

Transport and Environment Committee

10.00am, Tuesday, 4 June 2013

Pedestrian Crossing Prioritisation 2013/14

Item number	7.9
Report number	
Wards	All

Links

Coalition pledges	
Council outcomes	CO21
Single Outcome Agreement	SO4

Mark Turley

Director of Services for Communities

Contact: Caroline Burwell, Road Safety Manager

E-mail: caroline.burwell@edinburgh.gov.uk | Tel: 0131 469 3730

Executive summary

Pedestrian Crossing Prioritisation 2013/14

Summary

This report provides an update on the new pedestrian crossing priority list. Following consultation on the highest ranked locations, a construction programme has been prepared for Committee approval. A summary of this consultation exercise is also provided for the Committee's review. Further to Committee's request, the scoring system for crossing requests has also been reviewed and additional weighting factors considered for rural locations.

Recommendations

It is recommended that the Committee:

- 1 approves the updated pedestrian crossing priority list as per Appendix 1;
- 2 notes the locations removed from the priority list in Appendix 2 and those constructed in 2012/13 in Appendix 3;
- 3 notes the stakeholder consultation carried out for schemes detailed in Appendix 4;
- 4 approves the construction list for locations detailed in Appendix 5;
- 5 approves an amendment to the current pedestrian crossing priority list scoring system which will add weighting to rural locations; and
- 6 set aside the objections at Peffermill Road and proceed with the scheme, as advertised, to improve public safety and promote active travel.

Measures of success

Pedestrian crossing facilities are provided at locations across the city which have been assessed to have the greatest demand and difficulty. Local consultation ensures the facilities provided meet the requirements of the local community and stakeholders.

Financial impact

Funding of £250,000 will be made available from the 2013/14 capital road safety budget of £825,000 to introduce crossing facilities at locations from the priority lists, which are suitable on road safety grounds.

The sum of £250, 000 produces a construction list that is deliverable in a financial year given the available resources and substantially reduces the number of schemes on the construction programme. This ensures delivery of the facilities on the ground in a reasonable period from the time a request is made.

Appendix 5 details estimated costs and in which financial year these facilities will be constructed.

Equalities impact

The new pedestrian crossing priority list will take into account the road safety needs of all users. Due regard will be given to the protected characteristics (Age, Disability and Religion & Belief) through the consultation and design process.

Sustainability impact

Potential for positive impact on the environment by providing improved pedestrian facilities. This should encourage walking, reduce vehicle use and lower carbon emissions.

Consultation and engagement

Consultation was carried out in August 2012 and April 2013 on all locations listed in Appendix 4. This included the following stakeholders:

- Residents and businesses which front on to the location;
- Neighbourhood Partnerships;
- Community Councils;

- Local elected members;
- Council Roads Network Managers;
- Bus operators; and
- Emergency services.

Feedback received from this consultation is listed in Appendix 4.

Background reading/external references

- Appendix 1 – New Pedestrian Crossing Priority List
- Appendix 2 – List of locations which failed to meet priority list criteria
- Appendix 3 – List of Constructed Sites in 2012/13
- Appendix 4- Feedback from Consultation
- Appendix 5– Construction List
- Appendix 6 – Pedestrian Crossing Scoring Flow Diagram
- Background Paper - Report to the Transport, Infrastructure and Environment Committee 28 July 2009 titled “Pedestrian Crossing Prioritisation Process”
http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/download/meetings/id/8638/pedestrian_crossing_prioritisation_process

Pedestrian Crossing Prioritisation 2013/14

1. Background

- 1.1 In accordance with the decision made by the Transport, Infrastructure and Environment Committee on 28 July 2009, on the report titled “Pedestrian Crossing Prioritisation Process”, this report provides an annual update on the new priority list for pedestrian crossings.
- 1.2 Consultation was carried out in April 2013 on the highest ranked locations within the priority list for proposed crossing improvements. Following consultation, a final construction list for pedestrian crossing improvements was developed for Committee approval.
- 1.3 The current approved scoring system for crossing requests does not account for rural locations. This decision has been queried by an Elected Member and this report will also review the current process and consider options for including a weighting factor for rural assessment.

2. Main report

New Priority List

- 2.1 Last year’s pedestrian crossing priority list (approved by Transport, Infrastructure and Environment Committee on 18 June 2012) consisted of 30 locations. 19 sites were designed and constructed in the 2012/13 financial year; details of these are included in Appendix 3 – List of Constructed Sites in 2012/13. The remaining 11 sites remain in the new priority list, although three of these are temporarily on hold until the completion of other engineering projects within the area.
- 2.2 The base data which is used to assess if a location is suitable for a crossing is what is known as the PV² value. This is a nationally recognised value that indicates the number of passing vehicles and pedestrians. Pedestrian and vehicle counts are taken over the peak hours of a week day between both 0700hrs to 1000hrs and 1500hrs to 1800hrs, and avoid any school holidays or outside factors which may affect results. This base PV² value is then adjusted to take account of local factors such as the age of those crossing, the composition of passing traffic, the number of pedestrian incidents and the number of trip-attractors such as schools, doctors’ surgeries, shops etc.

- 2.3 A location with an adjusted PV² value of 1 or higher would be considered for a puffin crossing, locations with a value of 0.3 or higher would be considered for a suite of measures that includes a zebra crossing, a refuge island or pavement build-outs. If a very low PV² value is achieved no additional crossing facilities may be recommended. Appendix 6 is a flow diagram which details the steps carried out in a pedestrian crossing assessment.
- 2.4 There have since been 34 new crossing requests received and assessed. Out of the 34 assessed locations, eight sites achieved adjusted PV² values of 0.3 or more, so are to be included in the updated priority list. Any new requests which meet the scoring criteria are added to the end of the previous priority locations in date order.
- 2.5 26 of the requested locations either failed to meet the adjusted PV² scoring or were deemed unsafe for a crossing and were not progressed. The location on Ferniehill Drive (opposite no16) failed to meet the criteria, but will be subject to further investigation after representations were received from residents of the adjacent sheltered housing complex, before a final decision is made.
- 2.6 The new priority list therefore contains 20 locations, comprising the 11 sites from the previous list and the nine new locations identified in financial year 2013/14, (see Appendix 1). It should be noted that due to consultation requirements some locations may fall back into the following year's programme. Issues may arise which require alterations to the proposed designs or Traffic Regulation Orders may be required which may affect construction timescales. Should any location fall back into the following year's construction programme, additional locations will be brought forward on the basis of highest ranking from the priority list.
- 2.7 Locations which have an adjusted PV² value of less than 0.3 or deemed unsuitable are not being progressed and are listed in Appendix 2.

List for Construction

- 2.8 Consultation was carried out in August 2012 and April 2013 for the 14 highest ranked locations within the priority list. This included the following stakeholders:
- Residents and businesses which front on to the location;
 - Neighbourhood Partnerships;
 - Community Councils;
 - Local elected members;
 - Council Roads Network Managers;

- Bus operators; and
- Emergency services.

2.9 Feedback received from this consultation is listed in Appendix 4.

2.10 Further to feedback from consultation it has been recommended we proceed with 13 of the 14 locations for construction as listed in Appendix 5.

2.11 Previous consultation carried out on Peffermill Road in August 2012 resulted in two objections to the proposed refuge island on the grounds of parking removal. Please refer to Appendix 5, section 5.1 detailing all consultation comments received. It is recommended that the Committee set aside the following objections:

- 1) Resident - "Object to the loss of parking. Also when events are on at the playing fields this will make it even more difficult to get parked for residents".
- 2) Local Business – "The proposed alterations to parking restrictions will be detrimental to residents in Peffermill Road and will restrict nearby parking at our shop. There is a high demand for parking in this area and I have personally felt the wrath of residents for taking up a parking space with our works van. So removing several spaces will have a negative affect on residents and our business. I also cannot see any demand at this location".

Response - The pedestrian crossing assessment process identified a level of demand and difficulty for crossing which merits an improved facility for pedestrians. This aligns with Council policy to improve public safety and promote active travel. Whilst it is accepted some parking will be lost due to the crossing, the design has ensured this is kept to an absolute minimum whilst achieving safe visibility requirements for the crossing. A maximum of six parking spaces will be lost with the installation of the refuge island. From observations there is sufficient on street parking available on Peffermill Road to the immediate east and west of the crossing location. In addition, there are 5 responses to the consultation in favour of the proposal including the Community Council.

- 2.12 The location on Liberton Brae has received three objections and several comments from the local frontage properties with concerns over the location of the island and potential relocation of the bus stops. This initial design has since been reviewed and we are considering alternative options for improvements in the area. It should be noted that the site is restrictive in nature with nearby junctions, accesses and driveways which may prevent suitable siting of the refuge island and nearby bus stops. All stakeholders will be re-consulted in due course. It is recommended this site remains on the priority list however the locus will be removed from the proposed construction list.
- 2.13 It is noted that several comments were received in relation to the Puffin Crossing proposal on Piersfield Terrace requesting that the junction to Craigentenny Avenue was signalised.

This has been a long term community desire. After lengthy negotiations over the last two to three years with the Local Environment Forum, the East Area Roads Team and the Council's Traffic Signals section it was recognised that due to complications with this junction being located on a bridge deck that the Council would not be able to fund this scheme. It would be necessary to widen the bridge to accommodate traffic signals and maintain traffic flow and associated costs would be prohibitive.

The East Area Roads team, in consultation with the local community groups have developed proposals to improve the Craigentenny Avenue/Portobello Road junction. More localised improvements were sought by improving pedestrian access around this junction, stopping end on parking at the shops and calming speed of traffic entering Restalrig Avenue from Portobello Road. This also included widening of footways which are currently sub-standard. Plans have developed over the last few years to allow the Council to deliver this scheme incorporating money set aside for Local Environment improvements. This work has already commenced on site.

The Puffin Crossing proposal is planned to be delivered in addition to the above junction works and cater for the pedestrian movements over the main Portobello Road.

Review of Rural Weighting Factors

- 2.14 The Committee has requested that the scoring and weighting process is reviewed to consider options for rural weighting factors. Due to the nature of rural environments and lower community populations it is acknowledged that rural communities will be disadvantaged by the above process and crossing proposals in these areas would, generally, fall below those in urban environments.

- 2.15 Due to the nature of the road environment in rural locations the main feature which contributes to reduced crossing safety is the speed of vehicles. With less adjacent developments and lower volumes of pedestrians the speed of vehicles increases.
- 2.16 The current scoring process accounts for the speed of vehicles and adds the following weighting based on the recorded 85th percentile speeds:
- less than 30mph = no weighting factor;
 - between 30 to 35mph = 10% weighting factor;
 - between 36 and 40mph = 20% weighting factor;
 - between 41 and 45mph = 30% weighting factor; and
 - over 46mph = 40% weighting factor.
- 2.17 In rural locations the majority of the base PV^2 values are low and the above weighting factors will have little impact on the final score meeting the criteria for crossing improvements (over 0.3). It is therefore recommended these weighting factors are increased for the speeds over 40mph which can be assumed will be in rural locations. It is proposed to use the following weighting factors to account for high speeds over 40mph:
- between 41 and 45mph = 75% weighting factor; and
 - over 46mph = 100% weighting factor.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1 It is recommended that the Committee:
- 3.1.1 approves the updated pedestrian crossing priority list as per Appendix 1;
 - 3.1.2 notes the locations removed from the priority list in Appendix 2 and those constructed in 2012/13 in Appendix 3;
 - 3.1.3 notes the stakeholder consultation carried out for schemes detailed in Appendix 4;
 - 3.1.4 approves the construction list for locations detailed in Appendix 5;
 - 3.1.5 approves an amendment to the current pedestrian crossing priority list scoring system which will add weighting to rural locations; and
 - 3.1.6 sets aside the objections at Peffermill Road and proceed with the scheme as advertised to improve public safety and promote active travel.

Mark Turley

Director of Services for Communities

Links

Coalition pledges

Council outcomes CO21: Safe – Residents, visitors and businesses feel that Edinburgh is a safe city.

Single Outcome Agreement SO4: Edinburgh's communities are safer and have improved physical and social fabric.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – New Priority List
- Appendix 2 – List of Locations Removed from Priority List
- Appendix 3 – List of Constructed Sites in 2012/13
- Appendix 4 – Feedback from Public Consultation
- Appendix 5 – Construction List
- Appendix 6 – Pedestrian Crossing Assessment Process

**Appendix 1
New Priority List**

Adjusted PV2 < 0.3 no further action
0.3<1.0 consider a pedestrian refuge island
>1.0 consider a controlled crossing

Rank	LOCATION	Base PV ²	Date of PV ²	Vulnerable Users		Vehicle Composition		Ped. Accident Factor	Road Width Factor	85th Percentile Speed Factor (mph)					Trip Ends		Adjusted PV ²	Current Status
				Children >15% (% plus 100/115)	Elderly & Disabled >15% (% plus 100/115)	Buses & coaches > 10% (2)	HGVs > 10% (2.3)			1 + (N/10)	Actual width/7.3	<30 (1)	30-35 (1.1)	36-40 (1.2)	41-45 (1.3)	>46 (1.4)		
Previously Approved Sites from June 2012 TIE Committee																		
1	Peffermill Rd at Prestonfield Ave	0.269	Feb-10	1.00	1	1	1	1.1	1.47	1	1.1	1	1	1	1	1	0.48	Objections received to consultation in Aug 2012; Recommendation to set aside objections and allow scheme to progress
2	Drum Street outside № 40-42	0.252	Oct-09	1	1	1	1	1	1.26	1	1.1	1	1	1	1	1	0.35	Previously consulted in Aug 2012; TRO Required - In progress
3	Queensferry Terrace @ School Crossing, north of roundabout	0.752	May-12	1.496	1	1	1	1.1	1.6	1	1.1	1	1	1	1	1	2.22	Consultation Completed; TRO Required - In progress
4	202/ 204 Piersfield Terrace (near Cemetery Entrance)	0.66	Mar-12	1	1	1	1	1	1.6	1	1.1	1	1	1	1.25	1	1.58	Consultation Complete April 2013; Proposed for construction
5	Duddingston Park South (184) between Cleekim Drive and Niddrie Mill Crescent	0.705	Nov-11	1.017	1	1	1	1	1.74	1	1.1	1	1	1	1	1	1.37	Consultation Complete April 2013; Proposed for construction
6	Cowgatehead	0.764	Nov-11	1	1	1	1	1	1.04	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.80	Consultation Complete April 2013; Proposed for construction
7	West Granton Road opposite 26 Granton Mill Crescent	0.34	Mar-12	1	1	1	1	1	1.6	1	1.1	1	1	1	1	1	0.59	Consultation Complete April 2013; Proposed for construction
8	Liberton Brae at Orchardhead Road	0.22	Mar-12	1.1	1	1	1	1	1.5	1	1.1	1	1	1	1.25	1	0.49	Consultation Complete April 2013. On hold for investigation into options.
New Sites Added from 2012/13 Assessments																		
9	Ferry Road opp Ferry Road Drive	0.366	May-12	1	1	1	1	1	1.4	1	1.1	1	1	1	1	1	0.57	Consultation Complete April 2013; Proposed for construction
10	Comiston Road at Comiton Place	0.216	May-12	1.009	1	1	1	1.2	1.3	1	1.1	1	1	1	1	1	0.37	Consultation Complete April 2013; Proposed for construction
11	Sciennes at Summerside Crescent	0.145	May-12	1	1	1	1	1	2.4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.35	Consultation Complete April 2013; Proposed for construction
12	Slateford Road at Gorgie Park Close	0.481	Sep-12	1	1	1	1	1	1.8	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.86	Consultation Complete April 2013; Proposed for construction
13	Northumberland Street	0.263	Sep-12	1	1	1	1	1	1.3	1	1	1	1	1	1.25	1	0.41	Consultation Complete April 2013; Proposed for construction
14	Dean Park Crescent, between Comely Bank Ave and Queensferry Road	0.642	Oct-12	1	1	1	1	1	1.0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.67	Consultation Complete April 2013; Proposed for construction

Rank	LOCATION	Base PV ²	Date of pv ²	Vulnerable Users		Vehicle Composition		Ped. Accident Factor	Road Width Factor	85th Percentile Speed Factor (mph)					Trip Ends		Adjusted pv ²	Current Status
				Children >15% (% plus 100)/115	Elderly & Disabled >15% (% plus 100)/115	Buses & coaches > 10% (2)	HGVs > 10% (2.3)			1 + (N/10)	Actual width/7.3	<30 (1)	30-35 (1.1)	36-40 (1.2)	41-45 (1.3)	>46 (1.4)		
15	London Street at Drummond Place	0.681	Dec-12	1	1	1	1	1	2.2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.48	New Site recently assessed and added
16	Myreside Road at footbridge	0.189	Jan-13	1.348	1	1	1	1	1.2	1	1.1	1	1	1	1	1	0.33	New Site recently assessed and added

New site added for further Investigation

17	Ferniehill Drive, opp no. 16	0.11	May-12	1.03	1	1.0	1	1	1.40	1	1.1	1	1	1	1.25	1	0.22	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3). Further investigation to be carried out.
----	------------------------------	------	--------	------	---	-----	---	---	------	---	-----	---	---	---	------	---	------	---

Previously Approved Sites Currently on Hold

18	Corstorphine Road (A8) at Kaimes Road <i>Note: On hold due to development</i>	1.236	Oct-09	1	1	1	1	1.1	1.88	1	1.1	1	1	1	1	1	2.81	Development proposals include crossing facilities in this area.
19	Dalry Road at Dalry Place. <i>Note : on hold due to associated Tram Works.</i>	0.223	Oct-09	1	1	2	1	1.1	1.59	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.4	1.09	On hold due to Tram works in area.
20	East Hermitage Place at Somerset Place <i>Note : On hold pending detailed analysis of turning movements.</i>	0.278	Nov-09	1	1	1	1	1.1	1.36	1	1.1	1	1	1	1	1	0.46	On hold due to restrictive site constraints, options being reviewed. TRO likely to be required.

List of Locations which failed to meet the priority list criteria.

< 0.3 no further action

0.3<1.0 consider a pedestrian refuge island

>1.0 consider a controlled crossing

LOCATION	Base PV ²	Date of PV ²	Vulnerable Users		Vehicle Composition		Ped. Accident Factor	Road Width Factor	85th Percentile Speed Factor (mph)					Trip Ends		Adjusted PV ²	Comment
			Children >15% (% plus 100)/115)	Elderly & disabled <15% (1)	Buses & coaches > 10% (2)	HGVs > 10% (2.3)			<30 (1)	30-35 (1.1)	36-40 (1.2)	41-45 (1.3)	>46 (1.4)	Serves 2 trip-ends i.e. school, shops, leisure, community (1.25)	Serves 3 trip-ends i.e. school, shops, leisure, community (1.4)		
Greenbank Crescent south of Greenbank Road	0.05	May-12	1	1	1	1	1	1.2	1	1.1	1	1	1	1	1	0.07	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)
Marionville Ave Rbt at Restalrig Rd S, South Arm	0.11	May-12	1	1	1	1	1	2.0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.21	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)
Marionville Ave Rbt at Restalrig Rd S, West Arm	0.09	May-12	1	1	1	1	1	1.8	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.17	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)
Ellersley Road, location tbc	0.10	Jun-12	1	1	1	1	1	1.1	1	1.1	1	1	1	1	1	0.12	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)
Inverleith Place at Junction to Fettes Ave	0.08	Jun-12	1	1	1	1	1	1.9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.15	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)
Ratho Main Street	0.02	Sep-12	1.11	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.02	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)
Redford Road at it's junction with Redford Drive	0.08	Sep-12	1.10	1	1	1	1	1.2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.10	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)
Sciennes Road at Primary School	0.10	Sep-12	1.40	1	1	1	1	1.2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.16	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)
Old Dalkeith Road at footpath to Fernieside Drive	0.52	Sep-12	1.08	1	1	1	1	1.4	1	1	1.2	1	1	1	1	0.95	Score failed to meet criteria for controlled crossing (>1.0). Current refuge island in place suitable.
Joppa Road at Church	0.09	Oct-12	1.12	1	1	1	1	1.6	1	1.1	1	1	1	1	1	0.19	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)

List of Locations which failed to meet the priority list criteria.

LOCATION	Base PV ²	Date of PV ²	Vulnerable Users		Vehicle Composition		Ped. Accident Factor	Road Width Factor	85th Percentile Speed Factor (mph)					Trip Ends		Adjusted PV ²	Comment
			Children >15% (% plus 100)/115)	Elderly & disabled <15% (1)	Buses & coaches > 10% (2)	HGVs > 10% (2.3)			<30 (1)	30-35 (1.1)	36-40 (1.2)	41-45 (1.3)	>46 (1.4)	Serves 2 trip-ends i.e. school, shops, leisure, community (1.25)	Serves 3 trip-ends i.e. school, shops, leisure, community (1.4)		
Corstorphine High Street @ junction with Orchardfield Ave	0.15	Oct-12	1.04	1	1	1	1.1	1.2	1	1.1	1	1	1	1	1	0.22	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)
Claremont Park (Leith Links)	0.07	Oct-12	1.01	1	1	1	1	1.3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.09	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)
Strachan Road at Strachan Gardens	0.02	Nov-12	1.24	1	1	1	1	1.3	1	1.1	1	1	1	1	1	0.03	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)
Craighall Road, at junction to Starbank/Pier Pl	0.07	Oct-12	1.04	1	1	1	1	1.8	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.14	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)
Ravelston Dykes at Craighleith Crescent	0.26	Oct-11	1.28	1	1	1	1	1.0	1	1.1	1	1	1	1	1	0.36	Score failed to meet criteria for controlled crossing (>1.0). Current refuge island in place suitable.
Hillhouse Road, north of Forthview Terrace	0.30	Nov-12	1.04	1	1	1	1	2.1	1	1.1	1	1	1	1	1	0.74	Score failed to meet criteria for controlled crossing (>1.0). Current refuge island in place suitable.
Inverleith Place at Inverleith Park	0.07	Nov-12	1	1	1	1	1	1.9	1	1.1	1	1	1	1	1	0.14	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)
Groathill Road North, at Zebra south of Easter Drylaw Drive	0.10	Nov-12	1.27	1	1	1	1	1.3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.17	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)
Peffermill Road at nursing home, east of Prestonfield Ave jnc	0.04	Jan-13	1	1	1	1	1	1.9	1	1.1	1	1	1	1	1	0.08	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)
Frogston Road East at Mortonhall Park Ave (west jnc)	0.02	Feb-13	1	1	1	1	1	1.6	1	1	1.2	1	1	1	1	0.04	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)

List of Locations which failed to meet the priority list criteria.

LOCATION	Base PV ²	Date of PV ²	Vulnerable Users		Vehicle Composition		Ped. Accident Factor	Road Width Factor	85th Percentile Speed Factor (mph)					Trip Ends		Adjusted PV ²	Comment
			Children >15% (% plus 100)/115)	Elderly & disabled <15% (1)	Buses & coaches > 10% (2)	HGVs > 10% (2.3)			<30 (1)	30-35 (1.1)	36-40 (1.2)	41-45 (1.3)	>46 (1.4)	Serves 2 trip-ends i.e. school, shops, leisure, community (1.25)	Serves 3 trip-ends i.e. school, shops, leisure, community (1.4)		
Frogston Road East opp Mortonhall Park Gardens	0.01	Feb-13	1.07	1	1	1	1	1.6	1	1	1.2	1	1	1	1	0.02	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)
Northfield Broadway at junction to Piersfield Terrace (Portobello Road)	0.32	Jan-13	1	1	1	1	1	2.1	1	1	1	1	1	1.25	1	0.84	Score failed to meet criteria for controlled crossing (>1.0). Current refuge island in place suitable.
Glenlockhart Road, west of the roundabout at Steills estate	0.04	Feb-13	1.08	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.04	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)
Comiston Road, south of Buckstone Avenue	0.36	Mar-10	1.05	1	1	1	1	1.89	1	1.1	1	1	1	1	1	0.78	Developer proposals in this area include a signalised crossing.
East Fettes Avenue at west entrance to Inverleith Park	0.40	Jun-10	1.01	1	1	1	1	1.44	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.70	Cycling Team have recently installed new refuge islands

Appendix 3

List of Constructed Sites in 2012/13

Location	Neighbourhood Partnership	Crossing Type
Dundas Street North of junction with Fettes Row	Inverleith NP	2no. Sets of Refuge Islands
Lindsay Road at Co-op	Forth NP	Puffin Crossing
Chesser Avenue, 140m south of Chesser Crescent	South West NP	Refuge Island with Drop Kerbs and Tactile Paving
Captains Road at Southhouse Terrace	Liberton / Gilmerton NP	Refuge Island with Drop Kerbs and Tactile Paving
Murrayburn Road at Hailesland Road (2) East Jnc	South West NP	Puffin Crossing and Re-surfacing of Bus Lay-by
Crewe Road South at North Webber Park	Inverleith NP	Refuge Island with Drop Kerbs and Tactile Paving
Biggar Road at Winton Estates footpaths	Pentlands NP	Upgrade existing Refuge Island and install drop kerbs and tactile paving. Completed by South West Area Roads Team.
Inverleith Terrace at Inverleith Row	Inverleith NP	Drop Kerb + Tactiles only, existing island is suitable however not DDA compliant
Newcraighall Road at Fort Roundabout and Petsmart	Portobello / Craigmillar NP	Upgrade existing Refuge Island on arm of Roundabout
Craiglockhart Avenue at Craiglockhart Loan	South West NP	Drop Kerb + Tactiles only, existing island is suitable however not DDA compliant
Broomhouse Drive opposite 17 (bus stop)	South West NP	Refuge Island with Drop Kerbs and Tactile Paving
Redford Road, west of Oxgangs Road junction	Western NP	Refuge Island with Drop Kerbs and Tactile Paving
Orchard Road	Inverleith NP	Upgrade existing Refuge Island on arm of Roundabout
Newcraighall Road near Cleikimfield	Portobello / Craigmillar NP	Refuge Island with Drop Kerbs and Tactile Paving
Niddrie Mains Road at medical centre, east of Harewood Drive	Portobello / Craigmillar NP	Footway buildout with Drop Kerbs and Tactile Paving
Great Stuart Street	City Centre NP	Footway buildouts and new refuge island works

4.1 Peffermill Road @ Prestonfield Avenue - Consultation Responses (Covered in main report)

Summary	In Favour	Objections	Comments	Comments
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident			Yes	Your plan does not show the disabled parking bay at 49A Peffermill Road. With the proposed DYL this will leave very little room for parking between this. Could the island be constructed on the other side of the junction?
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	I am in favour of the proposed refuge island as it will make it easier to cross the road safely.
Business	No	Yes	Yes	The proposed alterations to parking restrictions will be detrimental to residents in Peffermill Road and will restrict nearby parking at our shop. There is a high demand for parking in this area and I have personally felt the wrath of residents for taking up a parking space with our works van. So removing several spaces will have a negative affect on residents and our business. I also cannot see any demand at this location.
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	No	Yes	Yes	Object to the loss of parking. Also when events are on at the playing fields this will make it even more difficult to get parked for residents.
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Grange / Prestonfield CC	Yes	No	No	The GPCC is fully supportive of the creation of this crossing.

4.2 Drum Street o/s No. 40-42 - Consultation Responses

Summary	In Favour	Objections	Comments	Comments
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	I am strongly in favour of the proposals. I am a wheelchair user who usually has great difficulty in crossing this busy road.
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	I am in favour of the proposals as this area has a lot of traffic travelling very fast. Also the double yellow lines will clearer crossing ways for myself and my young baby. Would like to add that delivery drivers at Dominoes ignore current parking arrangements and continuously park on the pavement and force pedestrians to walk on the road. Awaiting a response from a complaint logged with regards to parking/disabled bay which is restricting visibility when exiting from house.
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident			Yes	Due to the close proximity to the Gilmerton Road crossroads, consideration should be given to queuing traffic and right turns from the side road junction of our proposed scheme.
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Police	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	I am massively in favour of this.
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	I am in full favour of the proposal but would recommend a set of traffic lights.
Resident	Yes	No	No	

4.3 Queensferry Terrace @ School Crossing - Consultation Responses

Summary	In Favour	Objections	Comments	Comments
Resident	No	Yes	Yes	The current pedestrian entrance on Queensferry Terrace is a goods entrance to Stewart Melville's College and is unsuitable for pedestrians. A puffin crossing should not be installed as it will encourage use of this unsuitable entrance. A puffin crossing will increase the amount of parent drop off vehicles which is currently dangerous.
Fire Service	Yes	No	No	
CEC Area Roads Manager	Yes	No	Yes	Does not think removing build-outs is a good idea. UPDATE: email sent to justify the removal of buildouts.

Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Supportive of crossing however road is busy in AM PM peaks and the location of the bus stop will add to congestion.
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	This road is impossible to cross, I applaud these proposals. The parents at the school double park and create safety issues - can we have more parking attendants?
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Blackhall Community Council	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	I would like to draw attention to the actions of parents dropping off children at the school there drivers are oblivious to the Highway Code and park illegally. Much tighter control is required for parking in this area.
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	Can the parking bays nearest the traffic lights at Ravelston Dykes be removed, when in use the traffic conditions are extremely dangerous.
Resident			Yes	Pedestrians will cross anywhere to gain the nearest entry/exit. Drivers will park anywhere and illegally. Need additional enforcement.
Lothian & Borders Police	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	New crossing would make a real difference to pupils accessing the college. This is overdue and very much hope this can be completed as soon as possible.
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	In favour of crossing, however this will increase the volume of traffic and school drop offs on Belford Gardens. Could bollards be sited on the footways to tackle the problem of cars mounting and driving on pavements? (UPDATE: will be considered in final design).
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	The school parking is atrocious there is a real congestion problem on Belford Gardens during school pick ups.
Resident	Yes	No	No	

4.4 Piersfield Terrace - Consultation Responses (Covered in main report)

Summary	In Favour	Objections	Comments	Comments
NP Transport Sub-Group	Yes	No	No	
Community Council Treasurer	No	Yes	Yes	Does not think the puffin crossing will work. These proposals do not meet the requirements previously identified by the community council.
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Good place to cross going to Craigentenny Shops
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	More important that lights erected at the top of Craigentenny Avenue as it is a terrible place to cross.
Resident			Yes	Work has already started on site? Would like an explanation.
Resident			Yes	Relocation of crossing towards Craigentenny Avenue. Bus shelter required on cemetery side. Pavement very narrow will it be widened?
Resident			Yes	Work already started on site?. Traffic lights required at the junction of Craigentenny Avenue and Northfield Broadway.
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	More beneficial to have traffic signals at the junction of Craigentenny Avenue and Portobello Road
Fire and Rescue	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Crossing a great help.
Resident	No	Yes	Yes	Bus stop too close to access at the moment. Trying to get car in or out is dangerous. Leave as it is.
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Welcome, but a crossing on Craigentenny Avenue would be appreciated as more crossing at this location,
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	In favour as long as a safe crossing at Craigentenny. Bus stop location at 196 pavement is narrow and in wet weather the guttering overflows.
Resident / Business	No	Yes	Yes	Eastbound bus stop will blind drivers of vehicles exiting Craigentenny Avenue when a bus is stopped. Remove bus stop and use one further down the road. Traffic lights at the junction of Craigentenny with a crossing phase.
Resident	Yes	No	No	

Police	Yes	No	No	
Resident	No	Yes	Yes	Concern that the crossing not in the correct location. There should be traffic lights at the junction of Craigentiny Avenue and Piersfield Terrace. Making the right turn can be difficult and frustrating. Location of bus stops further from the cemetery

4.5 Duddingston Park South - Consultation Responses

Summary	In Favour	Objections	Comments	Comments
NP Transport Sub-Forum	Yes	No	Yes	In favour of the principle. Local consultation will confirm exact location and desire line.
Resident	No	Yes	Yes	Objecting to the proposals as the footway extension into the carriageway will result in a safety issue for vehicles on Duddingston Park South
Resident	Yes	Yes	Yes	In favour of crossing but the not bus stop location. Has concerns about amount of litter dropped into her gardens. Locating the bus shelter in the proposed location will only create more litter. No need for stop at all.
L&B Fire & Rescue	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	In favour of the proposal
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Busy road difficult to cross due to volume of cars. Totally in favour.
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Wonderful Idea
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	In favour as long as no bus stops outside their property
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Location of bus stop near Cleekim Drive affecting the visibility for those turning right out of this road. Suggestion to move outside Farmfoods. Remove the one outside Duddingston Fry. Good to hear about crossing.
Resident			Yes	Crossing would be better located nearer to the footpath leading Niddrie Mill. Not necessary to move bus stops.
Resident			Yes	Position of bus stop near Cleekim Drive too close to junction affecting visibility
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Police	Yes	No	No	

4.6 Cowgatehead - Consultation Responses

Summary	In Favour	Objections	Comments	Comments
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Could the pavement further east be widened too. Pedestrians often have to walk on the road. (UPDATE: Will be considered in the detailed design)
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Would welcome a controlled pedestrian crossing due to speed of vehicles along the Grassmarket. Busy pedestrian thoroughfare.
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Traffic Management, Police	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Welcome island as will make crossing the road easier and safer.
Business	Yes	No	No	

4.7 West Granton Road, opp Granton Mill Crescent - Consultation Responses

Summary	In Favour	Objections	Comments	Comments
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	

Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Would like to have seen a zebra crossing. For the amount of families and older children crossing this road, but if a refuge island is deemed as the safe option then yes I agree
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	I am in favour of the proposal. I also think that single or double yellow lines along West Granton Road would be beneficials , as due to all the parked cars (during Telford College Times) it is very difficult to see oncoming traffic. You have to step in
Resident			Yes	Although this is something. I think at a zebra crossing would have been better here, loads of kids cross here to go to the duck pond, and now its going to be darting to the middle. I don't think this is safe at all.
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	I am really pleased about the propped crossing. Wheelchair dependent and find it difficult crossing the road to get to the park. Love to have the crossing. It would also be safer for mothers and prams.
Resident			Yes	I think traffic lights would be the most effective way of crossing at this location.
Business			Yes	Has Stage 2 safety audit been carried out? Can a copy be forwarded to me please? Are existing double yellow lines sufficient or do they need to be extended. (UPDATE: Safety audits will be carried out on completion of detailed design).
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Fire & rescue			Yes	Please ensure access width between kerb allow access for fire appliances
Police			Yes	Concern over safety of pedestrians using refuge island due to high volume of traffic. Are pedestrians at risk whilst in the middle of the road? Is the road wide enough to accommodate the island?
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Excellent proposal - difficult to cross with kids due to parked cars.
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	An excellent idea but a pelican crossing would be safer.
Resident			Yes	I believe that a toucan crossing would be much safer than an island due to the volume of traffic and parked cars on both sides of the road.
West Granton Housing Co-operative Limited	Yes	No	Yes	Would prefer a toucan crossing. Would recommend line markings are extended to improve sightlines. No parking on both sides of West Granton Road, from Granton Mains Avenue to Granton Mill Crescent and /or footways built out beyond parked cars.

4.8 Liberton Brae, north of Orchardhead Road - Consultation Responses (Covered in main report)

Summary	In Favour	Objections	Comments	Comments
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	No	Yes	Yes	Agree with island not with relocation of bus stop going out of town. Bus will be directly outside driveway making access more difficult and dangerous. Property closer to road and same level as road affecting privacy
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Good idea, as finds it difficult to cross and often misses the bus.
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Lothian Buses			Yes	Southbound bus stop will be close to the island. May impact traffic flow and create difficulties when passing one or more buses at the stop. No other comments to make.
Resident			Yes	Reducing road to 2 lanes will leads to greater tailbacks at peak times and restrict access to the nursery and offices. The proposed bus stop opposite 14 Liberton Brae will intrude on our neighbours who have a low wall and are close to the road
Resident	No	Yes	Yes	Unnecessary expence and not essential. Money could be spent filling potholes and repairing road surfaces - this should be a priority.
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Welcome and appreciated but should it take precedence over fixing the growing number of potholes in the surrounding area.

Resident	No	Yes	Yes	Location of island will cause more disruption. Would like figures on any collisions. Disabled Driver - has difficulty walking any distance at all. If more than one bus at the stop this will make turning left from Orchardhead Road impossible. Vehicles encroach on oncoming traffic to get round. Buses located nearer the bend - in bright sunlight and wet surfaces passengers virtually invisible. Bus stop only 20ft from front door encroaching on peoples privacy and safety. Driveways will be used as shelter in bad weather. Litter left. passengers can see into people's houses.
Police	Yes	No	No	
Resident			Yes	Crossing on the South of Orchardhead Road, directly outside property. Welcome island but should not impinge on access into driveways. Busy traffic lane widths narrowed require some sort of space to allow right turns to be carried out safely.
Resident			Yes	Never encountered any difficulty in crossing at this location. Already a crossing at junction with Kirkbrae and one close to Alnwickhill Road. Waste of money when roads are affected by potholes. Bus stop directly outside their house gives passengers dire
Resident			Yes	Strong need or pedestrian island with essential flashing beacons on each pavement, south of Orchardhead Road or better still a signalised crossing due to excessive speed of much of the traffic
Resident			Yes	No need for this. Increase traffic congestion. Cars forced to park on uphill side making it more dangerous for cars coming out of drives and crossing the road. Moving bus stops less visibility. There are two crossing points already. Visibility 31-45 ok for people to cross to use the buses.
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident			Yes	Agree to resiting out of town bus stop to 33/35, current location causes tailbacks back to the lights. Into town stop should be moved towards 36- reduce speed of vehicles coming down Liberton Brae.

4.9 Ferry Road, opposite Ferry Road Drive - Consultation Responses

Summary	In Favour	Objections	Comments	Comments
Councillor	Yes	No	Yes	I agree with this proposal but could it be situated half way between the two bus stops? Declare an interest here as I cannot get over this road to get the bus in the morning!
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Busy road with poor visibility when vehicles are parked.
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Busy road, Lots of people crossing at this point.
Resident			Yes	Would prefer lights.
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Busy road with poor visibility when vehicles are parked.
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Long overdue
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Crossing appreciated
Roads Officer			Yes	Has a stage 2 Safety audit been carried out. Double Yellow lines on South side of Ferry Road. (UPDATE: A safety audit will be carried out on completed of the detailed design).
Fire & rescue			Yes	Ensure width between kerbs suitable for fire appliances.
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	
Police			Yes	
Resident			Yes	Commutes by motorbike along route twice a week. Already island outside Money Station. Signalised crossing by post office. Concern as pinch point created, which will be obscured by bus stop. Blocked view endangers many cyclists.

4.10 Comiston Road - Consultation Responses

Summary	In Favour	Objections	Comments	Comments
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Excellent Idea
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident			Yes	These comments will no doubt be ignored as before when over 969 Residents challenged and were subsequently ignored regarding the utterly ridiculous amounts of restricted parking in the Comiston Road area. Go for your life, you will do what you want anyway.
Resident			Yes	I have lived in this location for nearly 10 years and never had a problem crossing the road safely here. The proposed location is close to the existing pedestrian crossing that I feel the proposal is a waste of money.
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	I am in favour of the proposal but would like to know the consequences for drivers turning right out of Morningside Drive. It appears that it will be necessary to cross the hatched area north of the islands.
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	I think it is a brilliant idea and will be very welcome when relatives come with young children, crossing the road from Morningside Drive where cars are parked can be quite hazardous.
Resident			Yes	While I agree that Comiston Road needs a pedestrian refuge island, I think it would be better positioned further up the road near the junction with Comiston Place. The proposed position is very close to the traffic lights and the crossing there which is very safe. I realise the bus stop near Comiston Place may need to be moved slightly but would be well placed for shops and South Morningside school annexe. The parking bays could remain where they are. However I think it would be a good addition to our busy road.
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident			Yes	Very pleased with recent parking. Hope the sight of new bins will not cause problems for motorists trying to turn right onto Comiston Road from Comiston Place. Lorries park which impairs clear view from Comiston Place.
Fire & Rescue			Yes	Please ensure access width between kerbs allow access for fire appliances.
Morningside Community Council	No	Yes	Yes	Very little support for this proposal. Proposed site not a heavily used crossing point, too close to controlled crossing, likely to add congestion at the junction of Morningside Drive and Comiston Road. Consideration given to 2 new sites. - West end Craighouse Gardens at the junction with Myreside Road and Eastern end of Greenbank Drive. Also difficulty in crossing east end of Morningside Drive.
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	This is a good idea as it will stop two lanes or any overtaking at the junction of Comiston Road and Morningside Drive. As previously many accidents have occurred from drivers overtaking - then cars coming out from Morningside Drive turning right onto Comiston Road will not have this problem. Many have ignored the road markings too. Some good thinking.
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Business	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	

4.11 Sciennes at Summerhall - Consultation

Responses

Summary	In Favour	Objections	Comments	Comments
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Fire and Rescue	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Great
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Improvements to cyclepaths in the area. Road surface badly potholed making cycling unpleasant and dangerous.
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Visibility poor at present
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Excellent proposal as dangerous crossing at present. Should consider adding traffic lights and making it a full pedestrian crossing.
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Much needed. The junction of Melville Terrace and Summerhall is far more worrying, perhaps moving phone box to improve visibility, or a chicane added to slow traffic. Perhaps move bins towards the corner.
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Great idea. Thank you.
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident			Yes	Congested junction. To improve traffic, road markings required as indicated (Keep Clear).
Police			Yes	The island appears to be in close proximity to the junction - will this allow safe crossing with vehicle turning left into the junction (Sciennes Road)

4.12 Slateford Road - Consultation

Responses

Summary	In Favour	Objections	Comments	Comments
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Business	Yes	No	Yes	Number of clients have difficulty crossing the road and comment on how dangerous it is.
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	No	Yes	Yes	Waste of money. Problem is speed.
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Traffic goes too fast. Lots of elderly in the vicinity. Need one lane at the island
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Wishes improvement every success.
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Very necessary. Great asset to senior citizens.
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	State of the pavement. Should be resurfaced at the same time as the implementation of the crossing.
Resident	No	Yes	Yes	Already a crossing further up the road. Additional one does not seem merited
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Definitely needed. Crossing there is hazardous at present.
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Fully supportive of proposal. Advised that there is a community centre/facility within Gorgie Park Close with vulnerable users who cross road in this area.

4.13 Northumberland Street - Consultation

Responses

Summary	In Favour	Objections	Comments	Comments
---------	-----------	------------	----------	----------

Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Concerns over the location of the proposed motor cycle bay, which is to be located outside no.65. This will impact the sight lines for vehicles exiting the northern lane and may result in safety issues. A location within this lane or outside no. 68 may be better placed. There are numerous businesses in the northern lane, where as only a single business in southern lane - it would be better to use this junction area for m/c bay.
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Motorcycle bay needs to be relocated. Proposed location will restrict access to middle section of street for elderly / disabled etc. Also increase motorcycle noise.
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Dundas Global Investors	Yes	No	No	
Resident			Yes	Doubts that this will contribute to the safety of pedestrians due to the serious risk from traffic turning east into Northumberland Street from Howe Street and cutting the corner to beat traffic proceeding south on Howe Street. Any pedestrian on the proposed island would not be safe in those circumstances.
Resident	No	Yes	Yes	Crossing is unnecessary. Never had any problems crossing. Visual clutter and detriment of the character of the neighbourhood. It reinforced the seige feeling for pedestrians rather than the road being a place where there should be mutual respect.
Resident	No	Yes	Yes	Hardly necessary and will lead to more congestion. Concentrate on returning street back to normal this would stop traffic using the street as a rat run.
Boland Scottish Properties Ltd	No	Yes	Yes	Proposals will cause more problems than it will solve. No major issues with pedestrians using the road. Speed bumps would be more effective at slowing traffic. It will make life a 100x's more difficult for the shop (which as residents we need and value) deliveries, and any deliveries may well then block the road for cars and traffic. At this time, cars get round the lorries but an island would stop this.
Scottish Conservative Party	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Welcome and overdue. People at risk of speeding cars cutting the corner.
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Excellent first step in improving safety generally. More needs to be done, and in the context of a much broader New Town traffic plan, a one-way grid system (as in New York) would lend itself to new town layout.
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	When will this be constructed. (UPDATE: During 2014/15)
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Additional measures to be taken to limit the volume and speed of traffic. The cobbles are being destroyed and the vibration is causing serious damage to these listed buildings.
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Please extend the double Yellow Lines around the end of the lanes - parking is appalling at the weekends. No emergency vehicle could access them.
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Concerns with continuing to allow parking outside the mini-market. Will cause increased congestion and dangers around the junction. Would prefer parking to be limited rather than retained.
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	It seems ok as long as it does not give more public parking.
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Good Idea
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	There is a lot of traffic in this area, both cars and pedestrians. Important improvement in safety.
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Anything that might help slow down the cut through traffic that speeds very dangerously down the street.
Police			Yes	Concern over location of island to proximity of junction.
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Crossing key as Northumberland Street has become a rat race and the number of cars parked make it difficult to cross.

4.14 Dean Park Crescent - Consultation Responses

Summary	In Favour	Objections	Comments	Comments
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	In favour of the proposal. Traffic volumes and speeds make crossing hazardous. Has consideration been given to a lower speed limit.
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	In favour of crossing, but does this impinge on Resident Parking on Learmonth Terrace
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	No	
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Much needed measure
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Unsafe mixture of pedestrians and traffic from all directions. The whole junction controlled by signals. Should fit bollards to east end of Learmonth Terrace. This would simplify the whole junction and prevent the use of Learmonth Terrace as a rat run.
Resident	Yes	No	Yes	Traffic calming measures or some form of signage as you turn into DPC.
Police	No	No	Yes	Concern regarding vehicles exiting Learmonth Terrace, turning left onto Dean Park Crescent. Drivers may be distracted looking right for approaching vehicles and fail to see pedestrians on islands or crossing onto north footpath. Could island be moved fu
Resident	No	No	Yes	Proposed Refuge Island only goes halfway to a solution. Drivers will not slow down or give way to pedestrians. A further issue is drivers turning right onto Queenferry Road. Vehicles overtake queuing vehicles, turn into Learmonth Terrace without indicating along to next exit. Recommend bollards across the road near 4 Learmonth Terrace to stop the rat run. Recommend a full pelican crossing.
Resident	No	No	Yes	Crossing in Learmonth Terrace, not Dean Park Crescent. Welcome the proposed refuge facility. Concerns of the blocking back of traffic at peak times, The location of the bus stop is an issue.

**Appendix 5
Construction List**

Location	Neighbourhood Partnership	Crossing Type	Estimated Cost	Construction Year
Peffermill Rd at Prestonfield Ave	South Central NP	Refuge Island with Drop Kerbs and Tactile Paving	£14,500.00	2013/14
Drum Street outside Nos 40-42	Liberton / Gilmerton NP	Footway buildout with Drop Kerbs and Tactile Paving	£13,000.00	2013/14
Queensferry Terrace @ School Crossing, north of roundabout	Inverleith NP	Puffin Crossing	£50,000.00	2013/14
202/ 204 Piersfield Terrace (near Cemetery Entrance)	Craigentinny / Duddingston NP	Puffin Crossing	£50,000.00	2013/14
Duddingston Park South (184) between Cleekim Drive and Niddrie Mill Crescent	Portobello / Craigmillar NP	Puffin Crossing	£60,000.00	2013/14
Cowgatehead	City Centre NP	Refuge Island	£15,000.00	2013/14
West Granton Road opposite 26 Granton Mill Crescent	Forth NP	Refuge Island	£15,000.00	2013/14
Liberton Brae at Orchardhead Road	Liberton Gilmerton NP	Refuge Island Note: On hold following consultation; investigation required into alternative options.	-	-
Ferry Road opp Ferry Road Drive	Forth NP & Inverleith NP	Refuge Island	£15,000.00	2013/14
Comiston Road at Comiston Place	South Central NP	Refuge Island / Buildout	£15,000.00	2013/14

2013/14 Total £247,500.00

Sciennes at Summerside Crescent	South Central NP	Refuge Island / Buildout	£15,000.00	2014/15
Slateford Road at Gorgie Park Close	South West NP	Refuge Island	£15,000.00	2014/15
Northumberland Street	City Centre NP	Refuge Island	£15,000.00	2014/15
Dean Park Crescent, between Comely Bank Ave and Queensferry Road	Inverleith NP	Refuge Island / Buildout	£15,000.00	2014/15

Pedestrian Crossing Prioritisation Process

Appendix 6 – Pedestrian Crossing Assessment Process

