

OBJECTIONS TO REDETERMINATION ORDER ROD-230-2 (COUNCIL REF RSO/18/05)
AND/OR TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER TRO-230-3 (COUNCIL REF TRO/17/91),
ROSEBURN TO HAYMARKET, EDINBURGH

Key to colours in the submissions below indicating the Reporter's preliminary allocation of objections to cases:

xxxxxx – objections relating to the Redetermination Order (eventually to be the subject of the Reporter's report to Scottish Ministers).

xxxxxx – objections relating to the TRO on loading and unloading provision at Roseburn Terrace, Murrayfield Place, Haymarket Terrace and/or Morrison Street (eventually to be the subject of the Reporter's report to the council).

xxxxxx – submissions objecting in both of the ways indicated by yellow and blue highlights.

xxxxxx – other submissions, including submissions objecting to elements of the TRO other than those in blue or green above (these will not be considered by the Reporter; that is because the council has approved the advertised TRO in part omitting the four areas specified in blue above).

Brian D Allingham

Sent: 26 April 2018 10:36
To: Traffic Orders
Subject: TRO/17/91

Categories: Purple Category

I would like to make the following comments on the proposals for the West to East cycle way in respect of the latest proposals affecting the section between Murrayfield and Haymarket :-

- 1 The existing bus bay in front of the Apex Hotel is very useful for bus-users. Removing this will mean buses stopping there (virtually all of them) will form a serious blockage on the roadway. There will also be a serious danger of conflict between bus-users (many laden with heavy luggage) and users of the cycle way.
- 2 Making Coates Gardens and Rosebery Crescent one way streets will divert a great deal of traffic into Magdala Crescent, as drivers are forced to use this route to avoid the long delays at the lights in Haymarket etc. Magdala Crescent, Eglinton Crescent and Douglas Crescent are not suitable for heavy traffic loads, but will become busy rat runs.
- 3 It appears that you intend to continue to allow parking outside Donaldson's Hospital on the bus lane. This is bound to cause accidents with cyclists using the cycle way as car passengers open their doors into the cycleway. In addition, this parking will mean that any break-down of a bus or whatever will reduce the lanes available to traffic to one. To make sense of the bus lane, no parking will have to be allowed in front of Donaldson's Hospital.
- 4 You have made no allowance for the large number of cars etc leaving Donaldson's Hospital. The developers estimated that only about 30 or 40 cars would be leaving the Hospital between 8 and 9 am, but this estimate was deeply flawed and the likely departure rate at this time will be around 90 or 100 cars. With the additional flow of bikes in both directions on that side of Haymarket Terrace, driving out of the Hospital will become a dangerous and inevitably fractious event. The only solution is to provide a traffic light (perhaps operational only on demand and at rush hour).
- 5 The hopelessly inadequate "Statement of Reasons" provided does not seem to cover any of these matters.
- 6 It is not too late to abandon this ridiculous cycleway, which is clearly designed to satisfy only the cycling community. There is no guarantee that the cycleway will lead to any substantial increase in the use of cycles and, as designed, it will probably lead to an increase in the number of accidents involving cyclists and friction between cyclists and pedestrians. There are many more important uses for the money which will be spent on this cycleway.

Brian D Allingham
9 Magdala Crescent
Edinburgh EH12 5BE

Tel [REDACTED]

e-mail : brian.allingham@hotmail.com

Ann Anderson

Sent: 10 May 2018 18:13
To: Traffic Orders
Cc: Gillian Gloyer; Scott Douglas; Frank Ross; helen barbour
Subject: TRO - 17/91 & RSO18/05

Categories: Purple Category

Dear Sir/Madam

I still strongly object to the proposed cycle track which I do not think will encourage new inexperienced cyclists, due to the density of the traffic on the proposed route. You previously also received objections from residents and the Community Council which have been ignored. Inexperienced cyclists will be much safer on the existing route from Russell Road, adjacent to the tram track to Haymarket, and will not be subjected to the same levels of pollution.

It appears that you are taking a sledge hammer to crack a nut.

I have concerns about the increased traffic flow in Murrayfield Avenue when the slip road is closed, which currently allows a left turn into Roseburn Terrace. This will also impact on Henderland Road which is always very busy at St George's school start/end times, as cars will not want to be stuck in Murrayfield Place trying to enter or exit Murrayfield Avenue.

I am at a complete loss to understand why you cannot test this by temporarily closing the slip road and having a temporary bus stop at the proposed new site, to gauge the traffic flow at peak times and the ease, safety and time taken for cars to be able to enter Roseburn Terrace from Murrayfield Avenue.

Furthermore, there is an existing problem caused by traffic trying to turn at the Murrayfield bar end of Roseburn terrace, into Roseburn Street - are you thinking of stopping the traffic going westwards more frequently, as the current filter either does not allow sufficient vehicles to turn or is not always in use?

You may not be aware of the illegal turning right into Roseburn Gardens of vehicles cutting in front of the crossing island, which has already resulted in narrow misses of the vehicles trying to turn left onto the main road, a practice which I am pleased will be discontinued. The impact on the safety of cyclists would be even greater than that of crashed vehicles.

Yours faithfully,

Ann Anderson, 22 Coltbridge Terrace, Edinburgh, EH12 6AE.

Helen Barbour <

Sent: 17 May 2018 21:33
To: Traffic Orders
Subject: TRO 17/91

I am a pedestrian, leisure cyclist, motorist and regular bus user. I object to the proposal by CEC of the CCWEL from Roseburn Gardens to Haymarket.

I do not believe this is the best option to encourage people into cycling. It is the main road into Edinburgh from the west. Airport traffic as well as the new housing development in the same area will increase traffic flow making the section at Roseburn Terrace busy to the point of dangerous from fumes and the width of the road and cycle track both being very narrow. I think the proposal will also impact the flow of buses and the passengers thereon.

I am pleased that there will be new pedestrian crossings particularly at the east end of Roseburn Terrace however I am keen to know how long I shall have to wait to cross given the proposed new traffic light sequence

I am concerned about the reduction of parking spaces as a resident who struggles to find a parking space at present the proposed withdrawal of parking spaces will exacerbate the already very trying situation for residents and for short term spaces for people wishing to shop in the area this passing trade being vital to local traders and also those less mobile need to have easy access to shops and services on Roseburn Terrace.

The proposed new junction at Murrayfield Avenue will increase the amount of queuing traffic waiting to access Roseburn Terrace - it is proven that idling traffic produces more harmful emissions and it is busiest when children are coming and going to and from school

I believe that cyclists would be better served by option B as a safer and more pleasant experience

Helen Barbour
24/3 Roseburn Terrace
Edinburgh
EH12 6AW

Mr J D Berry

HANDWRITTEN OBJECTION TRANSCRIBED INTO TYPESCRIPT

Mr J D Berry
252 Morrison Street
Haymarket
Edinburgh
EH3 8DT

28/4/18

I wish to complain in the strongest possible terms about the TRO and RSO that seek to rearrange Morrison Street.

The plan to take half of our loading bay on Morrison Street and transform it into a taxi rank is wholly unacceptable. The loading bay has to serve West Maitland Street as well as Morrison Street. Furthermore making a loading bay across the road is totally impracticable, because it is not only difficult to cross with heavy deliveries but it is also dangerous.

I live and work in Morrison Street we already suffer greatly from noise nuisance caused by the "Jolly Botanist Public House".

Therefore I do not want further noise nuisance from a taxi rank which is not really necessary.

I feel that outside "Ryries Public House" there is room to make a taxi rank for 3 vehicles quite easily.

Yours faithfully

Michael Dawson <

Sent: 08 May 2018 10:22
To: Traffic Orders
Subject: Objection to Orders: TRO17/91 & RSO 18/05

Categories: Purple Category

The Orders Numbered: TRO - 17/91 & RSO 18/05

I have studied these orders carefully and determined that the Redetermination Order for the layout of pavements, roads & cycle path at Haymarket Terrace and the Traffic Regulation Order proposals for road closures and the one-way designation around Haymarket Terrace have been created to the detriment and care of pedestrians at the Magdala Crescent/Haymarket Terrace junction, at the expense of safety the health and well-being of local residents and blatantly poor consequential planning.

Haymarket Terrace is an 'A' Class road, whereas Magdala Crescent & Eglinton Crescent, Glencairn Crescent & Coates Gardens are officially classed as 'C' roads. None of these residential roads were created and laid to cope with the weight and volume of traffic they have had to endure in recent months; nor are they suitable for the consequential use as currently proposed within TRO 17/91 & RSO 18/05

Magdala Crescent is a Grade B Listed Terrace and benefits a mix of public, residential permits and City Car Club - parking on both sides. The remaining carriageway of 6.32 (approx.) metres approx. width is given over to traffic. Coates Gardens has residential, public and loading bays on both sides with the remaining carriageway of 8.22 metres (approx.) width given over to traffic.

Yet the proposal is the southern end of Magdala will be two-way traffic; and Coates under your proposals will be one way through traffic onto Haymarket Terrace. **This is unimaginative and illogical planning!**

However all that being said, the current diversion for east-bound traffic (via Magdala & Eglinton) and for west-bound traffic (via Glencairn & Coates) is actually flowing really rather well, but we are all fully aware of the damage that has and is continuing to be done to the road surfaces of these streets. This has largely been caused by the buses and other heavy commercial traffic going eastwards.

The current proposal for southern Magdala of being two way to and from the Haymarket Terrace junction is not best practice, nor safe, as vehicles travelling southwards on Magdala would at the junction with Haymarket Terrace have to contend with, firstly, a pedestrian crossing point, then a two way cycle lane, then entering or crossing an east moving traffic lane, or alternatively, then crossing into west moving traffic and then possibly have to dramatically stop as a preceding vehicle waits to move over east-bound traffic into Donaldsons!

The noise level and pollution in Magdala diversion is unacceptable. At certain times of the day, the front door to No. 7 Magdala can be felt and heard to vibrate. The dust and dirt endured for weeks by myself and some other residents has caused gritty and itchy eyes, as well as bouts of coughing. Personally it has been a thoroughly unpleasant experience. I have stopped using contact lenses; had to buy eye drops and increased my usage of an inhaler.

There is another way! It is a simple, but a radical rethink to proposed TRO and RSO. It will still allow the cycle lane to go ahead, but with a possible technical tweak here and there.

Magdala to be one way - northwards only, from Haymarket Terrace to junction with Eglinton, thereafter two-way to Douglas Crescent, or to the junction of Coates/Eglinton

The actual crescent (of Eglinton to be one way - eastwards

Glencairn to the one way westwards

Coates to be two way, but with a ONE-WAY EXIT ONLY southwards on to Haymarket Terrace i.e.

No entry from Haymarket Terrace.

Buses and heavy commercial vehicles restricted from accessing onto Magdala Crescent at the Haymarket Terrace junction.

A well lit Zebra crossing to be in place at the foot of Magdala at the Haymarket Terrace junction; not simply a pedestrian crossing point.

Michael Dawson

7/2 Magdala Crescent

Edinburgh EH12 5BE



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Donaldson Area Amenity Association (through Michael Stevens)

Sent: 17 May 2018 13:51

To: Traffic Orders

Subject: TRO/17/91 City centre west to east cycle link and street improvements plan proposed order

Categories: Purple Category

TRO/17/91 City centre west to east cycle link and street improvements plan proposed order

This reply is submitted on behalf of the Donaldson Area Amenity Association (DAAA), the residents association for the area to the south of the A8 from Devon Place to Balbirnie Place.

General Comments

When the scheme was originally proposed, it proved unpopular with the vast majority of our residents. While the efforts made by the City Council to engage with the community over their concerns are to be welcomed, the views of the residents nonetheless remain similarly resistant to these major changes to the congested roads in our area. Major concerns are a lack of short term customer parking for the shops in Roseburn, the difficulties that will be encountered by pedestrians in crossing the roads between the shops and the traffic that will build up throughout the area as a consequence of removal of lanes for motor traffic. While it has been pointed out that there is to be alternative (and less) short term parking in the surrounding area and an increase in signalled crossings, the practical reality is that these are largely inadequate solutions to a problem that is being created.

The DAAA therefore wishes to restate formally our opposition to the major CCWEL changes proposed for our area. We do recognise however that the City Council is extremely unlikely to change its mind on this issue at this stage, and on that basis we wish to engage constructively with the City Council on the details of the plans for our area. This reply does not address the wider "public realm" improvements to Roseburn that are currently the subject of separate discussions with Council officials; those proposals are to be welcomed, notwithstanding those improvements being conditional on the CCWEL changes being implemented.

Specific Comments

We have focused our detailed comments on two issues of particular concern.

1. The lack of availability of short term parking spaces for the shops at Roseburn remains a major concern. A significant amount of existing trade comes from drivers stopping for a few minutes outside the shops to buy a paper, drink or a light snack. It has previously been suggested that the restriction of spaces will stop local residents making unnecessary short drives to the shops, but this is a solution to a problem that does not exist. Most drivers are actually passing through the area, and not local residents, so making this essential passing trade more difficult will have a significant impact on the shop owners. A better solution needs to be found.

2. Residents in our area have recently learned that the pavement at the north western corner of Stanhope Street is to be a "shared area" with cyclists; this is not shown on the TRO but included in the associated SOR. The Council will wish to be aware that the majority of our residents are older people who are alarmed at the prospect of having cyclists in such close proximity. Further, there is a major concern that the tightening of the turn into Stanhope Street on the north eastern corner will mean that large vehicles coming in from the east will either cut the corner or be forced to stray into the western lane. This is a major concern for an area that anticipates an increase in heavy traffic due to the planned redevelopment of Osborne House.

These issues arise solely as a consequence of dedicated cycle lanes of just a few metres in length being introduced at the top of Stanhope Street. Unlike the other major changes proposed under the CCWEL these changes are being introduced exclusively for the apparent benefit for the few cyclists resident in the DAAA area (since the road does not lead anywhere else). Further, as was advised last year when the City Council proposed removal of egress from Stanhope Street to accommodate these changes, these proposals were not considered necessary by the City Council in their earlier designs and were included solely on the basis of informal discussions with two members of the DAAA and Murrayfield CC, who were co-incidentally both cyclists. We recognise that the City Council acted in good faith by assuming that they were representing the views of those organisations but, as has been subsequently clarified by both bodies, they did not. To be clear the DAAA did not request, and does not support, these changes to Stanhope Street.

The DAAA counts in its members the majority of households in the area using the Stanhope Street and Devon Place junctions, so legitimately speaks for the residents (we do not charge membership to those in the sheltered housing in Sutherland Street, although for obvious reasons they do not cycle). Having taken the views of our members, we can advise that they are strongly of the view that we should not have cycle lanes in Stanhope Street introduced solely for our benefit. Rather, our aging residents wish to have the current arrangement where the junction is devoted to road users (including cyclists) and pedestrians, each with their own exclusive areas.

We can see no reason why, given the flawed basis for these changes being proposed and the fact that these changes will impact solely on the local residents, that the clear views of the residents on what is best for our community should not be accepted. If they are not, it would be helpful to know in whose interests the City Council is imposing these changes. We would stress that this specific issue has

absolutely no impact on any cyclists other than those that are our residents and has no other consequences for the wider plans for cycle lanes. The DAAA would be happy to work with the City Council officials to revisit the design of this junction.

Yours sincerely

Michael Stevens CB

7 Pembroke Place

Edinburgh

EH12 5HX

Elizabeth East

I wish to make comment on the above TROs.

- a) The cycle track in many places necessitates pedestrians crossing over it. We know from experience that cyclists do not give way to pedestrians. The area to the south of the main road, Stanhope Street, Sutherland Street, West Catherine area has many elderly people, particularly living in the sheltered housing. These people rely on public transport and will have to cross the road, cross the cycle track twice to get to the bus stop on the North side of the main road.
- b) The entrance to Stanhope Street appears to be going to be made narrower to allow for cyclists. The number of cyclists coming from this area is negligible and really does not require all this extra work to be carried out. It is predominantly a car area feeding the commercial area at the end of Devon Place and priority therefore should be for car access.
- c) Inadequate consideration has been given to the delivery and parking at shops in both the Haymarket and Roseburn areas. These shopping areas are extremely important to the local community and to people travelling to and from Edinburgh. Many of the little cafes rely on customers being able to stop on their way to work. In addition those living in the Kew Terrace area rely on transport being able to stop in the main road outside their houses for deliveries, having no other access to their properties. This will be removed and no-one will be able to stop.
- d) There does not appear to be any room for buses to pull off the main lane to stop. We understand that it is presumed the buses will stop and hold up the traffic to allow people on and off. This is a tourist area, with many guests houses and during the holiday seasons is a busy area for bus users. Buses come in twos and threes and to hold up the whole traffic seems non-sensical.
- e) The scheme is being pushed forward before the impact of the flats and houses have been completed in Donaldsons and an assessment made of the traffic that will ensue from this development. In addition the Haymarket coalyard scheme has also not been completed. To make these major changes to the main Glasgow to Edinburgh road before all the additional traffic has been assessed seems irresponsible. The scheme is for a minority and to use a major arterial road to carry cyclists is extraordinary. The Council should be promoting the use of public transport and this scheme will only cause more traffic congestion, an increase in fumes while traffic sits and waits and will be a danger to both pedestrians and motorists.

It was disappointing that despite 6,000 objections, the Council has pursued this scheme and not used the cycle route, they themselves built beside the tramway.

Regards

Elizabeth East

5 Stanhope Place

Edinburgh EH12 5HH

Please note my new email address is [REDACTED]

Alistair Easton

Sent: 19 April 2018 17:41
To: Traffic Orders
Subject: TRO - 17/91 RSO 18/05

Categories: Purple Category

I write to object to the design of the proposed cycle track between Roseburn and the east end of Haymarket Terrace.

I have many concerns about this project and its impact on pedestrians, road traffic and businesses but I wish to concentrate my response to my two main area of concern, these being the safety of the various junctions along the route – i.e. Wester Coates, Wester Coates Road, Magdala Crescent, and Coates Gardens – and the safety of the islands bus stops.

Taking the second first, I believe that marooning the bus stops on islands between the road and the cycle track is dangerous. This is particularly so for groups involving children who will no doubt have been taught to keep off the road, but will not expect cyclists to be travelling at speed between them and the pavement.

As to the junctions, I feel that they are going to cause nothing but confusion as it appears that cyclists on the cycle track will have priority over cars entering or leaving the side streets.

For vehicles entering Wester Coates, Wester Coates Road, and Magdala Crescent, there is only a very limited space to stop at the edge of the cycle track and long vehicles, stopped by cyclists, will stick back out onto the main road. Strangers to the area will also not expect to hit a junction so soon after turning off the main road unless the main road is festooned with explanatory warning signs.

For vehicles leaving the side streets, the gap between the cycle track and the main road is so short (and does not appear to exist at all at Coates Gardens) that, when waiting to join the main road (and it can be a long wait at times) many vehicles will block the cycle track causing confusion when cycles then try to weave their way through queuing traffic further up the side road where they will presumably have no right of way.

I cannot believe that any safety conscious roads engineer would countenance effectively having traffic leaving a side road having to cope with two closely spaced junctions at both of which it seems the road traffic has to give way or having traffic leaving a main road immediately having to cope with another junction at which they have to give way.

The least worst solution to the junction issue is to give cars on the side roads priority over cycles, although, given the contempt many Edinburgh cyclists hold for road traffic regulations, this will still be far from ideal. As to the bus stops issue, a strict 3 mph speed limit on cyclists passing the bus stops, with speed bumps to encourage compliance, would seem to be one answer, if only a partial one.

I fear that these problems just demonstrate the ludicrous nature of the proposal to run the cycle track along the main road rather than following the National Cycle Network route through Haymarket Yards and then following Russell Road and Roseburn place.

Alistair Easton

6(2F) Glencairn Crescent, EH12 5BS

Michael Findlay

Sent: 18 May 2018 11:36
To: Traffic Orders
Subject: Order Number: TRO/17/91; RSO/18/05

Categories: Purple Category

Michael Findlay
15 Craigmount Terrace
Edinburgh
EH12 8BN

Order Number: TRO/17/91; RSO/18/05

While I appreciate the changes that are being suggested to improve cycle access around Roseburn the overall idea seems flawed. As a cyclist (I cycle through this area 6 times a week) and occasional motorist; trying to squeeze cars out of a congested area to make more space for cyclists just isn't the solution.

A number of points:

- There's only limited space and just because you add in cycle lanes it won't reduce the number of motorists. It just adds to congestion.
- Removing the bus stop from this area is a great idea, it's often the stopping and starting of buses that causes the delay.
- One way streets to stop rat-runs are just infuriating. Design a proper road network instead of blocking people from getting to where they want to.
- Improve the overall surface of the road. There's several large drops around drains in this area which makes cycling through here already more difficult.
- Car parking has to be provided very close to shops otherwise people will just go to a supermarket or out of town mall where there's ample parking. You see people using disabled/child spaces in supermarkets as they are too lazy to park in their standard parking area and walk. I'm not condoning or encouraging them, but making them walk from different streets and cross the road will just stop them using these local shops.

Kind regards,
Michael

Harvey D Frew

Sent: 27 April 2018 15:08
To: Traffic Orders
Subject: CCWEL

Categories: Purple Category

From: Harvey D. Frew, 23A Coates Gardens, Edinburgh EH12 5LG.

Order number: TRO-17/19 RSO 18/05

It would appear that the City of Edinburgh Council are proceeding with the construction of the proposed cycle track despite overwhelming opposition from local residents and businesses.

I submitted a list of comments and objections in November 2015 during the previous consultation period but did not receive a response. I also had an exchange of e-mails with Councillor Aldridge in his capacity as a member of the Transport Working Committee. He stated that if the cycle track was not a success it could possibly be removed or modified although he refused to be drawn on the criteria for this to happen.

One of my concerns regarding the proposals as presented at the drop-in session on 19th April was the removal of the bus lay-by at Magdala Crescent and the repositioning of the bus stop within the sight line of traffic emerging from the junction and the danger that this would present.

The removal of vehicular access from Haymarket Terrace to Coates Gardens and Rosebery Crescent is unnecessary. As well as a reduction in amenity for local residents the loading bays at the south end of both these streets are, without a degree of local knowledge, inaccessible for deliveries to the premises on Haymarket Terrace. I am pleased to note, however, that Coates Gardens and Rosebery Crescent are to remain two-way.

I reiterate my point regarding the continual referral to the proposals as "improvements" as this surely prejudices the consultation process.

Harvey
D. Frew

e-
mail.....

mobile.....

Tran Le Giang

Sent: 27 April 2018 12:05
To: Traffic Orders
Subject: Re: Proposed Haymarket/ Roseburn Cyclepath
Categories: Purple Category

Hi Andrew.
My apologies forgot to add.
Postal address details: 28 Haymarket Terrace
Thank you

On Thu, Apr 26, 2018 at 1:52 PM, Traffic Orders <TrafficOrders@edinburgh.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Sir/Madam,

In order that I can record you objection to the proposals,
please could you advise me of your postal address.

Regards

Andrew D Young

Traffic Orders Administration Officer
Place
Planning and Transport

City Chambers, Room 10.19
Edinburgh, EH1 1YJ

Tel 0131 469 3122

From: Tran Le Giang [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 April 2018 12:25

To: Traffic Orders <TrafficOrders@edinburgh.gov.uk>
Subject: Proposed Haymarket/ Roseburn Cyclepath Good day.

Some of our concerns:

The trams works, current roadworks have both had a detrimental effect on business. Now you propose narrowing the foot path and placing a cycle path on a busy pedestrian thoroughfare.

Plans illustrate narrowing of pavements. (The opposite of what has occurred on Princes Street)

There is a lot of foot traffic on Haymarket terrace due to the offices and hotels in the area, narrowing the pavements with bikes whizzing by seems to be an accident waiting to happen. (Bikes travel faster than cars in the 20mph areas)

It is very difficult for us to receive or pickup goods as limited parking bays are always occupied. Also, we do not have special equipment for carting heavy items.

Elimination of pavement signage? We need all the marketing help we can get and to ban pavement signs will make it all the more difficult to survive.

It appears that whoever planned and accepted this project do not have to run a business in Haymarket.

I do hope you can resolve our concerns.

Thank you.

Best Wishes

Le Giang

David and Janet Glasby <

Sent: 18 May 2018 16:10
To: Traffic Orders
Cc: David and Janet Glasby
Subject: TRO/17/91 City Centre west to east cycle link and street improvements plan comment

Categories: Purple Category

I write in connection with the proposed 'improvements' to traffic in Roseburn Terrace.

First, I do not agree with the title 'Improvement' since there is little if any evidence that for the majority of road users it will improve things; it is more likely to deteriorate things. At least you should call it an 'Alteration' plan. Your picture is also misleading; it shows more cyclists than are typically present, no buses at all, and no delivery vehicles. All these are present almost all the time.

Second, while it may improve matters for cyclists, there are better options. The cycle track over the bridge along the former railway line terminates just shy of the main railway line, but it is significantly higher than street level. If the path were sloped downwards as soon as it is to the south of the bridge, then cyclists and walkers would not need to ascend a slope. Moreover, there could then be a route towards Haymarket, readily accessible to users of the former railway as well as those entering via Roseburn Park. Roseburn Park itself represents an elegant solution to how to improve access for cyclists as it takes them away from other traffic, through a pleasant park, and thence to the access I have just described. It would also link with the various existing cycle/walkways and with Russell Road. So my view is that creating a cycle lane through the very congested Roseburn Terrace is not even a good solution for cyclists. For all other users of Roseburn Terrace, it represents a marked deterioration.

My main objections

- There are three double decker buses every ten minutes, as well as various other less frequent buses. The three, the 26 (2 of) and the 31, are typically half to 2/3 full even at off-peak times. This means that at least 150 bus users every ten minutes will have their journey delayed, by a significant period, since there will be no bus lane to enable them to progress rapidly through Roseburn Terrace. This means inconvenience to a large number of passengers, just so that a small number of cyclists can get through more quickly.
- Roseburn Terrace has numerous businesses which are frequented by many customers. They depend upon delivery vehicles for their stock. Delivery drivers are under pressure as never before to deliver without delay and get to the next drop off point. They simply do not have time to park as a distance, walk along the terrace, and then walk back again.
- Disabled access to these businesses is at present possible at off-peak times. Under your proposals, those with disability will find it considerably more difficult to access businesses. Are you to sacrifice the needs of those with disability so that able-bodies and fit cyclists can move more easily? Your priorities are all wrong here.
- For these reasons I wish you to withdraw your proposals, leave Roseburn Terrace as it is, and look at other options for cyclists such as I have suggested above.

- As a tail piece, there is a cycle rack at Haymarket Station that accommodates about 60 cycles, which is one third of the number of bus passengers every ten minutes. Are we to suppose that there will be many more such racks to accommodate all the new cyclists you envisage using this route? If so, where are they to be located? Each one is about the size of a bus!

Yours sincerely

David & Janet Glasby

'Orana'

81 Craigcrook

Avenue

Edinburgh EH4

3PS e:



Tim Glasby

Sent: 18 May 2018 15:34
To: Traffic Orders
Cc: Tim Glasby
Subject: TRO/17/91 City centre west to east cycle link and street improvement comment

To whom it may concern,

Having attended the recent open day at the former Florists shop in Roseburn, I wish to notify you that I wholeheartedly disagreed with this proposed development. I am dismayed at the manner in which this consultation has been carried out and the way the desire to introduce a segregated cycle track through the bottleneck that is Roseburn Terrace has been steamrolled through because it is politically expedient, in spite of significant legitimate objections from right across the community. To make it clear, I have no objection to cyclists or cycling, and prior to becoming disabled used to cycle myself, including through central London which, at that time, was no mean feat. However, to introduce a dedicated cycle lane at the bottleneck that is Roseburn Terrace is completely unnecessary. There are alternative routes into the city centre for cyclists, some of them off-road completely, that avoid this particular bottleneck. If I were still able to cycle, I would far prefer to cycle through Roseburn Park, along the tram route that is the existing National Cycle Route 1, along the many miles of dedicated cycle tracks and footpaths. By proceeding with these revised plans, not only will you significantly increase traffic congestion, but continue to negatively impact the local businesses in the area and the living environment for local residents.

1. The impact on businesses on Roseburn Terrace by these proposals is significant. The removal of most of the existing loading and unloading facilities makes it impossible for these businesses to receive and deliver goods. For example, how can a television repair shop have customers carrying large televisions hundreds of metres to access the shop? How can an art gallery have large pieces of glass or wood delivered? How can a disabled or visually impaired patient access the optometry practice, the hairdressers, safely? The distance from the nearest loading/blue badge spaces is significant. Even for someone to be dropped off to attend appointments at the dentist, optician, hairdressers, all crucial medical & personal services, the nearest 'drop-off/loading space' is a significant walk away particularly for people with mobility difficulties or the wheelchair bound, in spite of your plan to widen the pavements. This will have a significant negative impact on the viability of these small businesses working in a close community area. You risk killing this business community by these proposals; how can a business receive goods, or have disabled and elderly patients attend an optometry or dental practice easily under these proposals? **Answer: they can't.**

2. Residents on Roseburn Terrace will likewise be negatively affected; how can they arrange for deliveries of say larger pieces of furniture to their homes or removal vans given the permitted loading is a significant distance away from the properties above the optometrist at 13 Roseburn Terrace, hairdressers (x2), estate agent, pub etc. There are significantly more local businesses operating in Roseburn than in the nearby Blackhall, yet Blackhall has a greater number of assigned parking spaces on the Queensferry Road than the zero spaces that exist in Roseburn Terrace, despite this being an equivalent width of road. **This is inconsistent and unfair.**

3. There needs to be wholesale rethinking of the necessity to have a cycle lane in Roseburn Terrace. Instead, the 2 lanes for both city bound and airport bound traffic needs to be maintained, along with the loading areas right along Roseburn Terrace, to allow the disabled, vulnerable and elderly to access the essential services that the local businesses in Roseburn Terrace currently provide; the dentist, the hairdresser, the optician etc.

1

I would therefore ask that you formally lodge my opposition of this proposal and use such funding that has already been set aside for this to further support other more essential services rather than pander to the interests of a small minority of Edinburgh residents as cyclists. **These proposals impact the elderly and disabled most severely** – from the perspective of the Equality Act 2010, these proposals negatively impact the vulnerable and needy, in order to enhance the lifestyles of the fit and able (cyclists).

Yours sincerely

T. Glasby
11/2 Murrayfield Road
Edinburgh EH12 6EW

Tim Glasby

t:



Peter Gregson

Sent: 14 May 2018 23:28
To: Traffic Orders
Cc: Scott Douglas; Gillian Gloyer
Subject: TRO/17/91 and RSO/18/05- Concerns at Roseburn
Categories: Purple Category

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write with my objections to this TRO. My principal objection is to the cycle track running along Roseburn Terrace, when cyclists (myself included) prefer to travel along Roseburn Place. However, the Council was unwilling to listen to objections last year and presumably will not consider them now.

With the present design in mind, I have these particular objections I want to lodge.

1. The proposal to reduce parking at Murrayfield Place by 35% makes no sense. We are already going to lose 40% of the parking and loading at Roseburn Terrace because of the track itself; the next place shoppers with cars will head for is Murrayfield Place, it being the closest. The Council wants to "Rejuvenate Roseburn" but removing the parking that supports the traders is not the way. I have spoken to many traders who have stated they will have to move if there's a drop in sales. There are too many Edinburgh streets with empty shops. Rather than rejuvenating the area, the proposals are more likely to create a wasteland of vacant shop units. Please don't throttle our local shops – the locals (mostly elderly- the census shows we have 50% more older people than the city average) need them. There are ways to carry our environmental improvements at Murrayfield Place that do not necessitate reducing parking there. Please leave the parking/loading arrangements the way they are at present. One of the residents who walks through here every day thinks that the parking actually slows the cars down, making it a quieter street. Furthermore, parking at Murrayfield Place should be for a one-hour, rather than a two-hour limit, which will allow more drivers to make use of the spaces here.
2. The removal of parking at the south-western corner of Murrayfield Avenue, where it meets Corstorphine Road, is unnecessary. Residents need these spaces. The kerb build-out serves only to narrow the mouth of Murrayfield Avenue and reduce the size of the central island for pedestrians, an important oasis for those crossing the Avenue at this point.

3. Removing the island in the middle of Roseburn Terrace (at the top of Roseburn Gardens) will make this crossing more dangerous for the elderly people and children who cross here. It will also lead to greater delays for traffic, since vehicles must be stopped in both directions at the same time, thereby leading to more stoppages to get the same number of people across on foot. The reduction in road width from 4 lanes to 3 will only slow westbound traffic, creating more congestion in the Roseburn Terrace “canyon”.

4. The proposal to build up the kerbing at the entrance to Roseburn Park at Roseburn Place to provide a dedicated entrance for cyclists at H4 and J4 is ugly and unnecessary. The existing white line and keep clear notice is perfectly adequate for the many cyclists who enter and leave the park here – and I have never seen cars parked on it. I’ve been told by Council officers that the build-out is necessary for cycling safety but as a cyclist who travels through this entrance twice a day- and as someone who lived at the house here for 13 years - I can say that this stretch of Roseburn gets very little traffic- perhaps one car every 10 minutes, which travel slowly, because of the speed humps. The proposals will make cycling in and out of the park messier and slower for cyclists – who are more than likely to take a short cut across the pavement. Furthermore, due to its length, the kerbing will remove much-needed parking – important for both residents and traders. These are parking spaces that do not need to vanish. Once the cycle track is built, every single space in Roseburn will be key to allowing those driving to the Roseburn shops and cafes to trade. There is a need not to exacerbate the parking problem - if this were a busy stretch of road I would see the point, but there is just no need for this ugly and pointless kerbing.

5. The dedicated cycle track at the top of Roseburn Gardens is similarly over-engineered and far bigger than it needs to be. Whilst the principal of a “cycling gate” is clearly important here, the Council can copy the design used at the western end of Rankeillor Street for an example where the same can be achieved with a much smaller gate for cyclists only. Finally, by reducing the length of this stretch of cycle track in Roseburn Gardens, at least one more parking space could be provided.

6. The CCEWL design also does not make it clear that those driving west along Roseburn Terrace will be allowed to turn left down Roseburn Gardens. This was an arrangement promised to traders to encourage shoppers, travelling west, who were unable to stop in Roseburn Terrace, to make use of the loading bays on Roseburn Gardens. The blue one-way signs (with the bicycle) give the impression that cars would not be allowed to turn left down here.

7. The junction of Roseburn Street, Russell Road and Roseburn Terrace could be better served by a set of traffic lights here, as we used to have. This would be more effective than the proposed messy re-routing to give cars from Russell Road priority. The delay to cars travelling along Roseburn Street is likely to be significant, leading to greater pollution. Also the addition of a blister pavement on the west side of Roseburn Street will lead to a further reduction in parking – parking that we can ill afford to lose.

8. The City Car Club spaces on Russell Road should be moved into the enclosed public parking spaces by the Maltings. This would free up these spaces nearer Tesco for Roseburn shoppers.

I hope you will give my objections your thoughtful consideration and amend the design accordingly.

Yours faithfully,

Peter Gregson
27 Riversdale Grove
Edinburgh
EH12 5QS

Judith and Chris Hardie

Sent: 28 April 2018 07:44
To: Transport (VIP Use)
Subject: Re: SR1013586 - CITY CENTRE WEST TO EAST CYCLE LINK AND STREET IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT

Thank you for your communication. However we do not accept that you understand the full impact of the congestion these proposals will cause. One can see currently at school drop and collection times the traffic backed up Murrayfield Avenue and if there are any roadworks in Roseburn the result is gridlock. We can only emphasise again the pollution that will be caused and the ruination of the livelihood of the shops. Money would be far better spent filling potholes!

Judith and Chris Hardie

Sent from my iPhone

Edward Housley

Sent: 26 April 2018 16:35
To: Traffic Orders
Subject: TRO/17/91 and ESO/18/05

Categories: Purple Category

What is this cycle path supposed to achieve?

The number of cyclist is miniscule at present. I have counted them. The Council have done no assessment or, if they have done are keeping very quiet about it perhaps because it would embarrass them.

Here are the figures collected over several hours of observation from my front window upstairs.

Non Rush Hour (2-3pm).

Cycles 13 per hour. 13 passengers per hour. **One every 5 mins**

Cars 436 per hour ? 900 passengers per hour **15 per minute**

Buses 33 per hour ? 700 passengers per hour **12 per minute**

Rush Hour (5-6 pm)

Cycles 40 per hour **Less than one per minute**

Cars 400 per hour ? 900 passengers **7 per minute**

Buses 32 per hour ? 960 passengers **7 per minute**

Thus every hour nearly 2000 passengers are to be seriously inconvenienced for the sake of a handful of cyclists The mind boggles!

The proposed changes to West Coates, reducing the number of traffic lanes to 2, forcing cars to queue behind buses up at the 3 stops between Haymarket and Roseburn will cause traffic jams and increased air pollution..

Each stop takes 30 sec. so every there will be hundreds of extra minutes of taffic pollution in this road. Your man at the DAAA meeting yesterday thought the hold ups would be "about 1 minute". Clearly he had not the faintest idea of what he was talking about. His diagrams were incoprhenible and he had no data for us. A pathetic performance.

WE had no real opportunity to question him but that did no really matter as he clearly had no answers. I suppose my comments will be ignored by the Council as have all previous comments and objections. The Council seems obsessed with what clearly a politically correct exercise at the Ratepayers expense.

.
E. Housley

6Kew Terrace

Edinburgh EH12 5JE

Penny Housley

Sent: 15 May 2018 14:55
To: Traffic Orders
Cc: christine.jardine.mp@parliament.uk
Subject: TRO-17/91

Categories: Purple Category

Comments / objections to alterations in Roseburn for proposed cycle track.
From Penelope Housley 6 Kew Terrace EH12 5JE

1. The revision of the current pedestrian crossing, reduced lanes for buses and motor vehicles, together with very limited loading bays, is going to cause severe congestion/delays in Roseburn Terrace.

This in turn will exacerbate an already very polluted section of the road to and from the Airport.

2. The proposal for 3x 'whole of road' pedestrian crossings in this area will also add to increasing delays as the time allowed for crossing this length will have to take into account the considerable number of elderly residents living in surrounding accommodation. Many of these residents rely on their local shops for daily shopping.

3. I live on the main road (see address) and as with our neighbours, few of us have seen much use of this section of the road by cyclists, most of them preferring to come off the old rail line and use the track adjacent to the trams to come to and fro.

Again I would point out that when there is a demonstration by Spokes, the majority of cyclists come from elsewhere and do not use this route.

Furthermore, in spite of enquiries we have never been shown a survey showing the current use by cyclists from Roseburn to Haymarket.

Many times we have done our own unofficial count- being well paced living at Kew Terrace, even during the rush hours we have never counted more than 12 cyclists per hour.

4. I find it disappointing that people we elect as councillors on this occasion do not seem to have listened to those of us who actually live on the route, whose lives once again are going to be completely disrupted. It has been obvious from the start that this scheme was going to be imposed on us and is very frustrating that we have been treated with such disregard.

5. As motorists we are subject to strict regulations e.g. lights, roadworthiness, insurance, road tax, etc. To my knowledge none of these apply to a cyclist.

If the Council is so insistent on giving prominence to cyclists, then they should be required to have adequate light on their bicycles and some form of reflective clothing so they are visible on dark days. I suppose it would be too much to expect them to have insurance thus the poor motorists will always pick up the tab even if they have no blame.

1

I hope that some consideration might be given to the above comments, which I can safely say are held by most of my neighbours.

Yours sincerely,

Penelope Housley

Sarah Ingham <i

Sent: 19 April 2018 14:58
To: Traffic Orders
Subject: TR-17/91 and RSO 18/05

Categories: Purple Category

Please can you explain why the very dangerous proposed cycle lane from Roseburn Terrace to Haymarket is on the north side of the A8 and not the South side. The north side has many more and far busier access roads on to the A 8 and the density of traffic coming from the north side will increase significantly when the Donaldson's development is completed.

Why on earth are the cycles not going round by Haymarket yards which is so much quieter and safer.?

I object to the current plan because as a local resident I do not want to constantly be hearing ambulance and police sirens as the emergency services deal with squashed cyclists. Does the council have a threshold for deaths it believes are worth it in order to keep the cycle lane on the main road?

Regards

Mrs Sarah Ingham
10/3 Magdala Crescent
EH12 5BE

Sent from my iPad

Bryan Johnston

Sent: 30 April 2018 09:46
To: Traffic Orders
Subject: RSO 18/5

Categories: Purple Category

I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed cycleway out of Roseburn and into Haymarket. This perpetual pandering to cyclists who make no contribution to road maintenance and yet are a menace to pedestrians by their reckless use of pathways and their regular riding down pavements. By restricting the flow of traffic through road narrowings which will prove most disruptive, especially after the completion of the Donaldson's development, verges on the irresponsible. Accidents are inevitable. This whole project MUST be scrapped.

Bryan Johnston

19 Wester Coates Avenue
Edinburgh EH12 5LS

Sara Johnston

Sent: 30 April 2018 11:20
To: Traffic Orders
Subject: Order No TRO - 17/91

Categories: Purple Category

I object strongly to this proposed new cycle route from Roseburn through Haymarket. Not only will the traffic be disrupted - the main thoroughfare from the west - and cause queues, no access for local shops for their delivery drop offs. Every time a bus stops, the traffic stops and backs up. Have you thought of emergency vehicles getting through? - safely? Elderly people trying to cross this cycle route to get onto a bus, or off it? Goodness what a serious waste of money, when there is an alternative being offered. Then we could start on the pot holes..... Scotland has the worst pothole problem in Europe.

Sara Johnston
19 Wester Coates
Avenue, Edinburgh.
EH12 5LS.

Sent from my iPhone

Sheena Kelman

Sent: 20 April 2018 13:08
To: Traffic Orders
Subject: Comments to: TRO - 17/91 and RSO 18/05
Categories: Purple Category

From: Sheena Kelman
Address: 1 Wester Coates Avenue, Edinburgh EH12 5LS

I am a very regular cyclist in Edinburgh, and yet want to vehemently lodge my complaint against the proposed plans for Roseburn and West Coates.

I'm dismayed that the council does not appear to have listened to any of the opposition or alternative plans put forward. In a very undemocratic way the council seems to be just steamrolling forward, buoyed on by support from people out of town not residents.

I am fully supportive of encouraging cyclists, but only if it is safe for all - but we have a very good cycling path running south of the Glasgow Road and emerging at Haymarket. Narrowing Roseburn, by the shops, to try and squeeze in drivers, buses, cyclists and pedestrians is just irresponsible and dangerous to all. Saying it will slow traffic by 1 minute is ridiculous. You should have noted the traffic jams with the recent works at Western Corner, it tails all the way back to Haymarket at busy times. It will also damage business for the already struggling shopkeepers.

I would instead encourage:

Filling the potholes properly; as a cyclist it is currently a death trap.

Do mark proper red cycle lanes on the side of the main roads, but ensure the gutters are kept properly clear so they can be used.

Put markings on the existing Roseburn cycle path so pedestrians and cyclists are encouraged to go separate sides.

Get shop-owners to remove bins and signs from the pavement so it makes it more safe for pedestrians.

We don't unfortunately live in a city with wide boulevards, like Paris, Barcelona or Amsterdam. We can't just mimic their practices, we need to develop our own that actually work.

Please listen to the residents.

Kind regards,

Sheena Kelman

Mrs R Kennedy

Sent: 04 May 2018 13:24
To: Traffic Orders
Subject: TRO - 17/91, RSO 18/05

Categories: Purple Category

Dear Sirs,

I object to a designated bicycle route going along a road which is polluted above legal levels, namely Roseburn street. In all the consultations, no regard has been made to the suggestions by the Community Council to the principals of the route. In the consultations only minor modifications have been made. This route is highly unsuitable for a SAFE ROUTE FOR SCHOOL CHILDREN.

Yours faithfully, R Kennedy (Mrs). 41 Corstorphine Road, EH12 5QQ

James McBrinn

Sent: 18 May 2018 08:43
To: Traffic Orders
Subject: TRO - 17/91, RSO 18/05

Categories: Purple Category

TRO - 17/91, RSO 18/05

I am totally opposed to the proposed scheme as I consider the road from Roseburn to Haymarket too narrow to accommodate the current levels of traffic and 2 cycle lanes. The majority of local residents who attended a public meeting in Murrayfield Parish Church were also opposed to the scheme and I am yet to meet one local resident who wants the scheme to proceed.

Of course I am fully aware that the council has a history of ignoring the wishes of residents and for that reason I have listed below a number of specific objections to the proposed design.

Unsafe design for cyclists

The proposed design of the cycle route, with east and west bound cycle lanes adjacent to the east bound carriageway, is not safe for cyclists. This was acknowledged by officials at a public meeting in Murrayfield Parish Church, which I attended. At that meeting we were informed that the road was not wide enough to implement a safe design - with the west bound cycle lane adjacent to the west bound carriageway. It is ill-advised to continue with this acknowledged compromised design and as the road is not suitable for a safe design the whole scheme should be abandoned.

The Magdala Crescent Bus Stop

At present the Magdala Crescent bus stop is in a bay and does not restrict the east bound carriageway. The proposed design will result in any bus stopping at the Magdala Crescent stop blocking all east bound traffic, which will encourage drivers to turn left into Magdala Crescent. This is such an obvious point that I am bound to conclude that it is the intention of the scheme designers to encourage this driver behaviour. However, as the evidence of the damage that the increased traffic levels have caused, during both the current diversion due

to the Scottish water roadworks and the diversion due to the tram works, Magdala Crescent is wholly unsuitable for high levels of traffic.

Two way traffic on Magdala Crescent

In the proposed design Magdala Crescent is the only road with a junction on the north side of Haymarket Terrace with two way traffic. Magdala Crescent is a C road and is wholly unsuitable for the levels of traffic that would divert from Haymarket Terrace if the currently proposed design is implemented. I propose that Magdala Crescent is designated south bound only and that the significantly wider Coates Gardens is made the preferred north bound route for traffic avoiding the Haymarket junction.

[A change to the phasing of the traffic lights at the Haymarket Terrace/ Haymarket Yards junction would reduce the number of drivers avoiding the Haymarket junction. At present, when a tram is approaching or leaving the Haymarket tram stop, all traffic is stopped on Haymarket Terrace. This would be unnecessary if there was a traffic light filter preventing vehicles turning into Haymarket Yards when trams are approaching. As the vast majority of vehicles are travelling east-west this simple change would significantly increase traffic flow and reduce driver frustration.]

Segregation of Pedestrians and Cyclist

It is not clear from the TRO 8 drawings that there will be sufficient segregation of cyclists and pedestrians. By sufficient I mean that there will be a physical barrier preventing cyclists from cycling on the pavement. I am sure that you are aware that this is widespread and common problem in Edinburgh due again to the current laws not being enforced.

Traffic Calming measures

During the tram works, when Magdala Crescent was used as one way diversionary route for east bound traffic, I received from Edinburgh council a colour brochure detailing the proposed "residential area 20mph zones – Coates" (Distribution date 31/5/10, no document Reference). In this document it states that 68% of residents polled think that 20mph speed limits with speed humps are a good way of improving road safety. Of course this scheme was never implemented and instead we have the wholly ineffective and unenforced 20mph signage.

During the current Haymarket Terrace roadworks the Magdala Crescent residents are once again enduring levels of traffic not suitable for a minor C road and much of this traffic is exceeding the speed limit. In a letter from Scottish water dated 20/11/17, it was acknowledged that motorists were not adhering to the speed limit and that this was discussed with the council. An electronic speed warning sign was subsequently erected and this indicated that almost all vehicles are exceeding the speed limit.

I propose that the speed humps originally planned for Magdala Crescent and all other roads in the area are incorporated into the proposed scheme. Further I propose that a vehicle weight limit be imposed on Magdala Crescent. In the last 6 months, due to the high volumes of traffic, the Magdala Crescent road surface has been repaired several times and resurfaced once.

The City of Edinburgh Council has an obligation to maintain the character and fabric of the West end conservation area. The scheme as currently proposed will adversely affect a significant part of this area and, if the City of Edinburgh Council took its responsibilities seriously, the proposed scheme would be abandoned.

Regards

James McBrinn

1/1 Magdala Crescent

Edinburgh

EH12 5BE

Stuart McKenzie

Sent: 24 April 2018 12:13
To: Traffic Orders
Subject: Re: TRO/17/91, and RSO/18/05

Categories: Purple Category

Possibly the use of words like 'concerned' and 'dangerous' would seem to indicate an objection?

On 24/04/2018 11:59, Traffic Orders wrote:

Dear Mr McKenzie,

Please could you clarify whether you are supporting the above proposal or objecting to it.

Regards

Andrew D Young
Traffic Orders Administration Officer
Place
Planning and Transport
City Chambers, Room 10.19
Edinburgh, EH1 1YJ

Tel 0131 469 3122

From: Stuart McKenzie
Sent: 24 April 2018 11:36
To: Traffic Orders <TrafficOrders@edinburgh.gov.uk>
Subject: TRO/17/91, and RSO/18/05

Stuart McKenzie
2a Lansdowne Crescent
Edinburgh
EH12 5EQ

Residential

I attended your City Centre West to East Cycle Link and Street Improvements project (CCWEL) display last week. I am supportive of the introduction of cycle-ways but have concerns about how this scheme is designed. The main road between Roseburn and Haymarket is extremely busy, you will have the numbers but it carries upwards of 500 buses a day each way along with delivery trucks and cars. The scheme provides less space in the road as a result of the widening of the pedestrian/cycle-way. With less space, the traffic will become more congested. I also see the bus lanes have largely

disappeared too, obviously not enough space for them, therefore traffic into the city will be slowed considerably.

I'm also concerned about how the pedestrian/cycle-way will actually operate. Your plans show a pavement for pedestrians alongside two lanes of cycle-way, cyclists being separated from the roadway by blocks in the road. My main concern is ensuring pedestrian's safety to ensure they are protected from cycles. I don't think there is enough space left on the pavement. You need to consider wheelchairs using pavements too. Also these awful advertising 'A frames' that many shops use outside. Are they still allowed? I believe pedestrians will be forced into the cycle-ways increasing the risk of injuries. In fact your note asking for feedback on the consultation has a picture showing on the right of the road, a advertising board and on the left; a cafe table - are these both expected to continue with the cycle-way introduction? They obviously cannot.

The main road at Haymarket has Scottish Water replacing sewers at present. Once it has all completed, why not add temporary cones etc to the road to show where the different lanes in your design will actually be? That way you can prove there are no safety issues as I've outlined. Your artist impressions look wonderful, but I don't think they will work in practise.

I was also stuck by the completely off hand way the current cycle-way was discounted as having 'pinch-points' and steep inclines - and therefore was not being considered for development. It uses a quiet street, part of an old railway and then runs along the tramway into Haymarket. Surely you should have looked at developing this as a viable alternative. 'Pinch Points' can be removed, even purchasing and demolishing a house will be more cost effective than running cycles alongside very heavy traffic and pedestrians avoiding pavement obstacles. Similarly, cycles all have gears - to get up inclines. This is not a constraint.

I wouldn't use this cycle-way. It is too dangerous, I'd stick to what we currently have. Pinch-points and all.

Alison Milne <

Sent: 30 April 2018 11:20
To: Traffic Orders
Subject: TRO - 17/91

Categories: Purple Category

The proposed changes are extremely unwelcome. It appears that the cycling lobby's wishes are more important than those of the residents of the area.

Several points:

The proposed removal of the bus bay at the bottom of Magdala Crescent is going to make the junction very dangerous due to loss of sight lines for drivers.

Providing loading bays at the south end of Coates Gardens, which will not allow vehicles to turn in from Haymarket Terrace, will require delivery drivers to make convoluted and potentially dangerous diversions. Coaches, particularly those from abroad, of which there are many during the summer months serving the hotels in the area, will find the situation impossible to navigate with all the possibilities for chaos that will engender.

Residents and local businesses will suffer a further loss of amenity due to these changes in accessing shops on Haymarket Terrace.

On a purely aesthetic note, adding yet more clutter to streets which were planned to be open boulevards will result in ugly and eye-wateringly offensive additions. Edinburgh is a UNESCO World Heritage site. What you are proposing will damage the beauty of the city environment. Has that body been apprised of your plans?

I would have hoped that the views of, particularly, residents would have made some impact on these plans, but it appears we are at the bottom of the pecking order. The city council is supposed to work for everyone. So far, your 'consultations' have been more in the order of 'this is what the council wants to do, and your objections don't count'. This is unacceptable.

Alison Milne
23A Coates Gardens
Edinburgh
EH12 5LG

Sent from my iPad

Sona Murray

From: TRO 17/91 and RSO 18/05:
ROSEBURN
Sent: 18 May 2018 13:12
To: Traffic Orders
Subject: TRO 17/91 and RSO 18/05

Dear Sirs

This whole scheme is riddled with problems, but here are some specific comments for your consideration.

1) Removal of the island from the pedestrian crossing at the west end of Roseburn Terrace and holding up traffic in both directions long enough to allow pedestrians, many of them elderly, to cross will cause severe delays to the constant, but at the moment efficiently flowing, traffic and will be much less safe for pedestrians. Many cyclists will not dismount to cross, and cyclists and pedestrians hurrying in the same space is a recipe for disaster.

2) The reduction of loading bays on Roseburn Terrace, together with the increase in double red lines, will cause the shops to lose much opportunistic and short-stay business, leading inevitably to some closures.

3) The proposed layout at the foot of Murrayfield Avenue and removal of the curved cut-off from Murrayfield Place will cause tailbacks and jams. Most the traffic coming through Murrayfield Place from Coltbridge Terrace feeds left on to the main road via the cut-off, very often without having to stop. If it all has to feed on to Murrayfield Avenue, tailbacks will occur. Vehicles feeding left off Corstorphine Road onto Murrayfield Avenue will have to tailback at the yellow box markings, instead of peeling off before them.

4) Moving the north side bus shelter from its present convenient and relatively sheltered location to the middle of the bridge, the most exposed spot in the whole of Roseburn, is not acceptable. This bus-stop is so well used that passengers usually have to queue outside, and there will be no protection at all from the elements on the bridge.

My above comments can be taken as objections. I have treated the TRO and RSO as one, as it is unclear how to deal with them separately.

Yours faithfully

Sona Murray
5(2F1) Murrayfield Place
Edinburgh EH12 6AA

Murrayfield Community Council (through Ms Helen Barbour)

Sent: 17 May 2018 21:09
To: Traffic Orders
Cc: Frank Ross; Gillian Gloyer; Scott Douglas
Subject: TRO 17/91

Murrayfield Community Council's (MCC) response to the TRO 17/91

MCC are keen to work with CEC to ensure the very best outcomes possible for our community and residents. However it should be noted that MCC remain of the view that Option B is the better option for the Roseburn to Haymarket section of the CCWEL and in saying so we believe that we represent the view of the majority of residents.

In the spirit of co-operation and as a key stakeholder, MCC request that the following points and suggestions be given due consideration by CEC and seek a response accordingly:-

There is concern that the exit from Roseburn Gardens and approach to the Roseburn Terrace crossing is an unmanaged space with multiple users at the same time (pedestrians of all ages including school children and the elderly, as well as cyclists and motor vehicles), which will be difficult and dangerous for pedestrians, in particular, to negotiate. MCC suggest that the junction seems incongruously over-engineered and therefore suggest simplifying.

MCC consider that motion sensors at the 3 crossings on Roseburn Terrace and the crossing at the end of Russell Road are essential to safeguard pedestrians' safety. We would also like to know the maximum pedestrian waiting times to cross, particularly if they are waiting longer in the polluted canyon. We therefore emphasise that pedestrians be given priority, discouraging jay walking, increasing pedestrian safety.

The pedestrian crossings at the east end of Roseburn Terrace and the end of Russell Road should be synchronised to enable diagonal crossing i.e. from the dentist's on the north side to Tesco's.

MCC deplore the fact that there has been no simulation or trial of the proposed route to test whether what is proposed will work and determine what impact it will have on the environment. MCC would like to know the average crossing speed within the new traffic light sequence. Whilst MCC agree that the pedestrian experience should be enhanced, pedestrian safety is essential

MCC understands the reasons for the change of priority at the Russell Road and Roseburn Street junction but needs to know the traffic light sequence.

We support the stated aim of the scheme to push traffic through the canyon of Roseburn Terrace in such a way that the waiting time of stationary traffic between the traffic lights at either end of Roseburn Terrace is minimised.

MCC believe that the use of public transport should continue to be encouraged. MCC continue to support free flowing bus travel and trust that the CEC will ensure the CCWEL will not impact the movement of buses negatively.

MCC is against the removal of parking spaces from Murrayfield Place as it considers that they are required for shoppers including those less mobile visiting the shops of Roseburn Terrace.

1

MCC request that, with a view to supporting retail activity on Roseburn Terrace, the City Car Club spaces on Russell Road be swapped with the equivalent number of short stay parking spaces within the car park of 15 spaces adjoining the Maltings.

MCC suggest that 4 short stay parking spaces could be installed at the foot of Wester Coates Terrace. MCC has received strong representations from Roseburn residents, who are already finding it increasingly difficult to park in Roseburn, and are certain that the new scheme will exacerbate the situation in Roseburn Crescent, Place, Drive and Street. We support their view and strongly advocate for immediate investigation and analysis of this issue.

MCC believes the proposal to build up the kerbing at the entrance to Roseburn Park at Roseburn Place to be unnecessary. The traffic in this area is light and slow moving due to speed bumps in place. The white line and keep clear notice is perfectly adequate for the many cyclists who enter and leave the park here.

MCC shares and supports the Donaldson Area Amenity Association's view that the new short cycle lane section at the Stanhope Street junction is unnecessary, and the associated proposal for the existing pavement area to be shared with cyclists potentially dangerous and certainly unsettling for its substantial number of aged residents. Given that this proposal is for the sole benefit of the few cyclists resident in that area and is not supported by that area's residents association, it should be dropped since it has no wider consequences for the other CCWEL proposals.

Helen Barbour
Secretary MCC
24/3 Roseburn Terrace
Edinburgh
EH12 6AW
Mobile tel no
[REDACTED]

Laura and Sean Paterson

Sent: 29 April 2018 00:15
To: Traffic Orders
Subject: Roseburn to Haymarket Cycle Track objection
Categories: Purple Category

Dear Sir / Madam

Ref: TRO/17/91 and RSO/18/05

I am writing regarding the proposed Roseburn to Haymarket cycle track plans, specifically to object to the changes in the greenway parking bays. We live on the main road and these parking bays are regularly used by tradesmen and visitors to the local residents. As the current plans have removed all the parking to make way for the cycle track, as well as imposing a 30 minute parking restriction on the limited parking that has been left, this is going to have a major impact on the availability of parking. The current cost of parking, coupled with the time limitations on the metered parking bays, would make it much more difficult for many to carry out their work without incurring significant parking costs, either to themselves, or to the residents.

On a more personal note, we have family members who travel from outside Edinburgh to support us with childcare and the availability of the current parking bays enable them to do this. With the current changes that are being proposed this is going to have major implications on whether this childcare arrangement will be sustainable. If not, this will incur further expense to us on already costly childcare.

Whilst I am in favour of a number of changes that the current plans propose, I do feel that the implementation of the cycle lane will cause a significant amount of disruption and inconvenience to the residents and those who use the parking bays. I do feel that it would be more appropriate for the cycle lane to be routed around the back of the Balbirnie estate, running parallel to the train and tram tracks, as this is a quieter and safer section of road, it leads directly onto the cycle track and it will not affect the many people who currently use the parking facilities to support the local residents.

Regards

Laura and Sean Paterson
3 Kew Terrace, EH12 5JE

Jane Pickard

Sent: 26 April 2018 11:07
To: Traffic Orders
Cc: John Pickard
Subject: TRO/17/91, and RSO/18/05

Categories: Purple Category

Dear Sir Madam,

In response to the public consultation on the changes to Roseburn, A8 into Haymarket I have the following concerns.

I write as a pedestrian, cyclist, bus passenger and driver.

The removal of parking along the Roseburn terrace and around the stretch by the apex hotel area will destroy the environment for the businesses there and mean that closure will be inevitable. Apart from employment issues for the staff who work there, it also means that I will have to make more trips by car rather than on foot to shop, as the nearest food shops will be Craigleith, Murrayfield Sainsbury or Comely bank.

Introducing two lane cycle paths on one side of the road assumes that cyclists are responsible for pedestrians safety, happy not to overtake and will keep to their side of the road. This will not be the case, just as it is not the case on the Cycle/ walk path alongside St Georges where I am frequently almost mown down by cyclists determined not to drop their speed for pedestrians. this is a weekly event.

As a driver I am concerned about the risk posed to cyclists and drivers from trying to exit from Wester Coates whilst having to negotiate 4 lanes of traffic, 2 of cycle in 2 directions and 2 of traffic. This seems a recipe for serious accidents especially as a dance school operates in the church on the main road and during busy afternoons there are many children wandering over the road and many cars attempting to park around here.

The standing area between bus lane and cycle path is too narrow: impossible for parent and buggy to stand safely, probably also a problem for the elderly or physically impaired.

Yet again I would point out as a cyclist I find the roads perfectly adequate as found, with the exception of pot holes, which are the main hazard on a bike.

In terms of the City Council strategy, the budgets being spent on this kind of traffic rejigging would be better invested in giving the next generation of city residents proper cycle skills, via school, with certificates and a skills ladder with areas flagged as Red Green blue Cycle streets, so they can as generations have before learn how to cycle safely for themselves and responsibly towards others. Other money saved could be spent improving the water of leith path so it is accessible again for pedestrians

All activities have risks and it is better equipping people to understand and negotiate them than pretend any activity can be made risk free.

JANE PICKARD
3 Wester Coates Gardens
EH12 5LT

George Rendall

Sent: 18 May 2018 09:10
To: Andrew Young
Subject: RE: TRO/17/91 and RSO/18/05- Concerns at Roseburn

Categories: Purple Category

Hi Andrew

The email is from myself

George Rendall

Art et Facts

19 Roseburn Terrace

Edinburgh

EH12 5NG

Regards

George

Sent from my Samsung Galaxy smartphone.

----- Original message -----

From: Andrew Young <A.Young@edinburgh.gov.uk>

Date: 18/05/2018 08:55 (GMT+00:00)

To: Teresa Rendall [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: TRO/17/91 and RSO/18/05- Concerns at Roseburn

Dear Teresa Rendall,

In order that I can log your objection could you

advise me of your postal address.

Regards

Andrew D Young

Traffic Orders Administration Officer
Place

Planning and Transport

City Chambers, Room 10.19
Edinburgh, EH1 1YJ

Tel 0131 469 3122

From: Teresa Rendall **Sent:** 17 May 2018 22:43
To: Traffic Orders <TrafficOrders@edinburgh.gov.uk>
Subject: TRO/17/91 and RSO/18/05- Concerns at Roseburn

Dear Sir/Madam,

On behalf of the Roseburn Traders and having discussed this with many other stakeholders, we would wish you consider the following proposals in regards to the cycle path at Roseburn.

With the present design in mind, We have these particular objections we want to lodge.

1. The proposal to reduce parking at Murrayfield Place by 35% makes no sense. We are already going to lose 40% of the parking and loading at Roseburn Terrace because of the track itself; the next place shoppers with cars will head for is Murrayfield Place, it being the closest. The Council wants to “Rejuvenate Roseburn” but removing the parking that supports the traders is not the way. We have spoken to many traders who have stated they will have to move if there’s a drop in sales. There are too many Edinburgh streets with empty shops. Rather than rejuvenating the area, the proposals are more likely to create a wasteland of vacant shop

units. Please don't throttle our local shops – the locals (mostly elderly- the census shows we have 50% more older people than the city average) need them. There are ways to carry our environmental improvements at Murrayfield Place that do not necessitate reducing parking there. Please leave the parking/loading arrangements the way they are at present. One of the residents who walks through here every day thinks that the parking actually slows the cars down, making it a quieter street. Furthermore, parking at Murrayfield Place should be for a one-hour, rather than a two-hour limit, which will allow more drivers to make use of the spaces here.

2. The removal of parking at the south-western corner of Murrayfield Avenue, where it meets Corstorphine Road, is unnecessary. Residents need these spaces. The kerb build-out serves only to narrow the mouth of Murrayfield Avenue and reduce the size of the central island for pedestrians, an important oasis for those crossing the Avenue at this point.
3. Removing the island in the middle of Roseburn Terrace (at the top of Roseburn Gardens) will make this crossing more dangerous for the elderly people and children who cross here. It will also lead to greater delays for traffic, since vehicles must be stopped in both directions at the same time, thereby leading to more stoppages to get the same number of people across on foot. The reduction in road width from 4 lanes to 3 will only slow westbound traffic, creating more congestion in the Roseburn Terrace “canyon”.
4. The proposal to build up the kerbing at the entrance to Roseburn Park at Roseburn Place to provide a dedicated entrance for cyclists at H4 and J4 is ugly and unnecessary. The existing white line and keep clear notice is perfectly adequate for the many cyclists who enter and leave the park here – and I have never seen cars parked on it. I've been told by Council officers that the build-out is necessary for cycling safety but as a cyclist who travels through this entrance twice a day- and as someone who lived at the house here for 13 years - I can say that this stretch of Roseburn gets very little traffic- perhaps one car every 10 minutes, which travel slowly, because of the speed humps. The proposals will make cycling in and out of the park messier and slower for cyclists – who are more than likely to take a short cut

across the pavement. Furthermore, due to its length, the kerbing will remove much-needed parking – important for both residents and traders. These are parking spaces that do not need to vanish. Once the cycle track is built, every single space in Roseburn will be key to allowing those driving to the Roseburn shops and cafes to trade. There is a need not to exacerbate the parking problem - if this were a busy stretch of road I would see the point, but there is just no need for this ugly and pointless kerbing.

5. The dedicated cycle track at the top of Roseburn Gardens is similarly over-engineered and far bigger than it needs to be. Whilst the principal of a “cycling gate” is clearly important here, the Council can copy the design used at the western end of Rankeillor Street for an example where the same can be achieved with a much smaller gate for cyclists only. Finally, by reducing the length of this stretch of cycle track in Roseburn Gardens, at least one more parking space could be provided.
6. The CCEWL design also does not make it clear that those driving west along Roseburn Terrace will be allowed to turn left down Roseburn Gardens. This was an arrangement promised to traders to encourage shoppers, travelling west, who were unable to stop in Roseburn Terrace, to make use of the loading bays on Roseburn Gardens. The blue one-way signs (with the bicycle) give the impression that cars would not be allowed to turn left down here.
7. The junction of Roseburn Street, Russell Road and Roseburn Terrace could be better served by a set of traffic lights here, as we used to have. This would be more effective than the proposed messy re-routing to give cars from Russell Road priority. The delay to cars travelling along Roseburn Street is likely to be significant, leading to greater pollution. Also the addition of a blister pavement on the west side of Roseburn Street will lead to a further reduction in parking – parking that we can ill afford to lose.
8. The City Car Club spaces on Russell Road should be moved into the enclosed public parking spaces by the Maltings. This would free up these spaces nearer Tesco for Roseburn shoppers.

I hope you will give our objections to these proposed TRO's your thoughtful consideration and amend the design accordingly.

Yours sincerely

George Rendall

Art et Facts

On behalf of The Roseburn Traders

Roseburn Traders (through Kadir Kavak)

Sent: 18 May 2018 17:17
To: Traffic Orders
Subject: Roseburn cycle path
Categories: Purple Category

Sent from my iPhoneDear Sir/Madam,

On behalf of the Roseburn Traders and having discussed this with many other stakeholders, we would wish you consider the following proposals in regards to the cycle path at Roseburn.

With the present design in mind, We have these particular objections we want to lodge.

1. The proposal to reduce parking at Murrayfield Place by 35% makes no sense. We are already going to lose 40% of the parking and loading at Roseburn Terrace because of the track itself; the next place shoppers with cars will head for is Murrayfield Place, it being the closest. The Council wants to “Rejuvenate Roseburn” but removing the parking that supports the traders is not the way. We have spoken to many traders who have stated they will have to move if there’s a drop in sales. There are too many Edinburgh streets with empty shops. Rather than rejuvenating the area, the proposals are more likely to create a wasteland of vacant shop units. Please don’t throttle our local shops – the locals (mostly elderly- the census shows we have 50% more older people than the city average) need them. There are ways to carry our environmental improvements at Murrayfield Place that do not necessitate reducing parking there. Please leave the parking/loading arrangements the way they are at present. One of the residents who walks through here every day thinks that the parking actually slows the cars down, making it a quieter street. Furthermore, parking at Murrayfield Place should be for a one-hour, rather than a two-hour limit, which will allow more drivers to make use of the spaces here.
2. The removal of parking at the south-western corner of Murrayfield Avenue, where it meets Corstorphine Road, is unnecessary. Residents need these spaces. The kerb build-out serves only to narrow the mouth of Murrayfield Avenue and reduce the size of the central island for pedestrians, an important oasis for those crossing the Avenue at this point.
3. Removing the island in the middle of Roseburn Terrace (at the top of Roseburn Gardens) will make this crossing more dangerous for the elderly people and children who cross here. It will also lead to greater delays for traffic, since vehicles must be stopped in both directions at the same time, thereby leading to more stoppages to get the same number of people across on foot. The reduction in road width from 4 lanes to 3 will only slow westbound traffic, creating more congestion in the Roseburn Terrace “canyon”.

4. The proposal to build up the kerbing at the entrance to Roseburn Park at Roseburn Place to provide a dedicated entrance for cyclists at H4 and J4 is ugly and unnecessary. The existing white line and keep clear notice is perfectly adequate for the many cyclists who enter and leave the park here – and I have never seen cars parked on it. I've been told by Council officers that the build-out is necessary for cycling safety but as a cyclist who travels through this entrance twice a day- and as someone who lived at the house here for 13 years - I can say that this stretch of Roseburn gets very little traffic- perhaps one car every 10 minutes, which travel slowly, because of the speed humps. The proposals will make cycling in and out of the park messier and slower for cyclists – who are more than likely to take a short cut across the pavement. Furthermore, due to its length, the kerbing will remove much needed parking – important for both residents and traders. These are parking spaces that do not need to vanish. Once the cycle track is built, every single space in Roseburn will be key to allowing those driving to the Roseburn shops and cafes to trade. There is a need not to exacerbate the parking problem - if this were a busy stretch of road I would see the point, but there is just no need for this ugly and pointless kerbing.
5. The dedicated cycle track at the top of Roseburn Gardens is similarly over-engineered and far bigger than it needs to be. Whilst the principal of a “cycling gate” is clearly important here, the Council can copy the design used at the western end of Rankeillor Street for an example where the same can be achieved with a much smaller gate for cyclists only. Finally, by reducing the length of this stretch of cycle track in Roseburn Gardens, at least one more parking space could be provided.
6. The CCEWL design also does not make it clear that those driving west along Roseburn Terrace will be allowed to turn left down Roseburn Gardens. This was an arrangement promised to traders to encourage shoppers, travelling west, who were unable to stop in Roseburn Terrace, to make use of the loading bays on Roseburn Gardens. The blue one-way signs (with the bicycle) give the impression that cars would not be allowed to turn left down here.
7. The junction of Roseburn Street, Russell Road and Roseburn Terrace could be better served by a set of traffic lights here, as we used to have. This would be more effective than the proposed messy re-routing to give cars from Russell Road priority. The delay to cars travelling along Roseburn Street is likely to be significant, leading to greater pollution. Also the addition of a blister pavement on the west side of Roseburn Street will lead to a further reduction in parking – parking that we can ill afford to lose.
8. The City Car Club spaces on Russell Road should be moved into the enclosed public parking spaces by the Maltings. This would free up these spaces nearer Tesco for Roseburn shoppers.

I hope you will give our objections to these proposed TRO's your thoughtful consideration and amend the design accordingly.

Yours sincerely

Roseburn Cafe

Kadir Kavak.
On behalf of The Roseburn Traders

Kate Stephen

Sent: 20 April 2018 14:45
To: Traffic Orders
Subject: New cycle route via Roseburn

Categories: Purple Category
• The Order Number: TRO - 17/91 or RSO 18/05

- Kathryn Stephen, 3a West Coates, Edinburgh EH12 5JQ

As someone who commutes from West Coats to work at the royal Highland showground every day, I object to the proposals for this cycle route with particular reference to the bottle neck that is Roseburn Terrace. As things currently stand there is considerable traffic build up for traffic heading east from 5pm onwards. The major weight of traffic seems to turn right at the lights to head towards Murrayfield and with the bus lane being in operation there is only one operable lane until just before the lights. If this area is narrowed even further by putting in the cycle lane, this will be a severe pinch point and you will find a tail back of traffic to the western corner junction if not even further west towards the zoo every Monday to Friday evening. This will cause considerable frustration to thousands of car drivers who no doubt massively outweigh the number of cyclists.

Kate Stephen

Kate Stephen
Livestock & Competitions Manager

Direct Dial: [REDACTED]



RHET
The Royal Highland Education Trust



ROYAL
HIGHLAND
SHOW



A showcase for the best of farming, food and rural life – The Royal Highland Show, June 21st – 24th June 2018

The Royal Highland and Agricultural Society of Scotland (RHASS)
(Incorporated under Royal Charter with Charitable Status)
Royal Highland Centre, Ingliston, Edinburgh EH28 8NB
Scottish Charity Number SC4561
Vat Number: 859 2401 13

This e-mail and any attached files are confidential and may be legally privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure. E-mail communications cannot be guaranteed to be secure or complete.

Vernon Le Sueur

Sent: 25 April 2018 13:48

To: Traffic Orders; Rurighd McMeddes

Subject: Order Number - TRO - 17/91 or RSO 18/05

Dear Sirs

RE: Order Number - TRO - 17/91 or RSO 18/05

I have had the chance to review the current plans to rejuvenate Roseburn and I am not convinced you have consulted with all the residents of the area. I wanted to attend the two statutory consultations but this was not possible as they were held at an inconvenient time and date for me.

I currently live in Number 9 Murrayfield Avenue, within 100m of the junction to Roseburn Terrace. During peak times the traffic queues on Murrayfield Avenue stretch past Henderland road and it takes me approximately 20-30 minutes from outside my house to drive the 400metres to Russell road in order to take my daughter to Meggetland to play her sports. You need to come spend time from 4pm to 6pm to see how congested it really is or in the morning. Whereas you seemed to have focused on creating public spaces, better pavements and a public realms, you don't seem to have addressed getting the traffic to move quickly through the junction of Roseburn Terrace and Roseburn Street where Tesco is situated. The other huge bottle neck is the junction of Murrayfield avenue and Roseburn Terrace where there is no traffic lights or signals. The result is the queues are stretching right to the top of the avenue trying to feed into what is already a very busy road.

It is nice to think that all traffic will disappear when the cycle route is in place but the reality is many people will still use their cars and I prefer not to suck up the polluted fumes while they sit idling outside my house. When I look at the plans it does not appear you have addressed this issue, in fact it looks like that you have reduced the lanes down to one on Roseburn Terrace, which is just going to exacerbate the problem.

My second concern is the proposed position of the recycling bins. One of my biggest issues with Edinburgh council is the lack of attention paid to refuse removal and general area cleanliness. I know your picture makes it all look nice and clean but the reality is the complete opposite. Even today, I am incensed how dirty it is around the refuse bin areas in Murrayfield Place. What you are proposing is you want to move the bins and all the garbage around it to the bottom of Murrayfield Avenue outside the laundrette and in front of house number 1.

The refuse removal companies are only interested in how quickly they can get around the already time constrained route they need to do. Here you propose to put the recycling bins on a hill, far from the kerb where the refuse truck needs to stop. You trying to tell me that they will diligently unlock the wheels and roll it down to the kerb and then push it back up the hill and lock the wheels again? I have watched them clean before and if it is made cumbersome they will leave them where they empty them. I cannot see it happening as you are not making it easy for the refuse removal companies and this will be left to the residents to tidy up once they have left. As it is, they do not clean up any spillage and this is left for weeks on end before the council finally arrives but by this time, fed up residents have cleaned the area already. I have seen the residents of No.1 Murrayfield

Avenue clean the small black bin at the bottom of the road because the council have not been to clean it and it is over flowing with bags of dog faeces. Yet the council ups my council tax by 15% last year. What do i get in return?

The residents of Murrayfield Avenue use their personal recycle bins, which have been provided by the council to collect their garbage. These large recycle bins cater for the residents of the apartments in around the area, why do they have to be positioned in Murrayfield Avenue where we have no large apartment blocks. Secondly, over Christmas and Easter weekends, where we tend to have numerous public holidays, I have seen the bins over flowing with garbage. The local residents coming from the apartments dump their black garbage bags next to the recycle bins as they do not want it in their houses and the garbage piles up in the streets. Along with the numerous Christmas trees and any unwanted items, even sometimes furniture. This is not illustrated in your picture but since I have lived with this for 8 years I know what certain times of the year brings when it comes to garbage and I do not want it outside my house.

Finally. Roseburn is the supporters end for any games played at Tynecastle. I have yet to see the council come clean up after a game in the 8 years I have lived here. In Roseburn and specifically the water of Leith walkway, it is constantly left in a shambles with bottles and cans littering the pathways and bushes. I along with other residents personally cleaned this area before Christmas when Celtic played Hearts. We had stacked the bags next to the recycle bins at the bottom of Roseburn Cliff. As much as I object to people stacking bags next to already full bins , we had no other option because the bins had not been emptied and this was before Christmas. After Christmas, Hibernian came to play and again, us residents cleaned the area and added to the bins that had not been cleaned since before Christmas. Finally, close to New Year, did they eventually come and empty the bins. The newspaper bin was not emptied until after the new year. The bags of newspapers and magazines were just left propped up against the bins. I know first hand that the council does not come clean after home games at Tynecastle and recycle bins are not emptied for 3-4weeks over these long public holidays. I do not want this at the bottom of my street within 50m of my house where residents who do not live in Murrayfield avenue but in nearby apartments, feel they will just pile the garbage next to full bins that are not cleaned regularly by the council.

This morning 25/04/2018, I walked past the bins and they are all full. If the council do not clean them today then by Monday people would have already started piling black bags next to the bins and we are not even in a public holiday period. I know the bins need to go somewhere and there are other places in the area that are more suitable for these bins. There is a large area just before you enter Roseburn Park where large wheelie bins can sit. If you feel people cannot walk that far then create an area in the public space at the end of Murrayfield Place. It seems from the picture that there is trees and flower boxes, so surely you can create such an area where the trees and flower boxes obscure the vision from the public and make it easy for the refuse removal companies to access the bins. I know you cannot address peoples lack of pride in their area and general hygiene but personally I do not want these bins with in view of my house for which i paid a lot of money for.

Your sincerely
Vernon Le Sueur
9 Murrayfield Avenue

Edinburg

h EH12

6AU

Tel:



Alastair Weatherston

Sent: 08 May 2018 11:26
To: Traffic Orders
Subject: TRO/17/91 and RSO/18/05

Categories: Purple Category
TRO/17/91

I am not sure what justification there is for removing the slip road for traffic coming from the west towards Murrayfield Avenue. It enables traffic making for Murrayfield Avenue or Murrayfield Place to come off the main road without holding up other traffic. The proposed arrangement is bound to lead to delay for all traffic. In addition the small section of bus lane between the foot of Murrayfield Gardens and the foot of Murrayfield Avenue looks likely to confuse people hoping to turn left. Is that section really necessary? Further east the bus stops on the bridge appear to be opposite each other. Is it a good idea to have the possibility of buses going in opposite directions stopping opposite each other? Sometimes buses arrive at the same time anyway, so there is at least the possibility of two buses stopping opposite two other buses. The plan TRO 001 does not show the old pedestrian bridge as having a cycleway which is welcome (but see below).

RSO/18/05

The old pedestrian bridge is shown in plan RSO 001 as "redetermined as cycletrack". The bridge is used regularly by people going to and from the shops and bus stop and going to the post box and cafe, many of whom are elderly. Is the intention to discourage the use of the bridge by pedestrians? Area V is shown on the plan as "existing carriageway redetermined as footway". Is that area really regarded as carriageway at present?

Alastair Weatherston
1 Coltbridge Terrace

From: J Welsh
Number – TRO – 17/91 or RSO 18/05
Sent: 21 April 2018 16:45
To: Traffic Orders
Subject: objection TRO17/91 or RSO18/5
Categories: Purple Category

As a resident that has to get to work what is proposed will make it very difficult to get to and from my house during commuter times.

Hence I object to the traffic order proposals outlined in the designs for Roseburn and Haymarket.

To improve traffic flow loading through this area parking and or loading should be prohibited during peak commuter time in Roseburn and Haymarket areas.

If the work goes ahead despite public opinion the right turn going east at Roseburn down Roseburn street to get to Russell Road or Murrayfield should be prohibited.

The new crossing proposed at this junction is a good idea.

If the cycle path goes ahead and removes the bus lane, buses will need to stop in the only lane going in that direction and will stop all traffic flow in that direction. Due to the number of buses that are on this road it is difficult to envisage how traffic flow can be maintained. Idling cars behind buses will add to local air pollution rather than reduce it.

Nothing is proposed to improve safety at junction Murrayfield Avenue. Part time traffic lights used during peak periods / schools access would improve safety here.

J Welsh
5 Sutherland Street
EH12 5HP

Dr J L G Wight

Sent: 23 April 2018 14:39
To: Traffic Orders
Subject: tro and rso statutory consultation
Attachments: roseburn objection3.odt

Please see attachment with regards to TRO and RSO Statutory Consultation



Virus-free. www.avast.com

ORDER NUMBERS TRO-17/91 and RSO 18/05

I wish to formally object to this whole hair brained scheme and that further monies be saved to help remedy the disgraceful state of the roads and pavements in the city of Edinburgh.

Why do I object? Realistically all the citizens of Edinburgh use the pavements and a very high percentage use, and pay, for the road network. Bicycles are a minority option, characteristically used by a small percentage of the population to commute, and at weekends for pleasure, without any contribution. Also no account has been considered on the devastating effect on the local shops and traders. In addition these bicyclists, I suspect, do not have full insurance cover and there is no licencing requirement to the state of the machine or its user.

A very viable and sensible option for bicyclists, would be to connect with the former rail line from Roseburn to Craighleith (now a cycle and walkway) onto Ravelston Dykes, over Corstorphine Hill to Cairnmuir Road, onto Clermiston Road to Caroline terrace or Drumbrae Drive, hence onto Drumbrae South or North.

Lastly as in this case, Roseburn Terrace is the main road between the centre of Edinburgh and Glasgow. To restrict flow and narrow this major artery is the height of idiocracy. The "scheme" should be abandoned immediately before further professional consultancy or city architects time and fees are incurred.

Dr John Leslie Graeme Wight
30 Roseburn Place
EH12 5NX

John Yellowlees

From:

Sent: 18 May 2018 12:10

To: Traffic Orders

Subject: TRO17/91

Categories: Purple Category

Dear sir or madam

Like many other members of the Murrayfield community, I believe that cyclists arriving from Roseburn Park would have been perfectly content to head along Roseburn Place, then turn left on Roseburn Street to join the eastbound A8 outside Tesco.

However politics prevailed, and we can look forward to the consolation prize of Rejuvenating Roseburn.

The blight of Roseburn Terrace is eastbound traffic queuing to turn right into Roseburn Street/Russell Road. If the proposed arrangement result in the Terrace being free of such traffic while the three sets of lights are showing their green man to pedestrians, I believe that a decent result will have been achieved. If on the other hand we are still left with such queuing traffic, the project will have failed, and I urge City Councillors to demand a simulation of the traffic-light sequence before taking it forward.

Yours faithfully,

John Yellowlees

(submitted on a personal basis)



Virus-free. www.avg.com