

# Deputations

## Transport and Environment Committee

10.00am Thursday, 7th March, 2024

Dean of Guild Court Room - City Chambers

### Deputations

---

#### Contacts

Email: [rachel.gentleman@edinburgh.gov.uk](mailto:rachel.gentleman@edinburgh.gov.uk) / [carolanne.eyre@edinburgh.gov.uk](mailto:carolanne.eyre@edinburgh.gov.uk)

Tel: 0131 529 4264

#### Nick Smith

Service Director, Legal and Assurance

This page is intentionally left blank

## CITY OF EDINBURGH COUNCIL

Item No 3

### Transport and Environment Committee

7 March 2024

#### DEPUTATION REQUESTS

Subject	Deputation
<b>3.1 In relation to item 6.1 Business Bulletin - (Strategic Review of Parking, Phasing timeline)</b>	Westfield Street Residents (verbal submission)
<b>3.2 In relation to item 7.2 – Healthcare Worker and Carer (Parking) Permits)</b>	NLRP12 (verbal submission)
<b>3.3 In relation to item 7.3 – Travelling Safely Greenbank to Meadows Quiet Connection</b>	Blackford Safe Routes (verbal submission) Residents of Braid Avenue (verbal submission) The Whitehouse Loan Group (written submission) Spokes South Edinburgh (written submission) SW20 (written submission)
<b>3.4 In relation to Emergency Motion by Councillor Lang – Whitehouse Road</b>	Spokes (verbal deputation)

*Information or statements contained in any deputation to the City of Edinburgh Council represent the views and opinions of those submitting the deputation. The reference to, or publication of, any information or statements included within a deputation, including on the City of Edinburgh Council's website, does not constitute an endorsement by the City of Edinburgh Council of any such information or statement and should not be construed as representing the views or position of the Council. The Council accepts no responsibility for comments or views expressed by individuals or groups as part of their deputations.*

**Written Deputation to the Transport Committee Meeting 7 March 2024**  
**On behalf of the Whitehouse Loan Group**  
**Re: Item 7.3 on the Agenda: Travelling Safely, Greenbank to Meadows Quiet Connection**

We have just discovered that the report on the October public consultation is being presented to your Committee without us having advance notice. Consequently, we have had a limited opportunity to discuss this as a Group. This is our immediate response.

The report and the 'Revised Option 2' plan it promotes does not give the Committee a proper basis to decide on this important matter. Item 4.20 of the report recommends that 'the revised version of Option 2 be delivered'. **We submit in the strongest terms that it would be quite improper to proceed directly to another ETRO without prior further consultation with affected residents as it is new, not a revision of Option 2.**

Moving the filter from Churchill to the west end of Clinton Road is no minor amendment. Although not made clear in the report, the option supported by the large majority of consultees (98) was for either full or partial reopening of Whitehouse Loan and 39 of those voted for 'Option 3' proposed by our Whitehouse Loan Group. It is stating the obvious that had the majority vote counted, there would be no need for any of the Roads Section's controversial further measures.

'Revised Option 2' is a plan with obvious flaws. The residents at the west end of Clinton Road would be seriously inconvenienced, for example the residents in the 18 townhouses in Fairholm Mews whose sole vehicle entrance is 50 metres from Church Hill. They would have to drive 'around the block' to get to Church Hill, a distance of 700 metres. There is no indication of how vehicles would turn at the barrier. Manoeuvring vehicles would be disruptive for residents, and the narrow street makes this a serious road safety concern.

Other options should be considered. For example, turning movements could be reduced and accessibility improved by moving the barrier to a more central position in Clinton Road or the road closed at the east end which would be more consistent with the principle of reducing traffic on Whitehouse Loan. Residents are entitled to have these options explored

The generation of plan options is the job of the Roads Engineers but the responsibility for a decision on Agenda item 7.3 is down to our elected representatives acting through your Committee. We urge you to vote for a further evaluation of options and consultation with the local stakeholders.

Duncan Low for the Whitehouse Loan Group 5.3.2024

## TEC 07.03.24 Agenda Item 7.3

### *Travelling Safely Greenbank to Meadows Quiet Connection Public Engagement and Next Steps*

#### Response from Spokes South Edinburgh, March 2024

*This response considers the proposals for Greenbank to Meadows Quiet Route on options for re-designing the **Braid Estate** section only. We support the Officer recommendation for Clinton Rd. See Blackford Safe Routes deputation for further details.*

In a week where a young cyclist's life was lost in our city, we ask Councillors to carefully consider their vote on the proposals for this well-used Quiet Route that connects many schools in the area and beyond.

We are also very concerned that other safety projects will be cancelled to fund the Braid Estate Option 2 or 3, particularly given that the consultation did not advise residents of the relative costs of the different options.

We urge members of the Committee to vote for Braid Estate Option 1; an inexpensive option that allows the same benefits already enjoyed by those currently living in Braid Avenue to be provided to others across the Braids estate, particularly in the Midmar area where people are worried about vehicle volumes and behaviour (officers report to Committee, sections 4.26 and 4.27). This option will also increase cycle safety and provide a disincentive to rat-running traffic whilst still allowing locals vehicle access.

Voting for either Options 2 or 3 (estimated £200k - £400k) is very poor value for money which will come at the cost of delay or abandonment to other key active travel projects - which should have been specified in the report so that councillors can make an informed judgement. Examples of how that money could be better deployed are basic things like the replacement of the broken toucan crossing on Whitehouse Loan or simply resurfacing Canaan Lane / Woodburn Terrace. Getting the basics right! It will also take away valuable officer time from other active travel schemes.

Residents from outside the Braids area have signalled that they want to return to using the Braids Estate as a traffic light avoiding cut through, but are currently deterred by filters, so we believe Option 3 in particular will increase traffic through the Braids Estate. We would question why councillors would take that risk to their climate and road safety targets.



## Detailed comments:

Spokes have the following detailed comments on the proposals;

### **Walking Route between South Morningside & Canaan Lane Primary Schools:**

Option 1 retains the safe walking route between the two school Primary campuses.

### **Traffic Evaporation:**

Item 4.39 of the paper states that; *“the modal filters introduced in the Braid Estate may have successfully reduced the level of traffic travelling through the area. As such, it is possible that their removal may jeopardise this, resulting in an increase in overall traffic.”* The car counts were at 10,450 daily in 2019 down to 6,283 in 2023. This is a **39% reduction**, so Option 1 will more than contribute to the Council's 2030 30% target.

### **Speeding Traffic:**

A key issue repeatedly raised at Morningside Community Council is the speed of vehicles in the area. Braid Av has had the greatest reduction in average speeds whilst filters were in place. See Aug 2022 TEC papers where average speed was 28mph is now reduced to 17mph, a **37% reduction**. Why would Councillors vote to increase speeds on a quiet residential street with an active travel route designated on it? Vehicle speeds would create dangers for vulnerable cyclists versus impatient drivers at each end of Braid Avenue where the segregation ends/before it starts.

### **Heavy Segregation is inappropriate and over-costly for residential areas:**

We were delighted when all Councillors voted for the City Mobility plan which called for, amongst many things, a cycle network that is partly on main roads with suitable segregation and where that is not possible, quietened neighbourhoods. Options 2 or 3 would set a precedent for future *‘quietened neighbourhoods’* to have segregation that would make implementation of the CMP, both slower and much more expensive. Segregation would have to be wide enough to permit side by side cycling (parent and child) as children grow up and learn to cycle on their own bikes but need some help/support.

### **Removing all filters (option 3) should be rejected:**

The rationale for Option 3 appears to be to share the misery of increased traffic volumes across the whole estate, in contrast to Option 1 which would share the well-being. No filters and the resultant substantially increased levels of traffic across the estate makes it less safe, in particular for categories of cyclists such as the following;

- *Those with older or little legs who can't take the Braid Avenue hill in one long stretch*
- *Those living inside the Braid Estate and cycling*
- *Those whose destination is further East (e.g. Kings Buildings or Infirmary)*

In conclusion, despite current opinions from some residents about being inconvenienced, Edinburgh has many examples of decade old filters to streets where residents have got used to and support the filters that cause them some inconvenience but keep traffic volumes light just like the residents of Braid Av. Councillors should vote for Option 1.



### **Deputation from South West Edinburgh 20 Minute Neighbourhoods (SW20)**

#### Item 7.3: Travelling Safely Greenbank to Meadows Quiet Connection

Our deputation forms a single question – one that we would like all councillors to address in summing up their proposals, amendments and positions in debate today.

We anticipate many will advocate for a 'balanced decision' today. In reaching this balance based on the Council's (and worldwide) evidence, that on one side of the scales (Option 1 Braid Estate and Option 2 Clinton Road only) that:

- has 4000+ fewer vehicle movements a day (mostly non-residents), with reduced noise, pollution and emissions and, crucially, lower risk of road traffic injury
- delivers better pedestrian safety throughout
- displaces almost no traffic (less than 2% increase)
- retains access to every home by vehicle
- makes no change to change to existing parking
- reduced speeding (up to 10mph)
- makes cycling safe throughout most of the Braid estate, rather than only streets with segregated cycling
- contributes significantly, not detracts, from 30% car km targets
- supports a bike bus without additional investment
- makes junctions within the estate significantly safer for all users
- does not induce traffic
- links the two South Morningside Primary campuses much more effectively
- encourages health lifestyles
- contributes to climate goals
- benefits the least well off in society the most
- meets four out of five parties' manifestos
- is deliverable immediately
- is at least £200k-£400k cheaper and does not impact other active travel projects

**What is on the other side of the scales?**



This page is intentionally left blank