please tick here

The City of Edinburgh Council would probably deal with any improvement plan in stages. What are your top priorities for action to benefit pavement users and cyclists? Use the box below to enter a number from the list above; you can indicate two top priorities by putting two numbers below. Or use your own words.


6.13 The great beauty of the google form, which most respondents preferred to the paper version, was that the software aggregates and analyses the responses to numerical or yes/no answers as the survey proceeds; and at the end, produces some useful graphical representations of the responses. So, for example, the responses to the first question look like:

Do you live close to the Polwarth roundabout – within a 5 or 10 minute walk?
165 responses




And the answers to the second question look like

How do you use the roundabout? Tick below to indicate whether you pass it as a pavement user, driver or cyclist and indicate frequency.



And responses to the question 'how can we improve things?' look like –

How can we improve things? Select all options below that you would support
164 responses




6.14 We distributed around 300 paper survey forms through letter boxes of homes near the roundabout in early November. We also distributed a similar number of A5 postcards, which we hoped would be eye-catching.

6.15 Over the weekend of 12-13 November 2022, members of the project team organised a small street event outside the Margiotta store, to engage residents in discussion about the roundabout, hand out survey forms and links to the online form. There was a good deal of interest in the project: many people said they had already seen and completed the online form, many said they were following the story on the MCC website. Only one person approached us over that weekend to argue that no action was necessary to increase

pedestrian safety near the roundabout. Of the 165 responses to the survey, only 3 respondents took the view that no improvements were necessary.

—




The inclusion of QR codes on both the survey leaflet and the flyer proved valuable. Many people simply navigated to the online form using the code.

Analysing survey responses

6.16 The number of respondents was not the whole story. Each respondent was able to write free text answers to four questions. These were not analysed by google form. We had to use a different approach. Coached by PAS, we took all 800+ of the free text responses and coded them to the *Place Standard*, in line with best practice. PAS introduced us to the Standard and it proved extremely useful.

6.17 The Place Standard is a digital tool, widely used by communities and town planners across Scotland, which helps us to interpret how residents think and feel about their environment. It uses key features – such as ‘moving around’, ‘traffic & parking’, ‘feeling safe’ & ‘care & maintenance’ – to build up a picture of the features communities value, what they want to change, and why. There is more information at <https://www.ourplace.scot/About-Place-Standard>. The following image shows the features against which we plotted survey responses.



The outcomes are reported in the next sections and at Annex 2.

Traffic counts

6.18 Residents commented copiously on traffic matters, including speeding and road crossings. To properly assess this evidence, we decided to compare those impressions against objective, quantitative data on speed, volume and composition of vehicle traffic, & volume and composition of pedestrians using the roundabout over the course of a typical week. We commissioned those data from Traffic Data Collection, who by happy chance had done a similar exercise at the roundabout (though focused only on ‘peak hours’) for CEC in 2021.

6.19 We reported back to residents on the survey in further web-posts, all of which can be viewed at <https://merchistoncc.org.uk/projects/the-polwarth-pavement-project/>. We also wrote direct to all those who had signed up to the ‘contact’ list for regular updates and updated them also.

What improvements might look like – consulting on possible futures

6.20 It is crucial in projects of this kind to be able to show what improvement might look like. We all like to have an image of some kind of the change we want to see. As our conclusions and recommendations began to emerge, we consulted with and engaged a landscape architect – Marion Preez of Urban Pioneers – to give them expression in ‘visualisations’. You will find those in Section 12 where we discuss our proposals.

6.21 In February 2023, it was time for us to begin to share our thinking with the community and test out our ideas. At that month’s public meeting of MCC, we gave a presentation on

the project and its progress to that stage. You can find all the slides used for that event at this link –

<https://merchistoncc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/Polwarth-Pavement-Project-MCC-meeting-Feb-2023.pdf>

6.22 During February we also sent copies of a very early draft of this report to some of our key stakeholders and those residents who had been most active and interested throughout the project. We made a new contact within the City Council who signposted us to colleagues with an interest in our work and who encouraged us to send a draft into the Council as soon as a respectable one was ready. We were ready to put this report, in draft form, on the MCC website on 17 March 2023.

Further consultation with community

6.23 Over the weekend of 25 March we held another informal street event at the roundabout to share with the community our detailed proposals and to show the visualisations. We wanted to take questions, offer information, listen to views and generally assess the mood of those most directly affected by any change.

6.24 Without exception, those we met were delighted to see the Community Council take charge of the road safety issues at the roundabout and they supported the recommendations for action. Some residents wanted to go further, proposing for example additional measures - such as chicanes or pavement widening - to reduce the use of the 'rat-run' and also the speed of traffic using Merchiston Avenue. Many people continue to be concerned about speeding along Polwarth Crescent and along the east/west axis of Granville Terrace/ Polwarth Gardens. Several residents suggested much clearer signage on approach to the intersection, to alert drivers to a zone used heavily by pedestrians and cyclists, and much clearer instructions (on the road as well as on signs) to slow down before reaching the intersection.


6.25 We will report these suggestions in another web-post and have adjusted the recommendations in this report to take account of several of them. At the time of finalising this report (mid-May 2023) we had not yet received any substantive comments from CEC, though our officer contact commended the Community Council on an 'excellent' bit of work. This is disappointing but not unexpected given the large programmes on which Council officers are focused. We will be pressing for some reaction from them and we will also engage further with our Ward Councillors. We have also reached out to Sustrans, from whom we hope to contract design and costing services so that the City Council can be assured that we have fully explored all the key implementation issues.

6.26 The final version of this report is being distributed in hard copy and electronically to all our key stakeholders, to all those on our 'contact' list, to all Ward 9 & 10 councillors, and to other organisations who may have an interest. It will also, of course, be put on the MCC website.

SECTION 7

THE SURVEY EVIDENCE

7.1 It may be helpful to remind readers of the layout of the roundabout and its immediate environs. There is no longer a central ‘reservation’ at the roundabout, simply a mini-roundabout marking the intersection.



The Survey

7.2 The complete set of google form analyses of quantitative and yes/no questions are at Annex 1. At Annex 2 we attach tables showing the *Place Standard* analyses of the responses to the free text questions in the survey. Here we summarise the main points emerging from this work:

- we received 165 responses to the survey, most of them electronic, from households with 348 adults and 113 children
- 91% of respondents live close to the roundabout (defined in the survey as within a 5–10-minute walk)
- Close to 100 respondents use the roundabout as pedestrians every day; and a further 50+ several times a week

- More than two-thirds of respondents are ‘very concerned’ about provision for pedestrians at the roundabout; and 94.5% are either ‘concerned’ or ‘very concerned’.
- Slightly more than half of respondents are ‘very concerned’ about provision for cyclists; and some 82% are either concerned or very concerned. It’s not only those who regularly or sometimes cycle at the roundabout who recognise the hazards for cyclists: those who are predominantly drivers or pedestrians also see the risks.

“This terrible roundabout results in pedestrian and cyclists avoiding it completely and crossing at random places creating hazards in the wider area”

“I try to drive home a different way, simply to avoid the roundabout”

“Pedestrian crossings everywhere near there are a total terrifying mess and I am so stressed out every time I have to go near there with my 3- and 6-year-olds”.

‘It’s hard to cycle with children because of the speed of motor traffic, poor sight lines and lack of cycle paths.’

- The number of respondents pointing to insufficient delivery & loading bays (39) is larger than the number of businesses at the roundabout – indicating that this issue too is seen as problematic by more people than those with a direct commercial interest.
- Nearly one in four respondents is concerned about the lack of a disabled parking place near the shops. And nearly 84% of respondents are not happy with the state of the pavements.
- In answer to the question: *which problems most affect users, including those with a disability, near the roundabout?* concern about **speeding** comes top, but only by a slim margin. There is also widespread concern about **poor sightlines** for pedestrians, **insufficient pedestrian crossings**, and **heavy traffic** at peak hours.
- More than half of respondents are critical of **obstructive street furniture** – the bins at the south-east end of Polwarth Crescent are a particular cause for concern since they interfere with sightlines for those crossing to Margiotta. (The reforms to be introduced by CEC’s Bin Hubs strategy are relevant & are picked up later.) Parking information poles are set well back from the kerb, effectively bisecting the pavement.
- Often in this survey, large scale issues sit side by side with important matters of detail Those ‘wheeling’ or pushing buggies draw attention to missing dropped kerbs – for example, outside the physiotherapy clinic on the south side of Polwarth Gardens/ Granville Terrace at the junction with Merchiston Avenue: the kerb on the north side has

been dropped, but not on the south side. And illegal double parking, obstructing pedestrian crossings, is widely criticised.



- Only 8 respondents out of 165 told us there were no problems at all with the roundabout and only 3 saw no need for improvement.
- On **options for improvement**, 81% of respondents would support measures to slow traffic down; a very close second in terms of improvements is the creation of improved or additional zebra crossings.
- Other options - widening the pavements to signal priority for pedestrians, creating cycle lanes on approach to the roundabout, introducing benches & greenery to assist with well-being and a sense of place, and measures to limit the volume of HGV traffic – all drew comfortably in excess of 50%.

Free text answers

7.3 The survey included four questions for respondents to answer in their own words. We asked about any **other problems** they identified as pavement users, cyclists or drivers; we invited them to assess which of these problems posed the most serious **risk** to pavement users and cyclists; we asked for **other ideas** for beneficial change; and lastly we asked about **priorities**. The survey form made clear that *‘the City of Edinburgh Council would probably deal with any improvement plan in stages. What are your top two priorities for action to benefit pavement users and cyclists?’*

7.4 The fully coded answers to these questions, at Annex 2, are revealing:

7.5 In considering ‘other problems’, respondents focused on 4 main areas. First, the need for **behavioural change** on the part (mainly) of drivers to recognise the primacy of pavement use. Some of the behaviour complained about is clearly contrary to road rules and constitutes a threat to road and pedestrian safety. It includes: unwillingness to pause to allow pedestrians to safely cross; drivers driving over, not around, the roundabout; drivers overtaking too close to cyclists; traffic cutting the right corner from the Crescent up Merchiston Avenue; drivers using mobile phones; drivers swerving around speed pillows.



Here is a glimpse of what respondents said:

“...the general apparent attitude of many car drivers is that roads are for cars only and that pedestrians/cyclists should only have use of any segment of road when no car wishes to use it”

7.6 The second main area of comment is the inadequacy of **road crossings** in an area well traversed daily by adults and children. Respondents are acutely concerned that there are no safe pedestrian crossings on two sides of the roundabout, the only (dilapidated) zebra crossing lying at the Polwarth Gardens arm.



7.7 The 'refuges' placed elsewhere to assist pedestrians are criticised as too narrow for a dog, let alone a buggy. The junction with Merchiston Avenue near the roundabout 'is dangerous for children crossing on way to school - this is a major route to school for both Bruntsfield primary and Boroughmuir kids.' People don't always cross where planners think they should cross: parents walking up the north leg of Merchiston Avenue want to cross from the (former) Piece Box to Active Health or a few yards further east in order to be on the right side of Merchiston Avenue when making for the primary school. Those informal crossings ('desire lines' in urban design) were once patrolled by a crossing warden (long retired and not replaced).

7.8 A number of residents, both orally and in response to the survey, have complained about inconsiderate and dangerous **parking at or near pedestrian crossings**. Cars and vans routinely park on the double yellow lines at the south end of Polwarth Crescent in order to do some shopping or to carry out work. This is a parking offence. It is extremely vexing to pedestrians wishing to cross at this point. Traffic wardens, responsible for policing such infringements, do not appear concerned about the additional risk to pedestrian posed by such parking. The project team have a substantial library of photos of double yellow line parking. A couple are offered below. Similarly, but more seriously, cars often park on the zig-zag lines on either side of the zebra crossing. This impedes the view of pedestrians attempting to use the crossing. Such parking is an offence punishable by a fine and by points on the driver's licence. It is a matter for the police. Unsurprisingly, given the other demands on their time, it is not a high priority for them and the project team have never observed police monitoring at this point.



7.9 **Speeding vehicles** is one of the most heavily commented topics in the survey. In this part of the survey, respondents reported on their experience of speeding traffic both entering and exiting the roundabout; on the ineffectuality of the speed pillows along Polwarth Crescent; on the lack of 20mph enforcement; and the absence of speed cameras.

7.10 The last main topic highlighted in this part of the survey is **road & pavement maintenance**. Risks to cyclists, pedestrians and to cars arise from potholes, uneven and broken pavements. "Road surface repairs required (dangerous to cycle on, causes cars to swerve, e.g. near roundabout, last section of Merchiston Ave downhill)"



7.11 Respondents' views on the **risk** posed by various hazards were also instructive. **Speeding** is seen as the greatest risk, with more than double the number of statements (78) compared with any other risk factor. Other factors highlighted include: lack of segregated cycle lanes; poor road layout (many comments focused on restricted sightlines for

pedestrians caused by street furniture and parking); and, again, the paucity and insecurity of the available road crossings.

7.12 Question 8 in the survey invited respondents to give us **other ideas** to improve things. Very many of these relate to **road layout**, where a range of views has emerged about ways to make the roundabout safer for all types of users. Some favoured a wholly signalled intersection, emphasising the bus route east/west, with integrated pelican crossings at all roundabout 'arms'. Others argued against this, cautioning that lights would cause tailbacks and pollution without addressing the basic problem of traffic volumes. Some respondents proposed a 'raised bed' covering the whole roundabout area with advance warning of speed restrictions together with improved crossings for pavement users. Others again suggested remodelling the roundabout feature to make it more visible or more elevated or larger.

7.13 Many suggest pavement widening to give pedestrians more freedom of movement and to assert their primacy in the transportation pyramid. One resident with some experience of road design offered an approach combining several innovative ideas about layout: we return to this in section 12.

7.14 What comes across here is residents' desire to see improvement and to be involved in any future programme of change. Few claim to have the professional expertise in traffic modelling and road engineering to know what would best serve the safety and enjoyment of pavement users and cyclists; but all are pushing for change. We explore some of these ideas when we report on our work on visualising improvements.

7.15 Residents' **top priorities** (Question 9) will come as no surprise. Right out in front is the call for **improved and additional pedestrian crossings**; and in second place, just ahead of measures to **slow traffic down**, are the calls for **pavement widening and lane segregation** for cyclists.

7.16 For completeness, we should also make clear that we received many comments about areas further north and east, along Yeaman Place and Granville Terrace, respectively. The Walker Bridge on Yeaman Place is widely seen as dangerous for cyclists; the provision for road crossing on Yeaman Place is poor; and residents have already been waiting 9 years for the installation of a pelican crossing at the north end of Yeaman Place at its junction with Dundee Street. Although this part of the Polwarth corridor is outwith the current phase of the Polwarth Pavement project, we wish to alert CEC now to these issues and will return to them in the section on traffic counts. Similarly, survey respondents repeatedly mention the narrow and badly maintained pavements along Granville Terrace, so hard to navigate by wheelchair or with a buggy; and the way traffic surges from the lights at Viewforth westwards along Granville Terrace – a street close to a secondary school and also used for access to Bruntsfield Primary.

Summary

7.17 There is clearly a substantial body of concern and disquiet about the safety of pavement users and cyclists at and near the Polwarth roundabout. At the broadest level, respondents note the gap between CEC policy on the future of urban transport and the

present peak hour mayhem in their own neighbourhood; between the priority attached to pavement users and cyclists in the public commitments of the public authority and residents' lived experience. They aspire to be active travellers but multiple hazards and obstacles lie in their way.

7.18 Four issues stand out:

- Inadequate and in several places clearly **risky crossings** for pavement users; and the subordination of pedestrians to vehicles, reflected in pavement guardrails and cramped circulation space;
- **Inadequate provision for cyclists** at the roundabout, on approach to it (and in fact along the length of the Polwarth corridor, from the north end of Yeaman Place southwards);
- The **volume and speed of vehicles**, linked to the increasing use of the Polwarth corridor and Merchiston Avenue as a short-cut for traffic, including HGVs, from Dalry to Morningside & Colinton
- **Neglect of the footway and carriageways**, posing risks to all road and pavement users.

"We need more crossings and [to] make them much more child-safe. We are considering moving as a result of the danger at the roundabout for our kids."

"Street clutter prevents easy access for wheelchair users...the curbs are not dropped low enough for wheelchair users [at the foot of Merchiston Avenue]"

'My 70-year-old dad got knocked down on the zebra crossing 6 years ago'

"As a mother of 2 young children crossing the roundabout is extremely difficult; cars do not stop, park on double yellows to 'pop' to the shops, bins are obstruction to line of sight. Speed of traffic is too fast, heavy usage of the street at all times of day. No reduction of speed as cars approach the roundabout."


'People don't treat it as a roundabout and cut over it. Working opposite it we see a lot of dangerous driving. The roundabout should be raised or traffic lights put in place.'

7.18 Merchiston Community Council takes very seriously all these expressions of concern. We invite CEC to take a long, hard look at this neighbourhood and at the implications of current traffic patterns for the safety of those whom it claims to place first – pavement users. We need to change this *"awful, risky junction"*.

7.19 In the next section we test various aspects of respondents' views against professionally administered traffic counts.

SECTION 8

TRAFFIC COUNTS



Why Traffic Counts?

8.1 Vehicle traffic – its volume, composition and speed – attracted a large amount of comment in our community survey. MCC decided it was important to compare residents' lived experience of traffic to hard data about vehicle flows. If data – professionally collected and analysed – confirmed residents' observations, that would lend added weight to their views. If the data were at odds with neighbours' experience, it would be important to ask why, and to what extent the divergence matters.


Location, duration & coverage of counts

8.2 We therefore commissioned 'traffic counts', done by automatic traffic meter, on the four arteries of the roundabout: to the west, Polwarth Gardens; to the north Polwarth Crescent; to the east, Granville Terrace; and, since a good deal of traffic uses Merchiston Avenue, to the south, as the final leg on the north/south short cut from Dalry to Morningside, we included the Avenue as well. We wanted to be able to evaluate the many comments we had received about vehicles speeding on exiting the roundabout and speeding along the straight stretches of the Gardens, the Terrace and the Avenue. All these streets, together with Polwarth Crescent, are subject to a 20mph speed limit.

8.3 Those counts were in place at each location for 7 days. The period excluded days affected by rail and school strikes. The counts were able to differentiate amongst three

classes of vehicle: cars and vans, classed as 'light'; 'medium' or class 2 Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs), which include buses; and class 3 'heavy' HGVs, which are articulated lorries of substantial weight. The counts also detected actual vehicle speed (in increments of 5mph from 0-5mph upwards to 95-100mph) and reported on mean speeds (though not on median speed) & the 85th %ile. (We are not familiar with that metric in this context but understand it refers in traffic analyses to the speed that 85% of drivers will drive at under free-flowing conditions.) In analysing the data for speed, we focused on the number of vehicles travelling at 25-35mph and those at more than 35mph, for the reasons given at para 8.8 below. The first band allows a little tolerance above the 20mph limit to allow for imperfections in speed recording.

8.4 In addition, we set up cameras at the roundabout to capture pedestrian flows over a complete 12-hour, 0700-1900, weekday period. The four points at which the cameras were placed are shown on the following site plan. Data on pedestrian flows are used to calculate a special metric called a PV2 factor, which in turn determines the strength of the case for enhanced pedestrian crossing provision. We say more on this in section 9 below.



8.5 The cameras also capture vehicle type but do so over a much shorter time span than the traffic counts. We wanted camera data to help us assess the volume of school children (with or without parents) who were navigating the roundabout and its adjacent streets on normal weekdays. We were also interested in the numbers of adults crossing the various 'arms' of the roundabout throughout the day. (Since the same adult may use more than one crossing, we should perhaps focus on the number of 'transitions'.) One shortcoming of

the camera data is that cameras do not infallibly identify teenage schoolchildren: they may sometimes classify them as adults, because they look fully grown.

8.6 We commissioned these counts from Traffic Data Collection (TDC), who have also done work for CEC in the past. In fact, we learned in November 2022 that CEC had taken traffic counts at the roundabout as recently as November 2021. We therefore requested sight of those data, so that comparisons could be made over time.

8.7 TDC reported to us in the form of spreadsheets, which MCC is happy to copy to any reader who is interested in examining the data in more detail. (Since the reports make up a bulky dataset, we have not attached them to this report.) What follows is a summary.

Speeding

8.8 As one of our residents reminded us, crashes at higher speeds cause more severe injuries. According to Brake.org.uk, a pedestrian hit at 30mph has a very significant (one in five) chance of being killed. This rises to a one in three chance if they are hit at 35mph. Even small increases in speed can lead to an increase in impact severity. To consider only *serious* speeding, we focused in analysing these data on the numbers of vehicles moving at over 25mph (against a speed limit of 20mph); the number moving at over 35mph; and on the 85%ile figure.

8.9 The overall picture is that, over a typical week, some 65,000-70,000 vehicles approach the Polwarth roundabout from the four feeder routes. Of these, around 6,000 are HGVs (including buses on the east/west axis).

North/south axis – Polwarth Crescent and Merchiston Avenue

8.10 The counts for Polwarth Crescent and for Merchiston Avenue (in effect, the north/south axis) were in place from 14-20 November.

Polwarth Crescent Northbound

- This is a heavily trafficked sector with some 25,700 vehicles using it over an average week;
- Of these, 1034 comprise 'medium' HGVs and 83 are 'heavy' HGVs; none of these are buses;
- On weekdays, between 170 and 200 'medium' HGVs move north up Polwarth Crescent on a daily basis. Most weekdays, between 13 and 17 'heavy' HGVs ply the route;
- The counter for Polwarth Crescent was placed around 25metres from the roundabout; and it is unsurprising, therefore, that the count detected relatively little speeding on that segment (the all-hours 85%ile was just below 19);
- Nonetheless, 254 vehicles were counted as speeding in excess of 25mph over the week; and 13 went at over 35mph, several of these in the middle of the day – despite the 'speed pillows' that were installed along the Yeaman Place/ Polwarth Crescent corridor many years ago. One possible explanation for this is that cars entering the roundabout

from Merchiston Avenue or Granville Terrace, if they see no obstruction, will cut straight across the central circle and accelerate north & downhill towards Dundee Street.

Polwarth Crescent Southbound

- This sector is also heavily used, with some 24,700 vehicles a week;
- HGV traffic is a little lighter in this direction, at least in the 'heavy' category – 926 'medium' trucks and some 35 'heavy' HGVs over the week. Most weekdays, 140-160 medium lorries and around 10 HGVs will travel southwards down the Crescent.
- Fewer vehicles (172) were counted as speeding in the range 25-35mph than on the northbound carriageway – this probably reflects the fact that most southbound vehicles would have had to moderate their speed to negotiate the left curve of the Crescent and the roundabout would be visible as soon as they had done so.
- Broadly the same number of vehicles were doing more than 35mph as in the northern direction: 2 cars were doing more than 60mph in the middle of the afternoon, even though all exits from the roundabout – east, south or west – require considerable manoeuvre. The all-hours 85%ile was just under 19mph.
- The same qualifications to the speeding data apply as in the section above: to assess levels of speeding in the Crescent overall, a counter further north would be required.

Key points on this sector

- Polwarth Crescent (and Yeaman Place, the continuation north of the Walker Bridge) is bearing a traffic load – and environmental load – far in excess of that for which it was designed; for many of its residents, the costs of that load – in terms of noise, vibration and air pollution - are not tolerable;
- each weekday, at least 320 Class 2 HGVs and around 20 Class 3 HGVs will move in either direction up & down this residential street, using it as a short cut to other parts of town.
- From observation, we note that CEC itself, in the form of its refuse contractors, regularly uses this route even when refuse from this street itself is not being collected. It is, as we have already observed, a very popular rat-run.
- We cannot conclude reliably about speeding along the greater part of the Crescent because of the location of the counter. We can say however that in a small number of cases, dangerous speeds were recorded very close to the roundabout, both north and southwards.

Merchiston Avenue – northbound

- The Avenue carries, overall, far less traffic than Polwarth Crescent: weekly totals (north & south) are around 50,400 for the Crescent and 13,350 for the Avenue
- But the Avenue carries a much higher proportion of Class 2 & 3 vehicles: 8.5% of northbound vehicles are medium or heavy HGVs – double the proportion on the Crescent

- Some 46% of northbound vehicles are speeding in excess of 25mph. During peak hours of 0700-1000 & 1500-1800, the top morning 85%ile was 32 and the highest afternoon 85%ile was close to 33.

Merchiston Avenue – southbound

- Speeding is even more pronounced southbound: some 53% of all vehicles were counted as travelling at more than 25mph. In the week of the count, over 100 vehicles were counted at more than 35mph. During peak hours of 0700-1000 and 1500-1800, the 85%ile never dropped below 28; the morning top value was 36; the afternoon peak 34.
- Medium & heavy HGVs comprise close to 10% of all vehicles in this sector

Key points on this sector

- Merchiston Avenue is a main artery through the Merchiston Conservation Area. It is also the pedestrian route of choice for many parents whose children attend Bruntsfield Primary School. Footfall is further increased by the presence of the Napier Merchiston Campus. Though it doesn't exactly intersect with the roundabout, this street is a key leg of the north/south rat-run from Dalry to Colinton; traffic approaching and leaving the roundabout uses it extensively.
- The Avenue offers drivers a clear run without physical speed restrictions of any kind on the road. It is, as Police Scotland term it, a 'self-policing street' – by which they mean a street on which traffic calming decisions rest with the local authority. Speeding has become well established, despite the street's use as a pedestrian route to school and college.
- Because of deep rutting in the road surface and because of the narrowness of the road in places (preventing single file passing when cars are parked either side), the expectation might be that speed along the Avenue was effectively restrained to approximately the speed limit. The data show this is not happening.
- Given the proportion of HGV traffic, the same issue of environmental load applies here as in Polwarth Crescent.
- Given the Avenue's role as a school route, and the other footfall it welcomes, there are questions to be asked about the 'self-policing' status of this street.

East/ West Axis – Polwarth Gardens and Granville Terrace

The counts for Polwarth Gardens and Granville Terrace (in effect, the east/west axis) were in place from 23-29 January 2023.

Granville Terrace – eastbound

- This shares with Yeaman Place (northbound) the top spot for vehicle volume: across an average week, some 25, 800 vehicles used this route (there is however some doubt over

the accuracy of the count on one particular day: further work would be needed to resolve this).

- Nearly 8% of all vehicles were HGVs; nearly 2,000 goods vehicles used this road over one week, offering a short cut to Colinton Road and points west;
- The overall 85%ile of 25.4 does not disguise any very high spikes. At the same time, the count discloses that nearly 4,000 vehicles (or 16% of the total volume) were travelling at more than 25mph, which suggests considerable disregard for the prevailing speed limit in an area well used by students from Boroughmuir High School.

Granville Terrace – westbound

- A slightly lower volume was recorded – some 23,300 vehicles over the week
- The proportion of HGV traffic was broadly similar to that in the eastbound sector
- The overall 85%ile of around 22mph hides some early morning spikes of 27 and 28mph. While that may sound reassuring, some 2,300 vehicles were counted as speeding in excess of 25mph, which again suggests considerable flouting of the prevailing speed limit.

Key points on this sector

Granville eastbound is the faster part of this route. In both directions the traffic is substantial. Allowance within the HGV totals should be made for buses, roughly 200 a day in both directions.

Polwarth Gardens – eastbound

- The lighter flows along Polwarth Gardens (eastbound) – some 15,900 vehicles in an average week compared to Granville East's 25,800 – suggests that much of additional volume along Granville Terrace joins from Polwarth Crescent or Merchiston Avenue;
- Some 15% of all traffic on this sector comprises HGVs;
- Around 33% of all traffic on this sector moves at more than 25mph. Around 140 vehicles travelled at over 35mph. The overall 85%ile of 27.4 camouflages some quite high peaks during daytime – 29.8 at 11am and 28.7 at 1pm.

Polwarth Gardens – westbound

- Overall vehicle volumes were similar to those in the eastbound sector; but the proportion of HGVs was higher at 17%;
- This sector suffers the highest number of HGVs of all the routes radiating from the roundabout: over 2,700 HGVs were recorded over the week, suggesting that this street carries not only HGV flows from Granville Terrace but acquires a substantial HGV flow from Polwarth Crescent;
- Some 31% of vehicles were travelling at over 25mph. Over 200 were speeding at over 35mph.
- The 85%ile of 27-28 conceals some considerably higher spikes, mainly but not exclusively occurring in the early morning or late evening. This seems to be the fastest sector of the east/west axis.

Key points on this sector

East- and west-bound stretches of Polwarth Gardens show significant breaching of the 20mph limit; in the westbound section, more vehicles moved at speeds of over 35mph. The westbound section also carries the highest proportion of heavy good traffic of all the Polwarth roundabout feeder roads. Even when buses are abstracted, the number of HGVs remains high.

SECTION 9

PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS & PV2s

9.1 Both MCC's traffic count initiative and the work commissioned by CEC in 2021 produced data on numbers of people using crossing points at the Polwarth roundabout. Since in the following section we will be comparing the two sets of data, we will in the interests of clarity refer to the MCC data as '**MCC 2022 data**' and the data produced for CEC as '**CEC 2021 data**'. Both sets of data were produced by the same consultants – Traffic Data Collection.

The PV2 value

9.2 There is a long-established methodology for assessing the case for pedestrian crossings. The base data used is known as the 'PV2' value. This indicates the number of passing vehicles and crossing pedestrians. Pedestrian and vehicle counts are taken over the peak hours of a weekday, from 0700-1000 and from 1500-1800, avoiding school holidays and any other factors (eg rail strikes) that might cause abnormal traffic and/or pedestrian flows.

9.3 As CEC officers have explained to us: "this base PV2 value is then adjusted to take account of local factors such as the age of those crossing, the composition and speed of passing traffic, the road width, the number of pedestrians and the presence of nearby trip attractors such as schools, doctors' surgeries, shops etc. A location with an adjusted PV2 value of 1 or higher...would be considered for a puffin crossing; locations with a value of 0.3 or higher would be considered for a suite of measures that includes a zebra crossing, refuge island or pavement build-outs. If a very low PV2 value is achieved, no additional crossing facilities may be recommended."

CEC 2021 data

9.4 The Council's 2021 exercise looked at three crossing points near the roundabout:

- Polwarth Gardens, west: the location of the existing zebra crossing
- Polwarth Crescent, north: the crossing from the shops at the east side of the Crescent, across the refuge to the Margiotta convenience store
- Polwarth Gardens/ Granville Terrace, east: the crossing from the café Florentin to the Polwarth pharmacy, with a refuge at the mid-point.

MCC 2022 data

9.5 MCC instructed cameras at four locations. In addition to the locations specified by CEC, we asked the contractors to look at the east-west crossing at the north end of Merchiston Avenue. This is a crossing habitually used by parents and children going to & from Bruntsfield Primary School. For many years, it was patrolled by a crossing warden; when he retired, he was not replaced. We think it important to look at wherever people habitually cross, not just where traffic planners think people should cross. Our pedestrian counts were

taken over a full 12-hour period but for the purposes of comparison with the CEC 2021 data we have extracted those numbers arising in 'peak hours' as defined by CEC.

9.6 On the following page the table compares pavement usage at key locations derived from the two sets of data. Some data on cyclists is included.

9.7 It is important to note that pedestrian numbers are not additive, either in the CEC study or in MCC's: the same adults and children may use more than one crossing point in the same journey. The volume of crossings at the north end of Merchiston Avenue is substantial. It is a particularly hazardous crossing: from east to west or west to east, pedestrians have to monitor traffic from 3 different directions at once, one of which is behind them.

9.8 Across all crossing points common to both studies, there has been a substantial increase in pedestrian numbers and in peak hour passing vehicles. Numbers of children have also increased in all locations. Across two of the three locations assessed by CEC in 2021, the number of cycle movements has doubled.

COMPARISON OF CEC 2021 DATA & MCC 2022 DATA ON PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS & TWO-WAY PASSING VEHICLES AT CROSSING POINTS

CEC 2021 data Peak hours only	2-way vehicle hourly totals AM 0700-1000	2-way vehicle hourly totals, PM 1500- 1800	No of pavement crossings in peak periods	No of children, peak hours	No of cycles in peak hours	No of crossings outwith 'peak' hours	% change in pavement crossings at peak hours between 2021 & 2022
1. Polwarth Crescent , south end (Margiotta to Delhi)	1304	1660	800	14	89		
2. Polwarth Gardens (west) – zebra crossing	1231	1567	875	25	143		
3. Polwarth Gardens (east)/ Granville Terrace – Florentin to pharmacy	1258	1547	585	6	50		
			T = 2,260				
MCC 2022 data Data gathered 0700-1900					All cycles, 0700 -1900		
1. Polwarth Crescent , south end (Margiotta to Delhi)	1337	1758	922	17	198	831	+15.3%
2. Polwarth Gardens (west) – zebra crossing	1403	1784	1058	37	131	1158	+21%
3. Polwarth Gardens (east)/ Granville Terrace – Florentin to pharmacy	1307	1637	767	18	103	618	+31%
4. Merchiston Avenue (north) – Active Health to Piece Box	558	759	963	23	23	724	n/a
			T = 3,710			T = 3,331	

- All 2022 data supplied by Traffic Data Collection; data for 2021 supplied by CEC
- Note also substantial increase in 2-way vehicle flows, between 2021 & 2022, at all crossing points
- Table refers to pedestrian crossings rather than pavement users, and to cycles not cyclists, since the same user may use several crossings
- Peak hours crossings have increased by **64%** since 2021 (3,710 against 2,260)

Let's remind ourselves what residents said in responding to our survey on this topic:

"[the greatest risk to pavement users is] crossing Polwarth Gardens at Merchiston Ave"

"The riskiest bit is crossing the roundabout at Polwarth Crescent safely with no line of sight for children / disabled users"

"Heavy traffic at peak hours which poses such a risk particularly when crossing the roads with young children en route to school"

"Speed of traffic approaching roundabout especially at corner outside Margiotta: pedestrians crossing from Margiotta to east side of Polwarth Crescent can't see traffic speeding round corner from Polwarth Gardens"

"There is no crossing guard for the bottom of Merchiston Avenue and kids on the way to school at rush hour have to try to cross a 4-way junction with minimal visibility"

"The junction of Polwarth Gardens and Merchiston Avenue always has people crossing, but the traffic is very fast. Speed control at the exit from the roundabout towards Granville Terrace (cars coming from Yeaman Place often exit the roundabout at high speed)"

"at the junction of Merchiston Avenue/ Polwarth gardens/Granville terrace, drivers often blindly turn into Merchiston avenue, so it is very dangerous for children walking to school in the morning and trying to cross Merchiston Avenue. There used to be a lollipop person there but he retired. It needs a zebra crossing across Merchiston avenue so that children from Polwarth can commute to Bruntsfield Primary School."

"Crossing at the bottom of the main stretch of Merchiston Avenue to Piece Box where the recycling bins are, is particularly demanding & hazardous. Pedestrians have to look for vehicles racing from Granville Terrace, Merchiston Avenue and both sections of the roundabout. At peak times you can literally be waiting up to 5 mins to cross!"

"Needs zebra crossings all round. Traffic coming in from Merchiston Avenue can be aggressive and careless. Gilmore Place itself is used almost as a drag strip by some."

And finally, and from the heart –

"Pedestrian crossings everywhere near there are a total terrifying mess and I am so stressed out every time I have to go near there with my 3- and 6-year-olds."

PV2 Values – limitations & shortcomings

9.9 The PV2 values that underpin justifications for pedestrian crossings are a somewhat murky metric. It is not clear what weighting is attached to each of the various factors listed by CEC as relevant to the final calculation.

Relevant factors

9.10 The CEC 2021 data does not list all of the relevant local facilities that are said to have a bearing on the PV2s. The contractors did not seem aware of the retirement housing at Ker Court, managed by Bield Housing Association, which is within 100 metres of the roundabout and which should have featured in their analysis. There is one dental practice within 100 metres of the roundabout and another some 137 metres away (both are in Polwarth Gardens). It is not clear if they were taken into account.

Accidents

9.11 The number of pedestrian accidents is said to have a bearing on the PV2 factor. A young girl was knocked down on the zebra crossing in 2021; the prosecution was eventually abandoned by the Crown Office but the girl remains shaken by the incident. And what about the older man who was knocked down at the zebra crossing (see quote on page 7) – did that case enter the reckoning? What weighting is attached to such incidents? Many more ‘minor’ accidents are never reported to the police. Such incidents may be ‘minor’ in the sense that no life-threatening injuries were sustained but they nonetheless cause real shock and trauma.

Fear factor

9.12 Judging by the survey responses, many people have near misses at various crossing points, escaping by inches. (They are by no means always elderly: a delightful young student explained to us how she had narrowly missed being knocked down twice when crossing Polwarth Crescent.) Pedestrians do not report near misses. They alter their behaviour. Sometimes, they become extremely reluctant to use the crossing point at all. The PV2 method has no way of assessing the suppressed demand for decent crossings – the demand suppressed by fear.

Peak hours focus – inappropriate?

9.13 The CEC methodology focuses on ‘peak hours’ – that is, from 0700 to 1000 and from 1500 to 1800. But in local centres such as Polwarth, *the crossings are busy all day, not just at peak hours.*

9.14 The MCC 2022 data show that *outwith peak hours* - that is, between 1000 & 1500 and from 1800-1900 - some 1,158 crossings were made at the zebra crossing: slightly *more*, over those 6 hours, than at the six ‘peak’ hours. The table on page 55 shows that 831 crossings were made at Polwarth Crescent, and 618 at Polwarth Gardens/ Granville Terrace. This is what you would expect in an area with many students as well as families, whose bus stops

are well used, and where people may use several of the facilities at the centre, not only the convenience store. In short, the 'peak' hours pedestrian traffic captured by the CEC 2021 data does not represent the all-day flow of pedestrians using various crossings near the roundabout.

9.15 We question whether data limited to one six-hour period on one particular day provide an adequate basis for the assessment of absolute need or indeed the assessment of relative need across different localities.

The prospects for improved crossings

9.16 On the basis of the 2021 data, CEC have told MCC that, in light of the adjusted PV2 values calculated at that time, two of the three crossings assessed by the Council would qualify for enhanced pedestrian support measures, including the existing zebra crossing. CEC say - "various options will be considered to provide a signalled crossing improvement" at these locations. But they add that "the approved programme of pedestrian crossings contains 87 locations for.. improvements...The current programme represents a full work programme through to financial year 2030/31".

9.17 More positively, perhaps, we see that CEC, building on work done by Edinburgh Living Streets, is committed to a substantial programme of pedestrian crossing improvement, with a special focus on reducing wait times and extending 'green man' times. CEC's consultative Active Travel Action Plan, published in early February, acknowledges that much more needs to be done to improve crossings for pavement users.

MCC's view

9.18 MCC welcomes the news that two crossing points near the Polwarth Roundabout have 'made the grade' as it were and qualify for inclusion in the long-term forward programme of pedestrian crossing improvements. But the data underpinning CEC's conclusions significantly under-estimate the volume of crossings made at the roundabout intersections.

9.19 Across all four of the transition points examined in MCC's 2022 study, some 7,041 crossings were made in a single day, against a background of traffic moving at significantly more than the 20mph limit along Merchiston Avenue and Polwarth Gardens/ Granville Terrace and with minimal crossing support. Local factors bearing on CEC's calculation of the PV2s have been omitted. The way pavement users interact with the local centre as a whole, across the whole day, has not been factored in. The fear factor has not been considered.

9.20 Whilst MCC is glad to be able to report to residents that certain crossings will feature in the Council's improvement programme at some point after the turn of the decade, we think the disparities in the base data between 2021 and 2022 indicate that the PV2 factors should be recalculated. The crossing point at the north end of Merchiston Avenue should be included in the reappraisal. We call for greater transparency in the calculations that

drive decisions on these matters. And we call for action on pedestrian crossings to be integrated with other improvements in this area to recognise the pole position accorded to pavement users in the 'sustainable travel hierarchy'.

Core issue

9.21 This last point takes us to the heart of the matter. Improved crossings might be welcome, but they do not address the full range of issues explored in this report. They will not deal with the 'rat-run', or with the dangerous and careless driving identified by the police at the roundabout, or with the growing environmental problems of noise and emission pollution associated with HGV flows along residential streets. Crossings alone will not guarantee the future of Polwarth as a 20-minute neighbourhood. In short, they do not alter the fundamental problem of an intersection that serves vehicles, not people (whether pavement users or cyclists). We think a more radical approach should be taken to the roundabout. We set out our thinking and our proposals in the following sections.

9.22 Residents in Polwarth have not agitated hard in recent years: they are not amongst those city districts which are quick to ventilate their grievances. It will be acutely disappointing, in light of all the evidence presented by this report, if improved crossings – as a key part of a wider package of improvements - do not materialise sooner than the early 2030s. If CEC indicates its approval in principle to the proposals that follow, but is unable to resource them fully within the next 5 years, MCC stands ready to explore other funding sources and to work constructively with the Council on a funding package that it might find acceptable.

SECTION 10

ROAD SAFETY: VIEWS FROM POLICE SCOTLAND

10.1 In January 2023, Merchiston Community Council made contact with Police Scotland in order to have an experienced and professional view of road safety matters at and near the Polwarth roundabout.

10.2 The roundabout lies at the boundary between two police divisions – the one covering Morningside and other southern districts and other based in Oxfords covering the western side of the city.

10.3 Community police officers covering Morningside noted the data in the traffic counts and in particular the speeding along Merchiston Avenue. They explained that the Avenue was a ‘self-policing’ street, which apparently means that responsibility for deciding whether calming measures are appropriate lies with the local authority. Morningside officers passed our case over to their Oxfords colleagues.

10.4 We met with one of their officers at the roundabout early one afternoon in January 2023. Despite the uniform and high-vis jacket, the officer had within 10 minutes witnessed several instances of dangerous driving and of careless and inconsiderate driving. He observed that the intersection was too wide, that cars were going too fast around – or in many cases straight across – the roundabout, and that given traffic volumes at peak hours and limited sightlines, pedestrians were at a severe disadvantage when attempting to cross one of the arms of the roundabout.

10.5 We copy below the officer’s written report on viewing the roundabout from a road safety and compliance perspectives.

“I am a community police officer working within the South West of Edinburgh, I have responsibility for the Fountainbridge beat area. Within this area is the mini-roundabout at the junction of Polwarth Gardens and Polwarth Crescent. I was contacted by a representative of the Merchiston Community Council regarding this roundabout and the concerns of the local residents due to speeding vehicles, dangerous parking and poor crossing facilities for pedestrians. Due to these concerns, I visited the site alongside a representative of the community council. The visit took place on a weekday afternoon not during a peak period and I was present for approximately half an hour.

During this visit I observed multiple vehicles failing to observe the roundabout, often travelling over the top of the roundabout and on a number of occasions into the opposing carriageway. Vehicles travelling from the South Westerly direction are provided with an unobstructed view of opposing traffic and as such approach the junction at considerable speed. On this approach there is also a Zebra crossing which is the only pedestrian crossing at the junction. Due to the speed of the approaching vehicles from this direction, pedestrians crossing at this point are placed at considerable risk. As the local Officer I have also observed and carried out enforcement action against a number of vehicles that have been parked on the Zig-Zags at this crossing - again placing the most vulnerable road users at risk.

Vehicles approaching from the North East were observed to cut across the roundabout and on some occasions drive in the opposing carriageway when turning right; this increases the likelihood of a collision with vehicles entering the junction from the North. I understand that for larger vehicles to use the junction a mini-roundabout is required however from my observations it appears that the larger vehicles are using the junction as a short-cut to access Dundee Street.

My overall observation of the junction is that it is tailored for the use of motor vehicles, visibility is very good and vehicles are also permitted to park on the roundabout. There is no infrastructure in place at the junction to enhance the safety of vulnerable road users.”

10.6 This report makes clear that Police Scotland see the current layout of the roundabout as increasing the risk of vehicle collisions and also the risks faced by pavement users as they attempt to cross the road. His closing comment seems to us to sum up everything that is wrong with the Polwarth intersection: it is made for vehicles, not for people. *“There is no infrastructure in place at the junction to enhance the safety of vulnerable road users”* – ie pedestrians and cyclists.

SECTION 11

TOWARDS AN INTEGRATED SOLUTION: DISCUSSION

“We constantly hear car horns being blasted at the roundabout. Traffic also just drives straight over the crossing. It's really not safe. “

“The road surface on all three roads approaching the roundabout is very poor and dangerous for cycling on”

“The simple alternative would be to just turn it into a T-junction”

“Slow the traffic down, perhaps by creating a raised 'table' on the approaches”

Planning for decades ahead

11.1 The current roundabout was last remodelled, we estimate, in the 1970s. (There is a suggestion in older maps that, prior to this, the roundabout core was larger, forcing traffic around it.) There were some alterations, possibly in the late 1990s, when the zebra crossing across Polwarth Gardens was moved a few metres further west and some railings were extended. What we see however is essentially a 50-year-old road layout built on assumptions about traffic flows and urban design that have been almost totally superseded. Whatever is now done at the Polwarth local centre needs to anticipate changes over the next 20-30 years at least.

Policy direction

11.2 The thrust of policy for at least the next decade is clear, at both national and local level. Vehicle use in cities is to be restrained; public transport and active travel are to be the default ways of navigating our urban areas; the effects of extreme climate events have to be catered for, notably in storm water management; and, as far as possible, people's everyday needs should be catered for within a 20-minute walk or cycle.

11.3 The City of Edinburgh Council has made serious commitments towards sustainable, net zero local urban communities; and towards a healthier, more active lifestyle for all its citizens. We highlight just a few of the many important statements made earlier in 2023 in the context of consultations on the updated Active Travel Action Plan (ATAP), which will implement the City Mobility Plan:

The Active Travel Action Plan, covering the period for 2022-30, sets out our delivery programme for active travel interventions, and is derived from the City Mobility Plan. We are investing in improving conditions for walking, wheeling and cycling around the city. The ATAP aims to enable more people in Edinburgh to walk, wheel and cycle more safely and more often.

- *Encouraging active travel has an important part to play in delivering a healthier, more inclusive, zero carbon transport system.*
- *Over half of Edinburgh's residents feel that fewer motor vehicles and lower speed limits on their streets would help them to walk and wheel more.*
- *The majority of Edinburgh citizens live outside the city centre. An important aspect of the Active Travel Action Plan (ATAP) is supporting the creation of pleasant, people-focused residential streets and neighbourhoods; places where everyone feels safe to walk, wheel, cycle and spend time. This will help develop 20-minute neighbourhoods, with safe local travel to school and local facilities like shops and parks. Initiatives to help deliver safer and liveable neighbourhoods include:*
 - ✓ *Continuing the rollout of lower speed limits; delivering safer streets and roads for all, especially walkers, wheelers and cyclists.*
 - ✓ *Taking action to address 'rat-running' through residential areas via a prioritised 'liveable neighbourhood' programme. This would be integrated with measures from the EASI initiative to deliver more walkable streets across the city. At the heart of the liveable neighbourhood programme will be enabling safer travel to school, centred on an accelerated roll-out of traffic-free 'school streets'*

We have sought to ensure that all our proposals are consistent with, and give expression to, these commitments.

Complex problems – integrated solutions

11.4 Against this background, MCC wants to think in an integrated way about problems and solutions. Since improvements to the streetscape happen so rarely (because of their expense and the disruption they cause), we need to have a long horizon. We need to think about the kind of local community we want our children and grandchildren to inhabit. We have approached these issues as concerned fellow citizens: none of us is professionally qualified in road engineering, urban design or traffic modelling. We hope through these proposals to trigger a constructive discussion with our Councillors and with CEC officials.

The nub of the issue

11.5 Our strong sense is that the problems at and near the Polwarth roundabout stem from vehicles, not from pavement users or cyclists. Approaching 70,000 vehicles converge on the roundabout from four directions over an average week. Flows along all the feeder routes are significant, especially at peak hours. The reason for this is the easy availability of the north/south short-cut from Dalry to Morningside. MCC does not have the resources to identify the journey start & finish points of a sample of vehicles using Yeaman Place, Polwarth Crescent and Merchiston Avenue; but we think it very likely that they will lie at

some considerable distance from the local centre. North/south short-cuts through residential districts are popular because they frequently present fewer traffic light stoppages and fewer restraining features than the major routes. A vehicle can travel from Dundee Street to Holy Corner without encountering a single set of lights; many stretches of the 'rat-run' present open stretches of asphalt and long sightlines – both of which encourage speeding. Unlike the junctions at Viewforth and Harrison Road, this north-south route presents a clear run.

HGV rat-running

11.6 HGVs (classes 2 & 3) are a particular torment to streets in residential areas which were not built for their loads: they are polluting and destructive of community atmosphere. Some 2000 HGVs parade each week up and down Yeaman Place and Polwarth Crescent, many of them on their way to construction sites and delivery points well beyond the area. They choose this route in the main because satnavs suggest it: there are no impediments marked, no lights, and no traffic calming (the speed 'pillows' along Yeaman Place present no obstacle to vehicles of any class).

Intersection re-design

11.7 Pavement users and cyclists will never prosper while the rat-run operates without restriction. We need to grasp this nettle now. To be clear, MCC is not suggesting road closures, or a 'low traffic zone' in the sense of blocking access to all but residents, or a complex one-way system. We did not consult our community on such options and we received no comments urging the sealing off of the corridor from Yeaman Place up to the roundabout. We recognise that, for many people including local residents and individuals with disabilities, certain car journeys are inescapable; and certain types of larger vehicle (notably emergency vehicles) must have unimpeded access. What we *do* propose are changes to road layout combined with provision for pavement users and cyclists that should inhibit the over-use of the north-south short-cut by heavy goods vehicles and which would discourage other types of 'cut-through' traffic which simply want to swiftly bypass major routes.

Less space for vehicles – less speed


11.8 Our residents have told us that they are concerned about speed. Our traffic counts tell us that speeding is an issue on the open stretches of tarmac along the approach roads to the roundabout. Vehicle speeds increase when the sightlines for drivers are clear and long. Our residents have also told us that, conversely, pavement users feel unsafe crossing the local streets because sightlines are so poor. We start therefore with the ambition of reducing the sightlines for vehicles and improving those for pavement users & cyclists. This means shrinking the intersection.

SECTION 12

PROPOSALS AND VISUALISATIONS

12.1 MCC commissioned Marion Preez, landscape architect with Urban Pioneers, to prepare visualisations of a possible new future for the area of the Polwarth roundabout. We chose Urban Pioneers because of their work with community councils elsewhere in the city and because, as a firm, they are personally and professionally committed to active travel and the transformation of city spaces to serve the 'green' agenda.

12.2 Marion first of all prepared an analytical diagram to highlight the deficiencies of the current layout.



This shows the issues that we reported on in our web-post, summarised on page 35.

12.3 **Our consultations with the police as well as with residents point to one unequivocal prescription: in order to slow traffic down and reassert the primacy of pavement users and cyclists, vehicles should have less space and humans should have more.**

12.4 We summarise in the next box our main **recommendations** for the improvement of the roundabout area. **All of these are consistent with, and give expression to, the Council's own policy commitments. This is tabulated at Annex 3 in more detail.**


1. **Pavements should be substantially widened** to provide more public realm and to reconnect the local centre to its residents and clientele.
2. The primacy of the east/west route, which is the bus route, should be reasserted to give emphasis to public transport; instead of a mini-roundabout, the **junction with Polwarth Crescent should become a T junction**, with a 'Stop' sign and a protective waiting space for cyclists.
3. An **elevated 'table'** should be laid on top of the remaining carriageway surface and demarcated from pavements by colour and finish; such a table, level with the surrounding space for pavement users, would remove the need for dropped kerbs; the table should extend beyond the crossing points at the intersection.
4. **'Refuges' should be removed and improved road crossings across narrower carriageways should be installed**, with good lighting, at the crossing points habitually used by pavement users. Further consideration should be given to the type of crossing most appropriate, given the volume of pavement users and the sightlines available to them. The **refuse bins** at the south-east end of Polwarth Crescent should be **repositioned** as a matter of urgency, in order to improve sight lines for pavement users. The **zebra crossing** at the eastern end of Polwarth Gardens should be **upgraded** to a light-operated 'puffin' crossing.
5. The remaining railings at pavement edges near the roundabout should be replaced by **bollards with reflective banding**.
6. **Cycle parking** (including parking suitable for continental-style cargo bikes used by parents with young children and by delivery personnel) should be installed; one or more cycle hangars should also be provided.
7. **Planters should be used** to shorten vehicle sightlines, wherever it is safe to do so.
8. **Loading bays** for the resupply of local centre shops and services should be created from surplus road space released by the creation of the T junction. Innovative systems for delivery should be trialled.
9. Since the acute angle produced at the T junction will not be easily negotiated by HGVs, the City Council should use its TRO powers to prohibit turns right or left at the south end of Polwarth Crescent at the proposed 'T' junction, or to **designate** Polwarth Crescent, Yeaman Place and Merchiston Avenue as **routes unsuitable for heavy goods vehicles**. Use of the 'rat-run' should be discouraged by preventing HGV right turns up Merchiston Avenue and Merchiston Park, and by narrowing the junction of Merchiston Avenue & Granville Terrace, by pavement extension
10. **speed triggered warning signs** should be installed along Polwarth Gardens and Merchiston Avenue, both used by children going to & from Bruntsfield Primary School. In line with Council policy, the 20mph limit should be enforced by CEC and Police Scotland acting together. **Appropriate signage** should be put on all approach roads, alerting vehicles that they are entering a zone with pavement user priority.
11. Granville Terrace & Merchiston Avenue should be included in the list of streets scheduled for **speed reduction measures** in the Council's draft Road Safety Action Plan. (We welcome the inclusion of Polwarth Gardens in that list.)
12. **Carriageways and footpaths** which are not covered by the junction changes described above (but still within the neighbourhood of the roundabout) should be **overhauled** to remove cracks and potholes.

The images below show the roundabout as it is today.



12.5 Here now are some visualisations of how the area might look when improved. These visualisations do not show every detail of every proposed measure: the intention is to convey the kind of change – to layout and to atmosphere – that could be achieved if space

for pavement users were increased and if their safety, and that of cyclists also, were prioritised. They do not show road signage or the detail of junction design.



We offer the following additional comments on each of the **recommendations** on page 71.

Recommendation 1: Pavement widening

Pavements should be substantially widened to provide more public realm and to reconnect the local centre to its residents and clientele.

12.6 Pavement users lie at the top of the transport pyramid. At the Polwarth centre, they need space for shopping, singly or in groups, for conversation, rest and community. At present, pavement users at peak hours have to scuttle from narrow pavements across wide intersections, with little or no visibility of oncoming traffic.

12.7 Our proposals envisage a substantial extension of pavement space at the top of Polwarth Crescent and around the eastern end of Polwarth Gardens (the Margiotta corner). This would not cut across the planned locations for the new bin hubs – as the map at Annex 4 makes clear, the hubs are destined for further north along Polwarth Crescent. The margin of the pavement should be marked by studded material to reduce risks to those who are visually impaired.

12.8 In our visualisations, we have taken into consideration the space required by a fire engine turning right or left at the proposed intersection.

12.9 We note the pavement build-outs (and junction pinching) that have recently been carried out elsewhere in MCC's district (images below): our proposals are very much in keeping with these.



12.10 Widening the pavement would at a stroke remove the frequent double parking on double yellow lines which drew criticism in our survey. It would also pinch all of the intersections, thereby slowing traffic down (see below for more on the intersections).

“As a mother of 2 young children I find crossing the roundabout extremely difficult; cars do not stop; they park on double yellows to “pop” to the shops...”

“Dangerous parking (especially works and delivery vans). This includes double parking on Polwarth Crescent and parked cars blocking direct lines to pedestrian refuges.”

The ‘just popping to the shops’ syndrome should be broken because it impedes pavement users who want to cross the street. It is also illegal.



Recommendation 2: Remove roundabout; reassert primacy of east/west route & create ‘T’ junction with Polwarth Crescent

The primacy of the east/west route, which is the bus route, should be reasserted to give emphasis to public transport; instead of a mini-roundabout, the **junction with Polwarth Crescent should become a T junction**, with a ‘Stop’ sign and a protective waiting space for cyclists.

12.11 The reassertion of the east/west bus route is self-explanatory and needs no further comment here, save to say that planning for decades ahead means giving clear signals now

about how traffic will be prioritised in the coming decades, as the city turns increasingly to public transport and active travel as the prime means of urban travel.

12.12 We reported at para 7.12 the absence of consensus in survey responses on improvements to road layout. In light of this, the team decided to listen to those with expertise and to form its own judgement. We come down in favour of a T junction to replace the roundabout completely. In the visualisation we offer the outline of a possible design for a new T junction at the intersection of Polwarth Crescent and Polwarth Gardens. Our aim is to make the junction pinched enough to deter HGVs from using the north/south rat-run, while still allowing fire engines and other emergency vehicles to use the junction.

Recommendation 3: Elevated table

An **elevated 'table'** should be laid on top of the remaining carriageway surface and demarcated from pavements by colour and finish; such a table, level with the surrounding space for pavement users, would remove the need for dropped kerbs; the table should extend beyond the crossing points at the intersection.

12.13 An elevated table signals to drivers that they are entering a zone where pavement users have priority. Tables are already extensively used elsewhere in Edinburgh and elsewhere (see images below), to alert drivers to approaching control features – puffin crossings or zebra crossings. Colour coding would be a desirable additional way to highlight to drivers that they are entering a different zone.



12.14 An elevated table on the carriageway would be level with the enlarged pavements, removing the need for dropped kerbs. While there are some dropped kerbs at crossing


points near the roundabout, they are not complete. Moreover, given the drainage problems that have arisen on dropped kerbs further north along Yeaman Place (thankfully now redesigned and repaired) we think that a level surface is a much neater solution. Consideration will need to be given to the edging of the pavement when it is level with the carriageway to ensure that those with sight impairment do not face additional hazards.

Recommendation 4: Crossing points & 'refuges'

'Refuges' should be removed and improved road crossings across narrower carriageways should be installed, with good lighting, at the crossing points habitually used by pavement users. Further consideration should be given to the type of crossing most appropriate, given the volume of pavement users and the sightlines available to them. The **refuse bins** at the south-east end of Polwarth Crescent should be **repositioned** as a matter of urgency, in order to improve sight lines for pavement users. The **zebra crossing** at the eastern end of Polwarth Gardens should be **upgraded** to a light-operated 'puffin' crossing.

12.15 Over 2,200 crossings are made on an average day at the zebra crossing at Polwarth Gardens; over 1,750 crossings are made at the southern end of Polwarth Crescent, where the sightlines are particularly bad; some 1,600 transfers are made at the informal crossing (the 'desire line') at the north end of Merchiston Avenue at the junction with Granville Terrace. We suggested earlier (pages 59-60) that the Council's PV2 calculations do not take full account of these numbers, which show a considerable increase on the previous year.

12.16 Those crossing Polwarth Crescent are particularly at risk: cars moving west to east along Polwarth Gardens, seeing no other car on the roundabout, speed around the corner at Margiotta on to Polwarth Crescent: pavement users setting off for the mid-point 'refuge' are invisible to them and the cars are not visible to the pavement users precisely because of the corner. An additional hazard is created by vehicles which cut across the *wrong side* of the roundabout (see images).



12.17 Those trying to cross from east to west face a different set of hazards: the communal bins at the top of Polwarth Crescent obscure the view and intensify the effect of the street's curve, making cars all but invisible until they are practically at the roundabout. Under the Council's Bin Hubs strategy, these bins will at some point be moved to a position further north on the Crescent (see the map at Annex 4). But it is not safe to wait an indefinite period until the strategy is rolled out in Polwarth: those bins should be repositioned further north without delay.

12.18 We have read with interest the report by the Chartered Institute of Highways and Transportation, which offer guidance on the selection of appropriate crossings. Given the distribution of the crossings made each day near the roundabout, we suggest that (i) the existing zebra crossing be upgraded to a puffin crossing and (ii) zebra crossings be installed at all the other habitual crossing points. All of these crossings would be within the elevated table; all would be narrower than the current crossings, allowing the removal of the 'refuges' – which offer little protection and are too narrow for pavement users with prams or dogs.

12.19 The situation at the foot of Merchiston Avenue, at its intersection with Granville Terrace/ Polwarth Gardens (east) is confused. There is a refuge lying between Florentin café and the Polwarth pharmacy, suggesting that people might cross there. Just a few metres further east, the pavement has been built out in front of 'Active Health' to shorten the distance to the opposing pavement at 'Piece Box'. There is a dropped kerb on the north side but not on the south. It is clearly undesirable to have two crossing places within a few metres: an assessment should be made as to where, in the future, a crossing point should lie; and that point should fall within the elevated table.

12.20 We note in passing that the informal east/west crossing across the north end of Merchiston Avenue (no 4 on the table at page 58), which attracts a good deal of footfall, is also liable to flooding – see image below.



This would need to be addressed before any reconstruction of crossing places.

12.21 We have already acknowledged that, as a community council, we do not have the Council's expertise in the technical appraisal of crossing options. We offer these suggestions as a prompt to discussion. Our visualisations indicate zebra crossings at the three habitual crossing points; but the numbers using the crossing at the western end of Polwarth Gardens (where the present zebra crossing lies), combined with traffic flows along this street, suggest to us that it should be upgraded to a puffin crossing at the earliest opportunity.

Recommendation 5: Guardrails

The remaining railings (on the north and south-west sides of Polwarth Gardens and at the north-west corner of Polwarth Crescent) should be replaced by **bollards with reflective banding**.

12.22 The railings on pavements around the roundabout are largely symbolic: they would not offer any pavement user much protection in the event of a collision. They were put up at a time when it was thought good practice to restrain pavement users and keep the carriageway clear for cars. But times have moved on. As the Chartered Institute of Highways and Transportation says –

Although guardrail can be useful in limited circumstances, it is visually and physically intrusive, reduces the width of available footway, and can be dangerous for people riding bicycles on the carriageway who may become trapped between vehicles and guardrail when they could otherwise “escape” onto the footway. Guardrail is provided to restrict the movement of pedestrians, and unless their intended use is clear to pedestrians, they will be resented, and in many cases, people will simply walk on the live traffic side if it suits their desire line. There is some risk that guardrail leads to drivers becoming less aware of the presence of pedestrians (especially children because of their height), and this could create complacency in driving behaviour.

12.23 Railings are also an invitation to cyclists to attach their bikes to them. This limits the width of the pavement and, for those using a disability scooter or wheelchair, the pavements can become nearly impassable.

12.24 A few of our respondents felt that the railings offered them some protection against cars moving at speed. This is perfectly understandable. We think, though, that we should address such concerns by dealing directly with the speed and volume of vehicles. Once traffic is less threatening, and pavement users more empowered, railings become redundant.

12.25 We propose that all the remaining railings be taken down and replaced by bollards, with reflective banding (an older style of bollard is in front of the café Florentin). Bollards should be a sufficient signal to drivers; and they are less disfiguring to the streetscape.

Recommendation 6: Cycle parking & storage

Cycle parking (including parking suitable for continental-style cargo bikes used by parents with young children and by delivery personnel) should be installed; one or more cycle hangars should also be provided.

12.26 The survey showed strong support for better provision for cyclists, including by those who are not habitual cyclists. We have thought long and hard about the views expressed on cycle lanes on approach to the roundabout. The goal of such lanes is of course to give cyclists some protection against vehicles.

12.27 If we were proposing to retain the roundabout, then the provision of cycle lanes would have been a logical and appropriate step. But we feel that the safety of both cyclists and pavement users is better served by doing away with the roundabout, pinching the intersection and cutting down on ‘cut-through’ traffic, especially HGVs. Cyclists and pavement users stand to gain more by a reduction in vehicle traffic than from lane segregation (which would be unfeasible in the narrowed approaches to a T junction).

12.28 We have also considered introducing narrow cycle paths set within the extended pavements, following the design in Palmerston Place. But such cycle ways work best in straight sections of road, where cyclists and pavement users can see one another. At the intersection there are, perforce, several corners; and to introduce cycle lanes within pavements would in this context create risks for pavement users unable to see approaching cyclists (who, naturally, might feel able to go faster given the segregation).

12.29 Nonetheless, the drift of our survey responses is clear: there should be more support for and incentives to use cycles. In addition to the protected 'apron' for cyclists at the new junction of Polwarth Crescent and the east/west axis, we therefore propose bike parking near the roundabout so that people can shop while moving around on a bike. This should include spaces for the largest bikes – cargo bikes – now increasingly used by parents with small children and by shops for deliveries

12.30 We also include in our visualisation some bike hangars. There is at present zero provision for the secure overnight parking of bikes in our neighbourhood. The nearest hangars are on Mertoun Place and are fully subscribed. Those recently approved for Dundee Street are not conveniently located for those living near the roundabout. The extension of pavement envisaged in these proposals should allow for a couple of hangars without depriving pavement users of their much-needed additional space.

Recommendation 7: Planters & vehicle sightlines

Planters should be used to shorten vehicle sightlines, wherever it is safe to do so; consideration should be given also to accentuating the natural bend of the east/west carriageway to further shorten vehicle sightlines.

We received a number of comments from residents about the need to restrict vehicle sightlines -

“the better the sightlines, the faster the traffic. And, of course, whilst sometimes a roundabout can help to slow traffic, it also helps vehicles to avoid stopping, which is the most difficult environment possible for pedestrians to cross...”

“carriageways should be narrowed as much as possible, forcing all drivers to slow down and especially those turning....”

“It would also be desirable to use the available space created by the narrowed roads to skew the perpendicular T junction slightly anticlockwise to further break sightlines on the east/west axis, which will also reduce approach speeds.”

“Planters could also be used to break the line of sight of approaching motorists east to west and vice versa, to reduce speed and entitlement....”

12.31 We suggest that the issue of pinching the intersection and the use of planters be considered together: the one could reinforce the other. More detailed designs could gently accentuate the natural curve of the Victorian carriageway to shorten (but not obstruct) driver sightlines.

Recommendation 8: Supporting delivery & services - loading bays

Loading bays for the resupply of local centre shops and services should be created from surplus road space released by the proposed T junction. Innovative systems for delivery should be trialled.

12.32 As the CEC’s 2023 ATAP recognises, implementation of measures to support active travel raise concerns for local businesses, especially in the area of deliveries, loading and waiting. CEC. On page 13 it lists a number of mitigation measures to support businesses during the transition to a lower traffic environment.

12.33 Businesses at the roundabout are simultaneously critical of the current traffic arrangements, which severely limit their deliveries, and concerned that any significant rearrangement in favour of active travellers will make their position worse. At the same time, they have a direct interest in facilitating pedestrian and cyclist access to their services and in the health and prosperity of the neighbourhood.

12.34 MCC pledges to work intensively with those businesses, and with CEC, to minimise inconvenience and hardship to shops and services at the roundabout arising from these proposals, if they are implemented. We have a clear interest in doing so: the local centre

will cease to exist if those shops and services withdraw. Their loss would be a major blow to hundreds, possibly thousands, of local residents.

12.35 We need new thinking on deliveries, their mode of transport, timing and interaction with active travel space. The roundabout could offer CEC a demonstration space for such new thinking and experimentation and a way to evaluate the impacts of different strategies for supporting commercial hubs across the city. We think a remodelled T junction would offer sufficient space for at least a couple of 'white van-sized' loading bays without abstracting space from resident parking places further away from the current roundabout.

Recommendation 9: The rat-run problem

...the City Council should use its TRO powers to prohibit those turns, or to **designate** Polwarth Crescent, Yeaman Place and Merchiston Avenue as **routes unsuitable for heavy goods vehicles**. Use of the 'rat-run' should be discouraged by preventing right turns up Merchiston Avenue and Merchiston Park, by through traffic heading for Morningside;

12.36 We understand that Scottish local authorities have powers to consult on, and make, Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) which prohibit certain turns and/or mark certain roads as unsuitable for certain classes of vehicle; they also have powers to develop 'experimental' TROs to test out the impact of restrictions.

12.37 We urge CEC to use these powers so as to deter HGV traffic from the north/south rat-run of Yeaman Place, Polwarth Crescent and routes south (chiefly, Merchiston Avenue and Merchiston Park). Prohibiting HGV turns into Merchiston would also give a boost to cyclists moving south towards quiet routes to the southern fringes of the City. Use of the short-cut by other vehicles could also be discouraged by narrowing the junction of Merchiston Avenue and Granville Terrace, by pavement extension.

Recommendation 10: Combatting speeding

speed triggered warning signs should be installed along Polwarth Gardens and a speed camera should be installed along Merchiston Avenue - which, as previously discussed, is a route for parents with children heading to & from Bruntsfield Primary School. The 20mph limit should be enforced by the Council and Police Scotland acting together. Appropriate signage, alerting vehicles they are entering a zone for pavement users, should be put on all approach roads.

12.38 In August 2022 CEC reported that 'where non-compliance [with the 20mph speed limit] is reported, traffic surveys are undertaken and where average speeds are recorded above the normal tolerance, this is communicated to Police Scotland for targeted enforcement when resources allow, as well as further speed reduction measures being

investigated' (Transport & Environment Committee, 2022). There are several uncertainties in this statement (what is the 'normal tolerance'; in what sense are speed reduction measures 'investigated' when non-compliance has been confirmed?). In any event, MCC hope the City Council will take seriously the evidence accumulated in this report of substantial non-compliance in certain streets near the roundabout; and take action, in concert with Police Scotland.

12.39 Our traffic counts offer evidence of substantial flouting of the speed limit on Merchiston Avenue, where around half of all traffic moves at more than 25mph and where 85%ile figures reach 36mph. Around one third of traffic along Polwarth Gardens (east and west) moves at more than 25mph; and 85%iles reach 28.4mph. The Avenue is a route well used by parents and children as an access road to Bruntsfield Primary School. Students from Boroughmuir High School also cross the northern end of Merchiston Avenue on a daily basis. Young adults attending Napier's Merchiston Campus (including scores of overseas students during the summer vacation) use the Avenue continuously.

12.40 CEC officers are no doubt familiar with these issues, since they have been aired by residents and by MCC for many years. At a meeting with senior officers in the spring of 2021, assurances were given that the interests of pavement users would not be overlooked even though *Spaces for People* did not extend to Polwarth or to Merchiston Avenue as a main 'cut-through'. It is an irony that a street which is, literally, coming apart under the weight of traffic should be identified on CEC's South Edinburgh Quiet Routes as a 'suggested quieter road link' to cycle paths. For that to be true, action needs to be taken on vehicle speed and composition. Previous suggestions for area-wide traffic calming have not met with a positive response from the Council. Perhaps, in light of these data, CEC will reconsider.

12.41 Improved road signage is important – and inexpensive. It would alert drivers on approach roads to the roundabout that they are entering a zone with pavement users and cyclists have priority.

Recommendation 11: Speed reduction measures

12.42 CEC's draft Road Safety Action Plan includes Polwarth Gardens in the list of streets (Appendix 2 to the Plan) scheduled for speed reduction measures. In light of the traffic count data reported earlier, we recommend that -

Granville Terrace & Merchiston Avenue should be included in the list of streets scheduled for **speed reduction measures** in the Council's draft Road Safety Action Plan. (We welcome the inclusion of Polwarth Gardens in that list.)

Recommendation 12: Road and footway maintenance

Carriageways and footpaths which are not covered by the junction changes described above (but still within the neighbourhood of the roundabout) should be **overhauled** to remove cracks and potholes.

12.42 Nothing gives a clearer impression of the impact of uncontrolled vehicle volume and speed than the state of roads in the inner suburbs of the city. Polwarth is not alone in this, but that does not make residents' concerns about the condition of the streets any less valid. We therefore recommend that some serious upgrading of road surface and pavements on streets leading to the roundabout be included in our programme of improvements. The pavements on Granville Terrace are especially bad and have a steep 'crossfall' (ie they slope towards the road).

12.43 CEC responds promptly to calls for pothole repairs where life is endangered. But as we all know, the repairs carried out barely last a few weeks. Pavement users fare little better. In their survey responses, residents have been quick to point to redundant street furniture, narrow and uneven pavements and unclean streets as serious concerns.

12.44 Improvements do take place, even if the prompt to action seems unclear. Pavement improvement works were recently made at the junction of Yeaman Place and Watson Crescent and on streets to the west; but the Community Council does not know if these are linked to any wider plan. We take this up in the following section.

12.45 Similarly, pavements were built out and dropped kerbs installed at various junctions along Yeaman Place last autumn. In principle this is good and welcome, but projects of this kind would be even better if they were linked to a broader programme of streetscape enhancement – and if they took residents' views into account (the Community Council could facilitate this). We understand there is a plan to install an additional pedestrian refuge along Yeaman Place, though the design phase has not yet started. We would invite CEC to consider how this fits into a wider programme to make this stretch of road safer for pavement users and cyclists. A refuge without some respite from traffic does not greatly increase safety.

12.46 We finish this section with some additional comments on active travel and on the displacement effects of restraining rat-runs.

Links to active travel in wider locality

12.47 We have thought about how support for active travel impacts on the adjoining neighbourhoods and about linkages with cycle and 'green' routes. *Spaces for People* did not include any cycling support measures along Yeaman Place, Polwarth Terrace, or points south through Merchiston. The measures on Dundee Street stop abruptly at its junction with Yeaman Place. CEC recently published its proposals for a green travel link from Roseburn to the Union Canal, to encourage walking, wheeling and cycling. Until DDA-compliant access

points to the Canal are constructed along Dundee Street & Yeaman Place, active travellers must negotiate crossings from Fountainbridge to Canal access points further east or west.

12.48 Even with those access points in place, there will be no support for walkers, wheelers or cyclists who wish to travel south (rather than east/west) to link to the quiet route to Greenbank (accessed from Holy Corner and Strathearn Road). We invite CEC to consider additional measures along the Polwarth/ Merchiston 'corridor' – ie Yeaman Place, Polwarth Crescent and Merchiston Avenue – to facilitate active travel moving north/south. Priority for cyclists across the Walker Bridge would be a welcome first step.

"Oncoming vehicles play chicken with cyclists on Walker bridge"

"it is ridiculous that cars can park on a canal bridge, the road is so narrow, 2 cars cannot pass, cars with engines contributes to pollution, gets really busy, very unpleasant to walk or cycle."

"cars always block the sight, it's difficult to see approaching cars. T

The road on Polwarth Crescent is much wider than over the Walker Bridge, cars drive quite fast on the crescent, so turning to/from Temple Park Crescent is really dangerous on a bike. Polwarth is so central, people should be encouraged to walk and cycle, therefore a priority should be for pedestrians and cyclists."

Displacement

12.49 MCC's area extends well beyond Polwarth and includes Greenhill, Shandon, Merchiston, Bruntsfield and Churchill. We therefore have a responsibility to consider the wider impact of recommendations made here to alleviate the strain on residents living at or near the Polwarth roundabout. The question whether restrictions will lead to the displacement of traffic, rather than a net reduction in traffic, seems key. We have looked at some of the recent evidence on this, notably the paper on 'Disappearing Traffic? the story so far' which appeared in the Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers in 2002. This relates in the main to the impact of 'low traffic neighbourhoods' which generally imply tighter restrictions than MCC is proposing in this report (see box below).

12.50 That evidence points to significant overall reductions in vehicle journeys, over the medium term – provided that a holistic approach is adopted, with measures to complement restrictions such as new junction design, support for active travel and so forth. Some useful links are below. The benefits of reducing traffic volume (and in particular the volume of polluting vehicles such as HGVs) do not of course stop at environmental gains: there are significant health benefits to be reaped as well, as CEC's Active Travel Action Plan makes clear.

<https://enjoywalthamforest.co.uk/work-in-your-area/walthamstow-village/comparison-of-vehicle-numbers-before-and-after-the-scheme-and-during-the-trial/>

https://docs.google.com/document/d/13Nsm_GFdH6CpIpPpOZ7hbhLZScggCAP7ZGI0xi4qDgA/edit

<https://www.centreforlondon.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/CFL-StreetShift-LTNs-Final.pdf>

Reallocating road space from general traffic, to improve conditions for pedestrians or cyclists or buses or on-street light rail or other high-occupancy vehicles, is often predicted to cause major traffic problems on neighbouring streets. This paper reports on two phases of research, resulting in the examination of over 70 case studies of road space reallocation from eleven countries, and the collation of opinions from over 200 transport professionals worldwide.

The findings suggest that predictions of traffic problems are often unnecessarily alarmist, and that, given appropriate local circumstances, significant reductions in overall traffic levels can occur, with people making a far wider range of behavioural responses than has traditionally been assumed. Follow-up work has also highlighted the importance of managing how schemes are perceived by the public and reported in the media, with various lessons for avoiding problems. Finally, the findings highlight that well-designed schemes to reallocate road space can often contribute to a multiplicity of different policy aims and objectives.

SECTION 13

PATHS TO IMPLEMENTATION

13.1 In Section 6, we reported that the draft version of this report was sent to CEC officers in March 2023. A helpful contact in the Council offered to share it with the leaders of relevant teams. She commended MCC on its engagement with the local community. Disappointingly, however, we were told in May 2023 that all the major programmes in which our project might have featured were already fully subscribed, their participants having been decided some considerable time ago. We were pointed in the direction of a future programme, not yet formulated, which will follow on from the 2023 consultations on the Council's Active Travel Action Plan, perhaps around 2026.

13.2 That seems to MCC an inadequate response to the community engagement represented by this project. At the time of finalising this report in early June 2023, MCC is in discussion with City Councillors and others on a way forward. MCC has reflected carefully on how we might bring our proposals for Polwarth to fruition; and on possible options.

Resource constraints

13.3 We are ambitious for our community but not unrealistic. We know resources are extremely tight. We understand that, city-wide, progress on active travel goals will depend on the Council's securing substantial additional funds from various sources, including Sustrans (to whom the Scottish Government is entrusting large-scale resources for distribution across the country). We accept that the agenda for change spelt out in Section 12 is substantial. If the Council lacks resources to move towards full implementation of our proposals, MCC would be willing to step up its search for external support. If Council members and officers were to lend their clear support for our concept, MCC would apply to Sustrans for consultancy funding to move the project to the stage of design and costing.

Phasing

13.4 A key question relates to phasing. Projects that can easily be cut up into smaller units of activity are attractive because they can be progressed, over time and in increments, as resources permit. Our vision for the Polwarth roundabout presents some challenges to the 'quick wins' approach because it rests on an initial, powerful set of changes to traffic flows and road layout. Additional features, such as enhanced road crossings, would complement the layout changes. If they are attempted early, before the layout is altered, they would most probably need to be re-done later: that spells wasted expenditure.

Traffic volume

13.5 Previous sections have argued that the problems near the roundabout stem not from people but from the volume of traffic, particularly HGVs, attracted to the north-south cut-through offered by Yeaman Place and Merchiston Avenue. If CEC endorses our analysis,

then it could, as a first and crucial step, promote the local legislation (which might take the form of an 'experimental' Road Traffic Order) required to divert HGVs from the Yeaman Place/ Polwarth Crescent corridor and to prevent HGV turns southwards into Merchiston Avenue and Merchiston Park; and it could assess the impact of that measure. That alone would make a powerful impact on traffic flows and it would reduce the environmental damage on residential areas. No programme expenditure would be involved in such a move.

13.7 This approach does however hinge on CEC addressing an inconsistency in its Active Travel strategy. It cannot simultaneously advocate the removal of heavy vehicles from city centre main streets (such as Lothian Road) and also seek to prevent rat-running by heavy vehicles through residential districts such as Polwarth – unless it were to ban HGVs altogether from the city. There is no proposal for such a ban. It is not clear to MCC which path the Council intends to take.

Road layout

13.8 Our proposals for revised road layout conform to CEC policy. They also conform to CEC design guidance (Edinburgh Street Design Guidance Copyright © City of Edinburgh Council Version Date V1.01 January 2015) which recommends –

- *'Tight' corner radii, slowing down turning vehicles and making side roads easier to cross.*
- *Wider use of raised road junctions without specific vehicle priority to help reduce vehicle speeds and to give pedestrians more priority.*
- *Introduction of 'continuous pavement' side road crossings in streets pedestrians, giving greater priority to people.*

We acknowledge that road layout changes are complex, require detailed planning, and are costly. We believe those costs are justified in the case of Polwarth; we need to know if CEC officers agree.

Second best approach

13.9 Any approach to implementation which disregards traffic volumes and layout is, in MCC's view, very much a second-best option. Without measures to reduce volumes and to slow traffic down by layout changes, the impact of other measures may be compromised. Nonetheless, in the spirit of open consideration of all possible options, we have asked ourselves what could be done to improve on the current set-up if the Council is unable, or unwilling, to contemplate changes to road layout or traffic flow.

Priority measures for early implementation

13.10 We identify the following measures – none of which would be controversial or especially resource-intensive – as the irreducible minimum required to respond, over the

short term, to the concerns expressed by our community. They are, in effect, a subset of the recommendations in Section 12.

13.11 These changes could proceed independently of road layout. There is a risk of wastage in such an approach (if the intersection is eventually changed, as we recommend, to a 'T' junction, with remodelled and enlarged pavement areas, the pedestrian crossings will need to be redrawn). But the following changes could still achieve significant benefits for pavement users and cyclists.

(a) Pedestrian crossings

The PV2s for all three of the pedestrian crossings at the roundabout should be recalculated, using the independent data we have compiled; and upgrades to all three crossing points should be implemented within the next 2 years.

Appendix 2 to the Council's draft Road Safety Action Plan (RSAP) currently proposes crossing upgrades at the north end of Yeaman Place and at 'Polwarth Crescent'. The first presumably refers to the junction of Yeaman Place and Dundee Street – a crossing that City Councillors have been advocating for over 9 years and which is most welcome. The second is unclear: if it refers to the unfinished crossing north of the roundabout near the junction of Yeaman Place and Temple Park Crescent, that is of much less importance than the upgrade of the crossing at the south end of the Crescent at the roundabout.

We urge the Council to include, in the Appendix to its draft Road Safety Action Plan, **upgraded pedestrian crossings** at the south end of Polwarth Crescent; at the easternmost end of Polwarth Crescent, across from Polwarth Pharmacy where the refuge is inadequate; and at the junction of Merchiston Avenue and Granville Terrace. The current zebra crossing at the eastern end of Polwarth Gardens should be upgraded to a light-operated 'puffin' system.

(b) Improved signage & provision for cyclists

This is a low-cost measure.

We call for improved signage – on the road and by pavement sign – on all the approach roads to the Polwarth roundabout, alerting drivers to a zone with pavement user priority. Priority lanes for cyclists on approach to the roundabout should be considered.

(c) Communal bins – repositioning

The CEC 'Bin Hub Strategy' envisages the re-positioning of the communal bins currently situated at the south end of Polwarth Crescent where they block pedestrian sightlines (east to west). We ask that these bins be repositioned without delay:

The bins are hazardous and a solution is at hand. We appreciate that the rollout of the strategy involves the promotion of traffic orders and stipulates periods for public consultation. But this is a case where a temporary solution can and should be found, in the interests of public safety.

(d) Speed reduction measures

The Council's draft Road Safety Action Plan proposes speed reduction measures in a long list of Edinburgh streets. We welcome the inclusion of Polwarth Gardens in Appendix 2 of that Plan.

We ask that Granville Terrace and Merchiston Avenue be included in that list in line with the findings of this report.

(e) Traffic warden activity

At no additional cost, the Council could ask its traffic warden managers to prioritise the area near the roundabout for patrol activity.

This would help to deter parking on double yellow lines. It would focus an existing enforcement resource on an area where infringements are now routine, creating additional hazards for pavement users.

(f) Speed warning lights

At modest cost, the Council should erect speed warning lights along Polwarth Gardens and Merchiston Avenue.

This would be a very modest initiative that might have some impact in restraining the flouting of the 20mph limit now habitual in our area. Some argue that, since failures to heed the warning lights do not attract penalties, habitual speeders are not deterred; others point to the wisdom of trying first to curb speeding by appeal rather than by threat. It's worth a try and costs relatively little.

(g) Pavement widening

We recommend that CEC extend the pavements at the south end of Polwarth Crescent (at its junction with the roundabout) and at the eastern end of Polwarth Gardens (at the zebra crossing), thereby pinching the roundabout and forcing vehicles to slow down. To be clear, MCC's favoured solution is to convert the roundabout to a 'T' junction, but pavement widening could accompany the present layout if CEC refuses to contemplate changes to road layout.

We note, somewhat ruefully, that CEC managed only a few months ago to find resources to enlarge pavements and to pinch junctions in the area of Yeaman Place & Watson Crescent and at the north end of Merchiston Avenue (at its junction with Yeaman Place) - a series of street improvements that, while welcome, did not rest on local consultation and do not respond to footfall pressure in those side-streets. Those improvements were highlighted in the Council's Active Travel Action Plan, giving the impression that this was the template for future street improvement. But CEC chose to ignore the more pressing problems less than 100 metres away, at the roundabout, where the data confirms the urgent need for change.

The case for reclamation of public realm at the roundabout is much stronger and would help to redress the balance between vehicles and pavement users (and cyclists). It would be very regrettable if, after the Watson Crescent improvements, the Council refused to consider similar changes nearby where footfall is many times higher and where the community have clearly called for change.

Pavement widening would enable CEC to monitor its impact of on traffic volumes, composition and driver behaviour. If action on (d), (f) and (g) were coordinated and the speed monitoring data shared with Police Scotland (who could spot and fine drivers for dangerous or careless driving), that would quickly send a stiff message that pavement users and cyclists come first in the roundabout area.

We note that Edinburgh Street Design Guidance (2015) advocates exactly the kind of changes we propose; and that cycle lane street furniture - such as cycle lane dividers and posts - can be used to "pinch" streets, narrowing junctions and providing more pedestrian room to allow safe wheeler and pedestrian passage at busy junctions.

There is more than one way to enlarge pavement space; not all of them cost a fortune. (CEC may indeed have surplus street furniture in storage that could be used to pinch the approaches to the roundabout – or even (dare we say it) to create a 'T' junction. Dividers, as used during the 'Spaces for People' initiative, can offer a cheap and swift alternative to re-kerbing and tar infill.)

(h) Replacement of speed ‘pillows’ on Yeaman Place

The current speed pillows on Yeaman Place are ineffective: they do nothing to reduce vehicle speed and they are no deterrent at all to Heavy Goods Vehicles. They should be replaced by full-width speed bumps.

These would be more awkward for heavy vehicles to ignore or bypass. Measures (a), (b) and (h) would be mutually reinforcing.

None of the changes (a) to (h) above would involve the transformation of the roundabout into a ‘T’ junction, which we continue to believe is the best, long-term solution on public safety grounds. And there are limits to the benefits these modest changes would bring: none of these changes would address the current shortage of commercial loading space, which could be resolved by the carriageway narrowing we have proposed in Section 12. But if the Council is opposed to road layout changes, the eight measures outlined above would at least show the community that CEC has listened and is responding.

Greening improvements

13.12 Substantial numbers of transportable, easily moved and stored tree and shrub containers (planters) were used during the construction of the tram extension to Granton. In the “infill” areas provided for pedestrians using cycle lane dividers such planters could be utilised to provide temporary greening. For the longer term, there might be pockets of grant funding for other greening improvements such as proper tree planting and storm-water drainage (as illustrated in the visualisations). The community itself might be mobilised to support some greening of the environment. A similar argument applies to bike stands and bike hangars. MCC would campaign vigorously for those improvements if CEC would throw its weight behind the modest set of changes outlines above.

Commitment to community engagement?

13.13 The changes proposed in 13.11 could be brought about if there were a positive and creative approach by CEC to the issues raised by this report. The Council says it is committed to responding to community proposals for change. Its reaction to this report will show whether that commitment is backed by a real will to translate a community-driven initiative into reality. Engaging with us would help CEC to show not just that it wants to promote its policies on active travel and 20-minute neighbourhoods (important though those are), but also that it recognises the sense of investing in changes carefully developed by a community itself.

SECTION 14

OUR LEARNING AS A COMMUNITY COUNCIL

14.1 The Polwarth Pavements project is the first neighbourhood development project that MCC has tackled in several years. In the intervening period, policy and professional practice in urban design, place making and city transportation have changed fundamentally and in ways that make a project such as ours more challenging but also more rewarding. We offer below some thoughts about the process we have been through and about what we have learned as a team of two volunteer members of a community council, assisted by one part-time volunteer for the final three months of the project.

14.2 We approached this project rather naively. At the outset, we had no clear idea what we would have to learn or what skills we would have to master. Our understanding of community engagement or survey management was slender and untested. Our grasp of the issues surrounding road layout, pedestrian safety and traffic management was limited.

Input from Planning Aid Scotland

14.3 We were lucky. In our application to CEC for a SW community grant, we included a proposal that Planning Aid Scotland (PAS) should train us in community engagement, in the handling of survey data, and in report compilation. PAS, as CEC will know, are independent consultants on community planning and Scotland's foremost charity for land use planning education. We are in no doubt that it was this input from PAS that enabled us to progress the project from its impressionistic beginnings, through survey work and data collection, to analysis and the formulation of proposals. We wish we had succeeded in recruiting residents from our area to enjoy the benefits of this training alongside MCC; but sadly (and as explained earlier) we were unable to do so in the early days of the project. That is a point that others planning similar projects might like to consider.

14.4 We received four training sessions from PAS: one on overall project management and report-writing and three on data handling and the use of the Place Standard Scotland. PAS also acted as critical reader in the latter stages of the project. It was from PAS that we learned about good practice in survey work, the importance of regular and full feedback to the community, the need to use a variety of media to inform and seek views from our residents and businesses, and to see 'engagement' as a process of building trust and understanding rather than simply a series of discrete events.

14.5 It was through PAS' panel of volunteers (two of whom supported our street event in November 2022) that we met Charlotte Bae, who has brought her urban design expertise to our project in a most constructive and positive way.

14.6 We would strongly recommend that any other community council attempting an active travel or pedestrian safety project, or a local plan development project, should use the PAS online resources or commission them for specific inputs to their work.

Modes of engagement

14.7 We were naïve in thinking that posters and flyers and emails to interested residents, and notices on MCC's social media, would carry our message far & wide in the neighbourhood. Email, specifically, produced relatively little response, especially when it was the means to invite people to online meetings. Part of the reason for this lies, we think, in the nature of the neighbourhood. Young families lead exceptionally busy lives and simply cannot spare time in the evenings to join online events. Students are busy doing other things. Some residents with limited access to IT may be put off by invitations to use communication apps.

14.8 In any event, we had a much better response to an invitation on MCC's website to sign up for regular updates on the Polwarth Pavement project. That produced a list of over 40 addresses to whom we have sent material at regular intervals. Residents who became interested kindly acted as our agents and amplified our messages through their own social media contacts, friends and neighbours. Word got around.

14.9 Street events, even of the modest kind we mounted in November 2022 (and will do again in March 2023), were a success. People were glad to stop and chat. They were interested and sometimes vehement in their views. Street events are an excellent amplifier.

14.10 Had there been an indoors space near the roundabout where we could have offered a longer public meeting, we would have been glad to do so. Our nearest such space would have been in the hall of Polwarth Church and we doubted that many would walk over. We will however keep that option in mind as we move this report from draft to final stage.

14.11 Through these various interactions (and some setbacks as, for example, in the response to email approaches), we learned about what kinds of engagement were most productive and appreciated. But we hesitate to say whether our experience would be replicable elsewhere.

Skills for project work

14.12 Community volunteers working on development projects such as ours would find it useful to have (or to be able to call on) the following skills & competences:

- IT capability across Word, Excel, Powerpoint, & Wordpress
- familiarity with communication & survey apps including Zoom, Teams & Google form
- ability to identify and work with stakeholders
- ability to define contractor requirements eg for survey design, traffic counts
- skill in absorbing and interpreting material from a range of professional sources, and analysing relevant data
- ability to listen carefully to the views of residents, including any which may seem discordant or negative
- teamworking
- task setting, monitoring and delivery to deadlines

- openness to new information, perspectives, possible solutions
- report writing

The range of competences required will influence the size and composition of the volunteer team. Our team was almost certainly too small. Four active members might be sufficient for work of this kind.

Online community survey tools

14.13 MCC is extremely fortunate to have at present a member who was willing to lend his IT skills to this project. This enabled us to mount regular progress reports on our website and, crucially, to develop an electronic version of our survey instrument and publicise that by way of a simple link. As the electronic responses rolled in, we realised that the days of leaflet surveying are largely over and that very many people prefer to click a link and complete a survey on their 'phones or tablets than fill in a leaflet.

14.14 It is no exaggeration to say that, without an electronic survey, we would not have amassed sufficient consultation data for this engagement exercise. The project would have stumbled and likely fallen. We therefore want to emphasise the centrality of skills in survey work to any project similar in scale and focus to ours.

Respecting the data

14.15 Once a project team acquires data from residents, it has to respect it. First and most obviously, the team must respect the confidentiality of any personal data offered. We did not solicit email addresses through our survey form but invited anyone interested in the project to sign up for regular updates through a form on MCC's website. We drew attention to our data protection policy and reminded correspondents that they could withdraw their data at any time. Secondly, we learned through our discussions with PAS how important it is to deal properly with every last shred of opinion that reaches a team through survey work. In our case, we had some 850-900 free text survey responses to consider. Some of them expressed ideas which proved central to our eventual recommendations. PAS helped us to see how to analyse these responses in a way that was inclusive and respectful of individual views.

Subjective and objective data

14.16 An important learning point was how to test the 'lived experience' of residents' views, expressed in survey responses, against objective data obtained through traffic counts, accident records and police interventions. Where impressions gained through daily observation are confirmed by 'hard' statistical data, they grow in force. Where there is a divergence, new questions arise and should be addressed. This was a point worth learning in relation, for example, to discussions on vehicle speed. Not all perceptions of speed were upheld by traffic count data. But that data, in turn, had to be challenged: were the counters placed at a point in the street where speeding was most likely to occur?

Our sense is that most community development projects will benefit from a blend of subjective and objective data. The role of each should be carefully explained, lest residents feel that their opinions are not being trusted.

Engaging with the City of Edinburgh Council officers

14.17 We understand that the City Council has been progressing an extensive organisational and staffing review for quite some time. This may explain why we found it difficult to develop useful channels of communication with Council officers until quite late in the project. We started to email Council officers in December 2021; and repeated our overtures at intervals. By a lucky series of contacts, we finally made contact in February 2023 with Ruth White, who was able to explain to us which teams and which individuals were likely to be interested in our draft report.

14.18 We regret this lack of dialogue during the main phase of the project. Our learning would have been faster and deeper had we been in discussion with Council officers. We would have been better informed about policy objectives and constraints (such as on resources); and we would have benefited from their expertise, especially when we were debating the merits of different approaches to active travel, pedestrian safety and road layout. We very much look forward to having those discussions as we move from a draft to a finalised report.

Time commitment

14.19 There is no escaping it: neighbourhood development projects take a huge amount of time and effort on the part of the project team and those assisting them (in our case, our MCC IT expert). When news of our community grant came through, two of our experienced Ward Councillors advised us that our eventual recommendations would only be taken up by CEC if they were based on effective consultation and sound data, properly analysed. PAS advised that we should report in full, including on the policy context, in case we wanted at some future stage to engage with other funders who might support our cause. Those were both wise counsels and we hope we have reflected them in this report.

14.20 At the same time, we are prompted to ask whether the model of community development that rests on neighbourhood volunteers is in fact viable. There is an immense amount of work involved in even the smallest project, when done to the standards set by Councillors and others. The teams convened to take such projects forward need to be large enough to carry and share the burden, and to stay resilient in the face of departures, ill-health or any other factor that may affect the team as the project proceeds. The learning for those doing projects similar to ours can be very great, and very rewarding; but everyone needs to be aware that it comes at a price. That price will be worth paying if positive change emerges from community projects. If not, it will seem exorbitant, and community groups may be reluctant to make the commitment involved.

SECTION 15

CONCLUSIONS

15.1 Our aim in this exercise has been to do justice to the views of residents and businesses living and working near the Polwarth roundabout and to critically examine those views by testing them against objective data. We believe there is substantial and persuasive evidence of the need to improve pedestrian safety and amenity in this area. We hope the City of Edinburgh Council agrees.

15.2 Given the policies being pursued by CEC, we feel this is a good time to make the case for change. Across the city we see projects underway to prioritise walking, wheeling and cycling and to limit the environmental costs of motor vehicles. MCC would like to do its bit to advance these goals in its district and to show, through a demonstration project at the roundabout, just what can be achieved when residents, their community council and the City Council work together.

15.3 Changes to road layout and improvements to pedestrian safety do not come cheap. We recognise this and stand ready, if CEC wishes, to promote our proposals to other funders who might be interesting in co-resourcing our proposals.

15.4 We have many people and organisations to thank. First and foremost, we thank our residents and local businesses for their interest, engagement and support. Without them, nothing would have happened. As a project team we also want to thank our MCC Chair Ian Doig for his steadfast encouragement, insight and critical friendship. The expertise of our fellow MCC member Ewan Klein was critical to the launching of our electronic survey and to our efforts to keep the community in touch through web posts and promotional materials. We want also to recall that this project was in many ways the brainchild of Declan Murray, MCC member now working overseas: his creative thinking at the early stages of our project set it off on the right track.

15.5 We are indebted also, and in many ways, to Planning Aid Scotland who have generously given their time and expertise to our project. We also thank Living Streets Edinburgh for igniting MCC's interest in the issues around pavement usage in Polwarth and for their helpful comments on drafts of this report. Others, including the Fountainbridge Canalside Community Development Trust and our local schools – Bruntsfield Primary and Boroughmuir High School – have also helped to shape our thinking and our proposals.


15.6 As this report is considered and further action unfolds, we in MCC will continue to welcome comments on the issues it has raised. We can be contacted by email at pavementproject@merchistoncc.org.uk. Anyone wishing to stay in touch with this project can sign up for regular updates at <https://merchistoncc.org.uk/projects/the-polwarth-pavement-project/contact-the-polwarth-pavement-project/>.

GOOGLE SURVEY RESPONSES IN GRAPHIC FORM


We reproduce below the graphics produced by Google Form on the basis of the 165 returns to the community survey on the Polwarth Roundabout in November 2022

Do you live close to the Polwarth roundabout – within a 5 or 10 minute walk?

165 responses




How do you use the roundabout? Tick below to indicate whether you pass it as a pavement user, driver or cyclist and indicate frequency.




How many adults are in your household?

165 responses




How many children in your household who pass the roundabout by foot, buggy, scooter or bike?

164 responses




How concerned are you about road crossings for pavement users (pedestrians, wheelchair users and parents with pushchairs etc) near the Polwarth roundabout?

165 responses




How concerned are you about provision for cyclists near the roundabout?

165 responses




What problems most affect pavement users, including those with a disability, near the roundabout?
Select any of the following that you think apply. (This is a later question for those who see no problems.)

163 responses




What about problems for cyclists?

126 responses



Other issues – for businesses, disabled drivers and about general amenity


104 responses



Are there any other problems for any type of user? please use your own words below. [Please see section 6 of the main report for an analysis of these free text responses.]

If you don't think there are any problems, please tick below


8 responses



Which of these issues present the greatest risk to pavement users and cyclists? Select from the list above or use your own words. (141 responses) [Please section 7 of the main report for an analysis of these free text responses.]

How can we improve things? Select all options below that you would support

164 responses



Do you have other ideas for improving safety near the roundabout & making the area more pleasant? 73 responses. [Please see section 7 of the main report for an analysis of these free text responses]

The City of Edinburgh Council would probably deal with any improvement plan in stages. What are your **top priorities for action** to benefit pavement users and cyclists? You can select two options from the numbered list above, or use your own words. [Please see section 7 of the main report for an analysis of these free text responses.]

1	Sub theme 1	What are your top priorities for action (from list and in own words)	Cou
2		Moving Around	
3	Active Travel	Pavement widening and/or removal of railings to give priority to pedestrians	30
4	Active Travel Ro	Segregated cycle lanes	18
5	Active Travel	Improve lines of sight for pedestrians	3
6	Active Travel Route	Keep moving ahead with cycle routes and try to complete 'missing links'	1
7	Active Travel Route	Yeaman Place + Merchiston Avenue need major changes to make them more pleasant for people instead of cars.	1
8	Active Travel Route	clear cycling lanes, and cars shouldn't be parked on them, as cycling to/from cycling lane to the main road is	1
9	Behaviour Change	Pedestrians are the most vulnerable group & should be given priority & greater protection from both vehicles &	3
10	Accessibility	There's not even dropped kerbs at the junction of Polwarth Gardens (rather, Granville Terrace) and Merchiston	1
11		Public Transport	
12	Bus	Bus tracker at stops to assist public transport use for elderly without smart phones	1
13		Traffic and Parking	
14	Road Layout	Replacement of roundabout with fully signalled intersection (potential also incorporating 'pelican' crossing for	25
15	Road Layout	Cycle lanes on approach to roundabout	6
16	Road Layout	Install a proper raised roundabout	3
17	Road Layout	Slow the traffic down, perhaps by creating a raised 'table' on the approaches (shared surface) – such as those along Grange Road, and	1
18	Road Layout	A one way system from Dundee St up Yeaman Place so that cycle lanes can be implemented and all vehicles can still use the road safely.	1
19	Traffic/Congesti	Limits on HGVs using Yeaman Place/Polwarth Crescent as this is on the school route for children	7
20	Traffic/Congesti	Traffic congestion needs to be considered as a part of this effort.	3
21	Traffic/Congesti	Reducing through traffic on Yeaman Place. Its a 'rat run' and used by some very large vehicles.	1
22	Road Crossings	Improved crossings (eg At least one extra pedestrian crossing on the Granville side of the roundabout; , in each place people are likely to cross; in front of piecebox, margotta and maintain the current crossing; between Active	32
23	Road Crossings	Improved or additional zebra crossings for pavement users (eg on polwarth crescen, Merchiston Avenue, especially on school routes)	30
24	Road Crossings	Pelican crossings must incorporate traffic lights – speeding most problematic up Yeaman Place	1
25	Speeding	Measures to slow vehicles.	36
26	Speeding	Measures to slow traffic down on Polwarth Gardens, Polwarth Crescent & Granville Terrace	9
27	Parking	limit transport on Yeaman place and do not allow parking on Walker Bridge	1
28	Parking	stopping double parking/waiting	1
29	Parking	remove parking.	1
30	Parking	Top priority increase availability of parking spaces near the roundabout in the evenings.	1
31		Streets and spaces	
32	Street Furniture	Benches and greenery to promote wellbeing	5
33	Street Furniture	removal of barriers	1
34	Street Furniture	Put flowers on top of heightened roundabout	1
35	Street Furniture	Removal of street furniture	1
36	Street Furniture	Reposition rubbish bins.	1
37	Street Furniture	and or adding railings to protect cyclists and pedestrians	1
38	Street Furniture	new wheelie bins.	1
39		Care and maintenance	
40	Road	fixing potholes (merchiston avenue in particular)	3
41	Road Maintenance	Improved pavements	1
42	Road Maintenance	General road maintenance and cleaning, especially for the benefit of cyclists	1
43	Litter & Dog Mess	The Dundee street end is also highly littered. Address this	1
44		General Comment	
45	Other Comment	Ensure safe passage for school children and pedestrians!	1
46	Other Comment	In order: 1, 8, 3, 5, 7, 6	1
47	Other Comment	Being unable to cycle due to a disability . I have to walk take bus or drive. Able bodied can walk or take bus .	1
48	Other Comment	Pavement users and cyclists	1
49	Other Comment	Speed / access for crossing	1
50			
51			240

1	Sub theme	Other ideas to improve things	Count
2		Moving Around	
3	Active Travel Routes	access to canal path from Yeaman place, giving walkers/cyclist easier access	2
4	Behaviour Change	Other mechanisms to encourage people out of cars and onto foot and bicycle	1
5	Behaviour Change	priority should be for pedestrians and cyclists, the junction needs to put pedestrians, wheelers and cyclist first. Car need to slow down and give way	2
6		Public Transport	
7	Bus	Improve bus travel by hitting tracker at bus stops showing next buses for 10/37 - many residents are old and don't have smart phones	1
8		Traffic and Parking	
9	Road Layout	Narrow the roundabout or remove it and improve lines of site and ability to cross that is child safe	4
10	Road Layout	Not sure a fully set of traffic lights needed but a physical roundabout would definitely help slow traffic with crossings on each road.	2
11	Road Layout	Make it into a conventional roundabout - planted with trees, shrubs etc. Reduce road width and increase pavement	2
12	Road Layout	I don't like the idea of cycle lanes approaching a roundabout without signal controls, as they can encourage cyclists into wrong lanes and drivers to think that cyclists should only be at the side of the road	1
13	Road Layout	A 'no exit' sign at the top of the (supposedly) one-way section of Merchiston Avenue.	1
14	Road Layout	Bus gates to keep through traffic out	1
15	Road Layout	One way traffic	1
16	Road Layout	Close Polwarth Crescent to through-traffic to stop rat-running from Western Approach to Bruntsfield.	1
17	Road Layout	Far too many HGVs use this route (ie Yeaman Place & Polwarth Crescent) as a race track. Access should be limited especially on option 6. Make YP one way? 'Play' street access.	1
18	Road Layout	Remove/improve the speed bumps because cars will go in the middle of the road instead. Cars will slow down for the speed bumps but not for the pedestrian crossing areas.	1
19	Road Layout	I think by raising the road from merchiston avenue to the bus stop in front the dentists will slow traffic drastically (shared surface)	1
20	Road Layout	Wider pavements to make waiting to cross road and waiting for bus easier.	1
21	Road Layout	Wider island at crossing from Margiotta to cafes as currently it is too small to wait on while crossing (my dog doesn't fit, and a pushchair / wheelchair wouldn't either).	1
22	Road Layout	It would be great to have a zebra with priority to pedestrians on the intersection of Granville Terrace and Merchiston Avenue.	1
23	Road Layout	Look at making it clear that the bottom of merchiston avenue is a one way street	1
24	Road Layout	Narrow roadway for cars. Widen area for bikes/ pedestrian	1
25	Road Layout	Traffic lights may slow things down. I think there needs to be a crossing at the bottom of the road as well to make things safer (between Fountain News & Low Cost Market.)	1
26	Road Layout	turn it back into a T junction	1
27	Road Layout	Dutch style cycle roundabout so cycle and pedestrian priority at all 3 arms. Joining the cycle lanes on the approach.	1
28	Road Layout	I think cycle lanes on approach would make the junction more dangerous as cars would be encouraged to overtake and it's not wide enough to do so.	1
29	Road Layout	More speed restriction signs on road surfaces	1
30	Road Layout	Addition of a feature in the middle of the roundabout to prevent corner cutting. (May not be compatible with buses).	1
31	Road Layout	In road lighting encircling roundabout. This would improve driver awareness and understanding.	1
32	Road Layout	painting lines on a road,	1
33	Traffic/Congestion	Redesign the whole Polwarth area into one-way road system. The park cars makes it impossible to drive on both sides anyway.	1
34	Road Crossings	A crossing at the bottom of Merchiston avenue near the roundabout for kids walking to school.	4

35	Road Crossings	end collisions when cars stop on roundabout.	1
36	Road Crossings	Reinstate lollipop man	1
37	Road Crossings	Pelican crossing must incorporate traffic lights - speeding most problematic up Yeaman Place As mentioned above, thinking about those cyclists who have to turn right into Merchiston Av immediately after the	1
38	Road Crossings	roundabout. Could this be incorporated into a signalled junction?	1
39	Road Crossings	Better crossings near Piecebox and on Yeaman Place. Especially if they are on the east side of Merchiston avenue - then, there is no regulated and safe way to cross the street	1
40	Road Crossings	at all.	1
41	Speeding	Enforce speed limits with speed cameras (e.g. Put speed cameras on approach to zebra crossing and round about to deter cars from speeding)	4
42	Speeding	live speed signs to encourage drivers to stay below limit (e.g. "Smiley face" speed indicator sign for vehicles would make traffic more aware)	3
43	Speeding	Speed bumps (e.g. on Gilmore Place)	2
44	Speeding	'Sleeping policemen' don't work - ineffective in slowing traffic down.	1
45	Speeding	Include Merchiston Avenue in measures to slow down traffic.	1
46	Parking	Less parking on Yeaman Pl so it is easier to cross and more room for bikes / vehicles in general. I honestly think that parking is the priority in this area. We all pay for permits, but there simply isn't enough of it, I have to look at it practically and say that I already really struggle with 2 children and the shopping. I think safety could definitely be improved, I would happily see it become a T-Junction with traffic lights and pedestrian crossing.	1
47	Parking		1
48	Parking	Properly Enforcing no parking at junction .	1
49	Parking	Remove parking from one side of Walker bridge.	1
50	Parking	remove the excessive amount of car parking.	1
51	Parking	limiting car parking on polwarth crescent and canal.	1
52		Streets and Spaces	
53	Street Furniture	Move bins if they currently block view of oncoming traffic (e.g. relocation of bins near the roundabout, Re site the bins at the top of Yeoman; Repositioning of communal bins on approach to the roundabout from Polwarth Crescent) Greenery/green spaces (eg Trees to promote healthier living and slowing traffic (such as on viewforth) to discourage use by large vehicles and as a thorough fare.)	5
54	Street Furniture		3
55	Street Furniture	Do not get rid of railings. I feel safer with them separating pavement from cars. Also, people park on the roundabout!	3
56	Street Furniture	benches	2
57	Street Furniture	More Bins (eg replacement communal wheelie bins)	2
58	Street Furniture	Flowers/greenery/tree on raised roundabout Using the large area that currently occupied by the road for street trees, greenery and bike parking - creating a sense of place to support walking, wheeling and cycling and create more footfall (rather than car through traffic) for businesses.	2
59	Street Furniture		1
60	Heritage	In terms of improving amenity, small changes can also lift the neighbourhood - eg repainting the Victorian lamp-posts	1
61		Feeling Safe	
62	Lighting	Improved lighting (eg at zebra crossing, would enable to cycle on pavement and cross at lights)	3
63		Care and Maintenance	
64	Road Maintenance	Resurface road for cars and cyclists, Also repainting	6
65	Road Maintenance	New pavements/resurface Sort out drainage on Yeaman Pl near the scrapyard where the pavement has recently been 'improved' and water now pools when it rains.	3
66	Road Maintenance		1
67	Litter & Dog Mess	Some way to manage litter	1
68	Street cleaning	proper cleaning of pavements and gullies (eg Yeaman place)	2
69		General Comment	
70	Other Comment	All the ideas above are excellent and very sensible!	2
71	Other Comment	These are great ideas and I hope they can move forward. Gilmore Place also needs to be addressed.	1
72	Other Comment	I find that vans often behave far worse than HGVs do.	1
73	Other Comment	Do a visualisation of the area.	1
74			
75			103

1	Sub theme	Are there any other problems for any type of user? please use your own words below	Cour
2		Moving Around	
3	Active Travel Routes	Pavements are very narrow - hard to walk with bikes and buggies (e.g. especially Granville Terrace what is dangerous for kids and difficult to pass other pedestrians especially when I have a buggy. Unfortunately around Granville Terrace area and the Polwarth roundabout I always need to keep my children strapped in a buggy or hold their hand to ensure walking on the pavement is safe).	3
4	Active Travel Routes	No connecting route to the canal path (results in many cyclists riding down Gilmore place (very busy and unsafe)	2
5	Active Travel Routes	It's hard to cycle with children because of lack of cycle paths.	1
6	Active Travel Routes	No lane segregation on approach to the roundabout for cyclists	1
7	Active Travel Routes	No room for lane segregation (lane segregation would impact pedestrians)	1
8	Active Travel Routes	On entering polwarth gdns you have to get into the right-hand lane which feels unsafe when there is fast or heavy traffic (My usual bike journey is Polwarth Cres to Merchiston Av)	1
9	Active Travel Routes	Narrow pavements	1
10	Behaviour Change	Driver behaviour towards pedestrians and cyclists: e.g.unwillingness to pause to allow pedestrians to safely cross, not indicating when going up Polwarth Crescent to the roundabout and up towards Bruntsfield, drivers not treating it as a roundabout, drivers overtaking too close to cyclists, Traffic often cuts the corner turning right up Merchiston Avenue, drivers using mobile phones, drivers swerving around speed pillows	19
11	Behaviour Change	Cyclists behaviour towards pedestrians: e.g. Cyclists don't stop at zebra crossing, cycle on pavements, electric bikes and scooters speeding	4
12	Behaviour Change	Too many cyclist are not confident enough to use the roads, i.e. how to approach and use a roundabout (stick the the centre of the lanes and use proper hand signals, not pointing). Like all road users cyclist should receive training to build up confidence to use the roads properly.	1
13	Cycling infrastructure	Install bike parking (e.g. near shops)	2
14	Wayfinding	Advertise alternative cycle routes	1
15	Accessibility	Elderly using walking frames etc are especially vulnerable	1
16	Accessibility	Kerbs are not dropped low enough for wheelchair users	1
17		Traffic and parking	
18	Road Layout	Visibility splays (sightlines) for pedestrians and cyclists are poor (e.g.along Polwarth Cres/Yeamen Pl, at roundabout bins are obstruction line of sight).	7
19	Road Layout	The roundabout painted on the road causes confusion. Its very wide. Traffic just drives straight over the crossing.	3
20	Road Layout	The parked cars on the roundabout and exiting onto Polwarth Gardens force you into the traffic.	2
21	Road Layout	The bus stop is too close to the zebra crossing meaning drivers can't see beyond to the crossing, it needs moved away from the crossing	1
22	Road Layout	Sipped bumps push cars into middle of road effectively "narrowing the channel" into the roundabout.	1
23	Road Layout	Although it is a no exit road the bottom of merchiston avenue (54-70) is still used as a two way street, there is nothing that indicates the top of the road as a no exit. This makes it very dangerous going into the roundabout.	1
24	Traffic/Congestion	Rat run at peak times. Pedestrians wait for a gap and hope!	2
25	Traffic/Congestion	Traffic at peak hours when children are walking to school (along Polwarth Cres/Yeamen Pl)	1
26	Traffic/Congestion	Big issue: large HGVs!	1
27	Traffic/Congestion	at the bottom of the main stretch of Merchiston Avenue at peak times you can literally be waiting up to 5 mins to cross!	1

28	Road Crossings	Merchiston Avenue to piece box where the recycling bins are (eg Zebra Crossing) 3.at bottom of Yeaman Place/Dundee St 4.along Polwarth Cres/Yeamen Pl.	21
29	Road Crossings	There is no longer a lollypop person for the school children (e.g. at the bottom of Merchiston Ave)	3
30	Speeding	Speeding traffic (it's hard to cycle with children, No reduction of speed as cars approach the round about, Gilmore place specifically mentioned)	8
31	Speeding	Speeding traffic: (e.g slowing the vehicles coming from the West along Polwarth Gardens, slowing vehicles exiting from roundabout, at the bottom of the main stretch of Merchiston Avenue Pedestrians have to look for vehicles racing from Granville Terrace, Merchiston Avenue and both sections of the roundabout)	3
32	Speeding	Lack of physical anti-speeding measures (e.g. a speed camera/speed bumps on Polwarth Gardens may be helpful)	3
33	Speeding	Lack of visible speed restriction signs	1
34	Speeding	Speed bumps not effective on Polwarth Crescent	1
35	Speeding	20mph speed limit unenforced	1
36	Speeding	Zebra crossing is dangerous - traffic lights required instead	1
37	Parking	Parked cars on the roundabout and at crossing at the end of Yeaman Place (parked cars blocking direct lines to pedestrian refuges, blocking sight lines). cars parked illegally on double yellow	7
38	Parking	Double parking (e.g. Polwarth Crescent, especially works and delivery vans)	6
39	Parking	Pavement parking - obstructs wheelchair users (e.g uphill route from Polwarth Cresc into Polwarth Gardens)	2
40	Parking	Insufficient parking spaces particularly in the evenings (We really struggle for parking. Please do not add a cycle lane at the cost of parking spaces. Both of my children are under 3 years old, I already end up having to park a 5 minute walk away from my flat most of the time.)	2
41	Streets and Spaces		
42	Street Furniture	Street clutter (prevents easy access for wheelchairs)	3
43	Street Furniture	Railings on roundabout south side (The railings make it very difficult to pass other pedestrians, especially when bikes are locked to the railings)	2
44	Feeling safe		
45	Atmosphere	Roundabout should be spot where we come together - lacks good vibes	
46	Care and maintenance		
47	Road Maintenance	Road surface repairs required (dangerous to cycle on, causes cars to swerve, e.g. near roundabout, last section of Merchiston Ave downhill on to Polwarth Gardens downhill)	12
48	Road Maintenance	Pavement potholes (bad for wheelchairs)	8
49	Road Maintenance	Apart from that the roadworks around the roundabout are very frequent, for example at the moment there are gas works with very deep digged holes in the ground that are also dangerous when walking with children	1
50	Litter & Dog Mess	Dumping of furniture/rubbish on pavements - obstacles for wheelchairs and prams. Fly-tipping at bin sites.	2
51	Vandalism	Broken windows, graffiti	1
52	General Comment		
53	Noise	Noise pollution from vehicles with modified exhaust/engine	1
54			
55			148

1	Sub theme	Which of these issues present the greatest risk to pavement users and cyclists?	Cou
2		Moving around	
3	Active Travel Rou	Lack of segregated cycle provision (cycle lanes and cycle boxes at junctions)	10
4	Behaviour Chang	Cars do not stop for pedestrians (eg at zebra crossing, at roundabout)	5
5	Behaviour Chang	Traffic doesn't signal	3
6	Behaviour	Driver behaviour towards pedestrians and cyclists:	3
7	Behaviour	Privileging of motorists over pedestrians and cyclists.	2
8	Behaviour Chang	Cyclists using pavements	2
9	Behaviour Chang	People not giving way to cyclists or overtaking when a cyclist is trying to turn right	1
10	Accessibility	Narrow pavements (e.g. Further east along Gilmore Place)	5
11		Traffic and parking	
12	Road Layout	Poor visibility splays/sight lines (e.g. not enough visibility when crossing the roundabout, Children cannot see or be seen past the bins at the bottom of Merchiston Ave so it's very dangerous for them to cross, Difficult to see cars coming from polwarth gardens when crossing road next to margiotta, poor visibility when crossing (on foot/by bike) a street, to/from Temple park crescent to/from Polwarth crescent, Crossing the round about/ Polwarth crescent safely with No line of sight for children / disabled users. Unclear line of sight and difficult to cross at merchiston ave onto granville terrace; On the crossing between the cafe & Margiotta's, parked vehicles generally obstruct sight of oncoming vehicles towards the roundabout)	31
13	Road Layout	Lack of safe separation between pedestrians, cyclists & vehicles causes accident risks.	1
14	Road Layout	not enough warning/signage to warn drivers that pedestrians crossing have right of way	1
15	Traffic/Congestio	Drivers in a rush due to congestion	12
16	Traffic/Congestio	and an increasing volume of heavy goods vehicles due to the construction of new built residential buildings nearby	1
17	Road Crossings	Not enough Road & Pedestrian Crossings (e.g. especially on TPC re: traffic speeds and erratic driving. It's hard to cross TPC generally including by Polwarth Tavern; on two arms of the roundabout; pavement users can struggle to cross the main road near Merchiston Avenue and Merchiston Avenue [this relates to the crossing of Granville Terrace near Piece Box]; crossing point between margiotta and the purple cafe; crossing Polwarth Gardens at Merchiston Ave)	31
18	Road Crossings	insufficient number of zebra crossings (e.g. across Gilmore Place [respondent may mean Granville Terrace], when crossing Polwarth Crescent near margiotta.	5
19	Road Crossings	In my opinion the Zebra crossing is too close to the roundabout. A car turning right onto Polwarth Gardens from Polwarth Crescent doesn't have a lot of time to adjust speed when they make the turn. If the crossing were further west on Polwarth Gardens, I feel it would be safer.	
19	Road Crossings	The simple alternative would be to just turn it into a T-junction with traffic lights and "green man" button...	1
20	Road Crossings	There is no lollipop person for the bottom of merchiston avenue and kids on the way to school at rush hour have to try to cross a 4 way junction with minimal visibility	1
21	Road Crossings	zebra crossing not well maintained	1
22	Speeding	Speed of traffic (e.g. approaching roundabout especially at corner outside Margiotta; pedestrians crossing from Margiotta to east side of Polwarth Crescent can't see traffic speeding round corner from Polwarth Gardens; traffic travelling too fast along P Gdns and through the roundabout in the direction from west to east; traffic, often fast, coming up yeaman to roundabout, left turn then right into merchiston ave; speeding through zebra crossing)	78
23	Speeding	Not enough traffic calming	1
24	Speeding	obstructive speed bumps	1
25	Speeding	and they often come at speed	
26	Parking	needs more delivery bays (e.g. by moving the communal bins away from the roundabout)	2
27	Parking	Little enforcement preventing bad parking and deliveries double parking.	1
28	Parking	Parked cars (sightlines and obstructing buses) & parked cars (using up public space)	1
29	Parking	Parked up areas. No green boundaries	1
30	Parking	Cars/lorries park near roundabout and block view when crossing outside the pharmacy.	1
31	Parking	Double parking	1
32	Parking	Prevent cars parking on a canal bridge, the road is so narrow, 2 cars cannot pass	1
33		Streets and spaces	
34	Street Furniture	Obstructive street furniture (e.g. at Tavern Pub on Polwarth Crescent where rubbish bin also limits vision.)	5
35		Feeling safe	
36	Lighting	Poor lighting at night,	1
37		Care and maintenance	
38	Road	Road surface repairs required	4
39	Road	Pavement potholes	2
40	Litter & Dog Mess	Dog dirt and stinking bins (e.g. Yeaman place is always very messy)	2
41		General Comment	
42	Other Comment	All of the options on the list 1-11 are important.	1
43	Other Comment	Pavement users	1
44	Other Comment	Falling	1
45	Other Comment	It's the combination of them all- a full set of lights at the intersection is only solution that would adequately address all issues.	1
46			
47			222

1	Postcode	Live within a 10min walk of roundabout	Frequency (Pavement user)	Frequency (Driver)	Frequency (Cyclist)	Adults in household	Children in household	Concern re: crossings (pavement users)	Concern re: provision for cyclist
5	Blank	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	2	0	3	3
6	Blank	Yes	never	never	once or twice a week	2	0	2	1
7	EH10 4DA	Yes	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	2	0	2	2
8	EH10 4EQ	Yes	never	never	once or twice a week	2	1	3	3
9	EH10 4HN	Yes	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	never	1	0	1	1
10	EH10 4HT	Yes	once or twice a week	never	every day	3	0	2	3
11	EH10 4JL	No	sometimes	sometimes	sometimes	2	2	3	3
12	EH10 4JL	Yes	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	3	0	2	2
13	EH10 4JQ	Yes	once or twice a week	every day	never	3	0	2	1
14	EH10 4JS	Yes	once or twice a week	every day	never	2	3	3	2
15	EH10 4JU	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	every day	4	0	3	3
16	EH10 4LD	Yes	once or twice a week	every day	never	1	3	3	2
17	EH10 4LN	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	never	2	2	3	1
18	EH10 4LW	Yes	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	2	0	3	3
19	EH10 4LW	Yes	once or twice a week	never	never	2	0	3	3
20	EH10 4LZ	Yes	once or twice a week	never	once or twice a week	2	0	3	3
21	EH10 4NG	Yes	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	2	2	1	3
22	EH10 4NT	Yes	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	3	0	3	3
23	EH10 4NZ	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	2	2	3	3
24	EH10 4NZ	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	2	2	3	2
25	EH10 4PA	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	never	1	1	3	2
26	EH10 4PA	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	every day	2	1	3	2
27	EH10 4PA	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	2	1	3	3
28	EH10 4PG	Yes	once or twice a week	never	never	3	1	2	2
29	EH10 4PG	Yes	once or twice a week	never	never	3	1	3	2
30	EH10 4PG	Yes	every day	every day	once or twice a week	3	1	3	2
31	EH10 4PH	Yes	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	never	2	0	3	3
32	EH10 4PH	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	never	2	0	3	3
33	EH10 4PJ	Yes	every day	every day	never	1	0	3	3
34	EH10 4PQ	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	2	2	3	3
35	EH10 4PQ	Yes	every day	never	once or twice a week	2	0	3	3
36	EH10 4QD	Yes	once or twice a week	never	never	2	0	3	1
37	EH10 5AJ	Yes	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	every day	3	0	3	3
38	EH10 5AR	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	every day	2	2	3	3
39	EH10 5BW	Yes	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	never	2	0	2	1
40	EH10 5DD	Yes	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	2	0	3	3
41	EH10 5ET	Yes	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	2	3	2	3
42	EH10 5HZ	Yes	once or twice a week	never	every day	1	0	3	3
43	EH10 5JX	Yes	once or twice a week	never	once or twice a week	2	0	3	3
44	EH10 4LN	Yes	never	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	1	0	2	2
45	EH10 4NF	Yes	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	2	2	3	3
46	EH10 4PH	Yes	every day	every day	never	2	0	3	3
47	EH10 4QZ	Yes	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	every day	2	1	3	3
48	EH10 5EH	No	never	once or twice a week	never	1	0	3	3
49	EH10 5ER	No	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	never	2	0	1	1
50	EH11 1BT	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	never	1	0	2	3
51	EH11 1BZ	Yes	every day	never	never	1	0	2	3
52	EH11 1DA	Yes	once or twice a week	never	once or twice a week	1	0	2	2
53	EH11 1DN	Yes	once or twice a week	never	once or twice a week	1	0	3	3

1	Postcode	Live within a 10min walk of roundabout	Frequency (Pavement user)	Frequency (Driver)	Frequency (Cyclist)	Adults in household	Children in household
54	EH11 1DY	Yes	once or twice a week	never	never	1	0
55	EH11 1EB	Yes	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	1	0
56	EH11 1ER	Yes	every day	never	every day	2	1
57	EH11 1FE	Yes	once or twice a week	never	never	1	0
58	EH11 1HA	Yes	every day	never	every day	2	0
59	EH11 1HN	Yes	every day	never	never	1	1
60	EH11 1HN	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	never	2	0
61	EH11 1HN	Yes	every day	never	never	1	0
62	EH11 1HN	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	every day	2	2
63	EH11 1HN	Yes	every day	never	once or twice a week	2	1
64	EH11 1HN	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	never	2	2
65	EH11 1HN	Yes	every day	every day	every day	2	2
66	EH11 1HN	Yes	every day	never	never	2	0
67	EH11 1HN	Yes	every day	never	never	2	0
68	EH11 1HP	Yes	every day	every day	once or twice a week	2	2
69	EH11 1HP	Yes	every day	every day	every day	4	2
70	EH11 1HR	Yes	every day	every day	once or twice a week	2	1
71	EH11 1HR	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	2	1
72	EH11 1HR	Yes	every day	every day	once or twice a week	2	2
73	EH11 1HR	Yes	every day	never	never	2	0
74	EH11 1HR	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	2	0
75	EH11 1HR	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	never	2	2
76	EH11 1HR	Yes	every day	every day	never	2	2
77	EH11 1HR	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	never	1	0
78	EH11 1HT	Yes	every day	never	never	2	0
79	EH11 1HT	Yes	every day	never	every day	2	0
80	EH11 1HU	Yes	every day	never	once or twice a week	1	0
81	EH11 1HW	Yes	every day	every day	never	2	0
82	EH11 1HW	Yes	every day	every day	never	2	0
83	EH11 1HX	Yes	every day	never	once or twice a week	2	0
84	EH11 1HY	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	2	2
85	EH11 1HY	Yes	every day	never	once or twice a week	2	0
86	EH11 1HZ	Yes	every day	never	every day	2	0
87	EH11 1HZ	Yes	every day	never	once or twice a week	2	0
88	EH11 1JB	Yes	every day	every day	never	2	1
89	EH11 1JD	Yes	every day	never	every day	2	1
90	EH11 1JD	Yes	every day	never	never	2	2
91	EH11 1JE	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	never	3	0
92	EH11 1JE	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	4	0
93	EH11 1JF	Yes	once or twice a week	never	once or twice a week	2	2
94	EH11 1JQ	Yes	every day	never	never	2	0
95	EH11 1JT	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	never	3	0
96	EH11 1JT	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	never	2	2
97	EH11 1JT	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	every day	3	0
98	EH11 1JU	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	never	2	2
99	EH11 1JX	Yes	every day	every day	never	2	1
100	EH11 1JX	Yes	every day	never	never	2	0
101	EH11 1JX	Yes	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	every day	2	0
102	EH11 1JY	Yes	every day	every day	once or twice a week	2	2

1	Postcode	Live within a 10min walk of roundabout	Frequency (Pavement user)	Frequency (Driver)	Frequency (Cyclist)	Adults in household	Children in household
103	EH11 1JY	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	2	0
104	EH11 1LA	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	2	2
105	EH11 1LB	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	2	1
106	EH11 1LB	Yes	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	6	0
107	EH11 1LB	Yes	once or twice a week	never	every day	6	0
108	EH11 1LB	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	every day	2	1
109	EH11 1LB	Yes	every day	never	once or twice a week	2	2
110	EH11 1LE	Yes	every day	never	once or twice a week	2	0
111	EH11 1LF	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	2	2
112	EH11 1LG	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	2	0
113	EH11 1LH	Yes	every day	never	never	2	3
114	EH11 1LJ	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	never	2	1
115	EH11 1LL	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	never	2	0
116	EH11 1LL	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	never	2	0
117	EH11 1LL	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	2	1
118	EH11 1LL	Yes	every day	never	every day	4	0
119	EH11 1LN	Yes	every day	every day	never	4	1
120	EH11 1LN	Yes	every day	every day	never	4	1
121	EH11 1LN	Yes	every day	never	never	1	0
122	EH11 1LN	Yes	every day	every day	never	4	1
123	EH11 1LN	Yes	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	never	1	0
124	EH11 1LN	Yes	once or twice a week	never	never	1	0
125	EH11 1LN	Yes	every day	every day	never	4	1
126	EH11 1LW	Yes	every day	every day	every day	2	1
127	EH11 1LW	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	never	2	0
128	EH11 1LW	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	3	0
129	EH11 1LY	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	never	2	2
130	EH11 1NR	Yes	once or twice a week	never	once or twice a week	2	0
131	EH11 1NS	Yes	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	2	0
132	EH11 1QL	Yes	never	never	once or twice a week	2	0
133	EH11 1RL	Yes	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	2	2
134	EH11 1RT	Yes	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	every day	2	2
135	EH11 1SE	Yes	every day	every day	never	2	0
136	EH11 1SG	Yes	once or twice a week	never	never	2	0
137	EH11 1TX	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	every day	3	1
138	EH11 2JP	Yes	once or twice a week	never	once or twice a week	2	0
139	EH11 1BZ	Yes	once or twice a week	never	never	1	0
140	EH11 1HN	Yes	every day	never	every day	2	1
141	EH11 1HR	Yes	every day	every day	never	2	0
142	EH11 1HU	Yes	every day	never	never	2	1
143	EH11 1HW	Yes	every day	never	never	1	0
144	EH11 1JT	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	never	2	0
145	EH11 1JX	Yes	every day	once or twice a week	every day	2	1
146	EH12	No	once or twice a week	never	once or twice a week	2	0
147	EH12 5XG	No	once or twice a week	never	once or twice a week	2	3
148	EH13 9BP	No	never	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	2	0
149	EH13 9PJ	No	once or twice a week	never	once or twice a week	2	2
150	EH14 1AP	No	never	never	once or twice a week	2	1
151	EH14 1AP	No	once or twice a week	never	once or twice a week	1	2

152	EH14 1NN	Yes	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	1	0
153	EH16 5LB	No	never	never	once or twice a week	5	0
154	EH3 9LF	Yes	once or twice a week	never	once or twice a week	2	0
155	EH3 9PF	Yes	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	never	2	2
156	EH3 9PL	Yes	once or twice a week	never	never	5	0
157	EH3 9PL	Yes	every day	every day	every day	4	2
158	EH3 9PL	Yes	every day	never	never	3	0
159	EH3 9PL	Yes	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	2	2
160	EH3 9PN	Yes	once or twice a week	every day	never	2	0
161	EH3 9QY	Yes	never	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	2	0
162	EH3 9PW	Yes	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	2	0
163	EH43 9HN	No	never	never	once or twice a week	2	0
164	EH49 6AA	No	once or twice a week	never	once or twice a week	1	0
165	EH6 7HP	No	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	once or twice a week	2	0
166	FK7 8DJ	No	every day	never	never	1	0
167						348	113

CITY MOBILITY PLAN POLICIES 2021-30: LINKS TO POLWARTH ROUNDABOUT PROPOSALS

This annex lists policies and commitments in the Council's 'City Mobility Plan' 2021 and in its 'Active Travel Action Plan' (draft 2023) and shows how the proposals in MCC's report fulfil them. All of MCC's proposals are consistent with CEC policy.

City Mobility Plan

Movement 14: enhance and where necessary expand the walking/ wheeling network to serve and connect key destinations across the city.

CMP says: the [active travel] network 'is especially valuable for local journeys where walking and wheeling should be the natural mode of choice'.

Movement 15: Expand and enhance the citywide network of cycle routes ...including increased segregated cycle infrastructure on main roads.

Movement 20: Protecting vulnerable road users. The CMP says it will 'prioritise resources to improve the safety of the most vulnerable people using our streets...'

Movement 21: Speed limit reductions: The CMP will explore speed limit reductions on all non-20mph within the Council boundary and work with Police Scotland to enforce speed limits.

Movement 22: Tackling inconsiderate parking: the CMP commits to using existing legislation to tackle issues associated with parked vehicles obstructing footways, crossing points, roads and junctions.

Movement 24: Safe and accessible paths and streets. The CMP commits to designing and maintaining paths and streets 'to maximise safety and accessibility for all needs and abilities.

Movement 26: Managing deliveries and servicing. The CMP commits to reducing the impact of delivery and servicing vehicles by, for example, access & timing restrictions.

Place 2: 20-minute neighbourhoods: the CMP will support this concept so as to reduce the need for longer distance journeys.

Place 4: Liveable Places. The Plan commits to creating more liveable places by managing motorised vehicle access and traffic in the city centre...and residential areas.

Place 7: Street design. The Council observes “We need to put the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users first when designing streets. While most streets will accommodate car use, we need to achieve a much better balance, one where the street environment positively influences driver behaviour and where other street uses, and other forms of travel, especially journeys by foot, wheel or bicycle are prioritised over speed of movement by car.”

A range of policies and actions in CEC’s **‘Active Travel Action Plan’** (ATAP) are also relevant to this report and our proposals fulfil many of them. The main ones are listed below and included in the following table, linking CEC initiatives and MCC’s proposals.

Action W1a: Install dropped kerbs and accompanying tactiles where kerbs are either missing or damaged

Action W2: Reduce road widths and kerb radii at side-road junctions, and raising pedestrian crossing points

Action W3: Improve the useability of pavements around the city

Action W4: Undertake dedicated programme of footway clutter rationalisation, focusing on pole and signage rationalisation

Action W5: Undertake a dedicated programme of guardrail removal

Action W8: Improve pedestrian crossing opportunities by replacing two-stage crossings with single stage OR if not possible, ensuring adequate space in the central island

Action W9: Identify suitable locations for and install new pedestrian crossing facilities

Action C7: Travelling Safely: improve facilities for cyclists at junctions

Cycle Parking: we will ‘Ensure some of the new racks are specifically for non-standard cycles. These might be used by people riding cargo bikes, trikes or other adapted bikes for example. We will look to install new cycle parking in line with the Edinburgh Street Design guidance, which means increasingly taking carriageway rather than footway space to install new racks where possible.’

‘We will continue our installation programme of secure cycle hangars, which provide safe, covered spaces for our residents to store bikes close to home.’

W13: Undertake public realm and placemaking improvements in all of our town and key local centres

W14: Widen footways at key pinch points in highest footfall areas

‘Where we make changes to the street layout, we’ll look to make the streets a more pleasant place to spend time in. As mentioned in the walking and wheeling chapter, this might mean for example introducing extra greenery to support our pledge to become a One Million Tree city.’

Action J15: Continue delivering the rolling minor improvements programme

Initiatives to help deliver safer and *liveable neighbourhoods* include ‘taking action to address ‘rat-running’ through residential areas via a prioritised ‘liveable neighbourhood’ programme. ‘Making it easier and more pleasant to travel actively for local trips is an essential component of delivering the

Council's 20-minute neighbourhood strategy. The ATAP reflects this by including projects to redesign our local high streets as places where we need to give more space and priority to people, and less to cars. In addition, it envisages a further roll-out of low-traffic 'liveable neighbourhoods' to help make our local streets better places to walk, wheel and cycle.

CMP POLICY	POLWARTH PROPOSAL	COMMENTS & LINKS TO ATAP
<p><i>Movement 14: enhance and where necessary expand the walking/ wheeling network... [which is] especially valuable for local journeys where walking and wheeling should be the natural mode of choice'.</i></p>	<p>MCC proposals 1,3,4 & 11 directly reflect M14's focus on walking & wheeling. Several other proposals – nos 2, 9 & 10 also play into this policy in that measures to restrain vehicular traffic, especially HGVs, will benefit all active travellers</p>	<p>ATAP commitments W1a, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 8 are all consistent with the MCC proposals. W8 & 9 are reflected perfectly in MCC proposals 3 & 4. Action W13 – placemaking – lies at the core of the MCC proposals, see especially no 1. W14 is also reflected in MCC proposal 1.</p>
<p><i>Movement 15: Expand and enhance the citywide network of cycle routes ...including increased segregated cycle infrastructure on main roads</i></p>	<p>MCC proposals do not create new cycle routes but aim to make existing roads at & near the roundabout safer for cyclists. See especially nos 2,6 & 11.</p>	<p>Action C7 is reflected in MCC proposal 2. ATAP proposals for cycle parking are mirrored at MCC proposal 6.</p>
<p><i>Movement 20: Protecting vulnerable road users</i> <i>The CMP says it will 'prioritise resources to improve the safety of the most vulnerable people using our streets....'</i></p>	<p>MCC proposal for a raised table, for colour & textural demarcation between pavement and carriageway, and for widened pavements are all made with vulnerable pavement users in mind.</p>	
<p><i>Movement 21: Speed limit reductions</i> <i>The CMP will explore speed limit reductions on all non-20mph within the Council boundary and work with Police Scotland to enforce speed limits.</i></p>	<p>MCC has provided evidence of significant breaches of the 20mph limit, especially along Polwarth Gardens and Merchiston Avenue. We are unclear what 'work with Police Scotland' means, in practice. The MCC proposal no 2 for a pinched junction at the south end of Polwarth</p>	<p>The MCC report notes widespread disregard for double yellow lines near the Polwarth</p>

<p><i>Movement 22: Tackling inconsiderate parking</i> the CMP commits to using existing legislation to tackle issues associated with parked vehicles obstructing footways, crossing points, roads and junctions.</p>	<p>Crescent will at a stroke remove scope for the double yellow line parking that bedevils the area near the roundabout and makes pavement crossings even more dangerous.</p>	<p>roundabout. Many instances of parking on the prohibited fringes of the zebra crossing have also been observed. Parking attendants do not appear exercised about the former; the latter is a matter for the Police.</p>
<p><i>Movement 26: Managing deliveries and servicing</i> The CMP commits to reducing the impact of delivery and servicing vehicles by, for example, access & timing restrictions.</p>	<p>MCC proposal 8 addresses the issue of delivery vehicles and loading bays to service the 'local centre'.</p>	
<p><i>Place 2: 20-minute neighbourhoods:</i> the CMP will support this concept so as to reduce the need for longer distance journeys.</p>	<p>The MCC report explains how the Polwarth roundabout is also the commercial heart of the Polwarth neighbourhood. To enable this to flourish, traffic needs to be better controlled and pavement users prioritised.</p>	
<p><i>Place 4: Liveable Places.</i> The Plan commits to creating more liveable places by managing motorised vehicle access and traffic in the city centre...and residential areas.</p>	<p>MCC proposal 9 (to reduce HGV rat-running) and 2 (to make north-south trips slower and less attractive to cut-through traffic) are directly focused on the need to enhance the liveability of the Polwarth neighbourhood.</p>	<p>The ATAP commitments to 'liveable neighbourhoods' include a proposal to address 'rat-running' through residential areas.</p>
<p><i>Place 7: Street design</i></p>	<p>MCC's proposals are built on the principles set out in Place 7. Our goal is to redesign the</p>	<p>ATAP Action J15 reinforces the need to prioritise 'liveable' neighbourhoods and to</p>

<p>“We need to put the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users first when designing streets. While most streets will accommodate car use, we need to achieve a much better balance, one where the street environment positively influences driver behaviour and where other street uses, and other forms of travel, especially journeys by foot, wheel or bicycle are prioritised over speed of movement by car.”</p>	<p>roundabout so as to put pavement users front and centre, and to prioritise public transport over private and commercial vehicles.</p>	<p>make it easier to be or become an active traveller for local trips.</p>
--	--	---

CEC BIN HUBS: MAP OF PROPOSED LOCATIONS IN POLWARTH

