

Transport and Environment Committee

10.00am, Thursday, 10 August 2017

Updated Pedestrian Crossing Prioritisation 2017/18

Item number	8.1
Report number	
Executive/routine	
Wards	All

Executive Summary

This report provides an updated pedestrian crossing priority list and reports back on consultations undertaken for locations approved in the previous report to the Transport and Environment Committee meeting on [7 June 2016](#).

Links

[Coalition Pledges](#)
[Council Priorities](#)
[Single Outcome Agreement](#)

Updated Pedestrian Crossing Prioritisation 2017/18

1. Recommendations

- 1.1 It is recommended that the Committee:
 - 1.1.1 approves the updated pedestrian crossing priority list for 2017/18 as per Appendix 1;
 - 1.1.2 notes the locations that did not meet the priority list criteria in Appendix 2; and
 - 1.1.3 notes the results of the public consultations and sets aside any representations to allow construction to progress (Appendix 3).

2. Background

- 2.1 In accordance with the decision made by the former Transport, Infrastructure and Environment Committee on [28 July 2009](#), on the report titled “Pedestrian Crossing Prioritisation Process”; this report provides an update on the pedestrian crossing priority list.

3. Main report

Pedestrian crossing priority list

- 3.1 The previous pedestrian crossing priority list (approved by Transport and Environment Committee on 7 June 2016) consisted of 28 locations. Two of these crossings have since been constructed and 26 remain on the priority list for construction, as listed in Appendix 1.
- 3.2 The base data which is used to assess if a location is suitable for a crossing is known as the PV2 value. This is a nationally recognised value that indicates the number of passing vehicles and crossing pedestrians. Pedestrian and vehicle counts are taken over the peak hours of a week day, from 7am to 10am and 3pm to 6pm, and avoiding any school holidays or other factors which may skew 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 personal injury collisions involving pedestrians and the number of trip-attractors such as schools, doctors’ surgeries, shops etc.

- 3.3 A location with an adjusted PV2 value of 1 or higher (2 or higher on a dual carriageway) 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 4 is a flow diagram which details the steps carried out in a pedestrian crossing assessment. This process is only used for the provision of stand alone pedestrian facilities, such as puffin crossings and pedestrian islands; it does not include the provision of pedestrian phases at existing traffic signal controlled junctions.
- 3.4 Since May 2016 a total of 62 locations have been assessed. Sixteen of these met the criteria for additional pedestrian facilities and have been added to the priority list for construction. The updated priority list therefore now contains 42 locations.
- 3.5 Forty six of the locations assessed did not meet the criteria or are otherwise deemed unsuitable for crossing improvements. These locations are listed in Appendix 2.
- 3.6 Estimated timescales for the provision of each crossing are provided in the crossing priority list. It should be noted that issues may arise from consultation or as part of the Traffic Regulation Order process that mean the proposed designs have to be altered and that this can alter construction timescales. Should any location fall back into the following year's construction programme, replacement locations will be brought forward.
- 3.7 Pedestrian crossing facilities have been introduced at two locations from the construction list which was reported to Committee in June 2016, at Telford Road and Ferry Road. In addition, the existing zebra crossing on Marchmont Road was upgraded to a puffin crossing, as approved by Committee on 12 January 2016.
- 3.8 A design and consultation has also been carried out for a new puffin crossing on Buckstone Terrace. This is being funded by a developer contribution arising from the Waterfield development. The outcome of this consultation can be found in Appendix 3.
- 3.9 As previously reported to Committee in June 2016, there had been difficulties in identifying a design for crossing improvements in Pilrig Street that met the aspirations of the local community. Further consultations on various options have now taken place and a preferred solution has been identified. The comments raised in this consultation can also be found in Appendix 3. As there is no legal obligation to consult on schemes that do not require a TRO, where comments have been made against the proposals, these have been recorded as representations.
- 3.10 It should be noted that the proposed pedestrian crossing facilities on Ocean Drive are currently on hold, pending a decision on the tram extension.

- 3.11 The developer funding for the Corstorphine Road at Kaimes Road crossing has now been released and design work for this will commence in the current financial year.

4. Measures of success

- 4.1 Pedestrian crossing facilities are provided at locations across the city which have been assessed as having the greatest demand and difficulty experienced by pedestrians. Local consultation ensures the facilities provided meet the requirements of the local community and stakeholders.

5. Financial impact

- 5.1 Funding of up to £200,000 has been made available from the 2017/18 capital road safety budget of £850,000 to introduce crossing facilities at locations from the priority list.

6. Risk, policy, compliance and governance impact

- 6.1 The Edinburgh Road Safety Plan puts forward the vision that the Council and its partners will work towards Vision Zero and provide a modern road network where all users are safe from the risk of being killed or seriously injured. In the Plan, a number of interventions have been developed for pedestrians, including the provision of new crossings, to enable more people to walk greater distances safely and reduce conflict at key points.

7. Equalities impact

- 7.1 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 and Belief) through the consultation and design process.

8. Sustainability impact

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

9. Consultation and engagement

- 9.1 Consultation will be carried out at the proposed locations on the pedestrian crossing construction list once approval has been granted and a design has been produced. The results of the consultations on the proposed facilities on Pilrig Street and Buckstone Terrace are included in Appendix 3.

10. Background reading/external references

- 10.1 Background Paper - Report to the Transport, Infrastructure and Environment Committee 28 July 2009 titled "[Pedestrian Crossing Prioritisation Process](#)"

Paul Lawrence

Executive Director of Place

Contact: Stacey Monteith-Skelton, Senior Engineer (Road Safety)

E-mail: stacey.monteith-skelton@edinburgh.gov.uk | Tel: 0131 469 3558

11. Links

Coalition Pledges

Council Priorities

Single Outcome Agreement

Appendices

Appendix 1 - Updated Pedestrian Crossing Priority List

Appendix 2 - List of locations which failed to meet priority list criteria

Appendix 3 – Results of Consultations

Appendix 4 - Pedestrian Crossing Assessment Process

Appendix 1
Updated Priority List

Rank	LOCATION	Date of Assessment	Adjusted PV2	Crossing Type and Current Status	Estimated Construction Cost	Construction Year
Previously Approved Sites from June 2016 Committee						
1	London Street at Drummond Place	Dec-12	1.48	Various crossing options to be designed and consulted on. Construction dependant on implementation of TRO.	£40,000.00	2017/18
2	Myreside Road at Footbridge	Jan-13	0.33	Pedestrian island designed and audited. Still to be consulted on. Construction dependant on implementation of TRO.	£15,000.00	2017/18
3	East Fettes Avenue at Broughton High School opposite entrance to Inverleith Park	Apr-14	0.504	Pedestrian island designed. Still to be audited and consulted on. Construction dependant on implementation of TRO.	£15,000.00	2017/18
4	Pilrig Street at Cambridge Avenue	Apr-14	0.32	Pedestrian refuge island designed and consultation complete. Still to be audited. Construction dependant on implmentation of TRO.	£15,000.00	2017/18
5	South Gyle Crescent, 150m south of junction with Redheughs Avenue	Oct-14	0.3433	Vaiious crossing options being designed. Still to be audited and consulted on. Construction dependant on implmentation of TRO.	£15,000.00	2017/18
6	Ocean Drive - Between exit from BHS and Roundabout	Oct-14	1.3698	Signallised crossing. On hold depending on tram extension.	£40,000.00	Unknown
7	Costorphine Road (A8) at Kaimes Road	Oct-09	2.81	Signalised crossing to be designed and consulted on.	£40,000.00	To be programmed
8	St Johns Place at Elbe Street	May-15	0.4392	Pedestrian island to be designed and consulted on. Construction dependant on implmentation of TRO.	£15,000.00	2017/18
9	South Gyle Broadway at Roundabout	May-15	1.1495	Signalised crossing to be designed and consulted on.	£40,000.00	2017/18
10	Crewe Road South at Comely Bank Roundabout	May-15	0.7891	Upgrade pedestrian refuge island. This is now being delivered as part of a larger capital scheme.	£10,000.00	2017/18
11	Marionville Road at Wishaw Terrace	May-15	0.568	Various crossing options to be designed and consulted on.	£15,000.00	2017/18

Rank	LOCATION	Date of Assessment	Adjusted PV2	Crossing Type and Current Status	Estimated Construction Cost	Construction Year
12	South Gyle Crescent south of roundabout with South Gyle Access at entry to Tesco bank	May-15	0.5657	Pedestrian refuge island to be designed and consulted on.	£15,000.00	2018/19
13	Ratcliffe Terrace @ South island at BP garage	May-15	0.4023	Upgrade pedestrian refuge island	£10,000.00	2018/19
14	West Granton Road to the east of Granton Mains East	May-15	3.6662	Signalised crossing to be designed and consulted on.	£40,000.00	2018/19
15	Gilmerton Dykes Street at Bus Terminus	May-15	0.4895	Pedestrian refuge island to be designed and consulted on.	£15,000.00	2018/19
16	Lanark Road West at Stewart Road	May-15	0.8922	Various crossing options to be designed and consulted on.	£30,000.00	2018/19
17	Fettes Avenue at Comley Bank Road at existing D island	Nov-15	1.7454	Controlled crossing to be designed and consulted on. - Include as part of AIP scheme	£40,000.00	2018/19
18	North West Circus Place at junction with Royal Circus	Nov-15	0.5446	Various crossing options to be designed and consulted on.	£30,000.00	2018/19
19	Gilmerton Dykes Street at Gilmerton Dykes Crescent for access to shops	Nov-15	0.3876	Pedestrian refuge island to be designed and consulted on.	£15,000.00	2018/19
20	Great King Street (west end towards St Vincent St)	Nov-15	0.4055	Various crossing options to be designed and consulted on.	£30,000.00	2018/19
21	Restalrig Road at Ryehill Terrace	Nov-15	0.3518	Various crossing options to be designed and consulted on.	£30,000.00	2019/20
22	Lasswade Road at Little Learners Nursery (Existing Double D)	Nov-15	0.6633	Pedestrian refuge island upgrade to be designed and consulted on.	£10,000.00	2019/20
23	Corbiehill Road at Junction with Main Street	Nov-15	0.3031	Pedestrian refuge island to be designed and consulted on.	£15,000.00	2019/20
24	Milton Road East at Brunstane Road (existing D)	Nov-15	0.4292	Pedestrian refuge island upgrade to be designed and consulted on. Part of improvements by Children and Families	£10,000.00	Unknown
25	Torphichen Street - centred on existing drop crossing near corner.	Nov-15	0.4021	Various crossing options to be designed and consulted on.	£30,000.00	2019/20
26	South Bridge at Drummond Street	Nov-15	19.142	Controlled crossing to be designed and consulted on.	£40,000.00	2019/20

Rank	LOCATION	Date of Assessment	Adjusted PV2	Crossing Type and Current Status	Estimated Construction Cost	Construction Year
New Sites Added from Assessments						
27	Yeaman Place at its junction with Dundee Street	May-16	1.869	Various crossing options to be designed and consulted on.	£15,000.00	2019/20
28	Craiglockhart Avenue at existing traffic island north of Craiglockhart Drive North.	May-16	0.425	Pedestrian refuge island upgrade to be designed and consulted on.	£15,000.00	2019/20
29	Albion Road at Albion Place	May-16	0.46	Pedestrian refuge island to be designed and consulted on.	£15,000.00	2019/20
30	Ashley Terrace at Shaftesbury Park	Sep-16	0.85	Pedestrian refuge island upgrade and improvements to be designed and consulted on.	£15,000.00	2019/20
31	Colinton Road at Craiglockhart Park	Sep-16	0.606	Pedestrian refuge island upgrade to be designed and consulted on.	£10,000.00	2019/20
32	Lanark Road opp South end of Kingsknowe Playing Fields	Oct-16	0.37	Pedestrian refuge island upgrade to be designed and consulted on.	£10,000.00	2019/20
33	Telford Road at Forthview Terrace (both sides of the junction)	Apr-17	0.553	Pedestrian refuge island upgrade to be designed and consulted on.	£10,000.00	2019/20
34	Whitehouse Road east of Lawhouse Toll	Apr-17	0.319	Various crossing improvements to be designed and consulted on.	£15,000.00	2020/21
35	Chesser Avenue at Chesser Grove	May-17	0.752	Pedestrian refuge island designed. To be built as part of larger capital improvements scheme	£15,000.00	2017/18
36	Grosvenor Crescent at junction with Palmerston Place	Apr-17	0.503	Various crossing improvements to be designed and consulted on.	£15,000.00	2020/21

Rank	LOCATION	Date of Assessment	Adjusted PV2	Crossing Type and Current Status	Estimated Construction Cost	Construction Year
37	Clermiston Road at Clerwood Park	Apr-17	0.329	Various crossing options to be designed and consulted on.	£15,000.00	2020/21
38	Grassmarket Zebra	Apr-17	4.708	Controlled crossing to be designed and consulted on.	£40,000.00	2020/21
39	Telford Road at Telford Place	Apr-17	0.505	Pedestrian refuge island upgrade to be designed and consulted on.	£10,000.00	2020/21
40	Queensferry Road East of Buckingham Terrace	May-17	1.469	Controlled crossing to be designed and consulted on.	£40,000.00	2020/21
41	The Loan, South Queensferry (North of Loch Road)	Apr-17	0.313	Various crossing options to be designed and consulted on.	£15,000.00	2020/21
42	Gorgie Road East of Number 511	Apr-17	2.855	Controlled crossing to be designed and consulted on.	£40,000.00	2020/21

Appendix 2

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	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)		
Locations Which Failed to Meet the Priority List Criteria																	
Myreside Road at Meadowspot	0.149824	May-16	1	1	1	1	1	1.37	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.205	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>1) to upgrade existing islands to a puffin crossing.
Sleigh Drive close to roundabout at Restalrig Road South	0.2555	May-16	1.052	1	1	1	1	1.00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.258	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)
Braid Hills Drive at Lang Linn Path	0.0046	Jun-16	1.000	1	1	1	1	1.16	1	1	1	1.3	1	1	1	0.007	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)
Drumsheugh Gardens west of junction with Lynedoch Place Lane	0.0209	Jun-16	1.000	1	1	1	1.1	1.58	1	1.1	1	1	1	1	1	0.04	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)
Claremont Park to the east of Claremont Road	0.0851	May-16	1.009	1	1	1	1	1.51	1	1	1	1	1	1.25	1	0.162	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)
New Swanston - between Howe Park and Tryst Park	0.0456	May-16	1.000	1	1	1	1	1.10	1	1	1	1	1	1.25	1	0.062	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)
Polwarth Gardens - midway or at the Scotmid end of the street	0.121834	May-16	1.000	1	1	1	1.1	1.60	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.215	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)
Old Dalkeith Road at Bridgend/Inch Park	0.1499	May-16	1.000	1	1	1	1	1.44	1	1	1	1	1	1.25	1	0.269	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)
Restalrig Road to the north of Blackie Road/East Restalrig Terrace	0.0706	May-16	1.061	1	1	1	1	1.30	1	1	1	1	1	1.25	1	0.122	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)
Lanark Road West A70 at Newmills Road	0.0568	May-16	1.000	1	1	1	1	1.00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.057	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)
Groathill Road North at Zebra Crossing to north of Easter Drylaw Avenue	0.0619	Oct-16	1.174	1	1	1	1	1.29	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.094	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>1) to upgrade existing zebra to a puffin crossing.
Groathill Road North at Zebra Crossing to the south of Easter Drylaw Avenue	0.0909	Oct-16	1.261	1	1	1	1	1.29	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.148	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>1) to upgrade existing zebra to a puffin crossing.
Maybury Road at Craigs Road	0.5264	Oct-16	1.000	1	1	1	1	1.84	1	1.1	1	1	1	1	1	1.063	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>2) as on a dual carriageway

LOCATION			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)	Serves 2 trip-ends i.e. school, shops, leisure, community (1.25)	Serves 3 trip-ends i.e. school, shops, leisure, community (1.4)		Current Status
Silverknowes Road at the Shops	0.004	Sep-16	0.004	1	1	1	1	1.18	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.007	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>1) to upgrade existing islands to a puffin crossing.
Builyeon Road (at west bus stop)	0.0142	Sep-16	1.000	1	1	1	1	1.00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.014	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)
Builyeon Road (at east bus stop)	0.0182	Sep-16	1.000	1	1	1	1	1.00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.018	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)
Niddrie Mains Road at Craigmillar Castle Avenue	0.1223	Sep-16	1.000	1	1	1	1	1.00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.122	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)
Craigentenny Road at Craigentenny Ave (N arm)	0.0104	Sep-16	1.000	1	1	1	1	1.75	1	1	1	1	1	1.25	1	0.023	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>1) to upgrade existing islands to a puffin crossing.
Craigentenny Road at Craigentenny Ave (E arm)	0.0466	Sep-16	1.043	1	1	1	1	1.70	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.4	0.116	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>1) to upgrade existing islands to a puffin crossing.
Craigentenny Road at Craigentenny Ave (S arm)	0.0115	Sep-16	1.130	1	1	1	1	1.70	1	1	1	1	1	1.25	1	0.018	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>1) to upgrade existing islands to a puffin crossing.
Craigentenny Road at Craigentenny Ave (W arm)	0.1154	Sep-16	1.000	1	1	1	1	1.71	1	1	1	1	1	1.25	1	0.247	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>1) to upgrade existing islands to a puffin crossing.
Craigmillar Castle Road at Craigmillar Castle Avenue	0.0609	Sep-16	1.191	1	1	1	1	1.07	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.077	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)
A8 Ratho Station	0.0765	Oct-16	1.000	1	1	1	1	3.45	1	1	1	1	1	1.25	1	0.462	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>2) as on a dual carriageway
Braid Road at Braid Hills Road (N arm)	0.0677	Sep-16	1.113	1	1	1	1	1.58	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.119	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>1) to upgrade existing islands to a puffin crossing.
Braid Road at Braid Hills Road (E arm)	0.0302	Sep-16	1.000	1	1	1	1	1.85	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.056	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>1) to upgrade existing islands to a puffin crossing.
Braid Road at Braid Hills Road (S arm)	0.038	Sep-16	1.209	1	1	1	1	1.62	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.074	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>1) to upgrade existing islands to a puffin crossing.
Braid Road at Braid Hills Road (W arm)	0.0237	Sep-16	1.183	1	1	1	1	1.45	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.041	Low score, failed to meet criteria (>0.3)

Resident			x	
Resident			x	
Resident			x	
Resident			x	
Resident			x	
Resident			x	
Resident			x	
Resident			x	
Resident			x	
Resident			x	
Resident			x	
Resident			x	
Resident			x	
Resident			x	
Resident			x	
Resident			x	
Resident				x
Resident				x
Resident				x
Resident				x
Resident				x
Resident				x
Living Streets	x	x	x	
Resident		x	x	
Total	9	28	49	5

The outcome of the public consultation was that Option Three (Pedestrian Refuge Island) was the preferred option and is now being progressed.

Response to comments raised during the consultation period – Pilrig Street at Dryden Street

Can parking be enforced in the area as it causes problems for buses and large vehicles and makes crossing very difficult?

Concerns with regard to parking were raised in several responses to this consultation. These have been passed to the Council's parking enforcement team and a street visit will be undertaken when resources allow. Any vehicle observed parked incorrectly will be subject to enforcement action.

The current layout at this location makes exiting Dryden Street dangerous.

It is anticipated that with the introduction of the pedestrian refuge island, exiting from Dryden Street will be made easier due to increased visibility following the extension of double yellow lines to the north of Dryden Street and the introduction of double yellow lines opposite Dryden Street. The detailed design will be subject to a Road User Safety Audit.

Can traffic calming be implemented to reduce the speed of vehicles travelling along Pilrig Street?

The speed limit on Pilrig Street was reduced to 20mph, as part of Phase 2 of the city wide roll out, and the new speed limit became enforceable on 28 February 2017. The new 20mph speed limits will rely on a shift in driver behaviour which will take time to embed. We will be working to achieve this with the Police through road safety education, awareness raising and prevention activities. Post-implementation surveys will provide robust, citywide data to measure changes in relation to the 20mph after a longer period. In light of the 20mph roll out, the Road Safety team will not consider traffic calming in a residential area unless there is a significant collision history. In the most recent 3 years, up to the end of August 2016, there have been 6 personal injury collisions at various locations on Pilrig Street. Of these, 4 resulted in a slight injury and 2 in serious. Analysis was carried out on these collisions and no pattern was identified. As a result of this, no additional traffic calming is recommended.

Can speed cameras be installed on Pilrig Street?

Speed cameras in Edinburgh are provided by the Scottish Safety Camera Programme – East Unit. There are nationally set criteria which require to be satisfied before safety cameras can be considered for installation; the numbers and severity of personal injury collisions and excessive speed are two such criteria which require to be met. These criteria are essential to avoid a plethora of cameras that could be placed at numerous sites of concern and consequently reduce their effectiveness; the Council liaises closely with the East Safety Camera Unit Manager to assess the entire Council area for potential sites for the installation of safety cameras on an annual basis. This year's review period has concluded and Pilrig Street did not feature as a location where the requisite criteria have been triggered. Therefore, a safety camera would not be considered for installation.

The push button on the pedestrian crossing on Pilrig Street does not work properly.

The Council's Traffic Signals team were notified of this and repairs were carried out.

Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident			x
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident			
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Edinburgh Access Panel	x		
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident		x	

Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident	x		
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident			x
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident	x		
Resident	x		
Resident	x		
Resident	x		
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident	x		
Resident	x		
Living Streets Edinburgh	x		
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident	x		
Resident	x		
Resident	x		

Resident	x		
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident			x
Community Council		x	
Resident	x		
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident		x	
Resident	x		
Totals	106	168	5

The outcome of the public consultation was that Option Two - Signalised Crossing south of Waterfield Road was the preferred option and is now being progressed.

Response to comments raised during the consultation period – Buckstone Terrace Pedestrian Crossing

Why was more than one entrance not considered into the estate?

A single access is acceptable for developments of up to 200 residential units. Between 200 and 250 units a second access should be considered and above 250 it should be provided. However, this is in relation to emergency service access. In this instance, a second emergency access has been provided (near the Oxfords Road lights). A second general access was not practical given the site constraints. The site did not allow for connections to the east or a second access on Buckstone Terrace as the land that would have been required for this was not within the application boundary. There were other concerns with the potential for creating undesirable through routes for traffic.

What will be done to prevent vehicle accidents happening at this junction in peak times?

In the latest available 3-year period (to the end of October 2016) there were two personal injury collisions reported to the Police at this location. Only one of these collisions involved two vehicles and this resulted in slight injury. Road Safety works are targeted at priority locations and the current collision rate means that works on this road could not be recommended at this time. Spending from the road safety budget is to be targeted towards areas which will have the greatest potential collision reduction benefits.

Can the junction be signalised?

Consideration would have been given to a signalised junction at the planning stages of this development. In this case, a signalised junction was not justifiable. This was raised at Development Management Sub -Committee of the Planning Committee during the planning process and the conclusion of the debate was that a crossing should be provided.

Can a Yellow box be provided at the junction?

The implementation of a yellow box at the junction will be investigated during the detailed design.

Can double yellow lines be introduced to reduce parking on Buckstone Terrace?

With the crossing being implemented south of the junction, this will clear parking on both sides of the road as parking is prohibited on zig zag markings. There are no plans to extend the restrictions on Buckstone Terrace outside the Charwood Grill.

The current traffic signals impact the flow of vehicles in and out of the city, can they be linked?

The signals on this part of Comiston Road are not linked, at present, the Traffic Signals team have no plans to link them.

Can the speed on Buckstone Terrace be reduced to 20mph or 30mph?

The final 20mph network was approved by the Transport and Environment Committee on 13 January 2015. In developing the network, a consistent approach was applied across the city using a set of criteria to establish a network of 20mph streets in the city centre, main shopping and residential streets while retaining a strategic network of roads at 30 and 40 mph on key arterial routes, such as Comiston Road. The introduction of the citywide 20mph network is a major project for the Council, taking in a high percentage of streets. It is likely that as a result of surveys, monitoring and public feedback, there will be some post implementation adjustments. This may involve further changes to speed limits, both within 20mph zones and possibly on some strategic routes which have retained higher speed limits. Comments raised through this consultation in relation to a reduction to 20mph will be recorded as part of this review. In the Local Transport Strategy 2014 – 2019, Policy Safe5 states 'The Council will proceed with a programme of reducing speed limits on the urban road network that are currently 40mph to 30mph, combined with road markings and physical measures (e.g. pedestrian islands, cycle lanes) aimed at encouraging motorists to drive more slowly (see policy Safe7 below).' It is expected that a plan to implement this work will be developed later this year.

Can the right turn from the Waterfield development be banned?

No as there is no alternative, such as a roundabout, to allow vehicles to head north.

Can a zebra crossing be implemented at the Charwood Grill?

No, national design standards state that zebra crossings should not be located on roads with speeds of 35mph or above.

Why was a mini roundabout not considered at this junction?

Mini-roundabouts must only be used on roads with a speed limit of 30mph or less, this is detailed in national design standards. Due to the layout of Comiston Road, a multi lane roundabout would have had to be designed. In the Local Transport Strategy 2014 – 2019 it states in Policy PCycle 4 '*There will be a presumption against constructing any new roundabouts with more than one entry, exit or circulating lane within the builtup area.*'

Can the bus stops be removed as there are bus stops further down the road?

We would not be supportive of the removal of bus stops at this location as they are ideally located for nearby residential properties. Due to the layout of adjacent streets a large number of bus passengers would be disadvantaged by their removal.

Can the crossing be set so that the green man is instant, not after 20 seconds?

The crossing will not be set so that there is an instant change. The standard operation for a 40-mph road will be used. This will be vehicle actuated. This means that the timer starts when the push button is pressed, if there is no traffic it will change after 7 seconds. If there is a flow of traffic the traffic will not be signalled to stop for a maximum of 20 seconds depending on traffic flow before changing to the green man.

Care must be taken to maintain access to driveways if Option 2 is implemented.

The crossing will be positioned to ensure that it has no effect on access to nearby properties.

Can the hedge at the Northbound bus stop be cut back as it is growing over the footpath?

The Council's South West Locality team are responsible for enforcing hedges that encroach on to the public footway. I have forwarded this comment on to the Locality Team who will issue an order to the home owner to cut back the hedge within 28 days, if this is not carried out within this timeframe the Locality Team will arrange for the work to be carried out and bill the homeowner.

Can it be a Toucan for cyclists from Waterfield?

As there are no imminent plans for cycle facilities on Comiston Road, a toucan crossing will not be provided. However, the site suitability will be investigated during the detailed design to ensure that in future, if required, it can easily be converted to a Toucan.

Can tactile cones be fitted on the crossing?

Tactile cones to assist blind or partially sighted pedestrians will be fitted as standard to this crossing.

Can the noise from the crossing be controlled?

The audio will be time switched (off between 23:00 & 06:00).

Can the existing island be retained?

Retaining the existing pedestrian island will be investigated as part of the detailed design.

Air Quality is being affected by idling cars on Buckstone Terrace. Can something be done to combat this?

Air quality in the City of Edinburgh is assessed on an annual basis to fulfil the requirements of Local Air Quality Management (LAQM) as set out in Part IV of the Environment Act (1995) and the relevant Policy and Technical Guidance documents. The LAQM process places an obligation on all local authorities to regularly review and assess air quality in their areas, and to determine whether or not legal air quality objectives are likely to be achieved. Where an exceedance is considered likely the local authority must declare an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and prepare an Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) setting out the measures it intends to put in place in pursuit of the objectives. The Council produces an Annual Progress Report summarising this work, which can be found on the website at the following address; www.edinburgh.gov.uk/airquality The Buckstone Terrace/Comiston Road junction is not located within an Air Quality Management Area and not an area of concern in terms of traffic related pollution.

Can Buckstone Terrace be reduced to one lane and cycle facilities introduced?

At present, there are no plans to introduce cycle lanes on Comiston Road/ Buckstone Terrace.

Pedestrian Crossing Prioritisation Process

Appendix 4 – Pedestrian Crossing Assessment Process

